

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) | COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| AIRS ID#: 7775411 DATE: <u>07/26/2007</u> FACILITY NAME: APAC RAPID MIX SOIL CEMEN FACILITY LOCATION: RELOCATABLE for this insp. @ Lakewood Ranch site 1451 Myrtle Street SARASOTA 34234- | | | | | | |
| RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Linda Sheppard | PHONE: (941)483-3329 | | | | | |
| CONTACT NAME: Linda Sheppard | PHONE: (941)483-3329 | | | | | |
| REMITTANCE YEAR: 2007 ENTITL | LEMENT PERIOD: / (effective date) (end date) | | | | | |
| PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check | | | | | | |
| 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batcher controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible of 3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust coll at a rate that is representative of the normal silo lo unless such rate is unachievable in practice? 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) of to this question is "Yes", then continue on to quess skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)-a) Was the batching operation in operation during b) During the visible emissions test, was the batchuration? 5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) ope from the silo dust collector, are the visible emission | is site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter | | | | | |

| PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued) |
|---|
| (check 🗹 appropriate box(es) |
| <u>Compliance Demonstration</u> - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.) 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.) ∑Yes ∑Yes |
| 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? Xest Complexity Complexity |
| 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? □Yes □ No |

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.

| (check \square 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 Zonly 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.) | Yes 🗌 No | | | |
| a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility? | Yes 🗌 No | | | |
| b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel oil usage of all plants less than 240,000 gallons per | | | | |
| | Yes No | | | |
| | ∐Yes ∐ No | | | |
| d) Is the fuel oil sulfur content 0.5% by weight or less? | Yes No | | | |
| 3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant maintain a log book or books to account for: | | | | |
| | ∃Yes □ No | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| c) the sulfur content of the fuel being burned (Fuel supplier certifications)? | ∐Yes ∐ No | | | |

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)

(check ☑ appropriate box(es))

Unconfined 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:
 - 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? XYes No |
|----|--|---|
| | 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control | |
| | | emissions? 🖾 Yes 🗌 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 reduce airborne particulate matter? Xes No |
| | 4) | reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of |
| | | particulate matter from stock piles? 🖾 Yes 🗌 No |
| b) | use | e of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? [Yes] No |

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C. A. New or Modified Process Equipment 1 Since the last inspection has there been

| Since the last inspection has there been | | |
|--|---------|------|
| a) installation of any new process equipment? | | |
| b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? | Yes | 🛛 No |
| c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most | | |
| recent notification form? | - 🛛 Yes | 🗌 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 |
| | | |

Debbie Telemeco-Anders, ESII

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

07/26/2007

Date of Inspection

~ 2008

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: INS 3. Debbie Telemeco-Anders observed the visible emissions compliance test. No fugitive PM was observed at the time of this inspection.