

$\frac{\textbf{NON-METALLIC MINERAL PROCESSING}}{\underline{\textbf{PLANTS}}}$



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	ERY (CI)
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT N	O:
AIRS ID#: 7770389 DA	TE: <u>5/11/10</u>	ARRIVE: 9:55 AM	DEPART: <u>12:25 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: CR	USHING PORTABLE CRUS	SHING UNIT	
FACILITY LOCATION	1: 12601 State Road 545	5	
	WINTER GARDEN	34787-9772	
OWNER/AUTHORIZE	D REPRESENTATIVE: K	ENNETH HERRON PHON	IE: (407)699-7377
CONTACT NAME:		PHON	TE:
ENTITLEMENT PERIO	OD: 2/9/2007 / 2/9/2012 (effective date) (end date		
PART I: INSPECTION IN COMPLIANCE	CE MINOR Non-CO	·	ANT Non-COMPLIANCE
(check $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$ appropriat		210.310, F.A.C. Eligibility – Rule 62-210.310(2),	FAC
1.Does this facility ke	eep records to show that it do	es not have the potential to emit:	
c) 100 tons per ye 2. Does this facility of	-	lated air pollutants?	
a) any emission u of units and ac	nits or activities not covered tivities that are exempt from	by the applicable air general per permitting pursuant to subsection	
general permit	and the air general permit of	y another air general permit whe interest specifically allow the us	e of one another
1. Has the owner or	operator of this facility compl	n/Re-registration – Rule 62-210 leted and submitted the proper re o be used?;	
•	_	•	?;
(check R appropriat			
	= =	part of the facility?;ruction, modification, or equipme	Yes No N/A
			ent changes that require Yes No N/A

	NERAL CONDITIONS – Rule 62-210.310(3), F.A.C. Does the air general permit registration form contain all current information regarding the facility?;	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	
2.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allow the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?;		
3.	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 terms and conditions of the air general permit?;	all	
4.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, a to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air gen permit and Department rules?	eral	
PART	II-B: <u>DETERMINATION OF FACILITY TYPE/APPLICABILITY</u>		
(cł	$\operatorname{neck} \mathbf{R} \operatorname{only} \underline{\operatorname{one}} \operatorname{box})$		
	DR FACILTIES SUBJECT TO: (40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO, §60.670(a)(1)) you have checked R this category, answer all questions INCLUDING those with **.)		
<u>Subject Facilities:</u> (applicable fixed or portable facilities include each crusher, grinding mill, screening operation, bucket elevator, belt conveyor, bagging operation, storage bin, enclosed truck or railcar loading station, crushers & grinding mills at hot mix asphalt facilities that reduce the size of non-mettalic minerals embedded in recycled asphalt pavement & subsequent affected facilities up to, but not including the first storage silo or bin.)			
FOR FACILITIES NOT SUBJECT TO: (40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO, §60.670(a)(2), (b), (c), and (d)) (If you have checked R this category, answer all questions EXCEPT those with **.)			
gri sar plants,	on-Subject Facilities: (includes all facilities in underground mines; stand-alone screening operation and mills; facilities not subject to subparts F (Portland Cement Plants) or I (Hot Mix Asphalt Fand & gravel plants, & crushed stone plants w/capacities of 23 megagrams/hr (25 tons/hr) or less; put & crushed stone plants w/capacities of 136 megagrams/hr (150 tons/hr) or less; common clay place plants of 9 megagrams/hr (10 tons/hr) or less.)	cilities) of this part; <u>fixed</u> ortable sand & gravel	
	III: <u>EMISSION STANDARDS</u> – Chapter 62-210.310(5)(e), F.A.C. check R appropriate box(es))		
	<u>k Emissions</u> - 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO adopted by reference Chapter 62-204.800, F.A. Were visible stack emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (40 Appendix A)?) CFR 60,	
** 2.	Do stack emissions from any crusher, grinding mill, screening operation, bucket elevator, transfer belt conveyors, bagging operation, storage bin, enclosed truck or railcar loading station or any oth affected emission point:	point on	
	**a) exceed <u>7</u> % percent opacity?	Yes No	
	**b) exceed the particulate matter standard of $\underline{0.05}$ grams per dry standard cubic meter (g/dscm)?	

