

#### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO	, , <u> </u>			
AIRS ID#: 0950024 DATE: 4/30/2014 ARRIVE: 8:30AM DEPART: 12:00PM					
FACILITY NAME: CARDER ROAD READY M	IX PLANT				
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 5109 CARDER RI	)				
ORLANDO 328	10-5111				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: KATHERINE CHUMLEY Email: chumleyk@vmcmail.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/18/2013 / 4/18 (effective date) (end d	Mobile: PHONE Mobile: 5/2018	E: (904)380-0130			
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): katheine Cl Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
2. Is the Authorized Representative still LORI SAN If no, who is?:	VILLE?				
If different, did the facility provide an administra  3. Is the facility contact still KATHERINE CHUMI If no, who is?:					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at le					

# Emissions Unit Section 1 -Block Plant Cement Silo w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION (check 🗹	only one
box for each a	
1. Date of last hispection: <u>1/23/2015</u>	,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?   Yes	□ No
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	∐ No ⊠ No
<u> </u>	□ No
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: $\frac{7/25/2013}{1}$	□ N.
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?	∐ No □ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 29.26 tons/hour	☐ 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? N/A Yes	□ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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? \( \text{Yes} \)	□No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
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 q	uestion)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?   Yes	□ No
	N
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	∐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	□ 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 conducted at a rat	e
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo not loaded during inspe	
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? <u>25.74</u> 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 h	
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and	
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 is separate from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector	
	⊠ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.	<u> </u>
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? \(\Xi\) Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? X Yes	☐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?   Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? 25.74 tons/hour.	
· —	

# Emissions Unit Section 2 -Cement Silo w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b>	only one
1 D ( C1 ( ) 7/05/10	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 7/25/13		,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	- X Yes	□ No
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	_	∐ No ⊠ No
÷	- <u> </u>	M N0
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: $\frac{7/25/2013}{25/2013}$		
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?		∐ No □ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 31.5 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
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	<u> </u>	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- 🛚 Yes	∐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check <b>☑</b>	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
	00.1101 0401	question
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	X Yes	□ No
·	<del></del>	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.	<b>□ 1</b>	
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	conducted at a i	rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \( \subseteq \text{Yes}  \subseteq \text{No}  \subseteq \text{N/A} - \text{silo not log}		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 31.39 tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?		☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and $g(3) - g(3)$		
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching		□ N.
duration?		☐ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>8</u> minutes.	<del></del>	_
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?	X Yes	☐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $0.0$ % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? 31.39 tons/hour.		

# Emissions Unit Section 4 –Slag Silo w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☑ No
	operation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	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? 31.43 tons/hour	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	☐ 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? N/A  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
	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
PA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS 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?	Yes	☐ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	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 loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25.18</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?  **INVES*** the report in the second of the silo dust collector in the silo dust collector in the silo dust collector in the silo dust collector. The silo dust collector is the silo dust collector in the silo dust collector in 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 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate	Yes Yes	☐ No
	duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	- Yes	☐ No
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll 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? 8 minutes.		☐ No
	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	<ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>	<ul><li>☐ No</li><li>☐ No</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? 25.18 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 5 –Fly Ash Silo w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	only one question)
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: 4/18/2013</li> <li>Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:         <ul> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	∑ Yes	□ No □ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————	Yes	☐ No
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? 28.77 tons/hour		☐ 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? N/A  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
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: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	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?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?	- X Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ✓ Yes ✓ No ✓ N/A – silo not loading rate?		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 34.29 tons/hour		□ 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	Yes h.	⊠ No
<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>	☐ Yes	☐ No
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes	- 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 collector.	h is separate	
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? 8 minutes.		☐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?  a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?  b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.		☐ No ☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 34.29 tons/hour.	- 🛚 Yes	☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 6 -Weigh Hopper w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION  1. Date of last inspection: 4/18/2013 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		only one question)  No No No
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? 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?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?  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)?	X Yes	No No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	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?	X Yes	☐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	🛚 Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo of that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \( \bigvee \text{Yes}  \text{No}  \text{N/A} - \text{silo not log} \)		
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?		⊠ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mi.  h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co	ollector	□ No
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 8 minutes.	_	∐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		∐ No □ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	X Yes	☐ No

#### Emissions Unit Section 7 –Truck Load Out w/ Central Dust Collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

7 – Truck Load Out w/ Central Dust Conector Subject to Reasonable Frecautions			
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>✓</b> box for each o	•	
Date of last inspection: 4/18/2013     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: (0.0)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?  C. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	X Yes	No No No	
DADEN FILL D ODGDDYA EVONG D L (2.20( 4142) D 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, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each of	only one question)	
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfiend 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?	X Yes	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>	
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?		□ 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	

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

<u>C</u> (	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	
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)? gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propa	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No   No   No   No   No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	$\frac{\text{inc}/\text{yr}}{\text{e}/\text{yr}} \leq 1.00$	0.
4.	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?	iption - X Yes	☐ No
<u>G</u> ]	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> 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
2.	Does the owner or operator:		
	<ul><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li><li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li></ul>	- ⊠ 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?		□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:  1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	stationary and relocatable box for ea	only one ch question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (I	f only stationary, skip the following question	2.)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		☐ No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific</li> </ul>	prior to changing location? Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin 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)]	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit	air construction or air operation permit, in that separate permit:	
<ul><li>a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose?</li><li>b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it</li></ul>	<u> </u>	∐ No
co-located at the permitted facility?  If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES		only one ch question)
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation	the facility or authorized representative not n of the facility or any emissions units or	
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admi 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:		⊠ No □ No
Since the last registration form submittal has there been     a. Installation of any new process equipment?     b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	□ No 図 No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	tantially different? Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?	on form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes	☐ No
Assefa HAILEMARIAM	4/30/2014	
	Date of Inspection	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	•	
	~12/31/2015	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

**COMMENTS:** Assefa Hailemariam, inspector from OCEPD, met with Kathie Chumley, of Environental Argos USA, on April 30, 2014, at Carder Road, Orlando, Florida32810 to audit the visible emission test on six emission units. The emission units tested were EU001, EU002, EU004, EU005 and EU006. It should be noted that emission unit EU007 was not tested because it is truck loadout does not reqire annual testing. All emission units tested had an observed opacity of zero percent and loading rates were acceptable. No objectionable odors were detected. No PM was observed leaving the property during the compliance test. The facility Plant Operators, were present during the VE test. The facility appears to be in compliance during inspection performed on this date with the air permit.