

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 0250377 DATE: <u>10/29/2010</u>	ARRIVE: 10:24 AM DE	PART: <u>12:45 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: CENTRAL CONCRETE SUF	PERMIX, INC.	
FACILITY LOCATION: 4300 SW 74 AVE		
MIAMI 33155		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: ORLANDO CASTENEDA Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/2/2007 / 8/1/20 (effective date) (end decrease)	Mobile: PHONE: (305) Mobile:	E: (305)264-7101 264-7101
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATU	Facility Section US (check ☑ only one box) COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-O	COMPLIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): FRANK G Brief Notes:	_	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
Is the Authorized Representative still ORLANDO If no, who is?: FRANK PEREZ	O CASTENEDA?	Yes 🖾No
If different, did the facility provide an administra 3. Is the facility contact still ORLANDO CASTENI If no, who is?: FRANK GARCIA		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at le		

Emissions Unit Section 1 –96.4 T/HR 48.2 CY/HR BATCH PLANT W/ROSS V1400 CENTRAL BAGHOU subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 5/5/2010 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	YesYesYesYesYesYes	NoNoNoNoNoNo
	whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	box for each question) VE) tests: and within each of the past 4 calendar years?	
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment		•
1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	□ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	pection.
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?		⊠ No
	1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector. 	n is separate	
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 2) What was the batching rate? 25 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.	? Xes	☐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes Yes	⊠ No □ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –196.4 TPH Ready Mix Concrete Plant/3 dust collectors subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check	only one
1.	Date of last inspection: $5/5/2010$	box for each	question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	∐ No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	∐ No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 12/16/2009	☐ Yes	☐ No
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 25 tons/hour	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? 25 tons/hour	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Yes Yes	☐ No
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	☐ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes Yes	□ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load		
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	· 🔀 Yes	∐ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra	ite and	
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		☐ No
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll		
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? 25 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.	? 🛚 Yes	☐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		⊠ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes Yes	⊠ No
	b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	☐ No
	d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check box for e		
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 ⊠ No ⊠ No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		[2	⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?			⊠ No
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?	-		No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	e/yr	1.00?	
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		[☐ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check box for e		
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?			⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: 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	- X Yes	[□ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- X Yes	[□ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general	X Yes	Г	□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check ☑ box for each	•
e facility: stationary \(\sum_{\circ};\) relocatable \(\sum_{\circ};\) or consisting of trete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plant			• '
e relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	and		□ No
S, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c belo		🗀 190	
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Departmen			
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business	s day prior to changing location?		☐ No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation N			
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five b			∐ No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation No			\sqcap_{N_0}
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at leas	t five business days prior to relocation	.? ∐ res	∐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a sepa	rate air construction or air operation p	ermit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions		011111 ,	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routing		ge)? Yes	☐ No
If YES, what was the purpose?		<i>617</i> 1 <u>—</u>	_
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how lo		_	
co-located at the permitted facility?			☐ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duratio	n?	Yes	☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>		(check ☑	only one
		box for each	
Administrative Changes:			y
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number			
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc			NTO
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor			⊠ No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	days of the change ?	Yes	∐ No
New 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?		\(\text{Yes}	⊠ No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen			⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is			⊠ No
d. A change in ownership?			⊠ No
			
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new regis		_	_
		_	_
30 days prior to the change?	·		☐ No
		Yes	∐ No
30 days prior to the change?		<u>Yes</u>	∐ No
	10/29/2010	Yes	∐ No
30 days prior to the change?		Yes	∐ No
30 days prior to the change? FRANK DELGADO	10/29/2010	Yes	∐ No
30 days prior to the change? FRANK DELGADO	Date of Inspection		∐ No
30 days prior to the change? FRANK DELGADO Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection 10/2011 Approximate Date of Next In	Inspection	

ALL THE SILOS WERE LOADED AT 10 PSI. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE FOUR VISIBLE EMISSIONS TESTS.

I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY FUGITIVE PARTICULATES AROUND THE FACILITY.