CHARGED PROTECTION	
John Martin	
FLORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT, RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMP	/DISCOVERY (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 0250958 DATE: <u>10/28/2010</u> ARRIVE: <u>12:40</u>	<u>6 PM</u> DEPART: <u>1:30 PM</u>		
FACILITY NAME: CORESLAB STRUCTURES, INC.			
FACILITY LOCATION: 10501 NW 121 Way			
MIAMI 33178-1028			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: TED WOLFSTHAL Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/7/2008 / 4/7/2013 (effective date) (end date)	PHONE: (305)823-8950 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:		
Facility Section			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one be	x)		
	ox) IGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
	IGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE S	IGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE S PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	IGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE S PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): ALBERTO GONZALEZ	IGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE (check I only one box for each question)		

	If no, who is?:		_
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	Xes	No
	If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?	🛛 Yes	No

3. Is the facility contact still? ------

...No

Yes

Emissions Unit Section <u>1 – Concrete batch plant subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 6/24/2010	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 7/15/2010 N/A 	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? <u>25</u> 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	YesYes	D 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)?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
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.	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the inglicit six influte 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 conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.		
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25</u> tons/hour 		No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go to	\bowtie Yes	🗌 No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 a) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu 	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
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? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute	? 🗌 Yes	🗌 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?	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? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	Yes	🗌 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:	Ves 🛛 No
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?	
e roo tons per year of more of any other regulated an pondiant.	
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exce	eption of
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or	
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 other air	general
permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?	
If YES, what other general permit units or 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?	
b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? 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)?	
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal	<u>propane/yr < 1.00?</u>
275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal p	ropane/yr
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel co	
for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	Yes 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
 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 	_	No 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

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [X]; relocatable []; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable [] concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the follows)	(check ☑ box for each ing question 2.	question)
 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 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 (6)]	□ 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:	ermit,	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate perint: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage 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?		
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Ves	L No
CHANGES	(check 🗹	only one

Ad	Iministrative Changes:	DOX TOT Each	question)
1.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representation	tive not	
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un	its 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 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?		🛛 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 No
4.	If the answer to any question $3a d$. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub	mitted	
	30 days prior to the change?		🗌 No

FRANK DELGADO

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

10/2011

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

10/28/2010

COMMENTS: ALBERTO GONZALEZ, THE FACILITY'S PLANT MANAGER ATTENDED ME. CONCRETE BATCH PLANT #1 WAS TESTED BY ARLINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES. THE VE TEST ON THE SINGLE SILO STARTED AT 1:02 PM. THE SILO WAS LOADED WITH CEMENT AT A RATE OF 12 PSI. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE THIRTY (30) MINUTES TEST. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY FUGITIVE PARTICULATES AROUND THE FACILITY.