CHARGED PROTECTION	
John Martin	
FLORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [ RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [	_	IPLAINT/DI IS COMPLA		č (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 7775149 DATI	E: <u>8/7/2012</u>	ARRIV	VE: <u>9:52 AN</u>	<u>M</u>	DEPART: <u>1</u>	1:27 AM	
FACILITY NAME: CEM	EX-CARD SOUND POR	TABLE REAF	OY-MIX				
FACILITY LOCATION:	15900 SW 408TH S	T					
	FLORIDA CITY 3	33034					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED Email: Jeffreyr.porter@ CONTACT NAME: EDV Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOI	@cemex.com WARD WILLIAMS	24/2014		Mobile:	(561)820-8415 (561)718-7564 (305)247-3011		
		Facility S	ection				
PART I: <u>INSPECTION C</u>	COMPLIANCE STATUS	i (check 🗹 or	nly one box)	)			
IN COMPLIANCE	E MINOR Non-CC	OMPLIANCE	SIG!	NIFICANT	Non-COMPLIA	NCE	
L							
<ul><li><b>PART II:</b> <u>ONSITE INTRO</u></li><li>1. Name(s) of facility representation</li></ul>						(check 🗹 box for each d	•
Brief Notes:							
2. Is the Authorized Repres If no, who is?:	sentative still JEFFREY PC	ORTER*?				🛛 Yes	No
If different, did the facili 3. Is the facility contact stil	ity provide an administrativ ll EDWARD WILLIAMS?	ve update with?	in 30 days?		[ 	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No

3 - CCB Plant-weigh hopper w/baghouse batcher vent subject to Reasonable Precautions

5 – CCB Plant-weigh hopper w/bagnouse batcher vent subject to Keasonable Precautions					
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)			
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: <u>6/22/2011</u></li> <li>Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?</li> <li>b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions &lt; 20% opacity? X/A</li> <li>c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?</li> </ol>	🗌 Yes	□ No ⊠ No □ No			
<u>PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.</u> <u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u> <u>Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)			
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:</li> </ol>	ined				
<ul> <li>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?</li></ul>	Xes	No			
<ul> <li>control emissions?</li></ul>	-	□ No			
<ul> <li>4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?</li> </ul>		□ 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)?	· 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
	b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	· 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
	c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		

4 – CCB Plant-truck loadout, w/cent.dust collector, pulse-jet(new) subject to Reasonable Precautions				
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each d	only one question)		
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: <u>6/22/2011</u></li> <li>Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?</li></ol>	- 🗌 Yes	☐ No ⊠ No ☐ No		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)		
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfir emissions by:</li> </ol>	ıed			
<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the</li> <li>1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> <li>2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?</li></ul>	- Xes	□ No □ No		
<ul> <li>a) 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?</li> <li>4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?</li></ul>		No No		
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No		
<ul> <li>2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:</li> <li>a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?</li> <li>b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions &lt; 20% opacity?</li> <li>c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?</li> </ul>	- 🗌 Yes - 🗌 Yes	☐ No ☐ No		

5 -CCB Plant-split silo(cement)comp.#1w/cartridge dustcollector subject to Reasonable Precautions				
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1. Date of last inspection: 6/22/2011         2. 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? ⊠ N/A         c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	box for each o	only one question) □ No □ No □ No		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)		
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfir emissions by:	ied			
<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the</li> <li>1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> <li>2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?</li></ul>	Yes	□ No □ No		
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?		□ No □ No		
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No		
<ul> <li>2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:</li> <li>a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?</li> <li>b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions &lt; 20% opacity?</li> <li>c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?</li> </ul>		D No No		

6-CCB Plant-split silo(cement)comp.#2w/cartridge dustcollector subject to Reasonable Precautions				
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each			
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: <u>6/22/2011</u></li> <li>Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?</li></ol>	🗍 Yes	☐ No ⊠ No ☐ No		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)		
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control uncon emissions by:	fined			
<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of th</li> <li>1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> <li>2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?</li></ul>	Xes	□ No □ No		
<ul> <li>owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?</li> <li>4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment o particulate matter from stock piles?</li> </ul>	f	□ No □ No		
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? -	🛛 Yes	🗌 No		
<ul> <li>2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:</li> <li>a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?</li> <li>b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions &lt; 20% opacity?</li> <li>c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?</li> </ul>	🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	☐ No ☐ No		

## **Facility Section (continued)**

<u>C</u> (	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		
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? Yes b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? Yes 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.)? Yes If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	1	No
	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>	1	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 b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? Yes c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? Yes d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? Yes e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? Yes	ו ו ו	No No No No
	$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \le 1.00?$		
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? Yes	_ I	No

#### GENERAL CONDITIONS

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:			
		$\boxtimes$	Yes	🗌 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?	$\boxtimes$	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?	$\boxtimes$	Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary $\Box$ ; relocatable $\boxtimes$ ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable $\Box$	box for cach	question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	ng question 2.)	)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	TYes	🖂 No
(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone,		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?	TYes	No No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation?		No No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(		
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 pe	rmit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:	,	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usag	e)? 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
If YES, what was the purpose?		—
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was		
co-located at the permitted facility?	🛛 Yes	No No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
CHANGES	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	question)
Administrative Changes:		<b>1</b> '
1. 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 u		
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?		No No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	🗌 Yes	No No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:		
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	<b>—</b>	
a. Installation of any new process equipment?		No No
b Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	$\bigtriangledown$ 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
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted	
	30 days prior to the change? Yes	🗌 No

FRANK DELGADO

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

8/7/2012

Date of Inspection

8/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST WAS PERFORMED BY DANIEL BEATTY ON THE CEMENT WEIGH HOPPER (EU#3). I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE TEST. THE REST OF EMISSIONS UNITS WERE TESTED BY ARLINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ON 5/23/2012. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY FUGITIVE EMISSIONS AROUND THE FACILITY.

> **REVIEWED** By Ray Gordon at 10:45 am, Aug 14, 2012