

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		MPLAINT/I		(CI)		
ΑI	(RS ID#: 0251042 DA	ΓΕ: <u>8/17/2012</u>	ARR	IVE: <u>10:18</u>	<u>AM</u>	DEPART: 10:	<u>41 AM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: TREMRON MIAMI, INC.								
FA	ACILITY LOCATION	11321 NW 138th S	treet					
		MIAMI 33178						
CC	WNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: ONTACT NAME: Email: NTITLEMENT PERIC	D REPRESENTATIVE: DD: 11/2/2007 / 11/2/ (effective date) (end da	/2012	REZ	PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(305)825-9000		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE								
1.		resentative(s): <u>EDWIN PE</u>	_			,	heck 🗹	only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Reprosent If no, who is?:	esentative still EDWIN PE	EREZ?			·····] Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facilist the facility contact st. If no, who is?:	ility provide an administrat till ?	tive update w	ithin 30 days'	?		Yes Yes	⊠No □No
		eting VE test(s) during toda ance authority notified at lea] Yes] Yes	⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 - Concrete Batch Plant subject to Reasonable Precautions

1 - Concrete Datch Frant Subject to Reasonable Frecautions					
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)			
Date of last inspection: 6/28/11 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes	□ No □ No □ No			
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.		only one			
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	box for each of	(uestion)			
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards					
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:	ined				
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?		☐ No			
application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the	X Yes	☐ No			
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne	- -				
particulate matter?		∐ No			
particulate matter from stock piles?	X Yes	☐ No			
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	Yes	☐ No			
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:					
a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?		□ No			
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	L Yes	∐ No			

c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY (check 🗹 onl	
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 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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No
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?		□ 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? 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)?	Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propa 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS	check 🗹 onl	
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?	_	□ No
b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?	Yes	☐ No
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹 only one			
Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \square box for each question) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following question 2.</i>)				
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (<i>If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.</i>) a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air				
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to 6 b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification For	changing location? Yes No			
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification For	following a relocation? Yes No			
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business	s days prior to relocation? Yes No			
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air constraint and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that so a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e., If YES, what was the purpose?	eparate permit:			
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes No No			
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check \square only one box for each question)			
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facili associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	acility or any emissions units or e change at the facility? Yes No			
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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially of the companion of the comp	different? Yes No			
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form a 30 days prior to the change?				
FRANK DELGADO	8/17/2012			
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date Dat	e of Inspection			
8/2013				
Inspector's Signature App	proximate Date of Next Inspection			

COMMENTS: A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST WAS SCHEDULED FOR TODAY BY DANIEL BEATTY BUT WHEN I ARRIVED I FOUND OUT THAT THE VE TEST WAS CANCELLED BECAUSE ALL THE SILOS WERE FULL. THE FACILITY WAS OPERATIONAL AT THE TIME OF THE INSPECTION; I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE OR FUGITIVE EMISSIONS AROUND THE FACILITY.

REVIEWED

By Ray Gordon at 4:40 pm, Sep 05, 2012