

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF

ENVIRONMENTAL **P**ROTECTION

160 W GOVERNMENT STREET, SUITE 308 PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32502-5740 RICK SCOTT GOVERNOR

CARLOS LOPEZ-CANTERA LT. GOVERNOR

HERSCHEL T. VINYARD JR. SECRETARY

May 6, 2014

Mr. David Rabold Ready Mix USA, LLC Post Office Box 101868 Birmingham, Alabama 32510 davidr@specblockusa.com

Dear Mr. Tyson:

On April 23, 2014, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facilities, ID 1310256, 1310011 and 7775203. Copies of the inspection reports are enclosed. The inspections and a review of Department records indicate the facilities were in compliance at the time of the inspection for those items specifically noted in the inspection reports.

This letter applies only to activities covered by the Air Resource Management Program. If you have any questions, please contact Chris Stoll at 850/595-0654 or e-mail <u>christopher.stoll@dep.state.fl.us</u>.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Dickey

Kenneth Dickey Environmental Manager Compliance Assurance Program

KD/cs/c

Enclosures

c: Desiree Ellis, USA Ready Mix (dellis@readymixusa.com)



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 1310256 DA	TE: <u>04/23/2014</u>	ARRIVE: <u>12:05 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>12:20 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: DE	EFUNIAK SPRINGS PAVER PLA	ANT	
FACILITY LOCATION	1: 28 GENE HURLEY DR		
	DEFUNIAK SPRINGS	32435-4739	
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: suecu@ready CONTACT NAME: R Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIO	USTY CRAIG	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(205)986-4830 (205)639-6786 (866)332-5625 (850)401-4047

Facility Section

PART I: INSPECTION CON	IPLIANCE STATUS (check 🗹 only	y one box)
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PA	RT II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u>	(check 🗹	2
1.	Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Drew Sheehan</u>	box for each	question)
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still SUE CUMMINGS?	Yes	⊠No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 01/18/2012	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 3/22/13 	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	⊠ Yes □ Yes	☐ No ⊠ No
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
 k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	🛛 No
 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. 	Yes	No
 c. Did the visible emission test lestined in an opacity of% for the ingliest six-initial average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes 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?		pection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to	h.	∐ No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate 	te and	∐ No
 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	te and -	□ No
 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	te and -	
 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	te and - Yes tes h is separate lector ? Yes	
 2) 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 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 coll conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 	te and - Yes tes n is separate ector ? Yes es. Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C</u> (ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	•
		box for each	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?	🛛 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 gene permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities?		🛛 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	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
	gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propar		1?
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

<u>G</u>	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one uestion)
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?	- 🗆 Y	es	🖂 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			
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	X Y	es	🗌 No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	X Y	es	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹 only	one
1. Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting	box for each ques	
	plants? (If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cen	nent and	
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		No
(<i>If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c</i> a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Depart		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one bus	iness day prior to changing location? Yes	No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation		NT
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than f c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocatio		No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at		No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emiss		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emission a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-ro		No
If YES, what was the purpose?		_
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate he co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes	No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in du	ration? Yes	No
		e
CHANGES	(check 🗹 only	
Administrative Changes:	box for each ques	<i>tion)</i>
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone management of the schemes in summarity or with a physical		
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical operations comprising the facility; or any other similar m		No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within	n 30 days of the change? Xes	No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership	ip:	
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	Yes	No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without repl	$ acement \Box Yes \square$	
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment th	at is substantially different? 🗌 Yes 🛛 🛛	
d. A change in ownership?	Yes	No
4. If the answer to any question $3a d.$ is YES, was a new	registration form and the appropriate fee submitted	
30 days prior to the change?	Yes	No
Chris Stoll	04/23/2014	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	04/01/2016	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	
COMMENTS: On April 23, 2014, a Department representation inspection at the Ready Mix USA DeFuniak Springs Paver P	ative conducted an unannounced annual air program compliance Plant located in Walton County.	
manager, Mr. Drew Sheehan, provided me with the required	I no visible emissions were noted. During the inspection, the pl records and gave me a tour of the facility. Emissions units at the ge silos, a rock tumbler and a paver processing plant located insi-	ne

Visible emissions testing is being conducted annually as required. At the time of the inspection, visible emissions testing was last performed on March 22, 2013. Visible emissions testing is currently scheduled for May 5, 2014.

