	NUMERTAL PROTEC	TION	ic.
BI GHI	V	A rea	
FI	ORIDA	ar	1
			-

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 0950132 DATE: <u>12/17/10</u> ARRIVE: <u>9:54 AM</u> DEPART	Г: <u>2:25 РМ</u>
FACILITY NAME: TARMAC AMERICA/ORLANDO BLK	
FACILITY LOCATION: 339 Thorpe Rd	
ORLANDO 32824-8152	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Terry Lancaster PHONE: (561)504-67 Email: Mobile:	787
CONTACT NAME:Kelly Folsom, Environmental EngineerPHONE:(954)242-01Email:Mobile:	183
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2007 / 10/12/2012 (effective date) (end date)	
Facility Section	
PART I: <u>INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS</u> (check 🗹 only one box)	
IN COMPLIANCE IMINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMP	'LIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(check 🗹 only one
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Terry Lancaster</u>	box for each question)
Brief Notes:	
2. Is the Authorized Representative still SCOTT QUAAS?	Yes XNo
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?	XesNo - YesNo

 4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? ----
 ∑ Yes
 □..No
 [f yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance? ----- ∑ Yes
 □..No
 ∑ Yes
 □..No

Emissions Unit Section <u>1 –North Side Cement Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/1/09	(check 🗹 box for each	only one 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 forst even of evention, use a VE test performed within 20 days of events. 	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 12/1/09 	🗌 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? <u>28.9</u> tons/hour 		□ No □ No
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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
DADT II. STACK EMISSIONS from a sile, weigh honner/hotsher) or other		
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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?	Xes 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</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? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>28.09</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1 - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1 - g.3$ and go to	\square Yes	🛛 No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	🗌 No
 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	h 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? minut	? 🗌 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?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? $\underline{29}$ tons/hour.		□ No

Emissions Unit Section <u>2 – South Side Cement Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/1/09	(check 🗹 box for each	only one 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 fort even of event in the set of the past 4 within 20 days of event set. 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 12/1/09 	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? <u>26.4</u> 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Yes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes Yes	🗌 No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes 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?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 29 tons/hour	_	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to		No 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 rate 		∐ No
duration?	Yes	🗌 No
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 onducted 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? minute	Yes	🗌 No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		□ No
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? <u>26.4</u> tons/hour. 		∐ No □ No

Emissions Unit Section <u>3 – West Side Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/7/09	(check 🗹 box for each	only one 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 fort even of evention was a VE test performed within 20 days of events. 	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 12/7/09 	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? <u>35.1</u> 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
 k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \bigotimes 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?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>35</u> tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to		No 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 rate 		🗌 No
duration?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 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? minute	? 🗌 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 <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? <u>35</u> tons/hour. 	_	∐ No □ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –Mixer 1 - South Side subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/1/09	(check 🗹 box for eacl	
 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 		□ No ⊠ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 12/1/09 N/A 	Yes	🗌 No
 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour 		□ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
 k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?- If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.	Xes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opticity of <u>u</u> // for the ingless six influte 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 that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \Box N/A - silo not lo		
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour 		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go		🛛 No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
duration?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour . What was the batching duration? mi h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the second second	ich is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust 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>30</u> minutes	on? 🛛 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?		□ No □ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		D No

Emissions Unit Section 5 – Mixer 2 - North Side subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/1/09	(check 🗹 box for eacl	•
 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, we a VE test performed within 20 days of commencing. 	- 🛛 Yes - 🗌 Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 12/1/09 	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour 		□ 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	□ No □ No
 k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for eacl	•
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</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 d		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \Box N/A – silo not lo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		spection.
 f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? 		🛛 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 duration?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? <u>30</u> minute h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi 		
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 duratio 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>30</u> minutes	n? 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 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	□ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	
	(check \mathbf{v} only one box for each question)
	box for each question)
 Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? 	🖾 Yes 🔲 No
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the except units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	
 b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air g permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 	
 3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: 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)? 	X Yes No Yes No Yes No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal p275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal production	
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel con for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	•
1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	🗌 Yes	🖂 No
 Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? 		
 b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit? 3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access 		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	_	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary $[X]$; relocatable $[]$; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable $[]$	box for each	question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the followi</i>	no auestion ?)
concrete outening und/or noninetanie ninieral processing plants. (if only sumonary, ship ine jouowi	ng 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?		∐ No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900]		∐ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation		□ No
to the appropriate Department of Local Art Program at least rive business days prior to relocation.		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pe	ermit,	
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 usag	ge)? 🗌 Yes	No 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? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🗌 Yes	∐ No
CHANGES	(check 🗹	only one
	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes:	box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent	box for each tative not	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u	box for each tative not mits or	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 	box for each tative not nits or Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not nits or Yes	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not units or Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? -2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

12/17/11

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Inspector Norma Ali met with Kelly Folsom, Environmental Engineer and Steve Malloch, Plant Manager to audit the compliance test for this facility.

The facility has five emission units:

EU001 North Side Cement Silo Opacity observed = 0% Loading rate ~ 26.45 tph

EU002 South Side Cement Silo At approximately 14 minutes into the test, Kelly Folsom stopped the test because of excess opacity originating from the silo hatch, fugitive emissions were observe ~10% opacity. After plant personnel corrected the leaking seal on the hatch, a second VE test lasting 30-minutes was conducted during which the silo was being loaded with cement at between 8-10 psi. Opacity observed = 0% Loading rate ~ 28.9 tph

EU003 West Side Silo Opacity observed = 0% Loading rate ~ 35.4%

EU004 Mixer 1 - South Side Opacity observed = 0%

EU005 Mixer 2 - North Side Opacity observed = 0%

No objectionable odors or dust leaving the property were observed during the inspection.