| | WHENTAL PROTECTION |
|---------|--------------------|
| Mar | an 1 Cana |
| DENUTIN | |
| 1 | |

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| | NUAL (INS1, INS2) | COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPL | | (CI) | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| AIRS ID#: 1010374 DATE: | <u>10/14/2010</u> | ARRIVE: <u>1:00 p</u> | . <u>m.</u> | DEPART: <u>1:40 p.</u> | <u>m.</u> |
| FACILITY NAME: TAMPA | A YARD | | | | |
| FACILITY LOCATION: | 2231 MARATHON RD | | | | |
| | ODESSA 33556 | | | | |
| OWNER/AUTHORIZED RI Email: mmahoney@prest CONTACT NAME: MIKE Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: | ige-gunite.com | HAEL MAHONEY | PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile: | | |
| Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box) IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE | | | | | |
| L | | | | | |
| PART II: <u>ONSITE INTROD</u> 1. Name(s) of facility representation Brief Notes: | | | | | k ☑ only one each question) |
| Is the Authorized Represen If no, who is?: | tative still MICHAEL MAH | IONEY? | | X | es 🗌No |
| If different, did the facility 3. Is the facility contact still N If no, who is?: | provide an administrative up /IKE TOWNS? | | | | |
| 4. Will facility be conducting | VE test(s) during today's in authority notified at least 15 | | | | = |

Emissions Unit Section <u>2 -CEMENT SILO #2 w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

| PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION | (check 🗹 | only one |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Date of last inspection: <u>3/30/2007</u> | box for each | • |
| 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: | _ | _ |
| a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? | ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes | |
| b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? | 🛛 Yes | ∐ No |
| operation? 🛛 N/A | Yes | 🗌 No |
| d. Date of last VE test: <u>2/3/2010</u> 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>26.6</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 | \boxtimes Yes \boxtimes 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 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? | 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 conducted at a rate | | |
| that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \bigotimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? | | pection. |
| f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>26.6</u> 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 | \bowtie 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 ra duration? | - 🖂 Yes | 🗌 No |
| 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minute. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which | | |
| 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 collected at the silo dust collector. | - | |
| 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 |
| Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | Yes | ⊠ No □ No |
| b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% 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. | | □ No |

Facility Section (continued)

| CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| | (check ☑ box for each | |
| | DOX TOT Each | 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 |
| 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 gen 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)? | | No No No No No No No |
| gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal propaga275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propaga | |)? |
| 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 |
| 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: 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 following concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants</i>?) | (check ☑ box for each ing question 2.) | question) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? | | No No No No |
| 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per 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? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? | ermit, ge)? 🗌 Yes | □ No |
| If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? | Yes | No |
| | | |
| <u>CHANGES</u> <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 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 upper the second sec | inits or | question) |
| 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? | | ⊠ No □ No |

| 2. | If TES, did the facility provide written notification within 50 days of the change. | I 03 | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|
| Ne | ew 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? | Yes | 🛛 No |
| | b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? | Yes | 🛛 No |
| | c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? | Yes | 🛛 No |
| | d. A change in ownership? | Yes | 🛛 No |
| | | | |
| 4. | If the answer to any question 3a d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee subm | itted | |
| | 30 days prior to the change? | Yes | 🗌 No |

James Burkholder

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

10/14/2013

10/14/2010

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The facility keeps records of each shipment of cement received on the date it was received. The facility also keeps a record of how much product it ships out to customers. At the current year to date for 2010 the facility has shipped/sold 13,925 yards of concrete. There concrete weighs approximately 504 lbs per yard. The ground is kept graded as best as possible and a watering truck is brought on site on an as needed basis. At the time of inspection the facility appeared to be in compliance.