

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPLA	ISCOVERY (CI)	
AIRS ID#: 7775382 DATE: 11/1/2013 ARRIVE: 10:30 DEPART: 2:15				
FACILITY NAME: OKE	EECHOBEE PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION:	1080 NW 33RD W	AY		
	OKEECHOBEE	34972		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED Email: tucker@masch CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIO	meyer.com	2017	PHONE: (561)848-91 Mobile: (561)718-05: PHONE: Mobile:	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☑ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRO 1. Name(s) of facility repro Brief Notes:		<u>G</u>		(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Repre If no, who is?:	sentative still ROBERT T	UCKER?		⊠ Yes □No
If different, did the facil 3. Is the facility contact sti If no, who is?:		ive update within 30 days?		
4. Will facility be conducti		y's inspection?ast 15 days in advance?		

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

	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one
	Date of last inspection: $10/1/2012$	oux for each	question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	- -	
	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	⊠ No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 10/1/2012	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? 25 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? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
	k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	⊠ Yes	□ No
DA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_
I P	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑	only one
	encrosed 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
	 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 20 % 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? \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? 25 tons/hour	- M Ics	☐ 1NO
	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? 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 collected while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	? Yes	⊠ 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?	es. Yes	⊠ No
۷.	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		□ 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. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
	`
1. Date of last inspection: $10/1/2012$	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?	
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: 10/1/2012	163 110
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?	
	I les I No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 25 tons/hour	
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	∐ Yes ∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE to	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 question)
	box for each 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo r	not loaded during inspection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	
f. What was the silo loading rate? 25 tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector	r?
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and	
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	
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	
	r which is separate
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) du	r which is separate ust collector
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) do conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and du	r which is separate ust collector uration? Yes No
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 dust 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	r which is separate ust collector tration? Yes No minutes.
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? -	r which is separate ust collector uration? Yes No minutes. Yes No
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) do 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?	r which is separate ust collector uration? Yes No minutes Yes No Yes No
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) do 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?	r which is separate ust collector uration? Yes No minutes. Yes No Yes No One
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) do 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?	r which is separate ust collector uration? Yes No minutes. Yes No Yes No One
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) do 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?	r which is separate ust collector uration? Yes No minutes. Yes No Yes No One

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-weigh hopper/batcher w/cartridge dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 10/1/2012 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	box for each Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes 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
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 loading rate?		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 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 $g.1) - g.3$) 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 raduration?		☐ No
 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector. 	tes is separate	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	Yes Yes	☐ No
 What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute 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

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	Yes 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?		⊠ 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?	-	 No No No No No No
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal properties (23,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal properties the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumfor each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ne/yr)? □ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	- 🛚 Yes	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- X Yes	□ No
	permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(c	heck 🗹 only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary ar concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stational and or nonmetallic mineral processing plants</i>).	id relocatable	for each question)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		Yes No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Pre-e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to chab. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form 	nging location?	Yes No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days foll c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [owing a relocation?	Yes No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business da	ys prior to relocation?	Yes No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construct and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that sepa a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, the If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? ————————————————————————————————————	rate permit: ere is no repeated usage)?	
CHANGES Administrative Changes:		heck v only one for each question)
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative changes. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the changes. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 	ity or any emissions units or lange at the facility?	Yes No Yes No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially diff d. A change in ownership?	[] Ferent? []	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and 30 days prior to the change?		d Yes 🗌 No
Geoff Burke 1	1/1/2013	
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of	f Inspection	
11/1/2014		
Inspector's Signature Approx	ximate Date of Next Inspection	on
COMMENTED OF THE TAXABLE TO THE TAXA	V 11 12 C	1

COMMENTS: GB: VE emissions for cement silo (EU 1) exceeded the 5% opacity limit. Consultant therefore stopped test. VE emissions for fly ash silo (EU 2) were below 5% opacity. No VE test was done on the weigh hopper/batcher since there were no trucks to load, therefore the facility was unable to complete their annual compliance testing.