

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:
AIRS ID#: 0870043 DATE: <u>07-20-09</u> ARRIVE: <u>0905 hrs</u> DEPART:
FACILITY NAME: CEMEX-MARATHON READY-MIX
FACILITY LOCATION: 1500 107TH AVE
MARATHON 33050
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JEFFREY PORTER PHONE: (561)820-8415
CONTACT NAME: Henry Coffelt, manager PHONE: (305)797-1
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/26/2009 / 4/26/2014 (effective date) (end date)
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))
Stack Emissions 1. Ware visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 0 (Pof : Chapter
1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?
2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?
3. 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, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,
unless such rate is unachievable in practice?
to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answer is "No" then skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)
a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? \overline{\omega}Yes \overline{\omega}No
b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and
duration?
5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate

PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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 annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)			
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? b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?	n		
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 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 test was completed?	the - ⊠Yes □ No		
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))			
	le 🗌		
 (check appropriate box(es)) 1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary ; 2) a relocatable ; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable 	sing □Yes ⊠ No □Yes □ No		

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)					
(check appropriate box(es))					
<u>Unconfined</u> <u>Emissions</u> – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)					
	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 No					
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control					
emissions?					
	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?					
particulate matter from stock piles?		My es ☐ No			
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate	emissions at the drop point to the truck?	ĭ res ☐ No			
PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – R	Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.				
A. New or Modified Process Equipment					
1. Since the last inspection has there been					
a) installation of any new process equipment?		☐Yes ⊠ No			
b) alterations to existing process equipment without rep		□Yes ⊠ No			
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most					
recent notification form? Yes No					
d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete					
notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or					
local program office?					
Barbara Nevins	07-20-2009				
Datoara revins	07-20-2009				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_			
, ,					
Barbara Nevins					
7 = 7	07-20-2010				
		_			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection				

COMMENTS: Observed VE tests of the loading of both the cement and fly ash silos. The Consultant returned in the afternoon hours to observe and VE test a batching operation. No batching operations were scheduled during the morning hours. Zero emissions were observed for all three tests.