Greyed out areas of the inspection checklist do not apply for this inspection.



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 1310011 DA	TE: <u>4/23/2014</u>	ARRIVE: <u>12:20 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>12:38 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: DE	FUNIAK SPRINGS BLOCK PLA	ANT	
FACILITY LOCATION	• 91 GENE HURLEY RD		
	DEFUNIAK SPRINGS	32435-4736	
OWNER/AUTHORIZE	D REPRESENTATIVE: DAV	ID RABOLD PHONE:	(800)888-9262
Email: davidr@spec	blockusa.com	Mobile:	(850)549-8338
CONTACT NAME: J	IM MCNEELY	PHONE:	(850)892-5156
Email:		Mobile:	(251)591-8008
ENTITLEMENT PERI			
	(effective date) (end date)		

Facility Section

PART I: INSPECTION COM	IPLIANCE STATUS (check 1 onl	y one box)
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

	ART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u>	(check 🗹 box for each	-
1.	Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Bubba Craig</u>		
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still DAVID RABOLD?	Yes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still JIM MCNEELY? If no, who is?: <u>Bubba Craig</u>	YesYes	□No ⊠No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	Yes Yes	⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section <u>3 – CCB Plant-block plant mixer w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	•
1. Date of last inspection: $01/18/2012$	box for each	question
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes Yes	∐ No ⊠ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		🖂 No
 d. Date of last VE test: 05/15/2013 	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?		☐ 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 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? 	Yes Yes	☐ 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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No
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?	Yes	No 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% for the highest six-minute average. 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 co	onducted at a ra	ata
		ile
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A - silo not load	ded during insp	pection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	pection.
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour 	ded during insp - 🗌 Yes	Dection.
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp - Yes h.	No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp - Yes N. Yes h. Yes tte and	No No No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp Ves N. Yes te and - Yes ttes	No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp Yes Yes h. Yes tte and - Yes ites h is separate	No No No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp Yes Yes h. Yes te and Yes tes h is separate lector Yes	No No No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp Yes Yes h. Yes te and Yes tes h is separate lector Yes	No No No No No No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp Yes N. Yes te and Yes te and Yes tes h is separate lector Yes es. Yes	No No No No No No
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp Yes Yes h. Yes tte and Yes ttes h is separate lector Yes es. Yes Yes	No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C</u> (ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	•
		box for each	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?	🛛 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 gene permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities?		🛛 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	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
	gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propar		1?
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

<u>G</u>	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one uestion)
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?	- 🗆 Y	es	🖂 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			
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	X Y	es	🗌 No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	X Y	es	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [X]; relocatable []; or consisting of both	stationary and relocatable	(check ☑ box for each	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		ng question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		Yes	No No
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da	r Local Air Program by telephone, y prior to changing location?		No
 b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notified to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busic c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notified 	ness days following a relocation? cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least fin			No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions un a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	it in that separate permit:		No No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long	it was		
co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes Yes	
CHANGES		(check ☑ box for each	•
 Administrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last noting interval and physical head head head 	on of the facility or any emissions uninistrative change at the facility?	nits or 🗌 Yes	⊠ No □ No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? Yes Xes Xes Xes Xes Xes Xes Xes Xes Xes X		No No	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?		bmitted 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
Chris Stoll	4/23/2014		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	4/01/2016		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next In	spection	
COMMENTS: On April 23, 2014, A Department representaive con inspection at the Ready Mix USA DeFuniak Springs Block Plant loc of the inspection and no emissions were noted during the inspection equipped with a baghouse to control emissions.	ated in Walton County. The facility	was in operation	on at the time

Visible emissions testing is being performed on the emission unit annually as required. The last visible emissions test was conducted on May 15, 2013. No emissions were observed during the 30-minute test. Visible emissions testing is currently scheduled for May 5, 2014.

All batching occurs in an indoor, enclosed area. The interior was clean with no excessive dust present. Unconfined emissions are controlled by using water to wet down the yard as needed and by maintain aggregate below the containment walls.

