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



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 7775241 DATE: 4/30/14 ARRIVE: DEPA	ART:				
FACILITY NAME: CP11-CRUSHING UNIT- JIA					
FACILITY LOCATION: 5937 SOUTEL DRIVE					
JACKSONVILLE 32219-3739					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: BILLY MULLINIKS Email: bmj@mulliniksrecycling.com CONTACT NAME: DAWN SMITH Email: dawnsmith@mulliniksrecycling.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/16/2009 / 7/16/2014 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (904)764-3644 Mobile: Mobile:					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)					
I AKT 1. <u>INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATES</u> (check ≥ only one box) SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
DADE H. ONGVER INTRODUCTION MEDITING					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes: Unit in storage at Soutel Yard	(check ☑ only one box for each question)				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still BILLY MULLINIKS?	X YesNo				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still DAWN SMITH?					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?					

Emissions Unit Section

		(check 🗹	only one
	1	box for each	question)
s	the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO - Nonmetallic Mineral Processing	ng Plants?	
1. 2. 3.	{Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majori is any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Granix 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 Chlo 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) Vermic (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.} 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? ———————————————————————————————————	ty te, l Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite, culite; Yes Yes Yes	⊠No □No □No □No
	crusher, grinding mill, bucket elevator, belt conveyor, bagging operation, crusher, grinding mill at hot mix asphalt plant that reduces the size of nonmetallic minerals embedded in recycled asphalt pavement or subsequent emissions unit up to, but not including, the first storage silo or bin; screening operation (a device for separating material according to size by passing undersize material through one or more mesh surfaces (screens) in series, and retaining oversize material on the mesh surfaces. Grizzly feeders associated with truck dumping and static (non-moving) grizzlies used anywhere in the nonmetallic mineral processing plant are not considered to be screening operations.) building enclosing any of the above EUs if all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits. {A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from one or more affected EUs.}		
[f	answer to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to		
su	bpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.		
[f	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
6.	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
7.	Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a		
R	capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)?	☐ Yes	□No
<i>-</i> •	equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour)?	☐ Yes	□No

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?	Yes	□No
	at all times such that the product is saturated with water. "Saturated material" means mineral materia with sufficient surface moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from procession of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wet solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.}	l ng	
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?		
12	. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?	☐ Yes	□No
If	answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20		
13	.Does the EU have a particulate matter <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	☐ Yes	□No
If	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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	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 any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)? d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?	Yes Yes Yes	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

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 as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance)	ıg		
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
18.Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?	\boxtimes	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 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 device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions? {Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5% of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.} 		Yes	□No
19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?		Yes	□No
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 the EU was constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after $4/22/2008$ skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.			
20.Does the EU have a particulate matter <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?		Yes	□No
21. Initial Tests:			
a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?		Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐No ☐No ☐No
			_

22. If the EU is a building enclosing an		and all enclosed EUs are not		
individually in compliance with em		11: :4: 100 1 6		
a. Was an initial PM stack test perfor			T/A	□ M.
initial startup of the EU?{A "vent" is any opening through who			J/A	∐ No
purpose of exhausting from a building				
one or more affected EUs.}	g air carrying particula	te matter (1 141) emissions from		
b. Was the EU found to be in compliant.	ance with the PM limit	of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?	Yes	□No
c. Were initial fugitive emissions from				□No
c. Were initial rugitive emissions from	in non-vent bunding op	chings less than of equal to 770	opacity: 🔲 Tes	
23.Is a wet scrubber used to control en	nissions from the EU?		Yes	□No
If yes, does the owner/operator mainta	ain and operate:			
a. a device for the continuous measur	rement of the pressure lo	oss of the gas stream through th	ie	
scrubber and the device has been				
instructions?			Yes	□No
{Note: The monitoring device n	nust be certified by the i	nanufacturer to be accurate wit	hin +250	
pascals +1 inch water gauge pre	ssure.}			
and				
b. a device for the continuous measur				_
device has been calibrated on ar				No
{Note: The monitoring device n	•	manufacturer to be accurate wit	thin +5%	
of design scrubbing liquid flow	rate.}			
24 3371 41 . 1 375 4 4 1 4	. J. L	4		
24. When was the last VE test conducted		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		□ Na
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 s		U been tested within the past 5	years? Yes	∐No
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subparti. has the EU been tested during		nder veere?	□ V _{os}	□ No
ii. has the EU been tested during				∐No ∏No
ii. has the EO been tested yet wi	tunn the current calchda	ı year:	<u> </u>	\\0
25. Was a VE test conducted by the own	ner/operator for this u	nit during this site visit?	Yes	□No
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro				☐No
Rate:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
b. Was the VE test conducted accord	ing to EPA Method 9?		Yes	□No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity			_	_
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp			Yes	□No
			_	
26. Was a VE test conducted by the ins				No
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro	ocess rate that is represe	ntative of the normal rate?	Yes	∟No
Rate:				
b. Was the VE test conducted accord			Yes	□No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity				
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp	liance with the opacity	limit? (See chart below)	Yes	□No
	VE Opac	ity Limits		
	EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	Subpart OOO EU	
	40 CFR 60	constructed, modified,	constructed, modif	ïed,
	Subpart OOO	or reconstructed prior	or reconstructed or	
1		_		~-
	_	to 4/22/2008	after 4/22/2008	
Crusher with no capture system	20%	to 4/22/2008	after 4/22/2008	
Crusher with no capture system All other affected EUs	20%	15% 10%	12% 7%	

Facility Section (continued)

REASONABLE PRECAUTIONS FOR UNCONFINED EMISSIONS	(check ✓ 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	□ v _{os}	□ M _O
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	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No□ No
d) Removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to prevent re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
e) Reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of 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		only one
1. Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:	box for each o	auestion)
a) 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?		□No
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?		□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) o Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	or	□No
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		
b) any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gene permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		□No
If YES, what other general permit units or activities?		

<u>(</u>	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 ?
	ENERAL CONDITIONS Has the current or appropriate allowed the significant of any signallytical control devices or	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
	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 Yes	□No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	S	□No
RF	ELOCATABLE PLANT	(check ☑	only one
1.	The facility: \square is stationary; \bowtie is relocatable; or \square consists of both stationary and relocatable NMMP and/or concrete batching plants. (<i>If only stationary, skip the following questions 2 and 3.</i>)	box for each	question)
	For a relocated NMMP plant: 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? b) did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(or to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following relocation?	5)]	□No □No
3.	If the relocatable NMMP plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air opera 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? ————————————————————————————————————	tion - Yes	□No
	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in any consecutive 12-month period?	Yes	□No

<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑	only one
Administrative Changes:	box for each	question)
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloca operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor at 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. 	tion of the facility or any emissions units or dministrative change at the facility? Yes	⊠No □No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:		
 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a) Installation of any new process equipment? b) Alterations to existing process equipment without replaceme c) Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is st d) A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registr 30 days prior to the change? 	ent? Yes ubstantially different? Yes Yes ration form and the appropriate fee submitted	□No□No□No□No
William Coffman	4/30/14	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	
COMMENTS: Unit is in storage at Soutel Plant		