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

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DIS RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAI				
AIRS ID#: 0950132 DATE: <u>11/17/11</u> ARRIVE: <u>11:42 AN</u>	<u>M</u> DEPART: <u>2:50 PM</u>			
FACILITY NAME: TARMAC AMERICA/ORLANDO BLK				
FACILITY LOCATION: 339 Thorpe Rd				
ORLANDO 32824-8152				
Email:MCONTACT NAME:SAME AS ABOVEEmail:M	PHONE: (954)242-0183 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:			
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2007 / 10/12/2012 (effective date) (end date)				
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)				
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING (check only one box for each question) 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): STEVE MALLOCH, PLANT MANAGER box for each question) Brief Notes:				
 Is the Authorized Representative still TERRY LANCASTER?				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still SCOTT QUAAS?				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?	⊠ Yes □No ⊠ Yes □No			

Emissions Unit Section <u>1 –North Side Cement Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/17/10	(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 for the performance of the	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 12/17/10 	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>~29</u> tons/hour 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ 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/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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		1
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?	Xes 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? \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? $\underline{-25}$ tons/hour		
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		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 		∐ No
duration?		🗌 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? minute	? 🛛 Yes	🗌 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 <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>~25</u> tons/hour. 	_	🗌 No

Emissions Unit Section <u>2 –South Side Cement Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/17/10	(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
 d. Date of last VE test: 12/17/10 N/A 	Tes 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>~29</u> tons/hour 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ 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/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No
DADT II. STACK EMISSIONS from a sile, weigh hoppor(batcher) or other		
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?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of ~0.8 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes 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?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? $\frac{-25}{}$ 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 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 duration?	· 🗌 Yes	D No
 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu 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 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? minute	? 🗌 Yes	🗌 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? 		□ No □ 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? d. What was the process rate? <u>~25</u> tons/hour. 	Yes	🗌 No

Emissions Unit Section <u>4 – Mixer 1 - South Side subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/17/10 2. Date Visible Emissions (VE) tests	(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
 d. Date of last VE test: 12/17/10 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? tons/hour 	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ 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? <u>10 batch/h</u> 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)?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
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?	Xes 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?		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? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1 - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1 - g.3$ and go to	\square Yes h .	🛛 No
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 duration?	· 🗌 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? <u>3200</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>6-8</u> 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?	\boxtimes Yes \boxtimes Yes	□ No □ 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? d. What was the process rate? <u>3200</u> tons/hour. 	Xes Yes	🗌 No

Emissions Unit Section 5 – Mixer 2 - North Side subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/17/10	(check 🗹 box for each o	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		
 d. Date of last VE test: 12/17/10 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? tons/hour 	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ 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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		1		
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 Yes	🗌 No		
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes 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?	Xes Yes	🗌 No		
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate			
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes 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? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1 - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1 - g.3$ and go to a	☐ Yes h.	🛛 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 		🗌 No		
3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour . What was the batching duration?	Yes	🗌 No		
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 conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 2) What was the batching rate? <u>3200</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>6-8</u> 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?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ 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? d. What was the process rate? <u>3200</u> tons/hour. 	Xes Yes	🗌 No		

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 d	only one
	box for each c	
 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 - 🖾 Yes	No No No 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? 		🛛 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)? 	🛛 Yes 🖾 Yes 🕅 Yes	No No No No No No No No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal prop275,000 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 consume 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
 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?	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check ☑ box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary 🖾; relocatable 🗔; or consisting of both static 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?		- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 (If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.) a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Lee-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p 		Yes	🗌 No
 b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busines c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat 	s days following a relocation?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five b			🗌 No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate ai and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a Was the relocatable batch plant bains used for a pop routine purp	n that separate permit:		□ No
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purport If YES, what was the purpose?b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was a structure of the purpose.			
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	□ No □ No
CHANGES		(check ☑ box for each	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or 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 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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? Yes d. A change in ownership?			⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
 If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change? 		mitted 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
Norma Ali	11/17/2011		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	12/31/2012		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ins	pection	
COMMENTS: On November 17, 2011, the inspector, Norma Ali met Environmental Engineer from TARMAC America, to audit the annual of Plant as follows:			

EU 001 North Side Cement Silo Opacity Observed= 0% Loading rate of ~28.55 tph

EU 002 South Side Cement Silo Opacity Observed= 0% Loading rate of ~29.52 tph

EU 004 and 005 Mixers Opacity Observed = 0% Batching rate according to Mr. Malloch was 3200 tons/hr, 8-10 batches/hr EU 003 West Side Fly Ash Silo started dusting approx. on minute 20, test was stopped, plant personnel went up to check it and decided to reschedule the test.