

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DI ARMS COMPLA	ISCOVERY (CI) AINT NO:
AIRS ID#: 0951228 DATE: 6/18/2014	ARRIVE: 8:30AM	<u>M</u> DEPART: <u>14;00PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: CCB PLANT & BLOCK PLAN	NT	
FACILITY LOCATION: 10500 Rocket Ct		
ORLANDO 32824	4-8567	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: LOU DEBERADINIS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/8/2010 / 7/8/201 (effective date) (end date)	15	PHONE: (407)859-1300 Mobile: PHONE: (407)859-1300 Mobile:
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS IN COMPLIANCE	<u> </u>) NIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Pino Urso Brief Notes:	<u>.</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still LOU DEBEI If no, who is?:	RADINIS?	⊠ Yes □No
If different, did the facility provide an administrati 3. Is the facility contact still LOU DEBERADINIS? If no, who is?:		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at lea		

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-RMplant,silo#1(compart.#1&2)w/1silotop d-collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/4/2012 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No 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	ART 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?	Yes	☐ No
	 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?	⊠ 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 loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	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 rate 		☐ 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 from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.	n 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? minut	? 🛛 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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No☐ 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? d. What was the process rate? 24.12 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-RMplant,flyash silo#1,w/1silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

	5—CCD Frant-Respirate, ryash show 1, w/1 shotop dust concetor subject to 5/6 Opac	ty Dillit	
P	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
1	Deta of last immeration, 12/4/2012	box for each	question)
	Date of last inspection: 12/4/2012		•
۷.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	V.	□ Na
	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? 🖂 N/A	☐ Yes	∐ No
	d. Date of last VE test: $\frac{12/4/2012}{2}$		
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?		∐ No
	f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	⊠ Yes	⊠ No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 37.3 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)?		
P	ART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check	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?	⊠ 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 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.		
	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 co	nducted at a 1	ate
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{N/A} - \text{silo not loa} \)		
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>55.3</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?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra		
	duration?	- Yes	☐ 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		
		1 15 Separate	
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust col	lec <u>tor</u>	□ No
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collected while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	lector ? X Yes	□ No
2.	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust col 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	lector ? X Yes es	□ No
2.	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collected 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 was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	lector ? \(\sum \) Yes es. \(\sum \) Yes	_
2.	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust col 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	lector ? \(\sum \) Yes es. \(\sum \) Yes	□ No

d. What was the process rate? 55.3 tons/hour.

Emissions Unit Section <u>5 -CCB Plant-BlockPlant,silo#1(cement)w/silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/4/2012 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	∑ Yes	□ No
PA	ART 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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	 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?	⊠ 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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	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 L	⊠ 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 raduration?	- Yes	☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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. 	n is separate ector	
	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		☐ 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.	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 32.4 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-BlockPlant,silo#2(cement)w/silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/4/2012 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
PA	ART 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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	 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?	⊠ 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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	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	⊠ 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 raduration?	- Yes	☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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 collection.	n is separate ector	
	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		☐ 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
	 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? <u>40.96</u> tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 8 –CCB Plant-BlockPlant mixer w/1 single bag filter subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only	one
1. D	box for each ques	
1. Date of last inspection: 12/4/2012	1	,
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 No
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		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: <u>12/4/2012</u>		NT.
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? 2 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
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	<u> 1cs </u>	110
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE t	est? X Yes	No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		110
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 ques	tion)
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 EDA Method 02		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. 		NO
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		110
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? Yes No N/A – silo n	ot loaded during inspection	on.
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		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?		No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batch	ning rate and	
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 collector 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 du		No
2) What was the batching rate? 2 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 60 minutes.	iadon: [165 [110
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 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	<u></u>	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		No
d. What was the process rate? 2 tons/hour.		
·		

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check v box for each	only one 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.)? 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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the past 5 years?	ne/yr	0? □ No
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ✓ box for each	only one question)
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?	- ⊠ Yes	□ No
2	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?	- X Yes	□ No
5.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces 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:	(check ☑ c	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consis concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processi	ting of both stationary and relocatable box for each question g plants? (If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)	juestion)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question)	2.c below.)	□ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate De e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Reloc 	business day prior to changing location? Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later that c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation	an five business days following a relocation? Yes	☐ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program	n at least five business days prior to relocation? Yes	☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an er		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a nor If YES, what was the purpose?	n-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? Yes	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate	e how long it was Yes	□ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in	duration? Yes	□ No
CTLANGEG		
CHANGES Administrative Changes	(check ☑ c box for each q	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone	box for each q	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phonassociated with a change in ownership or with a physical statement of the change in ownership or with a physical state	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or	question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phonassociated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes	question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phonassociated with a change in ownership or with a physical statement of the change in ownership or with a physical state	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes	question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owner 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes rship:	uestion) No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owner 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes rship:	uestion) No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification with New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owner 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? ————————————————————————————————————	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes reship: en Yes replacement?	No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owner 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes reship: The state of the facility or authorized representative not call relocation of the facility or any emissions units or yes thin 30 days of the change?	uestion) No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phonassociated with a change in ownership or with a physioperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owner 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been as Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without reconstructions.	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or reminor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes reship: The state of the facility or any emissions units or reminor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change?	No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owners. 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or reminor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes reship: The state of the facility or any emissions units or reminor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change?	No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owners. 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or reminor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes reship: The state of the facility or any emissions units or reminor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change?	No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone associated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification win New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owners 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? ————————————————————————————————————	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes rship: en	No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phonassociated with a change in ownership or with a physicoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification winch New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owners 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each que number of the facility or authorized representative not cal relocation of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes reship: The state of the facility or any emissions units or minor administrative change at the facility? Yes thin 30 days of the change? Yes replacement? Yes that is substantially different? Yes that is substantially different? Yes ew registration form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes	No No No No No No No

COMMENTS: Assefa Hailemariam, inspector from OCEPD, met with Kent Bottorf, of Bottorf Associates Inc , on June 18, 2014, at 10500 Rocket Court Orlando, Florida 32824, to audit the visible emission test on five emission units. All emission units tested had an observed opacity of zero percent and loading rates were: EU001= 24.12 TPH, EU003= 55.30 TPH, EU005= 32.4 TPH, EU006= 40.96 TPH and EU008= 2 TPH. No objectionable odors were detected. No PM were observed leaving the property during the compliance test and yards were very clean. The facility Plant Operation Manager Pio Urso was present during the VE test. The facility appears to be in compliance during inspection performed on this date with the air permit.