

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	` /	
AIRS ID#: 1150007 DATE: <u>08/18/2011</u>	ARRIVE: ~8:30 am	DEPART:	
FACILITY NAME: SOUTH SARASOTA PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION: 6000 Deacon Pl			
SARASOTA 34238-2	2719		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: KA Email: CONTACT NAME: MIKE NEES Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/27/2010 / 6/27/201. (effective date) (end date)	Mobile: PHONE Mobile:	: (904)380-0130 : (941)351-9611	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
2. Is the Authorized Representative still KATHIE CHUN If no, who is?:	MLEY?		
If different, did the facility provide an administrative of 3. Is the facility contact still MIKE NEES?	update within 30 days?		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's in If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 1			

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-central dust collector for load out subject to Reasonable Precautions

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
2.	Date of last inspection: Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	Yes	No No No
- ·			
Un	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. aconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Onveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check ☑ box for each of	only one question)
1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:	ned	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 		☐ No
	control emissions?	X Yes	☐ No
	owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?		☐ No
	particulate matter from stock piles?		☐ No
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	X Yes	☐ No
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-NE baghouse on N silo cement subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
1. Date of last inspection:	box for each question)
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?	
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	
	N/A Yes No
d. Date of last VE test:	
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the	
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	
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hourk. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the las	st VE test?
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	it vE test?
if not, what was the problem (if known):	
DADTH, CITACIZ EMICCIONIC C	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check v 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 vis	sit?
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	of the silo conducted at a rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{No} \) \(\subseteq \text{N/A} - \)	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust co	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$	
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	
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 co from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) 	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate a 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site v	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute a	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	<u> </u>

Emissions Unit Section 5 – CCB Plant-NW baghouse on N silo cement subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one
1. Date of last inspection:	oox for each	question)
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? N/A d. Date of last VE test:	☐ 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)?	Yes	☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(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 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 % for the highest six-minute average. 	Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)? Not completed; Rescheduled.	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?	· L 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?	Yes	☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes Yes	☐ No
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? 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	? Yes	☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut		
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 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? 	Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 6 – CCB Plant-SE baghouse on S silo flyash subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ✓ only one box for each question)
 Date of last inspection: 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
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	g
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days 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 whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 	N/A Yes No Yes No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during If not, what was the problem (if known)?	the last VE test? Yes No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ only one box for each 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 <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute	e average.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit If not, what was the problem (if known)?	t?
 d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the lot that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes □ No □ e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in pract 	N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo	<u>_</u>
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip g 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions tends to the skip g 1) where g 2.	st?
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the duration?	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching dur 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 hoppe conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batchin 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching dura	ig rate and duration? ⊠ Yes ☐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during thi a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	is site visit?
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minut c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	

Emissions Unit Section 7 –CCB Plant-SW baghouse on S silo slag subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check only one	
1. Date of last inspection:	box for each question))
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?)
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?		•
 d. Date of last VE test: e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test 	st?	,
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	3	
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		
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VI If not, what was the problem (if known)?	E test? Yes No)
I not, what was the process (if this wh)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑ only one	e
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 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 th	ne silo conducted at a rate	
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?)
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collect		•
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) a		
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 bat 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 collect		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher)		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and o		•
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?		
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 % for the highest six-minute average. 	Yes No	'
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	,
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	Z 105 _ 110	

Emissions Unit Section 8 – CCB Plant-weigh hopper baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
1. Date of last inspection:	box for each	question)
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?		☐ 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:		
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		☐ 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	_	
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
If not, what was the problem (if known):		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
	oon for cach	question
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	X Yes	☐ 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.		∐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	□ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
ir not, what was the problem (ir known).		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the	silo conducted at a r	ate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo i		
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 collecto	r? X 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?	X Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batch		_
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 collecto		
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		☐ No
 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 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 by the hispector for this unit during this site visit: 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? tons/hour.	Z 105	

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(a la a .	1. [7]	1
				only one question)
		00X 101	each y	[uestion)
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:			N
	a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?			⊠ No
	b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?			No No
	c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	Y	es	⊠ No
2	Does this facility include:			
۷.	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	O1		
	Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	- N	es	⊠ No
	If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?			
	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?	∐ Y	es	⊠ No
	If YES, what other general permit units or activities?			
3	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:			
٥.	a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	-	es	⊠ No
	b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?		es	⊠ No
	c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?		es	⊠ No
	d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?		es	⊠ No
	e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?		es	No No
	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 1.5 MM gal propared 1.6 MM gal propared 1.7 MM gal propared 1.8 MM gal propared 1.9 MM g	ine/yr ·	< 1.00?	'
	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propan	e/yr		
4	The decrease of a contract of the contract of			
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?	ption		□ No
	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 3 years?	I	es	∐ No
_				
~				1
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one
		box for	each q	uestion)
1	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed			
1.	the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control			
	devices?	🗌 Y	es	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator:	_		
	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- 🛛 Y	es	☐ No
	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?		es	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access	3		
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general	<u> </u>		
	permit and Department rules?	- 🖂 Y	es	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	totionomy and malocatable.	(check 🗹 box for each o	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both s concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>Ij</i>	tationary and relocatable		- *
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		Yes	□ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or I e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day j b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification 	prior to changing location?		□ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	ss days following a relocation?tion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five			☐ No
 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purp If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it 	in that separate permit: pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)		□ No
co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES		(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t	he facility or authorized representati	box for each ove not	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	he facility or authorized representati of the facility or any emissions unit histrative change at the facility?	box for each ove not s or Yes	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unit histrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each ove not s or Yes Yes	question) No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unit nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unit a strative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on 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?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unitalistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes	question) No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unitalistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes	question) No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unitalistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes	question) No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unitalistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes	question) No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on 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?	he facility or authorized representation of the facility or any emissions unit histrative change at the facility? of the change?	ve not s or Yes	question) No No No No No No No

COMMENTS: INS 3. slag - 2 pods 25.94 tons; flyash - 2 pods 26.10 tons; cement - 1 pod 26.42 tons; cement - 3 pods 26.39 tons; weigh hopper/ bather baghouse. 9,000 gallon diesel AST on site; spray; yard sweeper - 60 days; hose down daily w/ fire hose = reasonable.