

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

_	NNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)		
R	E-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
<b>AIRS ID#:</b> 7775320 <b>DATE</b>	:: <u>01/03/07</u>	ARRIVE: <u>09:30</u>	DEPART: <u>10:15</u>		
FACILITY NAME: ROCK	KFILL ROAD PLANT				
FACILITY LOCATION:	2690 Rockfill Road				
	Fort Myers, Fl 33916-				
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIA	L: THOMAS LOMBARDY	PHONE:	(239)590-5986		
CONTACT NAME:		PHONE:			
REMITTANCE YEAR: 20	007 ENTITLE	EMENT PERIOD: 4/24/2006 (effective date)	/ 4/24/2011 (end date)		
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> C	OMPLIANCE STATUS (che	eck 🗹 only one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMP	LIANCE SIGNIFICAN	Γ Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))					
PART II: TESTING/RECO (check ☑ appropriate b	pox(es))	<u>1ENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A	.C.		
(check ☑ appropriate b	oox(es))				
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission	oox(es)) ns tests conducted during this	site visit according to EPA Metl			
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from state of the state of th	ns tests conducted during this	site visit according to EPA Meth	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter \Box\Yes \Box\No I conveying equipment		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from some controlled to the extent of the extent of the extent of the emission of the emission of the extent of the exten	ns tests conducted during this silos, weigh hoppers (batchers) ent necessary to limit visible en	site visit according to EPA Meth), and other enclosed storage and missions to 5 percent opacity?ctor exhaust points was the load	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from some controlled to the extension of the extension	ns tests conducted during this estimates the sent necessary to limit visible entions tests of the silo dust collesentative of the normal silo loanachievable in practice?	site visit according to EPA Methanner.  ), and other enclosed storage and missions to 5 percent opacity?ctor exhaust points was the load ading rate, or at least at the mining.	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)?  2. Are emissions from some controlled to the extension at a rate that is represented unless such rate is unless such rate is unless from the state of the emissions from the state of the extension of the emissions from the state of the emissions from the emission from the emissio	ns tests conducted during this silos, weigh hoppers (batchers) ent necessary to limit visible en ions tests of the silo dust colle sentative of the normal silo loa nachievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) ope	site visit according to EPA Methalon	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from some controlled to the extension at a rate that is representation in the sum of the sum	ns tests conducted during this silos, weigh hoppers (batchers) ent necessary to limit visible entions tests of the silo dust colle sentative of the normal silo loa achievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) ope fes", then continue on to questid d continue on to question 5.)	site visit according to EPA Methalon	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from so controlled to the extensional emission at a rate that is represented unless such rate is unle	ns tests conducted during this silos, weigh hoppers (batchers) ent necessary to limit visible en ions tests of the silo dust colle sentative of the normal silo loa nachievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) ope es", then continue on to questi d continue on to question 5.) operation in operation during e emissions test, was the batch	site visit according to EPA Methalon.  ), and other enclosed storage and missions to 5 percent opacity?ctor exhaust points was the load ading rate, or at least at the minimeration controlled by the silo dustions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answers the visible emissions test?ing rate representative of the normalic process.	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate be Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from secontrolled to the extensions of the extension of the extension of the extension of the emission of the emissio	ns tests conducted during this silos, weigh hoppers (batchers) ent necessary to limit visible er ions tests of the silo dust colle sentative of the normal silo loa achievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) oper des", then continue on to question d continue on to question 5.) operation in operation during e emissions test, was the batch	site visit according to EPA Methalon.  ), and other enclosed storage and missions to 5 percent opacity? ctor exhaust points was the load ading rate, or at least at the miningeration controlled by the silo dustions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answers the visible emissions test? ing rate representative of the normation are controlled by a dust column.	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from so controlled to the extensions of the extension of the extension of the extension of the emission of the emissi	ns tests conducted during this  silos, weigh hoppers (batchers) ent necessary to limit visible entions tests of the silo dust colle sentative of the normal silo load anachievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) operation on to question 5.) operation in operation during the emissions test, was the batcher weigh hopper (batcher) operation in the company of the continue on to question 5.) the weigh hopper (batcher) operation in operation during the emissions test, was the batcher weigh hopper (batcher) operation, are the visible emissions	site visit according to EPA Methalon.  ), and other enclosed storage and missions to 5 percent opacity? ctor exhaust points was the load ading rate, or at least at the miningeration controlled by the silo dustions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answers the visible emissions test? ing rate representative of the normation are controlled by a dust column at tests of the weigh hopper (bat	nod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		

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 tannual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)					
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?					
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?	to □Yes □ No				
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 test was completed?					
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? (Please check ☐ only one box.)	e 🗌				
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>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>)</li> <li>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.)</li></ol>	ing  ☐Yes ☐ No ☐Yes ☐ No				

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)					
(check ☑ 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 tak	ce reasonable precautions to control unconfined	Į į			
emissions by:					
a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and y					
<ol> <li>paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, sto</li> </ol>					
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-s					
emissions?					
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other					
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to		⊠Yes □ No			
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of win					
particulate matter from stock piles?					
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate	e emissions at the drop point to the truck?	□Yes ⊠ No			
PARTY GREGIAL COMPUTIONS AND PROCEDURES	P 1 62 240 200(A)(A)A E 1 C				
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - 1	Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.				
A. New or Modified Process Equipment					
1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					
1. Since the last inspection has there been					
a) installation of any new process equipment?		☐Yes ☐ No			
b) alterations to existing process equipment without rep		□Yes □ No			
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially differences	c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most				
recent notification form?					
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?					
local program office?		·  Yes  No			
Wayne Lewis	01/03/07				
		<del></del>			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection				
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection				
COMMENTS:					