PART III: <u>EMISSION STANDARDS</u> – Chapter 62-210.310(5)(e), F.A.C., Cont. (check R appropriate box(es))	
**3. Do stack emissions from any baghouse that controls emissions from only an individual, enclosed storage bin exceed 7% percent opacity?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
<u>Visible Emissions</u> - 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO adopted by reference Chapter 62-204.800, F.A.C.	
**1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (40 CFR 60, Appendix A)?	⊠ Yes □ No
**2. Do visible emissions from any: **a) grinding mill, screening operation, bucket elevator, transfer point on belt conveyors, bagging operation storage bin, enclosed truck or railcar loading station or any other affected emission point exceed 10% percent opacity?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
**b) crusher without a capture system, exceed 15 % opacity?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
3. Pursuant to subparagraph 62-296.320(4)(b)1., F.A.C., are visible emissions from any crusher, grinding, screening operation, bucket elevator, transfer points on belt conveyors, bagging operation, storage bin, enclosed truck or railcar loading station, or any other emission point NOT subject to 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO, equal to or greater than 20 % percent opacity?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
Emission Points Enclosed in Buildings - 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO adopted by reference Chapter 62	-204.800, F.A.C.
**4. Is any crusher, grinding mill, screening operation, bucket elevator, transfer point on belt conveyors, baggi operation, storage bin, enclosed truck or railcar loading station, or any other affected emission point enclo in a building? (<i>If answer to question #4 is YES</i> , then proceed to #4.a))	sed
**a) If enclosed in a building are the stack emissions discharged from a wet scrubbing control device? (If answer to this question is <u>NO</u> , then proceed to the next question #4.b)1) & 2). If <u>YES</u> skip to #4.c).)	☐ Yes ☐ No
**b) If the stack emissions from enclosed emission points are not discharged from a wet scrubbing control of the particulate matter in excess of 0.05 grams per dry standard cubic meter (g/dscm)?	
2) the opacity greater than $\underline{7}\%$ percent?	☐ Yes ☐ No
**c) Do the stack emissions from the baghouse(s) inside of the building(s) exceed $\underline{7}\%$ percent opacity?	☐ Yes ☐ No
**5. Do visible emissions from any: **a) grinding mill, screening operation, bucket elevator, transfer point on belt conveyors, bagging operation storage bin, enclosed truck or railcar loading station or any other affected emission point exceed 10% percent opacity?	
**b) crusher without a capture system, exceed 15 % opacity?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
Wet Screening/Wet Mining Operations:	
**6. Are there any visible emissions discharges at the wet screening operations and subsequent screening	
operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors that process saturated material in the production line up to the next crusher, grinding mill, or storage bin?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
**7. Are there any visible emissions discharges at the screening operations, bucket elevators, and belt conveyor in the production line downstream of wet mining operations, where such screening operations, bucket elevators, and belt conveyors process saturated materials up to the first crusher, grinding mill, or storage in the production line?	oin

