CHARGED PROTECTION	
John Martin	
FLORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DIS ARMS COMPLAI	SCOVERY (CI)	
AIRS ID#: 0251276 DA	TE: <u>12/7/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>1:03 PM</u>	<u>I</u> DEPART:	<u>2:25 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: SU	JPERIOR MIX PLANT #1			
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 6945 NW 53rd Ter			
	MIAMI 33166-4801			
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIC	CD REPRESENTATIVE: ROE OD: 1/6/2008 / 1/5/2013 (effective date) (end date)	l J	PHONE: (305)219-196 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	58
Facility Section				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE □ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE □ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
	RODUCTORY MEETING presentative(s): <u>ROBERTO TON</u>	MBO		(check 🗹 only one box for each question)
Brief Notes:				
2. Is the Authorized Repu If no, who is?:	resentative still ROBERTO TOM	ИВО?		YesNo
If different, did the fac	 cility provide an administrative u still ?			
4. Will facility be conduct If yes, was the compliant	cting VE test(s) during today's in ance authority notified at least 15	nspection? 5 days in advance?		- ⊠ Yes □No ⊠ Yes □No

Emissions Unit Section

1-100 T/HR CONCRETE BATCH PLANT W/ 2 SILOS & 2 BAGHOUSES subject to Reasonable Precautions			
PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹 only one box for each question)		
 Date of last inspection: <u>10/28/2011</u> 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)? 	🗌 Yes 🛛 No		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check \square only one box for each question)		
<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>	1 /		
 Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfiguration 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? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? 	Xes 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?			
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)? 	Yes No Yes No		

լլ

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only one box
	for each question)
 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 Yes No
 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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities? 	
 b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air ger 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/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?	

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ or for each q	•
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
 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? 3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access 		🗌 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 No

 RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following</i>) 	(check ☑ box for each <i>ng question 2.</i>)	question)
 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 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? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.9000] 		🗌 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 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:		□ No
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?b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was		
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		Delta No No
CHANGES	(check 🗹	only one

		box for each o	question)
Ac	Iministrative Changes:		1 /
1.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representation		
	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?	- 🗌 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
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?	- 🗌 Yes	No No

FRANK DELGADO

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

12/7/2012

Date of Inspection

12/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: WILLIAM ARLINGTON PERFORMED A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST ON THE WEST SILO. THE EAST SILO HAD A PROBLEM AND THEY WERE TRYING TO FIX IT. THE SILO WAS LOADED WITH CEMENT AT 10 PSI. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE THIRTY MINUTES VE TEST.

REVIEWED By Ray Gordon at 2:42 pm, Dec 21, 2012