

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)  ARMS COMPLAINT NO:   |  |
|---|--|
| AIRS ID#: 0951239 DATE: 10/14/2013 ARRIVE: 7:30AM DEPART:  FACILITY NAME: WEST ORANGE READY-MIX PLANT   | <u>10:45AM</u>                           |
| FACILITY LOCATION: 12601 AVALON RD  WINTER GARDEN 34787-9772  |  |
| OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: SIG BO Email: sigurdm.bo@cemex.com CONTACT NAME: SIG BO Email: sigurdm.bo@cemex.com Email: sigurdm.bo@cemex.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/2/2013 / 8/2/2018 (effective date) (end date)  PHONE: (407)841-840 Mobile: 4073127119 PHONE: Mobile: | )9                                       |
| Facility Section  |  |
| PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ✓ only one box)  ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE  | LIANCE                                   |
| PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Leon Demps  Brief Notes: Plant Manager  | (check ☑ only one box for each question) |
| 2. Is the Authorized Representative still SIG BO?   | ⊠ Yes □No                                |
| If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still SIG BO?  If no, who is?:  | ☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No                      |
| 4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?  If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?  |  |

## 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: 10/16/2012 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 |
|----|--|-----------------------|--|
|    | <ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>  | ⊠ 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<br>question)                    |
| 1. | Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?   | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?   | Yes                   | ☐ No                                     |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>  | ⊠ Yes                 | □ No                                     |
|    | d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? | ded during ins        |  |
|    | g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go to   | Yes                   | ⊠ No                                     |
|    | 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?  | ☐ Yes                 | ☐ 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. 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? 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?  |                       | <ul><li>☐ No</li><li>☐ No</li></ul>      |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? 29.95 tons/hour.</li> </ul>                  | ⊠ 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: 10/16/2012 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 |
|----|--|-----------------------|--|
|    | <ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>  | ⊠ 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<br>question)                    |
| 1. | Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?   | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?   | Yes                   | ⊠ No                                     |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>  | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?                                     | ded during ins        |  |
|    | g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?  | Yes                   | ⊠ No                                     |
|    | If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?   |                       | ☐ No                                     |
|    | 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?   |                       | ☐ No                                     |
|    | <ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.</li> </ul> | n is separate 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? minut   |                       | ☐ 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                 | ☐ No<br>☐ No                             |
|    | c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 40.13 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: 10/16/2012 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 |
|----|---|-----------------------|--|
|    | <ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>   | ∑ 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<br>question)                    |
| 1. | Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?  | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?  | Yes                   | ☐ No                                     |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>   | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?                                      | ded during ins        |  |
|    | g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and go to  | Yes                   | ⊠ No                                     |
|    | 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?   | ☐ Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?  | - Yes                 | ☐ No                                     |
|    | <ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.</li> </ul> | n is separate ector   | _  |
|    | conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut  |                       | ☐ 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                 | ☐ No<br>☐ No                             |
|    | c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 30.48 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 <b>☑</b>    | only one     |
|---|--------------------|--------------|
| 1. Data Classica di ana 10/16/2012  | box for each       |              |
| 1. Date of last inspection: 10/16/2012  |                    | ,            |
| 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<br>⊠ No |
|   | <u>l</u> i es      | ⊠ No         |
| c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————   | Yes                | ☐ No         |
| <ul> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 10/16/2012</li> <li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?</li> <li>f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 28.31 tons/hour</li> </ul> |                    | ☐ No<br>☐ 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<br>□ No |
| k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test If not, what was the problem (if known)?   | ? X Yes            | ☐ No         |
|   |                    |              |
| PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other  | (check ☑           | only one     |
| enclosed storage and conveying equipment  | box for each       | •            |
|   | ook 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 $0.0\%$ for the highest six-minute average.  |                    |              |
| c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?   | X Yes              | ☐ No         |
| d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo   | o conducted at a r | ate          |
| that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo not   |                    |              |
| 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? 24.86 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 $g.3$ 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 batchin  |                    | □ Na         |
| duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? n  |                    | ☐ No         |
| 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  2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mi   |                    | ☐ 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?  |                    | ☐ 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?   | X Yes              | ☐ No         |
| d. What was the process rate? 24.86 tons/hour.  |                    |              |
|   |                    |              |

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

| 1. | Date of last inspection: 10/16/2012 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?   |                                       | ☐ No ☐ No ☐ 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<br>☐ 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<br>question)         |
| 1. | Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?  | ⊠ Yes                                 | ☐ No                          |
|    | a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?  | ⊠ Yes                                 | ☐ No                          |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>   | ⊠ Yes                                 | ☐ No                          |
|    | d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?  | ded during ins                        |                               |
|    | g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and go to  | Yes                                   | ⊠ No                          |
|    | 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?   | ☐ Yes                                 | ☐ No                          |
|    | 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?  | - Yes                                 | ☐ No                          |
|    | <ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.</li> </ul>                 | n is separate                         |                               |
|    | conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration (2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 4 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.   | <ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul> | ☐ No<br>☐ 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

| PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION   | (check ☑ only one box for each question) |
|---|--|
| Date of last inspection: 10/16/2012     Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:     a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?     b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?     c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing |  |
| operation?  | Yes No                                   |
| e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the tes f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour   | Yes No                                   |
| h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the 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                                   |
| k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE If not, what was the problem (if known)?  | test? X Yes No                           |
| PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment   | (check ☑ only one box for each question) |
| 1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit? -   |  |
| <ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>   |  |
| c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?   |  |
| d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A – silo  |  |
| 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 collected of $If$ YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ are  |  |
| 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal bat  | Yes No                                   |
| duration?  3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration?   | Yes No                                   |
| h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) of   | or which is separate                     |
| conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and d  2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 4 min  | luration? 🛛 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   |  |
| c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.   |  |

