WENTA PROTECTION	
Same December	
FLORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/E ARMS COMPL		(CI)	
AIRS ID#: 0930007 DAT	E: <u>10/21/2013</u>	ARRIVE: <u>7:20</u>		DEPART: <u>10:45</u>	
FACILITY NAME: OKE	ECHOBEE READY-MIX CO	NCRETE PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION:	710 NE 3RD AVE				
	OKEECHOBEE 3497	2			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED Email: CONTACT NAME: MU Email: MKHAN@TIT ENTITLEMENT PERIO	ANAMERICA.COM	LLY FOLSOM		(305)200-1655 (561)248-9626	
(end date)         Facility Section         PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)         IN COMPLIANCE       MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE       SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
<ul> <li>PART II: <u>ONSITE INTR</u></li> <li>1. Name(s) of facility representation</li> <li>Brief Notes:</li> </ul>					only one h question)
If no, who is?: If different, did the facil	sentative still KELLY FOLSO	pdate within 30 days	?	Yes	□No
No If no, who is?:	ll MUHAMMAD KHAN?				Yes
If yes, was the complian	ce authority notified at least 15	5 days in advance?		X Yes X Yes	∐No ∏No

## **Emissions Unit Section** <u>1 -CEMENT SILO WITH BAGHOUSE subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       2/2/2012	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
<ul> <li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>d. Date of last VE test: <u>2/2/2012</u></li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<ul><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? <u>25</u> tons/hour</li></ul>		□ No □ No
<ul> <li>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</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? 25 tons/hour</li> </ul>	$\Box Yes \\ \boxtimes Yes$	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	🛛 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?	Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>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 co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		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? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1 - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1 - g.3$ and go to	$\bowtie$ Yes	🗌 No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?</li></ul>	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	h 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 <sup>4</sup> 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut	? 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
<ol> <li>Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?</li> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> </ol>	Yes	⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% 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? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No

## **Emissions Unit Section**

11 – PENCEM SILO	WITH BAG HOUSE FOR	<b>CONCRETE PLANT sub</b>	ject to 5% Opaci	tv Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>		
	(check 🗹 box for each d	only one question)
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/2}{2012}$	bon ici ili	4.000.000,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	<b>—</b>	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	🛛 Yes	No No
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: $2/2/2012$		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	🛛 Yes	No No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	Yes	D 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?	Yes	🗌 No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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?	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 of	-
	001101	question,
	<b></b>	
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?	Xes	No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.		
$\frac{1}{2}$ is the visible emission cost resulted in an equal $\frac{1}{2}$ is the inguest sin impact a $\frac{1}{2}$		
c Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🖂 Yes	$\square$ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes Yes	🗌 No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
	nducted at a ra	te
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo cor that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? X Yes No X/A - silo not load</li> </ul>	nducted at a ra	te
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo cor that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes □ No □ N/A - silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra	te bection.
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo corr that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? X Yes No X/A - silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra	te bection.
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo corr that is representative of the normal silo loading rate?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra ed during insp X Yes X Yes	te lection.
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo corr that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A – silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	inducted at a rated during insp $\square$ Yes $\square$ Yes $h_{}$	te lection.
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra ed during insp X Yes (A) Yes h. X Yes	te bection. No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo corr that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A – silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra ed during insp Yes Yes 2 2 4. 2 3 4. 2 4. 2 4. 2 4. 2 4. 2 4.	te bection. No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra ed during insp Yes Yes h. Yes e and Yes	te lection. No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo correct that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A - silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	inducted at a rated during insp $\boxtimes$ Yes $\boxtimes$ Yes h. $\boxtimes$ Yes h and $\boxtimes$ Yes $\boxtimes$ Yes $\boxtimes$ Yes $\boxtimes$ Yes $\boxtimes$ Ses	te lection. No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo correct that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A – silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	nducted at a ra ed during insp ⊠ Yes ∑ Yes n. ∑ Yes e and ∑ Yes es is separate	te lection. No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo corr that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A – silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	iducted at a ra ed during insp Yes Yes '. Yes e and Yes es is separate ector	te lection. No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo corr that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A – silo not loade</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aducted at a ra ed during insp ∑ Yes ∑ Yes b. ∑ Yes e and ∑ Yes es is separate cctor ∑ Yes	te Dection. No No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	aducted at a ra ed during insp ∑ Yes ∑ Yes b. ∑ Yes e and ∑ Yes es is separate cctor ∑ Yes	te hection. No No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	$\begin{array}{c} \text{aducted at a ra}\\ \text{ed during insp}\\ & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \stackrel{h}{\otimes} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{e and}\\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{es}\\ \text{is separate}\\ \text{ector}\\ & & \\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{s.}\\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \begin{array}{c} \text{s.}\\ & \\ & \\ \end{array} \text{ Yes} \end{array}$	te Dection. No No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	$\begin{array}{c} \text{aducted at a ra}\\ \text{ed during insp}\\ & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \stackrel{h}{\otimes} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{e and}\\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{es}\\ \text{is separate}\\ \text{ector}\\ & & \\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{s.}\\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \begin{array}{c} \text{s.}\\ & \\ & \\ \end{array} \text{ Yes} \end{array}$	te hection. No No No No No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	$\begin{array}{c} \text{aducted at a ra}\\ \text{ed during insp}\\ & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \stackrel{h}{\otimes} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{e and}\\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{es}\\ \text{is separate}\\ \text{ector}\\ & & \\ & & \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \text{s.}\\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \text{ Yes}\\ \begin{array}{c} \text{s.}\\ & \\ & \\ \end{array} \text{ Yes} \end{array}$	te Dection. No No No No No No
<ul> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li></ul>	inducted at a rated during insp $\bigtriangleup$ Yes $\bowtie$ Yes in $\bowtie$ Yes in $\bowtie$ Yes in i	te hection. No No No No No No No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	- 🗌 Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>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.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	- 🛛 Yes - 🖾 Yes - 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No ⊠ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal prop275,000 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 consur for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	•
1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	🗌 Yes	🖂 No
<ol> <li>Does the owner or operator:</li> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> </ol>	_	
<ul><li>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?</li></ul>		🗌 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:		(check 🗹	•
<ol> <li>Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of b concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plant</li> </ol>		box for each ing question 2.)	•
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement a soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>		🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Departmen e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notice</li> </ul>	day prior to changing location?		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five b c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Nor	usiness days following a relocation? ification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900	Yes	No
<ul><li>to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least</li><li>3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separ</li></ul>			L No
and 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?	unit in that separate permit:		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how lon co-located at the permitted facility?		🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	D No
CHANGES		(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes:			
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? -	tative not inits or DYes	No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ol>	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? -	tative not inits or DYes	
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 c</li> </ol>	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? - lays of the change?	tative not inits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 c <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? - lays of the change?	tative not mits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 c <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? - lays of the change?	tative not mits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 c <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? - lays of the change?	tative not mits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numbe associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor a</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 c <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	ation of the facility or any emissions u dministrative change at the facility? - lays of the change?	tative not mits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>

**COMMENTS:** An inspection, records review and VE test observation was conducted by Geoff Burke on 10/21/2012. Tarmac Okeechobee has only two active emission units. The facility was well maintained and no visible emissions were observed. The facility appeared to be well maintained and the only emission observed was when a cement mixing truck left the loading hopper prematurely and the dry mix fell to the ground.