

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER' ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)
AIRS ID#: 0951239 DATE: <u>9/7/2011</u>	ARRIVE: <u>08:17AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:15AM</u>
FACILITY NAME: WEST ORANGE READY-MI	X PLANT	
FACILITY LOCATION: 12601 AVALON RI	D	
WINTER GARDEN	N 34787	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: SIGURD BO Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 / 10/1 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile: 2/2013	(407)841-8409 (407)312-7119 (407)841-8409 (407)312-7119
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS IN COMPLIANCE	<u> </u>	Γ Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Leon Demps Brief Notes:	_	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD BO If no, who is?:)?	
If different, did the facility provide an administrati 3. Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO? If no, who is?:		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at lea		

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: 11/9/2010 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>0.0</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	
	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
	 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? 6 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.	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 32.1 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/9/2010 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?	☐ Yes ☐ 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>0.0</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?		☐ 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? 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 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? 34.95 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/9/2010 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
	 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>0.0</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	
	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 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
	 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 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? 6 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.		☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 33.9 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/29/2010 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		⊠ 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>0.0</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	
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	⊠ No
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust 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? 6 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.	✓ Yes✓ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 31.7 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 11/9/2010		4
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	∇ V	□ Na
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 ⊠ No
	<u> 1 es</u>	⊠ 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: 11/9/2010 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? 	⊠ v _{as}	□ No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		∐ No □ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 36.19 tons/hour	<u> </u>	
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	_	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test	? X Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
DADT II. CTACV EMICSIONS from a cita maigh homosy(botaken) on other		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ✓	only one
enciosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	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 <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.		
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		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	X Yes	∐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>39</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 $g.3$		⊠ No
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 batchin		
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? n	ninutes	_
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector w		
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 durat		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		□ 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 <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? 	X Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	168	
d. What was the process rate: tons/nour.		

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1. D	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 11-9-2010		,
Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	- X Yes	□ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		∐ No ⊠ No
	- les	M N0
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A	Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 11-9-2010		
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?		∐ No ⊠ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	Yes	∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	□ ••	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- 🛚 Yes	∐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	
	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?	🛛 Yes	☐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛚 Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo	conducted at a r	rata
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	☐ 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		
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		
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		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio	n? ⊠ Yes	☐ No
2) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.	N 37	
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?	X Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.	🛛 Yes	□ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	🖂 1 es	☐ No
d. What was the process rate:tons/nour.		

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 11-9-2010 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No No 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?	⊠ 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>0.0</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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	led during insp	pection.
f. What was the silo loading rate?tons/hour	i es	∐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$) and go to	Yes	⊠ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes	☐ No
During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	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 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? 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?	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ 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? 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

1.	Date of last inspection: 11-9-2010 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	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>0.0</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	
	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?		☐ 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? 6 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.	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 31.73 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
 Date of last inspection: 11-9-2010 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 	∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
operation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 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 🗹 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?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % 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)?	- 🛚 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 loading rate?		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 31.73 tons/hour	- X Yes	☐ 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 h.	⊠ 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? min	- Yes	☐ 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.	h 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
 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. 		☐ No ☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	- X Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each	
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		⊠ No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	<u>ane/yr</u> < 1.00 e/yr)?
4.	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?		⊠ No
GI	ENERAL 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
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
	permit and Department rules?	- X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹 box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (,
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		Yes	⊠ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi 	prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate			∐ No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions uni a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	in that separate permit: rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)		□ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long i co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES		(check 🗹	only one
		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		box for each of ive not	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	n of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility?	box for each of the not ts or Yes	
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 relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days	n of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each of the not ts or Yes Yes Yes	question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	n of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each of the not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	n of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 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 subsed. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?	n of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 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 subsed. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration of associated with a physical relocation of the phy	n of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	n of the facility or any emissions unitinistrative change at the facility? of the change? tantially different? on form and the appropriate fee subsection of the subsection of the subsection of the change?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question) No No No No No No No

COMMENTS: Assefa Hailemariam from Orange County EPD met Mattew Welborn, consultant, from Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., at the concrete ready -mix plant at 12601 Avalon Road, Winter Garden Florida. Nine VES were conducted on this date. The emissions units are EU001,EU002,EU003,EU004,EU005,EU006, EU007, EU008 and EU009. All the loading rates were acceptable and observed opacity was zero percent on all emission units tested. No PM was observed leaving the property.