NUMERCUL PROTECTION	
Same Manue	
FLORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPL		CI)	
AIRS ID#: 0251360 DA	TE: <u>11/7/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:45 A</u>	. <u>M</u>	DEPART: <u>11:30 AM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: BF	RICKELL CITICENTRE				
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 751 S Miami Ave				
	MIAMI 33130				
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: nbrant@malc CONTACT NAME: E Email: ebutterfield@ ENTITLEMENT PERI	ED BUTTERFIELD malcolmdrilling.com		PHONE: (3 Mobile: PHONE: (4 Mobile:	,	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box) IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: <u>ONSITE INT</u>	RODUCTORY MEETIN	G		(check 🗹	only one
1. Name(s) of facility rep	presentative(s): <u>NICK BRA</u>			box for each	
Brief Notes: 2. Is the Authorized Rep If no, who is?:	resentative still NICK BRA	NT?		Xes	No
	cility provide an administra still ED BUTTERFIELD? - -				□No □No
4. Will facility be condu If yes, was the compli	cting VE test(s) during toda ance authority notified at le	y's inspection? ast 15 days in advance?		Xes Yes Yes	□No □No

Emissions Unit Section Subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	only one question)
1. Date of last inspection:		440501011)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	🗌 No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	\square Yes	
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
operation? 🖾 N/A	Yes	🗌 No
d. Date of last VE test:		
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?	∐ Yes □ Yes	∐ No □ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? 🛛 N/A	Yes	🗌 No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	No No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour		
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)?	Yes	∐ No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes	□ 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?	Yes	🗌 No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo con	nducted at a r	ato
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \bigotimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	No No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to 1) West the surisic between (both bar) is accepted during the single-bar single-bar set 2^{2} .		
 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 		∐ No
duration?	Yes	🗌 No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu	tes	_
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust colle		
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		∐ No
 What was the batching fate: tonshour. What was the batching duration: minute Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? 	Yes	🛛 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	
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?	Yes	No No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section <u>Subject to Reasonable Precautions</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 only one box for each question)
 Date of last inspection: 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
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check 🗹 only one
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u> Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yard	box for each question)
 Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control emissions by: 	unconfined
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or mon 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necess 	Yes No
application of water of environmentary safe date suppressant enemieats when needs control emissions?	Yes No
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	
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 tr	uck? 🗌 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

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 gen 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 propa	
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 🗹 on for each qu	•
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

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following stationary)	(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
 a. Did the owner of operator houry the appropriate Department of Eocar An Trogram by deephone, 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	🗌 No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?		🗌 No
 If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pe 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 usage) 		□ No
a. was the relocatable batch plant being used for a hon-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usag 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?		☐ No ☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent	tative not	

1.	were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility of authorized representative not	
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units 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
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? Yes	🛛 No
	b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	🛛 No
	c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? [] Yes	🕅 No
	d. A change in ownership? TYes	🛛 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 No

FRANK DELGADO

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

11/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

11/7/2012

COMMENTS: EUGENE SCHALTENBRAND PERFORMED TWO (2) VE TESTS ON TWO SILOS. THE THIRD SILO WILL BE TESTED AT A LATER DATE. THE SILOS WERE LOADED WITH CEMENT AT APPROXIMATELY 10 PSI. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS WHILE I WAS ON SITE.

> **REVIEWED** By Ray Gordon at 10:28 am, Nov 27, 2012