CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Environmental Compliance

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☒ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐

RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

ARMS UPDATED 06/22/2012 AB

AIRS ID#: 1050073 **DATE:** **05/02/2012** **ARRIVE:** **~08:00 AM** **DEPART:** **09:45 AM**

FACILITY NAME: LAKELAND RM FACILITY

FACILITY LOCATION: 3770 Maine Ave

LAKELAND 33801-9757

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JASON JONES **PHONE:** (813)269-1240
Email: jasonp.jones@cemex.com **Mobile:** (813)363-6112
CONTACT NAME: JASON JONES **PHONE:** (813)269-1240
Email: jasonp.jones@cemex.com **Mobile:** (813)363-6112
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 (effective date) / 10/12/2013 (end date)

Facility Section

PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)

☒ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING (check ☑ only one box for each question)

1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Danny Moore (Operations Manager), Jeffrey Ramey (Plant Operator), and Matty (Truck Operator).

Brief Notes: I, Amaury Betancourt, audited a visible emissions (VE) test for each of the following operations: cement silo (EU001) loading, fly ash silo (EU002) loading, weigh scale baghouse (EU004) operation, and truck loadout central dust collector (EU005) operation. All VE tests for this facility on this day were conducted by Mr. Matthew Welborn of Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., the engineering consultant for this Cemex facility. This testing completes the requirements for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012 VE testing for all the active emission units for this facility.

2. Is the Authorized Representative still JASON JONES? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If no, who is?: N/A
   If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Is the facility contact still JASON JONES? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If no, who is?: N/A
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section

EU001 –CCB Plant-silo #1 (North side, cement) w/silo baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

1. Date of last inspection: 03/19/2010, facility was idle.
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 ☐ Yes ☐ No
   d. Date of last VE test: 05/04/2011
   e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? ☒ 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 ☐ Yes ☐ No
   i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   j. What was the actual batching rate? N/A 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)? N/A

PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment

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 % 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)? N/A

   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
   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? Approx. 27 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? ☐ Yes ☐ No
      2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and 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 is separate 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No
      2) What was the batching rate? N/A tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.

2. **Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 % 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? Approx. 27.24 tons/hour.

Emissions Unit Section

EU002 –CCB Plant-silo #2 (South side, fly ash) w/silo baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

1. Date of last inspection: 03/19/2010, facility was idle.
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 ☐ Yes ☐ No
   d. Date of last VE test: 05/04/2011
   e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? ------ ☒ Yes ☐ No
   f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 40.9 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? N/A 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)? N/A

PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment

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 % 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)? N/A

   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
   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? Approx. 31 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? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and 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 is separate 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   2) What was the batching rate? N/A tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.

2. **Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 % 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? Approx. 35 tons/hour.

Emissions Unit Section

EU004 –CCB Plant-weigh hopper w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

1. Date of last inspection: 03/19/2010, facility was idle.
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 ☐ Yes ☐ No
   d. Date of last VE test: 05/04/2011
   e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? ------ ☒ Yes ☐ No
   f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? ---------- ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   g. What was the actual silo loading rate? N/A 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

Batching occurred for test, but weigh hopper emissions are controlled by individual baghouse (EU004).

   i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   j. What was the actual batching rate? N/A 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)? N/A

PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment

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 % 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)? N/A

   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
   e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? ------ ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   f. What was the silo loading rate? N/A 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? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
      2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and 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 is separate 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No
      2) What was the batching rate? Normal (See comments) tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.

2. **Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 N/A % 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? N/A tons/hour.

Emissions Unit Section

EU005 –CCB Plant-truck loadout w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION (check ☑ only one box for each question)

1. Date of last inspection: 03/19/2010, facility was idle.
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:
   a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ No**

Last three (3) tests for EU005 were on 05/04/2011, 04/07/2009, and 05/01/2008.

   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: 05/04/2011
   e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? ------ ☒ Yes ☐ No
   f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? ---------- ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   g. What was the actual silo loading rate? N/A 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? N/A 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)? N/A

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? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 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)? N/A

   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
   e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? ------ ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   f. What was the silo loading rate? N/A 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? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and 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 is separate 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? ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   2) What was the batching rate? N/A tons/hour. What was the batching duration? N/A minutes.

2. **Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 N/A % 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? N/A tons/hour.

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY

(check ☑ only one box for each 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? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Does this facility include:
   a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception of units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ No
      If YES, what non-exempt units or activities? N/A

   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? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ No
      If YES, what other general permit units or activities? N/A

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*** ☐ No

******This facility only uses diesel fuel.***

   b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? ---------- ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? ---------- ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? ---------- ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? -- ☒ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No

$$\frac{\text{N/A gal diesel/yr}}{\text{275,000 gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{N/A gal gasoline/yr}}{\text{23,000 gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{\text{N/A MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{\text{44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{N/A MM gal propane/yr}}{\text{1.3 MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$$

4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

GENERAL CONDITIONS

(check ☑ only one box for each 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
   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
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:

(check ☑ only one box for each question)

1. Is the facility: stationary ☒; relocatable ☐; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable ☐ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (***If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)***

2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No

(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)

a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? --------- ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? ---- ☐ Yes ☐ No

c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation? --- ☐ Yes ☐ No

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 was co-located at the permitted facility? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No

CHANGES

(check ☑ only one box for each 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? ---------- ☐ 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 submitted 30 days prior to the change? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Amaury Betancourt	05/02/2012
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
Amaury Betancourt Digitally signed by Amaury Betancourt DN: cn=Amaury Betancourt, o=Florida Department of Environmental Protection, ou=Air Resource Management, email=amaury.betancourt@dep.state.fl.us, c=US Date: 2012.06.22 13:42:16 -04'00'	09/30/2017
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: I, Amaury Betancourt, conducted a facility walkthrough inspection and a visible emissions (VE) test audit of this Cemex concrete batch plant in Lakeland, FL, air operating facility ID 1050073. This facility currently operates under Air General Operating Permit No. 1050073-007-AG. The VE tests were conducted by Mr. Matthew Welborn of Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., the engineering consultant to this Cemex facility. A VE test was conducted for each of the four (4) active emission units (EUs) at the facility.