PART IV: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310, F.A.C.
(check \mathbf{R} appropriate box(es)
Compliance Demonstration – (Rule 62-210.310(5)(e)3, F.A.C.) 1. Is each affected emission point tested according to the visible emissions and stack emissions standards as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-210.310(5)(e)3.e., F.A.C.)
Compliance New Facilities – (Rule 62-210.310(5)(e)3., F.A.C.) 2. Did this facility demonstrate initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Compliance Existing Facilities – (Rule 62-210.310(5)(e)3., F.A.C.) 3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted within 365 days (annually thereafter) of the previous visible emissions compliance test? ✓ Yes ✓ No
<u>Test Methods and Procedures</u> – Chapter 62-297, F.A.C., 40 CFR 60.675, and 40 CFR Part 60, Appendix A adopted and incorporated by reference at Rule 62-204.800, F.A.C.
4. Were all referenced visible emissions tests conducted using EPA Method 9? 🖂 Yes 🗌 No
5. Were all referenced unconfined or fugitive emissions tests conducted using EPA Method 22? Yes 🛛 Yes
6. Were all referenced stack emissions or particulate matter tests conducted using EPA Methods 5 or 17? Yes 🛛 No
Reporting and Recordkeeping – (Rule 62-210.310(5)(e)3., F.A.C.)[Chapter 62-297, F.A.C. and
40 CFR Part 60.670 – 60.676, Subpart OOO, adopted and incorporated by reference at Rule 62-204.800, F.A.C.]
Facility and/or Equipment Replacement
**7. Did the owner or operator submit to the Administrator, the following information about the replacement of existing facility and/or equipment:
**a) for a Crusher, Grinding Mill, Bucket Elevator, Bagging Operation, or enclosed truck, or Railcar Loading Station, **1) the rated capacity in megagrams or tons per hour of the existing facility being replaced and the rated capacity in tons per hour of the replacement equipment?
**b) for a Screening Operation, **1) the total surface area of the top screen of the existing screening operation being replaced and the total surface area of the top screen of the replacement screening operation?
**c) for a Conveyor Belt, **1)the width of the existing belt being replaced and the width of the replacement conveyor belt? Yes No
**d) for a Storage Bin, **1) the rated capacity in megagrams or tons of the existing storage bin being replaced and the rated capacity in megagrams or tons of replacement storage bins?
Performance/Compliance Testing
**8. During the initial performance test, did the owner or operator record the measurements of both the change in pressure of the gas stream across the scrubber and the scrubbing liquid flow rate?
**9. After the initial performance test of a wet scrubber, did the owner or operator submit semiannual reports to the Administrator of occurrences when the measurements of the scrubber pressure loss (or gain) and liquid flow rate differ by more than ±30 percent from the averaged determined during the most recent performance test?
**a) Were the reports postmarked within 30 days following the end of the second and fourth calendar quarters?

PART IV:	
**10. Did the owner or operator of the facility submit written reports of the results of all performance tests conducted to demonstrate compliance with the particulate matter standards (40 CFR Part 60.672), opacity (using EPA Method 9 to demonstrate compliance with 40 CFR Part 60.672(b), (c), and (f)), and emission observations of transfer points enclosed in buildings (using EPA Method 22 to demonstrate compliance w 40 CFR Part 60.672(e))?	l
Process Changes	
**11. Does this facility have a screening operation, bucket elevator, and/or a belt conveyor system? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES, then answer either a)1) or a)2) below.</i>)	⊠ Yes □ No
**a)Did this screening operation, bucket elevator, and/or belt conveyor system: **1) originally process saturated material and switch to unsaturated material? (Note: The unsaturated material handling processes would now be subject to the 10% opacity limit in 40 CFR 60.672(b) and the emission test requirements of 40 CFR 60.11 and Subpart OOO.)	☐ Yes ⊠ No
**2) originally process unsaturated material and switch to saturated material? (Note: The saturated material handling processes would now be subject to the no visible emission limit in 40 CFR 60.672(h) (If answer to 1) or 2) above is <u>YES</u> then proceed to question b) below.)).)
**b) Did the owner or operator submit a report of the process change within thirty (30) days following the change?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
Notification Requirements	
**12. Was notification of the actual date of startup for each affected or combination of affected facilities submitted to the Administrator and postmarked within 15 days after such date?	⊠ Yes □ No
**a) Did the notification include a description of each affected facility, equipment manufacturer, and serial number of the equipment, if available?	⊠ Yes □ No
**b) For portable aggregate processing plants, did the notification of actual date of initial start up also include both the home office and the current address or location of the portable plant?	⊠ Yes □ No
PART V: OPERATING REQUIREMENTS/CONTROL TECHNOLOGY – Rule 62-210.310, F.A.C.	
(check \mathbf{R} appropriate box(es))	
1. Is this facility a: 1) relocatable⊠; 2) stationary□; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable	· 🗌
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check R only one box above.) (NOTE: If you have checked the box for relocatable go to questions 1.a) & 1.b). If you have checked the stationary go to question 1.c). If you have checked box #3, both, stationary and relocatable then answer relocatable and stationary questions 1.a), 1.b), & 1.c) below, respectively.)	r all
a) If this is a <u>relocatable facility</u> was the Department notified by phone prior to this relocation, and was a Facility Relocation Notification form submitted within 1 business day following the relocation?	
b) If this is a <u>relocatable facility</u> , is it located at a mine and/or quarry, and processing only material from deposits? (<i>If your answer to this question is <u>NO</u>, please proceed to question 1) below.</i>)	
c) If this is a <u>stationary facility</u> , does the owner or operator of this stationary facility have a water suppression system with spray bars located at the feeder(s), the entrance, and the exit of the crusher(s), the classifier screens and the conveyor drop points?	☐ Yes ☐ No

