	WEITUL PROTECTION	
NG.BI	1 Car	
E FI	ORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	JAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/E ARMS COMPL		(CI)		
AIRS ID#: 0950071 DATE: 15	<u>May2014</u>	ARRIVE: <u>0815</u>		DEPART: (<u>)930</u>	
FACILITY NAME: TAFT REA	ADY MIX PLANT					
FACILITY LOCATION:	131 E Landstreet Rd					
	ORLANDO 32824-782	24				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPI Email: CONTACT NAME: KATHY (Email: kchumley@argos-us.(ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1 (ef	CHUMLEY com	I SANVILLE	,	904)598-6568 904)629-0609		
Facility Section						
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☑ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☑ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
Г <u></u>						
PART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUC</u>	<u>TORY MEETING</u>			1	(check 🗹	only one
1. Name(s) of facility representat	ive(s): <u>Antonio Pietri</u>					question
Brief Notes:						
2. Is the Authorized Representati If no, who is?:	ve still LORI SANVILLI	E?			Xes Yes	No
If different, did the facility pro 3. Is the facility contact still KAT If no, who is?: <u>Antonio Pietri</u>	ΓΗΥ CHUMLEY?	odate within 30 days?	?		Yes Yes	□No ⊠No
4. Will facility be conducting VE If yes, was the compliance aut	test(s) during today's in hority notified at least 15	spection? days in advance?			\boxtimes Yes \boxtimes Yes	□No □No

Emissions Unit Section

<u>1 – CCB Plant-2silos(1Ecement,1W/slag)&batcherw/central baghouse subject to 5% O</u>	<u>pacity Limit</u>	
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 25Apr2013 2. Date View (VE) to the second	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
operation? 🛛 N/A	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? <u>41.6</u> 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)? 	X 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	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 co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection.
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	\bowtie_h Yes	🗌 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 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 a) 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	h 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? minut	? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	No 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</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? <u>34.4</u> tons/hour. 		∐ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		
	box for each	only one
		i 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 □ 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 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? 		🛛 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)? 	🛛 Yes 🖾 Yes 🖾 Yes	 □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
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 prop		0?
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?		🗌 No

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
2. 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, acces		🗌 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:	(check 🗹	only one
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 follown</i>)	box for each	1 /
 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. 62-210.900] 		🗌 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 to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation	Yes	□ No
3. 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 If YES, what was the purpose?	ge)? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?		D No No
CHANGES	(check ☑ box for each	•
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not units or Yes	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? -	box for each tative not mits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not units or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

31 December 2015

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Inspector Omar Horta met with Bruno Ferraro, consultant Grove Scientific & Engineering, and Antonio Pietri, Plant Manager, on 15 May 2014 to audit the Visible Emission test on EU 001. The loading rate of the cement silo was 34.4 tph. Observed Opacity was zero percent.