

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE ARMS COMPLAINT NO	<u> </u>		
AIRS ID#: 0951239 DATE: <u>11/9/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:48 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:40 AM</u>		
FACILITY NAME: CEMEX CONSTRUCTION	MATERIALS-WEST ORANGE RE	EADY-MIX PLANT		
FACILITY LOCATION: 12601 AVALON 1	RD			
WINTER GARDE	EN 34787			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: SIGURD BO Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 / 10/ (effective date) (end of	Mobile: PHONE Mobile: /12/2013	E: (407)841-8409		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Mike Hagn Brief Notes: Plant Manager 407-238-6425		(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD E If no, who is?:	3O?			
If different, did the facility provide an administra 3. Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO? If no, who is?:				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least				

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 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</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?	ded during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>35.93</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	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 	te and	∐ No
	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	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? 5 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?	⋉ Yes⋉ Yes	☐ No☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 35.93 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1. D. (1) 11/10/2000	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 2. Part Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	- X Yes	□No
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?		□ No
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- Miles	□ NO
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————	Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 11/12/2009	∇ v	□ Na
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?		∐ No □ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 25.99 tons/hour	M 168	
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	☐ Yes	□No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	I I Cs	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- 🛛 Yes	□No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Z 165	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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?	- X Yes	□No
	_	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	∇ v	□ Na
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points.	conducted at a r	ate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{No} \) \(\subseteq \text{N/A} - \text{silo not lo} \)		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 35.35 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 t		
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 to		
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min		
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		□ No
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? 5 minutes.	ıı. 🖂 i es	☐ No
2) What was the batching rate?tons/nour. What was the batching duration? 5 infinites. 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	- X Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted by the hispector for this time during this site visit:a.		
b. The visible emission test conducted according to Er A Method 9?	<u>∠</u> 1 cs	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? 35.35 tons/hour.	<u> </u>	

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

1. 2.	Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	 No No No No No No
	 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		⊠ 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
	 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 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	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>27.72</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
	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	ites	□ 100
	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? 5 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?	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 35.7 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-split silo #2, comp #2(cement), w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar year?	
operation?)
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? ────────────────────────────────────)
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? ————————————————————————————————————	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	
enclosed storage and conveying equipment 1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?)
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? Yes No If not, what was the problem (if known)? d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A − silo not loaded during inspection. 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? tons/hour)
 c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? Yes No If not, what was the problem (if known)? d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No No N/A – silo not loaded during inspection. e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? Yes No No f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour)
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Boxed Yes \Boxed No \Boxed N/A - silo not loaded during inspection. e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? \Boxed Yes \Boxed No f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour)
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? tons/hour	
)
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go to h.)
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? Yes No	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration? Yes No 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes)
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? Yes No 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? Yes a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? Yes No)
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute 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 5 – CCB Plant-silo #3 (flyash/slag), w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	 No 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</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. e. 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? <u>36.19</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?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute. 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? 6 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? 36.19 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-weigh hopper #1, w/cartridge batcher vent subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(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	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
	 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 contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A – silo not loader. 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? 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.	□ 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	ites	☐ 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? 5 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 7 – CCB Plant-weigh hopper #2, w/cartridge batcher vent subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		□ No □ No □ No □ No
	whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	☐ 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</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?	ded during ins	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	☐ No
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) 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?	- Yes	☐ 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 collector. 	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>5</u> 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 8 –CCB Plant-truck loadout area #1, w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
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
operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 11/12/2009	Yes 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 Yes	□ No □ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test If not, what was the problem (if known)?	? 🛚 Yes	□ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?		☐ 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.	X Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	X 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? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A − silo not I		
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		☐ 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 $g.0$		⊠ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	☐ No
duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? m	Yes	☐ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by the weight of the weight are controlled by	hich is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust of conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration. What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 5 minutes	ion? 🛛 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?	X Yes	☐ No☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	X Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 9 -CCB Plant-truck loadout area #2, w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/12/2009 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</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?	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?	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? minute. 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. 	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>5</u> 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

_			
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		only one h question)
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? 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 general 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)? gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation.	Yes 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
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS		only one h question)
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?		⊠ 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	- ⊠ Yes	∐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	Yes	☐ 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:	stationary and role and late	(check 🗹 box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary □; relocatable ☑; or consisting of both s concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (A		g question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		Yes	⊠ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific 	prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busing c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificato the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	ess days following a relocation? ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	- Yes [5]	□ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a	ir construction or air operation per	<u> </u>	110
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose?	pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage	e)?	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?			□ No
CHANGES		(-11 L7	1
		(check ☑ box for each	•
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 admi 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility?	nits or Yes	⊠ No □ No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been			
a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substituted. A change in ownership?	antially different?		NoNoNoNoNo
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?	on form and the appropriate fee sub	omitted Yes	☐ No
		_	
Ilka Bundy	10/9/2010		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	10/9/2011		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ins		

COMMENTS: Ilka Bundy met with Mike Hagmaier, Plant Manager, and Bill Arlington of Arlington Environmental Services, on November 9, 2010, to audit visible emission tests on EUs 001, 002, 003, 005, 006 and 008, and 007 and 009. EU004 was not tested during today's inspection. This emission unit was full of Texas flyash and is rarely used, per Mike Hagmaier. The unit will be emptied and scheduled for a visible emissions test before the end of the year. It should be noted that EUs 006 and 008 (West side) and EUs 007 and 009 (East side) were tested simultaneously since the weigh hopper and batching occur at the same time. The ready-mix trucks have approximately 7 yards of material loaded into each truck. The weight of the load was not given, therefore, the batching rate cannot be determined. All tested emission units had an opacity of zero percent. All silo loading rates were

acceptable. No objectionable odors were noted. No PM was observed leaving the property. The facility appears to be in compliance with their permit conditions at this time.