, all	REFEAL PROTECTION	Sec.
A SHELL	V	Same.
FLC	RIDA	
		-

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/I	DISCOVERY (CI AINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0112051 DAT	TE: <u>6/21/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>230</u>	D	EPART: <u>330</u>	
FACILITY NAME: CEN	MEX-PEMBROKE PINES	READY-MIX			
FACILITY LOCATION	: 17301 PINES BLVI)			
	PEMBROKE PINES	S 33029-1508			
OWNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: Jeffreyr.porter CONTACT NAME: LU Email: lucy.cardenas ENTITLEMENT PERIO	JCY CARDENAS* @cemex.com		Mobile: (561 PHONE: (954	1)820-8415 1)718-7564 4)431-7655 5)295-3739	
Facility Section					
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u>	COMPLIANCE STATUS		x) GNIFICANT Non	-COMPLIANCE	
1. Name(s) of facility repr	RODUCTORY MEETING resentative(s):	ž		(check 🗹 only on box for each question	
Brief Notes: 2. Is the Authorized Repro If no, who is?:	esentative still JEFFREY PO	ORTER*?		XesNo	D
	lity provide an administrati ill LUCY CARDENAS*? -				
	ting VE test(s) during today nce authority notified at lea				

1-CCB Plant-split silo compart. #1, w/cartridge dust collector subject to Reasonable	Precautions	
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
1. Date of last inspection: 2/16/2012		
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	🛛 Yes	No No
If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? \Box N/A	Yes	No No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		

PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.

<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u> <u>Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>

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 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 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? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	—	□ No
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	Yes	🗌 No
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No

	2 -CCB Plant-silo (flyash/slag) w/baghouse dust collector su	ubject to Reasonable Precautions
--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	
1. Date of last inspection: 6/29/2012 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? □ Yes If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? □ Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? □ N/A □ Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	□ No □ No □ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	
 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:	
 paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? X Yes application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 	🗌 No
control emissions? Xes	🗌 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? Xes	🗌 No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes 	🗌 No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	🗌 No

3 – CCB Plant-truck loadout w/central cartridge dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions	
PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	
1. Date of last inspection:	

PA	PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.				
<u>Co</u>	<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>				
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: paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? 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? Yes reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles? b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Yes 	 No No No No No No 			
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ No ☐ No			

8-CCB Plant-split silo compart. #2, w/cartridge dust collector subject to Reasonable	Precautions

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	
1. Date of last inspection:	
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? Yes	No No
If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	☐ No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? \square N/A \square Yes	\square No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	
c. what caused the problem(s) (if known):	
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	
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, which shall include one of more of the following.	□ 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? Yes	🗌 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 of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 🗌 Yes	□ No
b. Ose of spray bar, chute, of partial enclosure to intrigate enclosure at the drop point to the drock.	
2. If reasonable precautions not being taken:	
a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes	□ No
	\square No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? [Yes	

c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?

9 - CCB Plant-weigh hopper/batcher, w/baghouse batcher vent subject to Reasonable Precau	<u>tions</u>
PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	
1. Date of last inspection:	_
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	Yes 🗌 No
If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	Yes 🗌 No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions $< 20\%$ opacity? \square N/A \square Y	Yes 🗌 No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	

PA	PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.				
	<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u> <u>Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>				
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? Yes 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 	No			
	 control emissions? Yes 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? Yes 	∐ No			
	 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles? Yes 				
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No			
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ No ☐ No			

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only one
	box for each question)
	box for each question)
1. Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:	
a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?	
b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?	
c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	Yes No
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with	the exception of
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.3	
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	Yes No
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such	
permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facili If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	ity? Yes No
If TES, what other general permit units of activities?	
3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:	
a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	Yes No
b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?	Yes No
c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?	
d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?	
e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below	$V)? \dots$ Yes \Box No
<u>gal diesel/yr</u> + <u>gal gasoline/yr</u> + <u>MM SCF nat. gas/yr</u> + <u>275,000 gal diesel/yr</u> 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 M	
275,000 gai $(1050)/yi$ 25,000 gai gasolilie/yi 44 ivitvi SCI ildt. gdS/yi 1.5 iv	nn gai propane/ yi
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthl	ly fuel consumption
for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	•
1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	🗌 Yes	
 a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		
b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [\sqrts]; relocatable []; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable [] concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the follow)	(check 🗹 box for each <i>ing question 2.</i>	question)
 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 Yes	🛛 No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900] 		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? - c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900	Yes	🗌 No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation		🗌 No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation p	ermit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usa If YES, what was the purpose?	ge)? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	🗍 Ves	□ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	
CHANGES	(check 🗹	
Administrative Changes:	box for each	question)

1.	. were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not		
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or		
	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? [] Yes	🛛 No	
2.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? Yes	🛛 No	
Ne	ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:		
3.	Since the last registration form submittal has there been		
	a. Installation of any new process equipment? Yes	🗌 No	
	b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? Yes	🗌 No	
	c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? [] Yes	🗌 No	
	d. A change in ownership? Yes	🗌 No	
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted		
	30 days prior to the change? Yes	No No	

Cynthia Fernandez

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

6/21/2012

Date of Inspection

June 2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: In complian ce. No issues observed. Everything