Greyed out areas of the checklist do not apply at this time.



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:
AIRS ID#: 7775203 DATE: <u>4/23/14</u>	ARRIVE: <u>11:58 AM</u> DEPART: <u>12:05 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: DEFUNIAK SPRINGS READY MI	X PLANT
FACILITY LOCATION: 91 Gene Hurley Rd	
DEFUNIAK SPRINGS	32435-4736
 OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: SUE Email: suecu@readymixusa.com CONTACT NAME: WILEY WILLOUGHBY Email: wileyw@readymixusa.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/31/2013 / 8/31/2018 (effective date) (end date) 	CUMMINGS PHONE: (205)986-4830 Mobile: (205)639-6786 PHONE: (850)785-1934 Mobile: (850)258-1634

Facility Section

PART I: INSPECTION COM	IPLIANCE STATUS (check 🗹 onl	y one box)	
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	

	RT II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING Name(s) of facility representative(s):	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	Brief Notes: <u>No representives on- site</u>		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still SUE CUMMINGS?	Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still WILEY WILLOUGHBY?		□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section <u>1 – Cement Concrete Batch Plant subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹	only one
1. Date of last inspection: 01/18/2012	box for each	question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		\bigtriangledown No
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
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: <u>06/01/2009</u> e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>28.4</u> tons/hour 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? X N/A j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	Yes Yes	🗌 No
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?		No No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	No
 b. The visible emission test conducted according to D144 Method 91. 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?		□ 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 ate
 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 Yes	I 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 Yes	□ No ate
 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 Inducted at a raded during inspanded during dur	I 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 onducted at a ra ded during insp ☐ Yes ☐ Yes <i>h</i> . ☐ Yes	I No ate pection. 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 nducted at a raded during insp ☐ Yes ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes te and 	I No ate pection. No 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?	 ☐ Yes Producted at a radied during inspondent of the second second	I No ate pection. 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?	 ☐ Yes Producted at a raded during inspanded during durin	I No ate pection. No 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?	 ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes te and ☐ Yes n is separate ector ? ☐ Yes 	I No ate pection. No 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?	$\Box Yes$ $ded during inspected at a raded during inspected at a radius at a radius during iteration at a raded dur$	I No Ate pection. No No 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?	 ☐ Yes mducted at a raded during inspected at a raded during inspected at a raded during inspected at a raded at a	I No Ate pection. No No No 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?	Yes $ Yes $ $ Yes$	□ No ate pection. □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each o	
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 ⊠ 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? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 		🛛 No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
	gal diesel/yr +gal gasoline/yr +MM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal propa275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa		?
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

G	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ box for eacl	only one 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?	🗌 Yes	🖂 No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		
3.	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?		🗌 No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary □; relocatable ⊠; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following)	(check 🗹 of box for each of 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 Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?	Yes	🗌 No
 b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6) to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] 	Yes	🗌 No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?		🗌 No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation perm and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage) If YES, what was the purpose? 		🗌 No
 b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? 		□ No □ No

CHANGES	(check 🗹 box for each	2
Administrative Changes:		
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent		
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un		—
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?		∐ No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	Yes	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?	🗌 Yes	🛛 No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	🛛 No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?	Yes	🛛 No
d. A change in ownership?		🛛 No
4. If the answer to any question $3a - d$ is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sul	mitted	
30 days prior to the change?	TYes	□ No
50 days prior to the change:		

Chris Stoll	04/23/2014		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	04/01/2016		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		

COMMENTS: A Department representive conducted an unannounced air program compliance inspection on April 23, 2014, at the Couch Ready Mix USA concrete batch plant located on Gene Hurley Road in Walton County. The batch plant was not in operation at the time of the inspection. The batch plant has been in long term reserve shutdown since August 2008. Visible emission testing was last conducted on June 1, 2009, with passing results. Results of the June 1, 2009 test were submitted to the Department in a timely manner. The submitted test results indicate that testing was conducted while loading cement and flyash at a rate of 28.4 tons per hour.

As a reminder, a visible emissions test will be required within 30 days of restarting the facility.

Greyed out areas on the inspection checklist do not apply to this inspection.