

# $\frac{\text{NON-METALLIC MINERAL PROCESSING}}{\text{PLANTS}}$



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)								
AIRS ID#: 7775112 DA7	AIRS ID#: 7775112 DATE: 8/6/12 ARRIVE: 2:30 DEPART: 4:22										
FACILITY NAME: SAM	MSULA RECYCLING										
FACILITY LOCATION	: 363 S SR 415										
	NEW SMYRNA BEACH	I 32168-9029									
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: CHARLES MCDONALD PHONE: (386)423-6769 Email: Mobile: (386)547-4575 CONTACT NAME: PHONE: Email: Mobile: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 2/25/2011 / 2/25/2016 (effective date) (end date)											
DADTI. INCRECTION		acility Section									
IN COMPLIANC	COMPLIANCE STATUS (che	·	T Non-COMPLIANCE								
				1							
	resentative(s): Gary Brouillette		(check <b>✓</b> box for each	only one question)							
2. Is the Authorized Repression, who is?: Yance	esentative still CHARLES MCDO <u>y McDonald</u>	ONALD?	Yes	⊠No							
If different, did the faci 3. Is the facility contact st If no, who is?:	ility provide an administrative up till?	date within 30 days?		□No □No							
4. Will facility be conduc	ting VE test(s) during today's ins nce authority notified at least 15			⊠No □No							

# Emissions Unit Section 1 –NMMPPlant-crushrw/2dischg,1retrn2stackrconvyrs,screen250T/hr

		(check 🗹	only one
	ł	ox for each	question)
<u>Is</u>	the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processing (Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majorities any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Granit Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand and (3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Rock (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chlos and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax, and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vermice (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.}	ng Plants?  y e, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite,	1
2. 3.	Is the EU located at a fixed or portable nonmetallic mineral processing plant or hot mix asphalt plant that has an aboveground crusher or grinding mill?	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	□No □No □No
sul If	answer to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to bpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5.		
5.	Is the EU subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F (Portland Cement Plants) or subpart I (Hot Mix Asphalt Facilities), or does it follow in the plant process any other EU that is subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F or subpart I?	☐ Yes	⊠No
	Is the EU located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)?	☐ Yes	⊠No
	Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)?	☐ Yes	⊠No
გ.	Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour)?	Yes	⊠No

### $\underline{1-NMMPPlant-crushrw/2 dischg,1 retrn2 stackr convyrs,screen 250 T/hr}$

9.	Is the EU a wet screening operation or subsequent screening operation, bucket elevator or belt conveyor in a production line that processes saturated material up to the first crusher, grinding mill or storage bin in the production line? ————————————————————————————————————	l ng	⊠No
10	Is the EU a screening operation, bucket elevator or belt conveyor in the production line downstream of wet mining operation that process saturated material up to the first crusher, grinding mill or storage bin in the production line?	☐ Yes	⊠No
	{Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract any nonmetallic mineral from deposits existing at or below the water table, where the nonmetallic mineral is saturated with water. "Saturated material" means mineral material with sufficient surface moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from processing of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wetted solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.}		
su	answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to bpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. the answer to all of the six Questions 5-10 above is "No" then continue to Question 11.		
11	.When was the EU last constructed, modified, or reconstructed? 6/26/01		
12	. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?	Yes	⊠No
<b>I</b> f	answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20		
13	<b>.Does the EU have a particulate matter</b> <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	☐ Yes	□No
<b>I</b> f	answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19		
14	a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?	<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> </ul>	☐ No ☐No ☐No ☐No
15	If the EU is a building enclosing any other regulated EUs and all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits:  a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on each vent control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?	☐ Yes	□ No
	one or more affected EUs.} b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity?	Yes Yes Yes	□No □No □No