PART V: OPERATING REQUIREMENTS/CONTROL TECHNOLOGY – Rule 62-210.310, F.A.C. (Continued)
(check \mathbf{R} appropriate box(es))
**2. Does this facility incorporate the use of a wet scrubber to control emissions? (40 CFR Part 60, Subpart OOO adopted by reference Chapter 62-204.800, F.A.C.) (If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a) and 2.b), below.)
**a) Does the wet scrubber have continuous monitoring systems (CMS) for: **1) the measurement of the pressure loss of the gas stream through the scrubber?
**1) ±250 pascals ±1 inch water guage pressure for measuring pressure losses of the gas stream? Yes No
**2) ±5 percent of design scrubbing liquid flow rate?
PART VI: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.
(check R appropriate box(es))
1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary □; 2) a relocatable ⊠; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable □ (<i>Please check</i> R <i>only one box.</i>)
2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants, located with stationary or relocatable concreted batching plants: a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility?
 3. Does the owner/operator of the nonmetallic mineral processing plant submitting this registration maintain a log book or books to account for fuel consumption on a monthly basis? 4. Is this relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plant used to perform a <u>routine function</u> of a facility
(not a Title V source) subject to regular air permitting, such as crushing recycled asphalt (rap) at an asphalt plant? ☐ Yes ☒ No a) If YES , does the regularly permitted facility air construction or air operation permit(s) provide for the
operation of the nonmetallic mineral processing plant as an emission unit? Yes No
5. Is this relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plant used to perform a <u>non-routine activity</u> , such as destruction of a building, at a regularly permitted facility (<i>not a Title V source</i>)? ☐ Yes ☐ No a) If YES , does it operate under the authority of its air general permit? ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART VII: REASONABLE PRECAUTIONS/EMISSION CO	ONTROL MEASURES & TECHNOLOGY – Rule 62-
210.310(5)(e)3.c., F.A.C. (check R appropriate box(es))	
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)	
 Does the owner /operator of the nonmetallic mineral proce emissions by: 	ssing plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined
a) use of a water suppression system with spray bars loca	ated at the feeder(s), the entrance and exit of the pp points? Yes No
b) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, st	yards, which shall include one or more of the following: ock piles, and yards? 🄀 Yes 🔲 No
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust- emissions?	suppressant chemicals when necessary to control
 removal of particulate matter from roads and other re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to 	paved areas under control of the owner/operator to reduce airborne particulate matter? \boxtimes Yes \square No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wi particulate matter from stock piles?	X Yes No
	🔀 Yes 🗌 No
6) the use of hoods, fans, filters and similar equipment matter?	nt to contain, capture and/or vent particulate Yes No
7) the enclosure or covering of conveyor systems?	☐ Yes ⊠ No
b) alteration of existing process equipment without repc) replacement of existing equipment substantially diff	Yes No No Servent than that noted on the most Yes No No wner submit a new and complete F.A.C.) to the appropriate DEP or
Norma Ali	5/11/10
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	
inspector s rume (redse rime)	Date of Inspection
inspector s rease r rinky	Date of Inspection 5/11/11

COMMENTS: The inspector Norma Ali, met with Kent Bottorf, consultant from Bottorf Associates to audit the compliance test on the RAP crusher. Eight points were tested. Opacity observed on each one of the points was zero percent opacity. The average crushing rate was 172 tph. No objectionable odors, no particulate matter was observed leaving the property. Facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of the inspection.