

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	SPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/D  ARMS COMPLA		(CI)	
ΑI	RS ID#: 0950036 DATE: <u>3/23/2011</u>	ARRIVE: <u>07:02</u>		DEPART: <u>09:35</u>	
FA	CILITY NAME: WINTER PARK READY-MIX	« & BLOCK PLANT			
FA	CILITY LOCATION: 4010 FORSYTH RI	D			
	WINTER PARK	32792-6803			
CO	WNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: ONTACT NAME: SIGURD BO Email: (TITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 / 10/1 (effective date) (end date)	2/2013	Mobile:	(407)841-8409 (407)312-7119 (407)841-8409 (407)312-7119	
PA	RT I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS  IN COMPLIANCE			Non-COMPLIANCE	
D.A	DE II. ONGUE INTRODUCTORY MEETING				
	Name(s) of facility representative(s): SIGURD BO Brief Notes:	_		(check ☑ obox for each q	only one uestion)
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD BC If no, who is?:	)?		X Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrati Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO?If no, who is?:				□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at lea				□No □No

# Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-R-Mix,split silo,comp #1(cement)w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1	Deta-Glass' and 5/20/2010	box for each	
	Date of last inspection: 5/20/2010  Part Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		,
۷.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	⊠ Yes	□ No
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		∐ No ⊠ No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	res	⊠ 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: 5/20/2010	Yes	☐ No
	d. Date of last VE test: 5/20/2010  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? 26.57 tons/hour	<ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>	☐ 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 Yes	□ No
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check <b>☑</b>	only one
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
		oon for cucii	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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>		☐ 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 loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate?	ded during insp	pection.
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 35.61 tons/hour	· M Tes	∐ No
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?  If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go to	Yes	⊠ No
	1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes Yes	☐ No
	duration?	- Yes	☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.  1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll	ector	
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 3.5 minutes.	? Xes	☐ 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. What was the process rate? 35.61 tons/hour.		

# Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-R-Mix,split silo,comp #2(cement)w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 5/20/2010 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>		□ No
PA	RT 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	
	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
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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? 3.5 minutes.	? Xes	☐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 36.43 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

# Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-R-Mix, silo #1 (flyash/slag) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 5/20/2010 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
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>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)?</li> </ul>		☐ No
PA	RT 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	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
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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? 3.5 minutes.	Yes 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 0.0 % 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? 35.65 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

## Emissions Unit Section 5 -CCB Plant-R-Mix, weigh hopper, w/3 fabric filter bags subject to Reasonable Precautions

5 – CCD Hant-R-Mix, weigh hopper, w/3 labile linter bags subject to Reasonable 1	recautions	
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	•
Date of last inspection: 5/20/2010     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?  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	only one question)

Uı	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.  nconfined 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	only one question)
1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:	ned	
	<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the <ol> <li>paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> <li>application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?</li> <li>removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?</li> <li>reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	- \( \times \text{ Yes} \) \( \times \text{ Yes} \) \( \times \text{ Yes} \)	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	- 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 6 -CCB Plant-R-Mix,batcher/truckloadoutw/shroud&centdustcollect subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 6/5/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>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)?</li> </ul>		□ 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 3.5 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	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
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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? 3.5 minutes.	Yes 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 % for the highest six-minute average.	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	☐ 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 7 –CCB Plant-Block, silo (cement) w/4 cartridge dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 5/20/2010 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?	☐ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No
PA	RT 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	ded during ins	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>40.635</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 rate duration?	te and	□ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	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? 30 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 0.0 % 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? 40.635 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 8 –CCB Plant-Block,weighhopper/mixer ops w/2 fabric filter bags subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 5/20/2010 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>		□ 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	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	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	- Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	n is separate ector	
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? 40.635 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 30 minutes.	? ⊠ 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 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	☐ 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

## **Facility Section (continued)**

_			
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check <b>box</b> 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?		☐ 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 gene permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		⊠ No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
4.	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propar  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?	ne/yr	∨. ⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>v</b> 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
2.	Does the owner or operator:	— ∇ <b>V</b> <sub>23</sub>	
	<ul><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li><li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li></ul>	<del></del>	∐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- X Yes	☐ No
	permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

	OCATABLE PLANT:		✓ only one ch question)
	the facility: stationary $\boxtimes$ ; relocatable $\square$ ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable $\square$ oncrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If only stationary, skip the following</i>		• ,
so ( <b>If</b> )	the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and bil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	- Yes	☐ No
	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?		☐ No
c.	to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? 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?	)]	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>
3. If	the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per		
a.	nd the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:  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?	e)?  Yes	☐ No
	Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was p-located at the permitted facility?		☐ No
	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	-   Yes	∐ No
T			
CHA	NGES		<b>7</b> 1
			only one
Admi	inistrative Changes:	box for ea	only one ch question)
Admi 1. W	inistrative Changes:  Vere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations.	box for ea	
Admi 1. W	inistrative Changes:	box for ea tive not its or	
Admi 1. W as op 2. If	inistrative Changes:  Yere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations sociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions unperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for eative not its or - Yes	ch question)
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New o	inistrative Changes:  Yere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations sociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions unperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for eative not its or - Yes	ch question)
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si	inistrative Changes:  Yere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations sociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions underations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for ea	ch question)
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Sin a. b.	distrative Changes:  Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?  or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:  nce the last registration form submittal has there been  Installation of any new process equipment?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si a. b. c.	Inistrative Changes:  Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?  or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:  nce the last registration form submittal has there been  Installation of any new process equipment?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New (3. Sin a. b. c. d.	Inistrative Changes:  Yere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations sociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions underations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si a. b. c. d. 4. If	Inistrative Changes:  Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?  YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?  or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:  nce the last registration form submittal has there been  Installation of any new process equipment?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si a. b. c. d. 4. If	rere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No No No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si a. b. c. d. 4. If 30	rere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No No No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si a. b. c. d. 4. If 30	rere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations sociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions underations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No No No No No
Admi 1. W ass op 2. If New 6 3. Si a. b. c. d. 4. If 30	rere there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations sociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions underations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for ea	ch question)  No No No No No No No

**COMMENTS:** Assefa Hailemariam from Orange County EPD met Noah Handley, consultant, from Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., at the concrete ready -mix and Block plant at Forsyth Road, Winter Park Florida. Six VES were conducted on this date. The emissions units are EU001,EU002,EU003,EU006,EU007 and EU008. Other emissions were not tested EU004 and E005. All the loading rate were with acceptable and observed opacity was zero percent on all emission units tested. No PM was observed leaving the property.