

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	SPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (RE-INSPEC	INS1, INS2) CTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/ ARMS COMPI		7 (CI)		
ΑI	RS ID#: 0610088 DATE: <u>12/14/2</u> 0	<u>011</u>	ARRIVE:	_	DEPART: _		
FA	CILITY NAME: CEMEX-VERO	NORTH READY-N	MIX				
FA	ACILITY LOCATION: 3150	53RD CT					
	VER	O BEACH 32967-	6269				
CC	OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JEFFREY PORTER Email: CONTACT NAME: MARK PETRICK Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 5/22/2011 / 5/22/2016 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (561)820-8415 Mobile: (561)718-7564 PHONE: (772)794-3555 Mobile:						
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE							
	Name(s) of facility representative(s) Brief Notes:				b	(check 🗹 oox for each o	only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Representative sti If no, who is?:					Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility provide Is the facility contact still MARK P If no, who is?:					☐ Yes ☐ Yes	∐No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(If yes, was the compliance authority					☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-split silo(cement)comp #1w/cartridgedust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	
1. Date of last inspection: 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? Yes If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
DADEW EVELD ODGDDWATYONG DAY (2.20) 414(2) DAG	
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>	
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Foints, Roads, Farking Areas, Stock Files, and Tards	
 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 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?	□ No
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? 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 □ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-split silo(cement)comp #2w/cartridgedust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? Yes If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	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			
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?	No No 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 No		

 $Emissions\ Unit\ Section \\ {3-CCB\ Plant-splitsilo} (flyash/slag) comp {\#1w/cartridgedust collect\ subject\ to\ Reasonable\ Precautions}$

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? Yes If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No		
DADELL EVELD ODGEDVATIONS D. L. (2.40(MA(2) E.A. C			
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.			
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>			
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?	— □ No		
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?	— □ No		
_	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:	□ N.		
a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	∐ No □ No		
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?			

 $Emissions\ Unit\ Section \\ {4-CCB\ Plant-splitsilo} (flyash/slag) comp {\#2w/cartridgedust collect\ subject\ to\ Reasonable\ Precautions}$

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: 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)?		☐ 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 1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfemissions 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?	Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No 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)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No	

Emissions Unit Section 5 –CCB Plant-weigh hopper w/cartridge batcher vent subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? Yes If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ 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			
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?	□ No□ No□ No		
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	No No		
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	□ No □ No		

Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-truck loadout w/central cartridge dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? Yes If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ 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			
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?	□ No□ No□ No		
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	No No		
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	□ No □ No		

Facility Section (continued)

			1
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ✓ box for each	only one h question)
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? 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 units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		☐ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gene 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)? gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal prop	-	☐ No
4.	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propar Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	nption	□ No
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹	only one h question)
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	- Yes	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- Yes	☐ No
	permit and Department rules?	Yes	☐ No

 RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary □; relocatable □; or consisting of both st concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If</i> 				
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (<i>If YES</i> , <i>answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO</i> , <i>answer question 2.c below.</i>) a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or L	ocal Air Program by telephone,			
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day pb. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificato the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificato the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] ss days following a relocation? Yes No tion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]			
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purp If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?	ir construction or air operation permit, In that separate permit: In that separate permit. In that separate permit, In that separate permit, In that separate permit. In th			
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? ————————————————————————————————————				
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adming 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New 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?	of the facility or any emissions units or histrative change at the facility? Yes No of the change? Yes No			
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?				
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registratio 30 days prior to the change?				
Sangeeta Sharma	12/14/2011			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			

COMMENTS: Ms. Sangeeta Sharma inspected this facility on 12/14/2011. This facility appears to be temporary shut down. There were no cars, trucks or any other vehicle at this facility.