### $\underline{1-NMMPPlant-crushrw/2 dischg,1 retrn2 stackr convyrs,screen 250 T/hr}$

16. Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?	Yes	No
If yes, the owner operator: conducts quarterly 30-minute VE tests using Method 22;		
uses a bag leak detection system specified in 40 CFR 60.674(d);		
follows the requirements of 40 CFR 63AAAAA Lime Manufacturing	ıg	
as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or		
none of the above (i.e., out of compliance)		
17. If the EU is an individual, enclosed storage bin controlled by a baghouse,		
were initial fugitive emissions less than or equal to 7% opacity? N/A	∐ Yes	∐ No
40 7 4 11 14 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	□ <b>x</b> z	
18. Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?	∐ Yes	∟No
If yes, does the owner/operator maintain and operate:		
a. a device for the continuous measurement of the pressure loss of the gas stream through the		
scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions?	☐ Yes	□No
{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +250	L Tes	No
pascals +1 inch water gauge pressure.}		
and		
b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and the		
	Yes	No
{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5%		
of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}		
19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?	☐ Yes	□No
If yes:		
a. Does the owner/operator perform monthly inspections to check that water is flowing to		
the discharge spray nozzles?		
b. Does the owner/operator initiate corrective action within 24 hours and complete		
corrective action as expediently as practical is water is not flowing properly?		
c. Is each inspection of the spray nozzles, including the date and any corrective action taken,		
recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)?	∐ Yes	No
If d. FII		
If the EU was constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.		
questions and go directly to Question 24.		
<b>20. Does the EU have a particulate matter</b> <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures,		
Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	☐ Yes	⊠No
1100ds, raiss, dampers, etc.) to capture and dampert particulate matter to a control device.		
21. Initial Tests:		
a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of		
initial startup of the EU? N/A	Yes	⊠ No
b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?	Yes	□No
c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?	Yes	⊠No
d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?	Yes	No

### $\underline{1-NMMPPlant-crushrw/2 dischg,1 retrn2 stackr convyrs,screen 250 T/hr}$

22. If the EU is a building enclosing any		and all enclosed EUs are not										
individually in compliance with emi												
a. Was an initial PM stack test perform				_	_							
initial startup of the EU?			/A	∐ Yes	∐ No							
{A "vent" is any opening through which												
purpose of exhausting from a building	air carrying particula	te matter (PM) emissions from										
one or more affected EUs.}					_							
b. Was the EU found to be in complia				∐ Yes	∐No							
c. Were initial fugitive emissions from	n non-vent building op	enings less than or equal to 7%	opacity?	∐ Yes	∐No							
23.Is a wet scrubber used to control em	Yes	⊠No										
If yes, does the owner/operator mainta												
	a. a device for the continuous measurement of the pressure loss of the gas stream through the											
	scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's											
instructions?				Yes	No							
{Note: The monitoring device m	ust be certified by the	manufacturer to be accurate with	hin +250	_	<u> </u>							
pascals +1 inch water gauge pres	•											
and	,											
b. a device for the continuous measure	ement of the scrubbing	gliquid flow rate to the wet scrub	bber and the	<u> </u>								
device has been calibrated on an				Yes	No							
{Note: The monitoring device m				_								
of design scrubbing liquid flow r												
24. When was the last VE test conducted	d by the owner/opera	tor for this EU? <u>2/4/11</u>										
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 s	ubpart OOO, has the E	EU been tested within the past 5	years?	☐ Yes	□No							
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart	000:											
i. has the EU been tested during				☐ Yes	$\boxtimes$ No							
ii. has the EU been tested yet wit	hin the current calenda	ar year?		☐ Yes	⊠No							
L					<u> </u>							
25. Was a VE test conducted by the own				∐ Yes	⊠No							
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro	cess rate that is represe	entative of the normal rate?		☐ Yes	No							
Rate:	- FD4 M d 100											
b. Was the VE test conducted accordi				∐ Yes	No							
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of	of% for the high	lest six-minute average.		□ ***								
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compl	iance with the opacity	limit? (See chart below)		∐ Yes	∐No							
26. Was a VE test conducted by the insp	pector for this unit du	ring this site visit?		Yes	⊠No							
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro				Yes	□No							
Rate:	eess rate that is represe	situative of the normal rate.										
b. Was the VE test conducted accordi	ng to EPA Method 97			Yes	□No							
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of												
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compl				☐ Yes	□No							
	,											
	VE O											
<u> </u>		city Limits		OOO EU								
	EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	_	OOO EU	,							
	40 CFR 60	constructed, modified,		ted, modifi	,							
	Subpart OOO	or reconstructed prior		structed on	or							
		to 4/22/2008	after 4/22	2/2008								
Crusher with no capture system	20%	15%		12%								
All other affected EUs	20%	10%		7%								
	• •		ı									

