

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		AINT/DISCOV OMPLAINT N	· / <u>-</u>	
ΑI	IRS ID#: 0210026 DA	TE: <u>05/09/2013</u>	ARRIVE:	7:45 a.m.	DEPART: <u>12:50 a.m.</u>	
FA	ACILITY NAME: EA	ST TRAIL R/M FACILITY				
FA	ACILITY LOCATION	I: 15555 US 41				
		NAPLES 34114				
CO	WNER/AUTHORIZE Email: jasonp.jones@ ONTACT NAME: JA Email: NTITLEMENT PERIC	ASON JONES		PHON Mobil PHON Mobil	e: NE:	
			Facility Sect			1
PA	ART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> IN COMPLIANC	COMPLIANCE STATUS CE MINOR Non-CO		·	ANT Non-COMPLIANCE	
PA	ART II: <u>ONSITE INTI</u>	RODUCTORY MEETING	Ţ		(check	only one
1.	Name(s) of facility rep	presentative(s):			box for each	h question)
	Brief Notes:					
2.	Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?:	resentative still JASON JON	IES?		\times Yes	□No
3.		ility provide an administrativitil JASON JONES?				□No □No
4.		eting VE test(s) during today ance authority notified at least				□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) Plant #2 w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check	only one
1.	Date of last inspection: $07/29/10$	box for each	question)
	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	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? 31.9 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
D.A	DT H. CTACK EMICCIONC C		
PA	RT II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑	only one
	enciosed 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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.00</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 co		
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load		
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	Yes	∐ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>29.28</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 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	te and	
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		☐ 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 coll		
	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? 11 minutes.	' 🔀 Yes	∐ No
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 0.00 % 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 2 –CCB Plant-silo (flyash) Plant #2 w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/29/10 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? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 31.2 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?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☑ Yes	⊠ No □ No □ 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>0.00</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 conthat 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?	led during ins Yes Yes h.	
	 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?	Yes ites is separate	☐ No
	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.		☐ No
2.	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>11</u> minutes. 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∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-splitsilo(cement)Plant#2ASouth compart#1w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 9/18/09 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? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
	i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?		□ 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>0.00</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	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 32.34 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 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 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 collection. 	ites 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? <u>06</u> minutes.		☐ 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 0.00 % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-splitsilo(cement)Plant#2ANorth compart#1w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 07/29/10 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>0.00</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?		□ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>21.47</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 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	h. Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra	te and	
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		☐ 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.		
	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? <u>06</u> minutes.		☐ No
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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.00</u> % for the highest six-minute average. 		∐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 5 -CCB Plant-silo (flyash)Plant #2A w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1	D	box for each	
	Date of last inspection: 12/29/10 Part Visible Environment (VE) tentos		,
۷.	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 ⊠ No
		res	M 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: 7/11/12	⊠ 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? 26.37 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?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
	j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hourk. 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
P	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(-1 1 L7	1
	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 <u>0.00</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 co	nducted at a ra	ate
	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?		□ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 21.3 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 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		☐ No
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
	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 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>06</u> minutes.		∐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	No 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 0.00 % 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-weigh hopper Plant #2 w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 11/04/11	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	
	☐ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour	Yes No
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the repowhether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	⊠ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the If not, what was the problem (if known)?	last VE test? 🛛 Yes 🔲 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(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 <u>0.00</u> % for the highest six-minute 	
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 that is representative of the normal silo loading rate?	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 dust	_
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	g.3) and go to h.
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normalization?	mal batching rate and
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration	n? minutes
 h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) 	tcher) dust collector
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate? 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 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.00 % for the highest six-minute 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-weigh hopper Plant #2A w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
1. Date of last inspection: 09/18/09 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?		□ No □ No □ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 7/11/12 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 ⊠ 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)?	- X Yes	☐ No
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?	- X Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	- Xes	☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.00</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 dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo not lead to the first properties of the properti		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\bigsim\) Yes \(\bigsim\) No \(\bigsim\) N/A - silo not lo 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 collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$) and go to	Yes o 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 in the visible emissions. 		☐ No
duration?	Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mirh. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi	ch is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co- 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? minu	n? 🛛 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.00 % 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? tons/hour.	X Yes	☐ No

Facility Section (continued)

-	AND MARKON OF COMPANY PERMIT BY LOWIN YOU		1
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ box for each	•
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	☐ Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener 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)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No No
4.	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 + MM gal propared 1.3 mm gal	e/yr aption	? □ No
	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	
	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? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	- X Yes	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		☐ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	stationary and relocatable	(check b ox for each	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		ng question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	Yes	☐ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificent 	y prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busing. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	ness days following a relocation?cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	- Yes 5)] _	☐ 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 and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions uni a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	t in that separate permit: rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage		☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes Yes	□ No □ No
<u>CHANGES</u>		(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions un ninistrative change at the facility?	box for each ative not nits or Yes	question) No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits of the provide written notification within 30 days. 	on of the facility or any emissions ur ninistrative change at the facility? s of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No
Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub-	on of the facility or any emissions ur ninistrative change at the facility? s of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes	No No No No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminor adminor adminor. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	on of the facility or any emissions ur ninistrative change at the facility? s of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminor adminor adminor. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	on of the facility or any emissions ur inistrative change at the facility? s of the change?? ?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminor adminor adminor. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	on of the facility or any emissions urainistrative change at the facility?s of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo

COMMENTS: During the VE test of emission unit EU-04 split silo, north compartment baghouse, a small dusting leak was seen by facility personnel on the baghouse approx. 30 minutes into the VE test. The leak was not visible from the positions of the facility's visible emissions consultant or the DEP inspector during the test. Both trucks loading silos for EU units 4 & 5 were stopped from loading to let facility personnel check the baghouse unit EU-04. The gasket on the baghouse was re-seated and the VE test and

trucks loading the silos were resumed after approx. five minutes time. No other emissions were noted from any of the other emission units tested during the VE test. Silo bahouse EU-08 was not tested at this time and will be tested at a later date to be scheduled.