

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, IN	NS2) 🛮 COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY	(CI)			
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
AIRS ID#: 0950175 DATE: <u>11/11/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>08:00AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:30AM</u>			
FACILITY NAME: TARMAC ARMERICA	S ORANGE RMC				
FACILITY LOCATION: 200 ZELL DI	₹				
ORLANDO	32824				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATI Email: tlancaster@titanamerica.com CONTACT NAME: KELLY FOLSOM	Mobile: PHONE:	(954)481-2800			
Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/13/2008 / (effective date)	Mobile: 3/13/2013 (end date)	(954)242-0183			
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEE 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Terry Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
Is the Authorized Representative still TERR If no, who is?:	Y LANCASTER?				
If different, did the facility provide an admir 3. Is the facility contact still KELLY FOLSON If no, who is?:	nistrative update within 30 days?				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during If yes, was the compliance authority notified	g today's inspection?				

Emissions Unit Section 1 -CEMENT SILO subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 1/28/2009 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	□ No □ No
operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 1/28/2009	☐ 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? 31.4 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 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average. 	- Xes	☐ 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 c that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A − silo not loading the silo collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo c		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 35.0 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
 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 r 	Yes	☐ No
duration?	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? 6 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? 35.8 tons/hour.	- X Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –FLY ASH SILO subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u> 1. Date of last inspection: <u>1/28/2009</u> 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
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	
	N/A ⊠ Yes □ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 32.1 tons/hour	
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	☑ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the l If not, what was the problem (if known)?	ast VE test?
PART 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 v	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 av 	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ⊠ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? 29.0 tons/hour	X Yes No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust of <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.31$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.11$	
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 norm duration?	Yes No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust of	collector which is separate
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (bat conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate? 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	e and duration? X Yes No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	visit?
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute at c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? <u>29.6</u> tons/hour. 	

Emissions Unit Section 3 -TRUCK LOADOUT subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
1. D	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{1/28/2010}{(VI)}$	territoria de la company
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?	Yes 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: 1/28/2010 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? N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ 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 If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	test? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	/ 1 1 1 7 1
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ✓ only one
choissed soorage and control ing equipment	box for each question)
	_
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility 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. 	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? 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	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo	
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 [CMES] d. [Control of the control of	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ an 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 batch duration?	Yes No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collected	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) d	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and du	uration? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 min 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>0.0</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? tons/hour.	

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		1 [7]	1
			eck 🗹 (only one luestion)
1	Donathia facilitar hann manufata ahanrahat it dana mat hanratha matantial ta amit.	OOX IC	or each q	(uestion)
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?	\boxtimes	Vac	□ No
	b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?			□ No
	c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?		Yes	□ No
	The state of the s			
2.	Does this facility include:			
	a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception	of		
	units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		Vac	⊠ No
	If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	- Ш	Yes	M N0
	ii 1 L5, what non-exempt units of activities:			
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general permit where such as a such		3 7	
	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?	Ш	Y es	⊠ No
	if TES, what other general permit units of activities?			
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:		3 .7	
	a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?			∐ No
	c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?			∐ No □ No
	d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?			□ No
	e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?		Yes	☐ No
	and discretions and anadignous and MM CCE and analysis and MM and anad		- 1 009	,
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g		<u><</u> 1.00?	
	275,000 gai diesel ji 25,000 gai gasoline, ji 1171111 sei nat. gas, ji 11.5 min gai propan	.C/ y1		
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?	- Ш `	Yes	⊠ No
_				
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		1 17	,
<u> </u>	A PARTE COMBITTO NO		eck 🗹 (only one luestion)
		DOX IC	or cacir q	(ucstion)
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?	·	Vac	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator:	Ш	Yes	⊠ No
ļ	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- 🛛 `	Yes	☐ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all			
2	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- 🛛 ՝	Yes	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general	S		
	permit and Department rules?	X	Yes	□ No
	r · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u></u>		

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</i> , <i>skip th</i>	
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.)	
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by te 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] 	on? Yes No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a reloc. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62]	ocation?
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to r	elocation? Yes No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air op 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 report of YES, what was the purpose?b. Were records kept by the overloperator to indicate how long it was	eated usage)? Yes No
co-located at the permitted facility?	
CHANGES Administrative Changes	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
 Administrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any erroperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility Provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	missions units or facility? Yes 🛛 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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership?	Yes No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?	
 b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	
 b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	
 b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership?	

COMMENTS: Facility has three emissions units. The loading rates were acceptable and observed opacity for all emissions units tesed was 0.0%.