

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	]				
AIRS ID#: 0251361 DATE: 11/14/2012 ARRIVE: 8:14 AM DEPA	RT: <u>9:05 AM</u>				
FACILITY NAME: BRICKELL CITICENTRE (NORTH)					
FACILITY LOCATION: 650 S Miami Ave					
MIAMI 33130-3016					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: NICK BRANT Email: nbrant@malcolmdrilling.com CONTACT NAME: ED BUTTERFIELD Email: ebutterfield@malcolmdrilling.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:  (effective date) (end date)  PHONE: (305)374 Mobile: PHONE: (415)559 Mobile:					
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING					
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>NICK BRANT</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes:  2. Is the Authorized Representative still NICK BRANT?	⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still ED BUTTERFIELD?	YesNo YesNo				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?					

### Emissions Unit Section Subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b>	only one
	box for each	•
1. Date of last inspection:		1
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ <b>v</b>	□ Na
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?	☐ Yes	∐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————	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?		<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
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
<ul><li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li><li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?</li></ul>	☐ Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
in not, what was the problem (if known):		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
		•
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		
b. The visible emission test conducted according to EFA Method 9?	les 🖂	∐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	- X Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Z Tes	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo not loa		pection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	- 🛚 Yes	☐ 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
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go to		□ Na
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate.</li> </ol>		☐ No
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes		
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 col		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	? 🗌 Yes	☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		⊠ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	∐ 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?	· U Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

# **Emissions Unit Section Subject to Reasonable Precautions**

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	,	check 🗹 o	only one uestion)
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 ] Yes ] Yes	No No No
DADELL EVELD ODGEDNATIONG D. L. (2.40/.414/2). E. A. G.			
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, a	box	check 🗹 o x for each qu	only one destion)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to emissions by:	control unconfined		
<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include on <ol> <li>paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> <li>application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals whe control emissions?</li> <li>removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce air particulate matter?</li> <li>reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind particulate matter from stock piles?</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	on necessary to of the borne entrainment of	Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
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 Yes	□ No □ No

### **Facility Section (continued)**

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 or for each q	
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 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)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the second secon		0?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumers for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		☐ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> 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
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?	X Yes	☐ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	ationary and relocateble	(check 🗹 box for each c	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both st concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If</i>		g question 2.)	
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 L		Yes	☐ No
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	orior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat	ss days following a relocation?ion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)	Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five			∐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate at and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit if 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 was a superior of the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purp If YES, what was the purpose?	n that separate permit: ose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)		□ No
co-located at the permitted facility?			☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES  Administrative Changes:		(check <b>v</b> box for each c	
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 admir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	istrative change at the facility?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No
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?		- 🔲 Yes	☐ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substated. A change in ownership?			☐ No ☐ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registratio	n form and the appropriate fee sub-	_	
30 days prior to the change?		- <u></u> Yes	∐ No
FRANK DELGADO	11/14/2012		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	11/2013		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Insp	pection	

**COMMENTS:** THIS IS A NEW FACILITY LOCATED IN A CONSTRUCTION SITE. I WITNESSED A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST ON THE SLAG SILO (SOUTHEAST); THIS SILO IS PART OF A STANDARD MIXING PLANT. EUGENE SCHALTENBRAND PERFORMED THE VE TEST. THE SILO WAS LOADED AT APPROXIMATELY 10 PSI. THE VE TEST STARTED AT 8:29 AM. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE TEST.

**REVIEWED**By Ray Gordon at 10:36 am, Nov 27, 2012

5