

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS RE-INSPECTION (FU		· · · —					
AIRS ID#: 0250416 DATE: <u>10/29/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>1:15 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>1:53 PM</u>					
FACILITY NAME: CENTRAL CONCRETE SUPERMIX, INC.							
FACILITY LOCATION: 9825 NW 117 V	WAY						
MEDLEY 33	178						
	Mobile:	E: (305)262-3250					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ✓ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE							
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEET 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): FRANK Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still ORLAN If no, who is?: FRANK PEREZ	NDO CASTANEDA?	Yes 🗵No					
If different, did the facility provide an administration of the facility contact still ORLANDO CASTA If no, who is?: FRANK PEREZ							
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during t If yes, was the compliance authority notified a							

Emissions Unit Section 1 –86.5 T/HR CONCRETE READY-MIX PLANT W/ A STEPHENS SV-170 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one			
1. Date of last inspection: $\underline{12/16/2009}$	JON 101 Cuch	440011011/			
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	N ***				
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		∐ No			
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	X 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		☐ 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? i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? 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)?	- X Yes	☐ No			
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(ahaala 🗸	anly and			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one			
	box for each	i 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. 	X Yes	∐ No			
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	X Yes	☐ No			
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate					
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\begin{align*} \text{Yes} & \Box \text{No} & \Box \text{N/A} - \text{silo not log} \)		_			
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					
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	X Yes	☐ No			
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching duration?		☐ No			
3) What was the batching rate? $\underline{25}$ tons/hour. What was the batching duration? $\underline{6}$ minutes		_			
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate					
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co					
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min		☐ No			
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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	☐ No			
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	_	_			

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check v box for each	only one 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 ⊠ 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.)?		⊠ 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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	□ 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 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	e/yr	0?		
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		
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ☑ only one box for each question)					
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	⊠ 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?	Yes	☐ No		
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general	. N Ves	□ No		

RELOCATABLE PLANT: (check ☑ only one box for each question) 1. Is the facility: stationary ☒; relocatable ☐; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable ☐ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)						
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	Yes	☐ No			
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notified 	y prior to changing location?	Yes	☐ No			
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busic. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi	ness days following a relocation? cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes	□ No			
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least fi			☐ No			
 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions un a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine property of the second state of the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?	it in that separate permit: urpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)	? Yes	□ No			
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?			☐ No			
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	1	(check 🗹 box for each o				
Administrative Changes: 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 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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement	t?	☐ Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No			
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subtle. A change in ownership?		Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No			
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?		nitted Yes	☐ No			
FRANK DELGADO	10/29/2010					
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection					
	10/2011					
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Insp	ection				
COMMENTS. ADLINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL CEDVICES O	ONDITIONED MAIN E ENAGGIONA	ODGEDIAE	IOMONI			

COMMENTS: ARLINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONDUCTED VISIBLE EMISSIONS OBSERVATION ON THE CEMENT SILO, THE SLAG SILO WILL BE TESTED AT A LATER DATE DUE TO A LEAKING BAG. THE SILO WAS LOADED AT 10 PSI. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE TEST. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY FUGITIVE PARTICULATES AROUND THE FACILITY.