## **Facility Section (continued)**

REASONABLE PRECAUTIONS FOR UNCONFINED EMISSIONS	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	only one question)
1. Does the owner/operator of the NMMP Plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined		
emissions by:  a) Use of water suppression system(s) with spray bars located wherever unconfined emissions occur (at the feeder(s), the entrance and exit of the crusher(s), the classifier screens, and the conveyor drop points)?   N/A  If no, where are unconfined emissions occurring?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
b) Use of water trucks equipped with spray bars to apply water or effective dust suppressant(s) on a regular basis (to all stockpiles, roadways and work yards)? N/A c) Paving and maintaining roads and parking areas? N/A d) Removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control	Yes Yes	□ No
of the owner/operator to prevent re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? N/A  e) Reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of	☐ Yes	□ No
particulate matter from stock piles? 🖂 N/A	Yes	☐ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:  a) Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? N/A  b) If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?  c) What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □No
CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY  1. Does this facility bear records to show that it does not have the network less write.	(check 🗹 o	only one nuestion)
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?	- X 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?	or	⊠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? 7775601 and 1270154</li> </ul>		□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
GENERAL CONDITIONS  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?	box for each	only one question) ⊠No
<ul> <li>2. Does the owner or operator: <ul> <li>a) maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> <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> </li> <li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acce to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?</li> </ul>	Yes	□No □No
RELOCATABLE PLANT		only one
<ol> <li>The facility:  is stationary; is relocatable; or consists of both stationary and relocatable NMMP and/or concrete batching plants. (<i>If only stationary, skip the following questions 2 and 3.</i>)</li> <li>For a relocated NMMP plant:         <ul> <li>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?</li> <li>b) did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.9006 to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following relocation? -</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	(6)]	□No
3. If the relocatable NMMP plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air oper permit, and the relocatable NMMP plant is <u>not</u> included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:  a) was the relocatable NMMP plant being used for a non-routine purpose?	ation 	□No
the permitted facility?		□No □No

CHANGES  Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)						
associated with a change in ownership or with a physi operations comprising the facility; or any other simila	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes							
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?								
<ul> <li>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Owne</li> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there bee a) Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ul>	en Yes replacement? Yes nt that is substantially different? Yes Yes	<ul><li>□No</li><li>□No</li><li>□No</li><li>□No</li></ul>						
Wanda Parker-Garvin	8/6/12							
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection							
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection							

**COMMENTS:** Ms. Parker-Garvin evaluated compliance based on the permit operating conditions. The operation logs for the stationary unit was reviewed. The stationary crusher (7775112) operates on electricity along with 3 other units on the site including a mobile crusher and two air curtain incinerators. Mr. Brouillette accompanied Ms. Parker-Garvin on a walkthrough inspection which included the existing in-ground incinerator, the new mobile incinerator, the stationary crusher and the mobile crusher. It was noted that none of the units were operating at the time of inspection. Mr. Brouillette stated the unit processed recycled material consisting of approximately 90% concrete and 10% asphalt. The facility's last VE test was conducted on 2/4/11 and the next VE is scheduled for 9/13/12. There is no documentation of annual VE tests for 2007 through 2010. An enforcement referral will be forwarded based on the facility not conducting conduct performance tests for visible emissions annually for permit 7775112.

# SAMSULA LANDFILL, INC. MONTHLY CRUSHER LOG

TOTAL	7280	4,955	3,675	360	-485°	8,500	- 6380	1,124	1,074	3024	3.724	7,634	10.744	18,059	25,459	31,384	3/6,434	79,024	39,134	37.1030			
																					,		
TONS	25.50	3575	050	375	20	00	2,700	12,454	Š	5975	00	00/	R	060	50	00	QQ	200	8	950.			
TO	25	35	9	13	1850	4,300	7.7	C	5.2	59	3,700	2,900	5,670	10,890	8,050	7,300	<b>6</b> ,900	2	7,800	10,9			
3010			110												010								
DATE	>	7	N 201	ପ	17.	_	1	H.	2+	Ь			>		2000		5	ر'.	フ	lu		8	
DA	NOV	De	くらい	Feb	MARCH	APR	NAM	JUNE J	5 6	AUG	1925	0	¥0<	Dec	79%	FeD	Soco.	人ない	Bot	JUNE			