

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)				
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
AIRS ID#: 1110116 DATE: <u>11/15/06</u>	ARRIVE: <u>0925</u> DEPART: <u>1035</u>				
FACILITY NAME: ARMORDEC					
FACILITY LOCATION: LOT # 5 MIDWAY INDUSTRIAL PARK					
FORT PIERCE 3	34981				
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Mike Adams	PHONE: (772)468-68				
CONTACT NAME:	PHONE: (468)688-9				
REMITTANCE YEAR: EN	TITLEMENT PERIOD: 11/11/2004 / 11/11/2009 (offcotive data)				
	(effective date) (end date)				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATU	US (check ☑ only one box)				
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQU	<u>JIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.				
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))					
	ng this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No			
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?					
controlled to the extent necessary to limit vis	sible emissions to 5 percent opacity? Yes				
controlled to the extent necessary to limit visDuring visible emissions tests of the silo dus at a rate that is representative of the normal s	sible emissions to 5 percent opacity? Yes st collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted silo loading rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,	No			
 controlled to the extent necessary to limit vis 3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dus at a rate that is representative of the normal sunless such rate is unachievable in practice? 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batch to this question is "Yes", then continue on to 	sible emissions to 5 percent opacity?	No No			
controlled to the extent necessary to limit vis 3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dus at a rate that is representative of the normal s unless such rate is unachievable in practice?- 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batch to this question is "Yes", then continue on to skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question a) Was the batching operation in operation of b) During the visible emissions test, was the	sible emissions to 5 percent opacity?	No No No No			
controlled to the extent necessary to limit vis 3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dus at a rate that is representative of the normal s unless such rate is unachievable in practice?- 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batch to this question is "Yes", then continue on to skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question a) Was the batching operation in operation of b) During the visible emissions test, was the duration? 5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher from the silo dust collector, are the visible em	sible emissions to 5 percent opacity?	No No No No			

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))	
	e 🗌
 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>) 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))					
<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? \bigsymbol{\times} Yes \bigsymbol{\times} No					
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control					
emissions?					
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 es	missions at the drop point to the truck?	⊠Yes ∐ No			
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Ru	ıle 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.				
A. New or Modified Process Equipment	ne 02 2101e 00(1)(u) 11,1 1111e.				
110 110 or 110 o					
Since the last inspection has there been					
a) installation of any new process equipment?		□Yes ⊠ No			
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?					
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most					
recent notification form? \square Yes \square 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, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or					
local program office?		□Yes □ No			
iocui program office.					
Robert J Duke	11/15/06				
Robert J Duke	11/13/00				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection				
•	•				
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection				
COMMENTS:					