| | NUMERTAL PROTEC | TION | ic. |
|--------|-----------------|--------------|-----|
| BI GHI | V | A rea | |
| FI | ORIDA | ar | 1 |
| | | | - |

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| | OMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) |
|---|--|
| AIRS ID#: 0950020 DATE: <u>3/11/11</u> ARR | RIVE: <u>9:52 AM</u> DEPART: <u>11:25 AM</u> |
| FACILITY NAME: MASCHMEYER-ORLANDO FACILITY | |
| FACILITY LOCATION: 2311 DINNEEN AVE | |
| ORLANDO 32804-4203 | |
| OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ROBERT T Email: CONTACT NAME: DAX DAWSON/ Operations Manager Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/5/2009 / 10/5/2014 (effective date) (end date) | UCKER PHONE: (561)848-9112 Mobile: (561)718-0551 PHONE: (561)718-2696 Mobile: (561)718-2696 |

Facility Section

PART I: <u>INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS</u> (check I only one box)

IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

| | ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING Name(s) of facility representative(s): Greg Murphy/Plant Operator | (check 🗹 box for each | 2 |
|----|--|--------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Brief Notes: <u>Tel. (407) 4674779</u> | | |
| 2. | Is the Authorized Representative still ROBERT TUCKER? | 🛛 Yes | No |
| 3. | If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still DAX DAWSON? | ☐ Yes ⊠ Yes | □No □No |
| 4. | Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? | | □No □No |

Emissions Unit Section

| 2 -CCB Plant-splitsilo,comp.#1(cement)w/individ.silotop | b b-house subject to 5% Opacity Limit |
|---|---------------------------------------|
|---|---------------------------------------|

| PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION | | (check ☑ box for each | only one question) |
|--|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{1/29/10}{1}$ | | | 1 , |
| 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: | | _ | |
| a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar y | | 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 c | | | |
| operation? | | Yes | No No |
| d. Date of last VE test: $\frac{1/29/10}{10}$ | | | |
| e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no | later than 45 days after the test? | 🛛 Yes | No No |
| f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissio | | 🛛 Yes | No No |
| g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 26.73 tons/hour | - | | |
| h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo du | st collector, did the report state | | |
| whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? | | Yes | No No |
| i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emission | | \square Yes | $\boxed{\times}$ No |
| j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour | | | |
| k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% of | opacity limit during the last VE test? | Yes | No |
| If not, what was the problem (if known)? | spacity mine during the last viz test. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(bate | | (check 🗹 | only one |
| enclosed storage and conveyi | ng equipment | box for each | |
| | | bon for each | question, |
| | | | |
| 1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for the | is unit during this site visit? | 🛛 Yes | No 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the | | | |
| c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of \underline{o} // for the | | Xes | No |
| If not, what was the problem (if known)? | ne 570 opacity mint. | | |
| | | | |
| d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhat | | | |
| that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \sum | | | |
| e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour | | | No No |
| f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>26.73</u> tons/hour | L | | |
| g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation co | ntrolled by the silo dust collector? | Yes | 🛛 No |
| If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer | | | |
| 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the | | T Yes | No No |
| 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate r | | | |
| duration? | | | No No |
| 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What w | | | |
| h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation | | | |
| from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test | | | |
| conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of | | | 🗌 No |
| | | | |
| 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour What was | | AC | |
| What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for t | | | \square No |
| 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for t | his unit during this site visit? | 🛛 Yes | □ No |
| Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for t a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA | his unit during this site visit? Method 9? | 🛛 Yes | □ No □ No |
| 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for t a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the visible emission test resulted in an opacity | his unit during this site visit? Method 9? he highest six-minute average. | ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes | No |
| 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for t a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA | his unit during this site visit? Method 9? he highest six-minute average. | ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes | = |

