TOWER NOTCION
FLORIDA

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUA RE-INSP	L (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT ARMS COMI	T/DISCOVERY (CI)	]
AIRS ID#: 0870043 DATE: 06-2.	<u>3-2011</u>	ARRIVE:	DEPAL	RT:
FACILITY NAME: CEMEX-MA	RATHON READY-MI	X		
FACILITY LOCATION: 15	500 107TH AVE			
M	ARATHON 33050			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRE Email: CONTACT NAME: JAMES PEI Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/26 (effec	RRY	REY PORTER	PHONE: (561)820 Mobile: (561)718 PHONE: (305)743 Mobile:	-7564
	Fa	cility Section		
PART I: INSPECTION COMPL	IANCE STATUS (che	ck 🗹 only one t	box)	
IN COMPLIANCE	] MINOR Non-COMPL	LIANCE S	SIGNIFICANT Non-CON	<b>MPLIANCE</b>
L				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCT	ORY MEETING			(check 🗹 only one
1. Name(s) of facility representative	e(s): Bill and Kaye Arl	ington, consultant	<u>ts</u>	box for each question)
Brief Notes:				
2. Is the Authorized Representative	still JEFFREY PORTE	ER?		- 🛛 Yes 🗌No

2.	Is the Authorized Representative still JEFFREY PORTER?	Yes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.		⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No

## **Emissions Unit Section**

	2-CCB Flant-sho (cement) w/cartridge dust conector subject to 576 Opacity F	mm	
PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	-
1.	Date of last inspection: 07-08-2010		question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	🛛 Yes	No No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	🛛 Yes	No No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
	operation? N/A	Yes	No No
	d. Date of last VE test: 07-08-2010		
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	🖂 Yes	No No
	f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	🕅 Yes	No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? $26.86$ tons/hour		
	h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
	whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	Yes	🛛 No
	i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		$\overline{\times}$ No
	j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour		
	k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	Xes Yes	No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
P/	ART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	omly on a
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment		only one
		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 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 No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
	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? $\bigotimes$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not load		spection.
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	· 🛛 Yes	No No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 29.33 tons/hour 25.91 tons off-loaded in 53 minutes at 11 psi		
	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	<i>h</i> .	
	1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	🛛 No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate	te and	
	duration?		No No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu	ites	
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	1 is separate	
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector	ector	
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		No No
	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut		
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		No No
			□ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	⊠Yes	
	<ul><li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li><li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li></ul>	∐ i es	
	b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.		

## **Emissions Unit Section**

3 – CCB Plant-silo	(flyash	) w/cartridge	dust collector sub	ject to 5% O	pacity Limit
--------------------	---------	---------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       07-21-2010	(	(check 🗹 of for each c	only one box (uestion)
<ol> <li>Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing</li> </ol>		⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
operation?	N/A	Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>d. Date of last VE test: <u>07-21-2010</u></li> <li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days at f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>		⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the reweight whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?</li></ul>	N/A	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during t If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	he last VE test?	Yes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(	check 🗹 of for each c	only one box Juestion)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this si	ite visit?	Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		Yes Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-mi</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>		Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loa		nducted at a	rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🔲 I e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practic f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>29.33</u> tons/hour		Yes	🗌 No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo due <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> $g.1) - g.3$ <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.</i>		$\square$ Yes $h$ .	🛛 No
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the r</li> </ol>	?	Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching dura</li> </ul>		- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a d from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper			
<ul> <li>conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching</li> <li>2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching durati</li> </ul>	rate and duration?	? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this	site visit?	Yes Yes	
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> </ul>	average.		∐ No □ No
d. What was the process rate? $29.33$ tons/hour.			

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(1 1 17	1
	(check 🗹	•
	box for each	question)
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	🛛 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>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.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gen permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>		X No X No X No X No X No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal pro275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propagation		)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consu for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🛛 No

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	🖂 No
<ul><li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li><li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li></ul>	- Xes	No
terms and conditions of the air general permit?		🗌 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

<b>RELOCATABLE PLANT:</b> 1. Is the facility: stationary is relocatable ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable .	(check 🗹 box for each	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	ng question 2.)	
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone,</li> <li>e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.9000]</li> </ul>		🗌 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 per and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: <ul> <li>a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usag If YES, what was the purpose?</li> </ul>		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	□ No □ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ box for each	•
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ol>	nits or 🗌 Yes	⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?</li> <li>d. A change in ownership?</li> </ul>	🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	<ul><li>➢ No</li><li>➢ No</li><li>➢ No</li><li>➢ No</li></ul>
4. If the answer to any question $3a - d$ is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee su	mittad	

Barbara Nevins

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Barbara Nevinos

June 23, 2011

Date of Inspection

June 23, 2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** The consultant's VE test results have not yet been submitted, therefore this report was completed using only my own VE results.