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

| 1. | Date of last inspection: 10/16/2012 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 |
|----|---|--|---------------------------------------|
|    | 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<br>☑ No<br>☐ No                  |
| PA | ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment  | (check 🗹 box for each  | only one question)                    |
| 1. | Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?  | ⊠ Yes  | ☐ No                                  |
|    | a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?  | ⊠ Yes  | ☐ No                                  |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>   | ⊠ Yes  | □ No                                  |
|    | d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?  | ded during insp  |                                       |
|    | g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?   | ☐ Yes  | ⊠ No                                  |
|    | If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?  |  | ☐ No                                  |
|    | 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?  |  | ☐ No                                  |
|    | <ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collection.</li> </ul>                | n is separate  |                                       |
|    | conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 4 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<br>⊠ Yes   | ☐ No<br>☐ 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 9 -CCB Plant-truck loadout area #2, w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

| 1. | Date of last inspection: 10/16/2012 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                               |
|    | <ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>   | ⊠ Yes  | ☐ No                               |
|    | d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?                                    | ded during ins   |                                    |
|    | g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?   | Yes  | ⊠ No                               |
|    | If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?  |  | ☐ No                               |
|    | 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?  |  | ☐ No                               |
|    | <ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration?minuth.</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.</li> </ul> | n is separate  |                                    |
|    | conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 4 minutes.   | ? Xes  | ☐ No                               |
| 2. | Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?  a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?  b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.   | <ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>                            | ☐ No<br>☐ 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)**

| _         |  |                              | 1                    |
|-----------|--|------------------------------|----------------------|
| <u>C(</u> | ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY  | (check <b>v</b> box for each | 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<br>☐ No<br>☐ 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      | No                   |
| 4.        | 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared that 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  | (check 🗹                     | only one             |
|           |  | box for eac                  |                      |
|           | 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?  | - 🖂 Yes                      | ☐ No                 |
| 2         | 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?  | - X Yes                      | □ No                 |
| Э.        | 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 🗹                  | -            |
|---|--|---------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of be concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plant  | oth stationary and relocatable   | box for each question 2.) | question)    |
| 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c belo  | w. )   | ☐ Yes                     | ☐ No         |
| <ul><li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business</li><li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation No.</li></ul>  | day prior to changing location?  | Yes                       | ☐ No         |
| to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five b<br>c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation No   | usiness days following a relocation?   | Yes                       | ☐ No         |
| to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least   |  |                           | ☐ No         |
| 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separand the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine If YES, what was the purpose?  b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how lo | unit in that separate permit:<br>e purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage) |                           | □ No         |
| co-located at the permitted facility?  If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration  | n?   | Yes Yes                   | ☐ No<br>☐ No |
|   |  |                           |              |
| CHANGES  Administrative Changes:  |  | (check ☑<br>box for each  |              |
| 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number   |  |                           |              |
| associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc<br>operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a<br>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 of<br>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:                          | administrative change at the facility?                                       | ☐ Yes                     | ⊠ No<br>□ No |
| <ol> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been         <ul> <li>Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>Alterations to existing process equipment without replacem</li> </ul> </li> </ol>   | <br>ent?   | Yes Yes                   | ⊠ No<br>⊠ No |
| c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is d. A change in ownership?   | substantially different?   | ☐ Yes                     | ⊠ No<br>⊠ No |
| 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new regis 30 days prior to the change?  |  | nitted  Yes               | □ No         |
| 30 days prior to the change.  |  | 103                       |              |
| Assefa Hailemariam  | 10/14/2013   |                           |              |
| Inspector's Name (Please Print)   | Date of Inspection   |                           |              |
|   | ~12/31/2014  |                           |              |
| Inspector's Signature   | Approximate Date of Next Insp  | ection                    |              |

**COMMENTS:** Assefa Hailemariam, inspector from OCEPD, met with Zachary Beatty of Beatty Environmental Services, LLC, on October 14, 2013, at 12601 Avalon Road, Winter, Garden, Florida 34787, to audit the visible emission test on eight emission units. The emission units tested were EU001, EU002, EU003, EU005, EU006, EU007, EU008, and EU009. EU001 was not tested during today's inspection. This emission unit was full of white cement and is rarely used, per the facility Manager, Mr. Demps. All emission units tested had an observed opacity of zero percent and loading rates were acceptable. OCEPD accepts the loading rate of 24.86 tons/hours for EU005. No objectionable odors were detected. No PM was observed leaving the property during the compliance test.