

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

NNUAL (INS1, INS2) E-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE ARMS COMPLAINT NO	· · · —
1/11/08	ARRIVE: 1:10 pm	DEPART: 2:05 pm
BRIARGLEN RD		
4054 Briarglen Rd		
MILTON 32583-2819	)	
EPRESENTATIVE: DO	UGLAS RUSSELL PHON	E: (850)626-7777
Russell	PHON	E: 8506267777
11/19/2005 / 11/19/20 (effective date) (end date)	010	
	_	NT Non-COMPLIANCE
RDKEEPING REQUIRED	<u>MENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F	Z.A.C.
ilos, weigh hoppers (batchers to necessary to limit visible erons tests of the silo dust collemative of the normal silo loachievable in practice?	rs), and other enclosed storage a emissions to 5 percent opacity? lector exhaust points was the lo bading rate, or at least at the misperation controlled by the silo ostions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If an g the visible emissions test?	Yes No and conveying equipment Yes No adding of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour rate, Yes No adding of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour rate, Yes No No dust collector? (If answer is "No" then Yes No No normal batching rate and
	E-INSPECTION (FUI)  1. 1/11/08  BRIARGLEN RD  4054 Briarglen Rd  MILTON 32583-2819  EPRESENTATIVE: DO  Russell  11/19/2005 / 11/19/20  (effective date) (end date)  DMPLIANCE STATUS (compared of the continuous continuous continuous continuous continuous continuous no to question 5.)- Deperation in operation during emissions test, was the bate	ARRIVE: 1:10 pm  BRIARGLEN RD  4054 Briarglen Rd  MILTON 32583-2819  EPPRESENTATIVE: DOUGLAS RUSSELL PHON  Russell PHON  11/19/2005 / 11/19/2010 (effective date) (end date)  DMPLIANCE STATUS (check only one box)  MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICA  BROKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, Fox(es))  Is tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Martin (electronic processor)  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?  In the necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C (continued)
(check <b>☑</b> 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.)   ☑ Yes ☐ No
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?
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?  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 the test was completed? □Yes ☒ No
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check   management   manage
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.)
(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? ( <i>Please check ☒ only 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.)————————————————————————————————————
(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? ( <i>Please check ☒ only 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.)————————————————————————————————————

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)			
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))			
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)  1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant to emissions by:  a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and  1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and  2) application of water or environmentally safe dust emissions?————————————————————————————————————	yards, which shall include one or more of the folstock piles, and yards?suppressant chemicals when necessary to controer paved areas under control of the owner/operato to reduce airborne particulate matter?	⊠Yes □ No l ⊠Yes □ No	
<ol> <li>reduction of stock pile height, or installation of w particulate matter from stock piles?</li> </ol>	and breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of	⊠v □ N.	
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitiga			
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES  A. New or Modified Process Equipment  1. Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment? b) alterations to existing process equipment without in c) replacement of existing equipment substantially discrete notification form?	replacement? fferent than that noted on the most  owner submit a new and complete 50, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or	☐Yes ☐ No ☐Yes ☐ No	
Greg Landry & Chris Stoll	1/11/08		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_	
	1/11/09		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	_	

**COMMENTS:** On January 11, 2008, an unannounced compliance inspection was conducted at the new WPR concrete batch plant. The facility was operating at the time of the inspection. There were no dust or visible emisions observed during the inspection. The Department, on January 10, 2008, was notified that the visual emissions test will be preformed on February 26, 2008. This test date was changed from July to February in order to have visible emission testing preformed for both batch plants on the same day. At the time of the inspection, the facility appeared to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit.

Formatted: Border: Bottom: (Shadowed Double solid lines, Auto, 0.75 pt Line width, From text: 9 pt Border spacing: )