

#### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)		
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0950175 DATE: 4/19/2013 ARRIVE: 8:30 AM DEPART:	<u>10:30 AM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: TARMAC ARMERICA/S ORANGE RMC		
FACILITY LOCATION: 200 ZELL DR		
ORLANDO 32824-7619		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: TERRY LANCASTER PHONE: (954)481-280 Email: tlancaster@titanamerica.com Mobile:	00	
CONTACT NAME: KELLY FOLSOM* PHONE: (954)242-018		
<b>Email:</b> kfolsom@titanamerica.com <b>Mobile:</b> (954)242-018 <b>ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:</b> 4/5/2013 / 4/5/2018	3	
(effective date) (end date)		
Facility Section		
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> <u>COMPLIANCE</u> <u>STATUS</u> (check ☑ only one box)		
	IANCE	
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(check 🗹 only one	
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Chris Fitch/Plant Manager</u>	box for each question)	
Brief Notes:		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still TERRY LANCASTER?	⊠ Yes □No	
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still KELLY FOLSOM*?  If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No	
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	<ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>☐No</li><li>∑ Yes</li><li>☐No</li></ul>	

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: <u>10/25/2012</u>			
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:			
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? ————————————————————————————————————	☐ Yes	☐ No	
d. Date of last VE test: 10/25/2012	✓ Vac	□ 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?		∐ No □ No	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 33 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?		⊠ 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	☐ No	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
chelosed storage and conveying equipment			
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?		∐ 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.			
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	- X Yes	∐ No	
in 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 rate			
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ N/A – silo not loading			
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>27.42</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		<u></u>	
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 rate			
duration?		☐ No	
3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration?min			
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.			
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 3-4 minutes			
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	
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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. What was the process rate? 27.42 tons/hour.	- M 168	☐ 1NO	
<u> </u>			

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. D			
1. Date of last inspection: <u>10/25/2012</u>			
Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:     a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	X Yes	☐ No	
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		□ No	
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	103	Z 110	
operation? 🔯 N/A	Yes	☐ No	
d. Date of last VE test: 10/25/2012			
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test	t? X Yes	☐ No	
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	X Yes	☐ No	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 32 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		∐ No	
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		⊠ No	
<ul><li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li><li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE</li></ul>	test? X Yes	☐ No	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		□ No	
in not, what was the problem (if known).			
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
1 Was a might a missions 4554 and had a had be the facility for this mit down a this site misit	∇ v	□ Na	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.			
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X 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	e silo conducted at a	rate	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No	
f. What was the silo loading rate? 28.63 tons/hour			
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collected	or? Yes	No	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and			
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	<del></del>	☐ No	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate representative rate rate representative rate rate rate rate rate rate rate rat			
duration?		☐ 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 collector from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) of			
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and d		☐ No	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>3-4</u> m			
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?		☐ No	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % 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? 28.63 tons/hour.			

# Emissions Unit Section 3 –TRUCK LOADOUT subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
1. Date of last inspection: 10/25/2012 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	· 🔲 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
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		
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:</li> </ol>	ed	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the	following:	
<ol> <li>paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> <li>application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
control emissions?	X Yes	☐ No
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne		
particulate matter?	X Yes	☐ No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:     a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	. N Ves	□ No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes	□ No

# Emissions Unit Section 4 -Weigh Hopper subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> only one
	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: <u>10/25/2012</u>	4
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: 10/25/2012	
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?	Yes No
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	Yes 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?  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 question)
	com for <b>cuent que</b> stion)
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 $\underline{0}$ % 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	silo conducted at a rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \( \subseteq \text{ Yes} \) No \( \subseteq \text{ N/A} -  silo silo silo silo silo silo silo silo	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collecto	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and	
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 batch	thing rate and
duration?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 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	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 3-4 n	
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 $\underline{0}$ % 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)**

_			
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check vector) box for each	only one h question)
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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No
4.	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared that the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ne/yr	□ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ✓ only one			
1	The decrease was a state of the	box for eac	
	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?	- X Yes	☐ No
3.	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?	- 🛭 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	hov fo	ck ☑ only one r each question)	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If		ion 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.)	_	es 🗌 No	
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or L     e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p     b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	prior to changing location?  ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	tion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, 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)? Yes No If YES, what was the purpose?			
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes No	
<u>CHANGES</u>		ck <b>☑</b> only one reach question)	
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 substated. A change in ownership?	antially different?	Yes ⊠ No Yes ⊠ No Yes ⊠ No Yes ⊠ No	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted 30 days prior to the change? ————————————————————————————————————			
Bill Rhodes	4/19/2013		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	12/31/2014		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		
COMMENTS: Bill Rhodes, with OCEPD, audited visible emissions tests conducted at the facility on 4/19/2013. Persons present at the facility at the time of the VEs/inspection were: Kelly Folsom, consultant performing the VEs, representing Titan America, and Chris Fitch, Plant Manager, representing Tarmac America.  Opacity observed:  Cement Silo (EU-001) - 0% opacity - Loading rate was 27.42 TPH, which is acceptable.  Flyash Silo (EU-002) - 0% opacity - Loading rate was 28.63 TPH, which is acceptable.  Weigh Hopper (EU-004) - 0% opacity- three trucks were batched for approximately 3-4 minutes, each.			

Truck Load-Out (EU-003) - 0% opacity (VE not required, however fugitive emissions were not observed during batching operations).

The yard was sufficiently wet, and no PM was observed leaving the property. No objectionable odors were noted.