

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)			
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 0150087 DATE: <u>06/13/07</u>	ARRIVE: <u>14:30</u> DEPART: <u>15:45</u>			
FACILITY NAME: FORTRESS BLOCK				
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 26475 Eagle Boulevard				
PUNTA GORDA, FL 339	955			
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: DAVID CASMAN	<b>PHONE:</b> (239)437-9488			
CONTACT NAME:	PHONE:			
REMITTANCE YEAR: 2007 ENTITLEM	MENT PERIOD: 10/3/2005 / 10/3/2010			
	(effective date) (end date)			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check	x ☑ only one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLI	_			
The state of the s	2777			
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREME (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	<u>NTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.			
Stack Emissions				
Were visible emissions tests conducted during this sit 62-297, F.A.C.)?	re visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter			
2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment				
controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?   Yes  No  During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted				
· ·	ssions to 5 percent opacity?   Yes   No or exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi	ssions to 5 percent opacity?   Yes  No or exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted ng rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi unless such rate is unachievable in practice?  4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operations.	ssions to 5 percent opacity?			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi unless such rate is unachievable in practice?  4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) opera to this question is "Yes", then continue on to question skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)	ssions to 5 percent opacity?			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi unless such rate is unachievable in practice?	ssions to 5 percent opacity?			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi unless such rate is unachievable in practice?  4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) opera to this question is "Yes", then continue on to question skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)  a) Was the batching operation in operation during the b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching duration?	ssions to 5 percent opacity?			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi unless such rate is unachievable in practice?  4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operato this question is "Yes", then continue on to question skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)a) Was the batching operation in operation during the b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching duration?	ssions to 5 percent opacity?			
at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loadi unless such rate is unachievable in practice?  4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operato this question is "Yes", then continue on to question skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)a) Was the batching operation in operation during the b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching duration?	ssions to 5 percent opacity?			

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued) (check ☑ appropriate box(es)	
Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)  1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)	he ⊠Yes □ No
New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)  2. Did this facility demonstrate:  a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?————  b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?————————————————————————————————————	☐Yes ☐ No
Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)  3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?	
Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.)  4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after t test was completed?	
•	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.	e 🗌
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☐ appropriate box(es))  1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary ☒; 2) a relocatable ☐; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>Please check ☐ only one box.</i> )  2. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? ( <i>If your answer to this question is YES</i> , then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)————————————————————————————————————	

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)				
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))				
	<u>Unconfined</u> <u>Emissions</u> – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)			
1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take	reasonable precautions to control unconfined			
emissions by:				
a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the following:				
1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?   Yes  No				
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control				
emissions? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No				
	3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to			
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to re		□Yes □ No		
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind				
particulate matter from stock piles?				
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate en	missions at the drop point to the truck?	☐Yes ☐ No		
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Ru	ulo 62-210 300(4)(d)4 F A C			
A. New or Modified Process Equipment	ne 02-210.500(4)(u)4., F.A.C.			
A. New of Mounica Process Equipment				
Since the last inspection has there been				
a) installation of any new process equipment?		□Yes ⊠ No		
b) alterations to existing process equipment without repla	ocamant9	☐Yes ☐ No		
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different				
recent notification form?		□Yes ⊠ No		
		LIES MINO		
d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete				
notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or local program office?   Yes  No				
iocai program office ?		∐Yes ∐ No		
W/ I	06/12/07			
Wayne Lewis	06/13/07			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_		
hispector's realite (1 lease 1 tille)	Date of Inspection			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	_		
moposito: 5 2 ginnaro	1 pp10 2 and 01 1			
COMMENTS:				
0011111211121				