

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

D	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)		
K	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0390045 DATE	E: <u>6/18/2009</u>	ARRIVE: DEPART:		
FACILITY NAME: CDS-FDOT CASTING YARD				
FACILITY LOCATION:	106 CHARLES HAYES SI	R DR		
	GRETNA 32332			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED	REPRESENTATIVE: CLAY	TON SEMBLER PHONE: (850)875-4651		
CONTACT NAME:		PHONE:		
ENTITLEMENT PERIOR				
	(effective date) (end date)			
PART I: INSPECTION C	COMPLIANCE STATUS (check	ck 🗹 only one box)		
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLI	IANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
		<u>ENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.		
(check ☑ appropriate t		<u>ENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission	pox(es)) ons tests conducted during this sit	ite visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)?	ons tests conducted during this sit	ite visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter Yes N	10	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extended appropriate by the state of the extended appropriate by	ons tests conducted during this sit	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity?		
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extent of th	ons tests conducted during this sitsilos, weigh hoppers (batchers), a ent necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collecte sentative of the normal silo loadi	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity? Tyes \Boxed N tor exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted ing rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,	Ю	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extent of th	ons tests conducted during this sitsilos, weigh hoppers (batchers), a ent necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collecte sentative of the normal silo loadinachievable in practice?	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity? Tyes \Boxed N tor exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted ing rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,	Ю	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extensions of the extension of the extension of the emission of the emission of the emissions from the emissions from the emission of the e	ons tests conducted during this sitsilos, weigh hoppers (batchers), a ent necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collecte sentative of the normal silo loadi nachievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) opera yes", then continue on to question	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity?	10 10	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extension of the extension of the extension of the emission of the emission of the emissions from the emissions from the emissions from the emission of the	ons tests conducted during this sit- silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), a ent necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collecte sentative of the normal silo loadi nachievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) opera des", then continue on to question d continue on to question 5.) g operation in operation during the	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity?	10 10	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extension of the extension of the extension of the emission	ons tests conducted during this sit- silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), a ent necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collecte sentative of the normal silo loadi nachievable in practice? the weigh hopper (batcher) opera yes", then continue on to question d continue on to question 5.) g operation in operation during the e emissions test, was the batching	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity?	lo lo	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extension of the extension of the extension of the extension of the emission of the emission of the emission of the emission of the extension of the emission of the emi	ons tests conducted during this sitement necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collected sentative of the normal silo loadinachievable in practice?the weigh hopper (batcher) operation d continue on to question during the e emissions test, was the batching e weigh hopper (batcher) operation	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity?	lo lo	
(check ☑ appropriate by Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from a controlled to the extension of	ons tests conducted during this sitement necessary to limit visible emissions tests of the silo dust collected sentative of the normal silo loadinachievable in practice?the weigh hopper (batcher) operates", then continue on to question d continue on to question d continue on to question d continue on to question during the e emissions test, was the batching e weigh hopper (batcher) operation during the decident of the proper continue on the proper co	and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment issions to 5 percent opacity?	10 10 10	

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.)	e □Yes □ No
b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form	□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?	e □Yes □ No
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☐ appropriate box(es))	
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 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.)	
 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>) 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.)————————————————————————————————————	g □Yes ⊠ No □Yes □ No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIRE (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	EMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)
 paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas application of water or environmentally safe du emissions? removal of particulate matter from roads and of re-entrainment, and from building or work area reduction of stock pile height, or installation of particulate matter from stock piles?	and yards, which shall include one or more of the following: s, stock piles, and yards? ust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES A. New or Modified Process Equipment	<u>S</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.
b) alterations to existing process equipment withouc) replacement of existing equipment substantially	treplacement?
 d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did th notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4 	ne owner submit a new and complete
Tracy White	6/18/2009
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
I ray Evilue	6-12 months
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection
COMMENTS:	
6/18/2009, 10:45 A.M.	
batcher. No batch-point baghouse appeared to be present. The does not appear to need batch trucks. The facility did not appear to be in operation. Afterwards I met with Leanne Moorehead, QC manager. Ms. Mapproximately two weeks.	appliance testing rule and I also informed her of the 15 day notification
Rule 62-297.310(7)(a)9, Florida Administrative Code, states: The owner or operator shall notify the department, at least 15 d	
begin, of the date, time, and place of each such test, and the test such test conducted for the owner or operator.	days prior to the date on which each formal compliance test is to st contact person who will be responsible for coordinating and having