

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		SCOVERY (CI) INT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 1050372 DATE: <u>10/13/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>3:30 p.n</u>	<u>m.</u> DEPART: <u>4:15 p.m.</u>		
FACILITY NAME: HANSON HARDSCAPE PR	ODUCTS			
FACILITY LOCATION: 1980 Marley Dr.				
HAINES CITY	33844-9202			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: SCOTT SIMPSON Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/10/2007 / 3/10 (effective date) (end	0/2012	PHONE: (863)421-7422 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Scott Simp Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still PAUL CA If no, who is?:	RPENTER?	⊠ Yes □No		
If different, did the facility provide an administra 3. Is the facility contact still? If no, who is?: Scott Simpson				
Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during tod If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least				

Emissions Unit Section 1 -Grey Cement Silo W/BAGHOUSE 80 tons------Plant # 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 2. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	
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? 29.8 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? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE t If not, what was the problem (if known)?	test? 🛛 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)
	box for each 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 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 re. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	not loaded during inspection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	<u>_</u>
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	d go to h.
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batcher. 	
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	which is separate
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) du conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and du 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	ration? Yes No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? - a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes 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.	

Emissions Unit Section 2 – White Cement Silo W/BAGHOUSE 40 tons------Plant # 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

 PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 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 cooperation?	Yes No No No No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No No No Yes No No Yes No No Yes
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or o enclosed storage and conveying equipments of the state	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit du	rring 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 hig c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity of If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	thest six-minute average.
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by If YES, then continue on to questions g.1) - g.3) below. If answer NO, the silo loading rate of 25 tons/hour. If answer NO, the silo loading rate of 25 tons/hour. If answer NO, the silo loading rate of 25 tons/hour. If answer NO, the silo loading rate of 26 tons/hour is a silo loading rate of 27 tons/hour. What was the batching rate of 28 tons/hour is a silo loading rate of 29 tons/hour. What was the batching rate of 29 tons/hour. What was the batching at a rate that is representative of the norm 20 tons/hour is a silo loading rate? tons/hour. What was the batching rate? tons/hour.	No N/A – silo not loaded during inspection. Ile in practice? ————————————————————————————————————

Emissions Unit Section 3 -CEMENTsupplement SILO W/BAGHOUSE 40 ton------Plant # 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	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
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? 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 □ No
	 c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	onducted at a ra	
	If YES, then continue on to questions g.1) – g.3) below. If answer NO, then skip g.1) – g.3) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? ————————————————————————————————————	h. Yes te and Yes ttes n is separate ector	□ No□ No□ No
2.	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut 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 % 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.	es. Yes Yes	No No No No

Emissions Unit Section 4 -Concrete Batch Mixer Central Dust Collector------Plant # 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 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 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)?	<u> </u>	∐ 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? 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
	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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ 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 is the still duration of the still become (batcher) duration.	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?	☐ 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
	a na na process rue tons, nou.		

Emissions Unit Section
5 - Grey Cement Silo w/ baghouse 45 ton------Plant # 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/21/2008}{2}$	con 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 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: $\frac{1/30/2007}{1.000000000000000000000000000000000000$	
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	
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	•9
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE tes If not, what was the problem (if known)?	t? ⊠ Yes □ No
ii not, what was the problem (ii known):	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑ only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)
	1
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	
·	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	□ V □ N.
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 sil	lo conducted at a rate
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?	
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 $g.3$	
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 batching	ng rate and
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector v	
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 dura	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? m	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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.	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	

Emissions Unit Section
6 -White Cement Silo w/baghouse (45 Ton)-------Plant # 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one
1. Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008	00/1101 04011	question
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ x ₂	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	∐ Yes	⊠ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes Yes	⊠ 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: 2/14/07 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? 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)?	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	
	box for each	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 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		
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?	· U Yes	☐ 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 to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	h. Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra		_
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu		☐ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll	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? minute.		☐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.		☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	⊠ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 7 - Cement supplement Silo w/baghouse (90 Ton)------Plant # 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check box for each Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	only one question) No No No No No No No No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
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 % 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	led during insp	
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	Yes	☐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?		☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes 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? 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 	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? minute.	Yes 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 % for the highest six-minute average.	☐ Yes	⊠ No □ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section
11 –Grey Cement Silo W/baghouse 75 ton------Plant # 4 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar year? 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?		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 % 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	ded during ins	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		□ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?		☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	h. Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching raduration?		☐ No
 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 	ites n is separate	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.	Yes 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 % for the highest six-minute average.	☐ Yes	⊠ No □ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section

12 -White cement silo w/baghouse 75 tons------Plant # 4 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 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 % 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 the silo loaded was the minimum loading rate of 25 tens/hour achievable in practice?	led 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	⊥ Yes	∐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$ 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 Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra duration?	Yes	☐ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.	Yes Yes	□ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	☐ Yes	⊠ 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 13 -Cement Supplement Silo w/baghouse 150 tons------Plant # 4 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008 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 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
PA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	⊠ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	□ No
	 d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	☐ No
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes	☐ 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 collected by the silong that the silong test of the silong test	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? minute.		∐ 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 14 –Paver Tumbler Machine w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: 2/21/2008	4
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	✓ V □ N.
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? N/A	☐ Yes ☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: <u>1/7/2010</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? 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
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	
j. What was the actual batching rate? <u>8 cubes/hr</u> tons/hour	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE to	est? 🛚 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 question)
	box for each question)
1 177	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the	silo conducted at a rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \square Yes \square No \square N/A – silo n	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector	? Yes No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and	l go to h.
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 batch	ning rate and
duration?	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?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) du	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and du	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	
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 No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average	ge.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each question)	
Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ 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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ 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	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
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 g	$\frac{\text{ane/yr}}{\text{e/yr}} \le 1.00$)?
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?	nption - 🛭 Yes	☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ box for each	•
Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	Yes	⊠ No
Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- Xes	☐ No
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?	- 🛭 Yes	☐ No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ▼	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary \(\subseteq\); relocatable \(\subseteq\); 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?	Local Air Program by telephone, prior to changing location?	□ No□ No□ No□ 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 unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine put If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?	t in that separate permit: rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? Yes t was Yes	NoNoNoNo
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check $\sqrt{}$	only one
Administrative Changes:	box for each	
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes	
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 	box for each box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes of the change?	h question)
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes of the change? Yes Yes tantially different?	h question) No No No No No No
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes of the change? Yes Yes tantially different?	h question) No No No No No No No
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes of the change? Yes Yes tantially different?	h question) No No No No No No No
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes of the change? Yes Yes Yes stantially different? Yes Yes ton form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes	h question) No No No No No No No
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	box for each box for each the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes of the change? Yes Yes stantially different? Yes Yes ion form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes 10/18/2010	h question) No No No No No No No

COMMENTS: Plant #2 (EU#005-007) has not operated since 2007 and is still inactive. Plant #3 (EU#008-010) remains idle and has not commenced operations. Plant #4 EU# 013 has not been used in 2010 and has not been tested. The facility checks the baghouse bags for each active EU once a month. Hanson has an oracle database to keep track of incoming shipments and outgoing shipments and keeps a separate log for crusher diesel fuel usage. The facility has their own street sweeper to remove particulate matter from the roadways. The facility appears to be in compliance with all permit and state regulation requirements.