This facility currently has four active emission units listed in the Air Resource Management System (ARMS) database:

(1.) EU001: North compartment of two-compartment silo, used for cement, with its own silo-top baghouse. This EU is active.
(2.) EU002: South compartment of two-compartment silo, used for fly ash, with its own silo-top baghouse. This EU is active.
(3.) EU004: Weigh hopper with individual baghouse. This EU is active.
(4.) EU005: Truck loadout with central dust collector. This EU is active.

The VE tests on 05/02/2012 were originally scheduled to begin at 07:30 AM, but the first tests, for EU001 and EU002, did not begin until approximately 08:45 AM due to late truck arrival. Visible emissions limitations were not exceeded and this facility appeared to pass the VE tests. For weigh hopper and batching, EU004, the VE test report, which was received by the Department on 05/16/2012, states that the batching rate was normal but the report does not state the actual batching rate.

During this facility walkthrough inspection, I observed a possible wastewater violation on the facility's property: a concrete channel is present on the South side of the property, and this channel was filled with murky water and a conveyor belt was mostly submerged under the water. The channel had dimensions of approximately 6 feet in width and approximately 50 feet in length, with an unknown depth. I forwarded information on this possible wastewater issue to Ms. Sherry Sheffield of Polk County Code Enforcement on 05/10/2012, and I also forwarded this information to Michael Lynch of Industrial Wastewater Compliance at the FDEP Southwest District on 05/11/2012. On 06/08/2012, Ms. Sheffield contacted me to let me know that the Building Division Director of the Polk County Code Enforcement office thinks that OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) is the organization to contact. After discussing this issue with Ms. Danielle Henry of Air Compliance (FDEP) and Mr. Michael Lynch, I forwarded this potential issue on 06/12/2012 to Ms. Lara Padgett (Padgett.Lara@dol.gov) of OSHA (Ms. Padgett stated that she also has information on a possible environmental issue at a heating and cooling facility that is dumping waste in the back of their property, and that she would forward this information to me when she learns more on the issue). On 06/20/2012, I called the Tampa Area Office of OSHA (813-626-1177) and spoke with Mr. Winfred Marrero, who told me he would let me know about the possible Cemex issue that I forwarded to OSHA on 06/12/2012 and about the environmental issue that Ms. Padgett had mentioned regarding the heating and cooling facility. I will update this information in the electronic compliance file of the FDEP Southwest District and, if applicable, in the ARMS database upon receipt.

In addition, during the Cemex facility inspection on 05/02/2012, I noted sawdust on the grounds of the property and I also noted black smoke from a neighboring property, Wood Mulch Products, Inc. (air operating facility ID 1050215). Wood Mulch Products, Inc. processes wood products and generates sawdust. The truck operator at the Cemex facility stated that sometimes it is hard to breathe at the Cemex facility because there is so much sawdust in the air. I told the operator that I would check the neighboring wood processing facility after completing my inspection of the Cemex facility. The current and only applicable air operating permit for this Wood Mulch Products, Inc. facility is air operating permit 1050215-007-AF. After my inspection of this Cemex facility, I drove to Wood Mulch Products, Inc. and spoke with a facility representative there, Mr. Ali Rastegar. During the approximately two weeks following my inspection of the Cemex facility, I spoke with Mr. Jason P. Jones of Cemex numerous times on the telephone to discuss the complaint from the operators at this Cemex facility, and told Mr. Jones that I had investigated the complaint and I had spoken with the Compliance Engineer at FDEP who is responsible for this facility (Mr. William Schroeder) and I found that the Wood Mulch Products, Inc. facility appears to be within their permit limits, but that if the operators at the Cemex facility wanted to file an official complaint with the Department, I would conduct a more thorough inspection of the Wood Mulch Products, Inc. facility. Mr. Jones stated that the operators at the Cemex facility did not want to file an official complaint on Wood Mulch Products, Inc. with the Department. Details of my complaint investigation of the Wood Mulch Products, Inc. facility will be reported in Complaint number 12755 in the ARMS database.

On 05/18/2012, I e-mailed Mr. Jason P. Jones, Environmental Manager of Cemex Construction Materials Florida, LLC, to ask several inspection follow-up questions. Mr. Jones e-mailed me back on the same day and told me that this Cemex concrete batch plant (facility ID 1050073) is used on an as needed basis, and that when the company has work in the area (of the plant), the company runs the plant. Mr. Jones also confirmed that there have been no changes at the plant since 2010 (the last compliance inspection at this plant). Mr. Jones stated that I may update the descriptions of the silo at the facility to indicate that the North compartment of the split silo is for cement (EU001) and the South compartment of the split silo is for fly ash (EU002). On 05/31/2012, Mr. James L. Twiggs, Area Operations Manager for Cemex, e-mailed me and told me that concrete production for this facility in the year 2011 was 1,791 cubic yards, and in the year 2012 to date is 6,640 cubic yards. Fuel usage in the year 2011 was approximately 150 gallons of diesel, and in the year 2012 to date is approximately 1,476 gallons of diesel.

A photo log, VE test audit report, and an e-mail conversation log are attached to this inspection report. Based on this facility inspection, VE test audit, and questions and answers via e-mail, this facility appears to be IN compliance with its air general operating permit.####