Emissions Unit Section

| PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1 Date of last inspection: 1/29/10 | (check 🗹 box for each d | only one question) |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{1/29/10}{1}$ | | 1 |
| 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: | <u> </u> | |
| 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? d. Data of last VE test: 1/20/10 | Yes | 🗌 No |
| d. Date of last VE test: <u>1/29/10</u> 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? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>34.60</u> tons/hour | ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes | D No No |
| h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? | Yes 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 Yes | 🗌 No |
| | | |
| PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment | (check 🗹 box for each o | only one question) |
| 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? | Yes | 🗌 No |
| b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? | Yes | □ No |
| d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo con | | |
| that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not load | | vection. |
| e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>34.60</u> tons/hour | Yes Yes | No |
| g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to h | | No No |
| 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 | e and | No No |
| duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minut | Yes Yes | 🗌 No |
| 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 | ctor | |
| 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 |
| 2. 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 | 🗌 No |
| b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? | Yes | — |
| d. What was the process rate? $\underline{34.67}$ tons/hour. | | |

Facility Section (continued)

| CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY | (1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1. | _ |
|---|--|---|
| | (check $\mathbf{\nabla}$ only one box for each question) | |
| | 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? | Xes 🗌 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.)? | | |
| 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? 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)? | │ Yes │ No │ Yes │ No │ Yes │ No | |
| gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal pr275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal proj | | |
| 4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel cons for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? | | |

| GENERAL CONDITIONS | (check 🗹 box for each | • |
|--|--------------------------|------|
| 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? | | |
| 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? | _ | 🗌 No |

| RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [3]; relocatable []; or consisting of both statement | ho | (check ☑ only ox for each ques | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If e | | uestion 2.) | |
| 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 Lc e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day pr b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat | rior to changing location? [| Yes | No |
| to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificati | s days following a relocation? [on Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] | Yes | No |
| to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five b3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air | construction or air operation permit, | Yes | No |
| and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpo If YES, what was the purpose? | | Yes | No |
| b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it w co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? | [| Yes Yes | No No |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| CHANGES | | (check 🗹 only | |
| CHANGES 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 of | bo e facility or authorized representative | e not | |
| Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the | bo e facility or authorized representative of the facility or any emissions units strative change at the facility? | e not | |
| <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 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 of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of | bo e facility or authorized representative of the facility or any emissions units of strative change at the facility? [f the change? [[[ntially different? [| ox for each quest e not or Yes X | tion) No No |
| <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 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 of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? | bo e facility or authorized representative of the facility or any emissions units of strative change at the facility? [f the change? [[ntially different? [f form and the appropriate fee submit | ox for each quest e not or Yes Yes | tion) No No No No |
| <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 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 of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? | bo e facility or authorized representative of the facility or any emissions units of strative change at the facility? [f the change? [[ntially different? [f form and the appropriate fee submit | ox for each quest e not T Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A | tion) No No No No No |
| <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 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 of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substant d. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change? | bo e facility or authorized representative of the facility or any emissions units of strative change at the facility? [f the change? [[ntially different? [f form and the appropriate fee submit [3/11/2011 | ox for each quest e not T Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A | tion) No No No No No |
| 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 of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini 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? | bo e facility or authorized representative of the facility or any emissions units of strative change at the facility? [f the change? [| ox for each quest e not T Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A Yes A | tion) No No No No No |

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Inspector, Norma Ali met with Greg Murphy, Plant Manager and Kent Bottorf, Consultant from Bottorf Associates, Inc, to audit the visual emissiones compliance test on EU002 and EU003 on this date. Readings were taken from parking lot in the SE side of the facility. Batching occurred while loading the silos. Due to slow business, by the time we returned to the facility, we were able to observe only one truck batching and tested the weigh hopper for about five minutes. After that, no more trucks loading for that day. A test for Emission Unit 004 will be rescheduled in the future. EU005 Truck load, doesn't have a pollution control device, it is subject to no more of 20 % opacity, it doesn't requiere a VE compliance test.