

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	UAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	ERY (CI)		
RE-IN	ISPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT N	O:		
AIRS ID#: 7775344 DATE: 05	<u>5/20/10</u>	ARRIVE: <u>08:00</u>	DEPART: <u>09:15</u>		
FACILITY NAME: FORT MYERS					
FACILITY LOCATION:	16401 Old US 41				
	FORT MYERS 33912				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REP	RESENTATIVE: JULI	O RAMOS PHON	NE: (239)226-9595		
CONTACT NAME:		PHO	NE:		
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8					
	ffective date) (end date)				
PART I: INSPECTION COM	PLIANCE STATUS (ch	eck 🗹 only one box)			
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMP	LIANCE SIGNIFICA	ANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: TESTING/RECORD		<u> 1ENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414,	F.A.C.		
(check ☑ appropriate box(e					
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions te	ests conducted during this	site visit according to EPA M	¶ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions to 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos	, weigh hoppers (batchers)), and other enclosed storage			
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions te 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent n 3. During visible emissions	, weigh hoppers (batchers) ecessary to limit visible entests of the silo dust colle), and other enclosed storage missions to 5 percent opacity ctor exhaust points was the l	and conveying equipment ? \Boxed{Yes} \Boxed{No} No oading of the silo conducted		
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions te 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent n 3. During visible emissions at a rate that is representa unless such rate is unach	weigh hoppers (batchers) ecessary to limit visible entests of the silo dust collective of the normal silo loadevable in practice?), and other enclosed storage missions to 5 percent opacity ctor exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the m			
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions to 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent n 3. During visible emissions at a rate that is representa unless such rate is unachi 4. Are emissions from the v to this question is "Yes",	weigh hoppers (batchers) ecessary to limit visible et tests of the silo dust collective of the normal silo load evable in practice?veigh hopper (batcher) opethen continue on to questi), and other enclosed storage missions to 5 percent opacity ctor exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the meration controlled by the silo ions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a	and conveying equipment ?		
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions to 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent n 3. During visible emissions at a rate that is representa unless such rate is unachial. 4. Are emissions from the voto this question is "Yes", skip 4.a) and 4.b) and cona) Was the batching open	weigh hoppers (batchers) ecessary to limit visible entests of the silo dust collective of the normal silo load evable in practice?), and other enclosed storage missions to 5 percent opacity ctor exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the meration controlled by the silo ions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a the visible emissions test?			
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions to 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent n 3. During visible emissions at a rate that is representa unless such rate is unach! 4. Are emissions from the v to this question is "Yes", skip 4.a) and 4.b) and cora) Was the batching open b) During the visible em duration?	weigh hoppers (batchers) ecessary to limit visible entests of the silo dust collective of the normal silo loadevable in practice?veigh hopper (batcher) operation to question to question to question to question in operation during issions test, was the batchers.), and other enclosed storage missions to 5 percent opacity ctor exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the meration controlled by the silo ions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a the visible emissions test?			
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions te 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent n 3. During visible emissions at a rate that is representa unless such rate is unachidated. Are emissions from the verto to this question is "Yes", skip 4.a) and 4.b) and cona) Was the batching open b) During the visible emissions from the we from the silo dust collective.	weigh hoppers (batchers) ecessary to limit visible entests of the silo dust collective of the normal silo load evable in practice?), and other enclosed storage missions to 5 percent opacity ctor exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the meration controlled by the silo ions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a the visible emissions test?ing rate representative of the mation are controlled by a dust ins tests of the weigh hopper of the missions tests.			

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.)	
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 the test was completed?	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
	; <u> </u>
 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 </i> □ <i>only one box.</i>) 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: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)				
(check appropriate box(es))				
		I		
<u>Unconfined</u> Emissions – (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:	64.64.			
a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yar				
	ck piles, and yards? Yes No	D		
		0		
 removal of particulate matter from roads and other particulate 		Ĩ		
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to re		О		
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind		Ī		
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? \bigsilon Yes \bigsilon No	О		
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Re				
A. New or Modified Process Equipment	ine 02-210.500(4)(u)+., r.A.C.	ĺ		
A. Mew of Mounta Freess Equipment				
Since the last inspection has there been				
a) installation of any new process equipment?		Jo		
b) alterations to existing process equipment without repla	acement? Yes N			
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially differ		`		
recent notification form?		No.		
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,				
local program office?		No.		
Program office.		`		
Wayne Lewis	05/20/10			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
hispector's rame (rease rime)	Date of hispection			
	05/20/11			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
COMMENTS:				