(check ☑ only one box for each q COMPLIANCE	question) ERAL PROCESSING <u>NTS</u> E INSPECTION CHECKLIST			
INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)			
AIRS ID#: 7775293 DATE: 4/21/2011         ARRIVE: 11:35 AM         DEPART: 12:10 PM           FACILITY NAME: MIAMI-QUARRY         ARRIVE: 11:35 AM         DEPART: 12:10 PM				
FACILITY LOCATION: 12201 NW 41 Street MIAMI 33178				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JIN Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/17/2005 / 12/16/2 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile: '2010 Facility may be operating without Entitlement!			

# **Facility Section**

PART I: INSPECTION CON	<b>IPLIANCE STATUS</b> (check <b>I</b> only	y one box)	
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	

	ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING         Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Tim Blaisdell</u>	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still JIM HURLEY?	Xes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still ?		□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		⊠No □No

**Emissions Unit Section** <u>1 – Primary Crusher 800 TPH Boehringer, Inc.</u>

Ē

		(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	question)
	<b>the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processin</b> <i>{Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majori</i> <i>is any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Grani</i> <i>Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand and</i> <i>(3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Rock</i> <i>(5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chlo</i> <i>and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax</i> <i>and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vermice</i> <i>(17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.}</i>	ty te, ! Gravel; Salt; ride, , Kernite,	
1.	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?	Xes	□No
2.	Is the EU located above ground (i.e., not in an underground mine)?	$\boxtimes$ Yes	No
3.	Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed after August 31, 1983?	🖾 Yes	No
4.	<ul> <li>Is the EU one of the following?</li></ul>		No
	answer to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to ubpart 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?	Xes 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		
	capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour) ?	Yes	🖾No
8.	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	XNo

#### <u>1 – Primary Crusher 800 TPH Boehringer, Inc.</u>

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
<ul> <li>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?</li></ul>	☐ Yes	⊠No
If answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If 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		
<b>13.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
If answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19		
<ul> <li>14. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? X N/A</li> <li>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)?</li></ul>	<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? X/A {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	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?	<ul><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li></ul>	□No □No □No

1 – Prima	ry Crusher	800 TPH	<b>Boehringer, Inc.</b>

16. Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?	Yes	No
If yes, the owner operator: 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 Manufacturit as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance)		
<b>17. If the EU is an individual, enclosed storage bin controlled by a baghouse,</b> were initial fugitive emissions less than or equal to 7% opacity? N/A	Yes	🗌 No
<b>18.Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?</b>	Yes	No
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +250 pascals +1 inch water gauge pressure.}</li> </ul>	- 🗌 Yes	□No
<ul> <li>and</li> <li>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.}     </li> </ul>		□No
19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?	Xes Yes	No
<ul> <li>If yes:</li> <li>a. Does the owner/operator perform monthly inspections to check that water is flowing to the discharge spray nozzles?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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)?</li></ul>		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.		
<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
<ul> <li>21. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?  N/A</li> <li>b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)? c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?</li></ul>	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐No ☐No ☐No

22. If the EU is a building enclosing an individually in compliance with em		and all enclosed EUs are not			
a. Was an initial PM stack test perfor		ol device within 180 days of			
initial startup of the EU?			/Δ	Yes	□ No
			/11		
<i>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</i>					
one or more affected EUs.}	g air carrying particula	ie mailer (1 14) emissions from			
b. Was the EU found to be in compli	ance with the PM limit	of 0.05 g/dscm $(0.022 \text{ gr/dscf})^2$		Yes	□No
c. Were initial fugitive emissions fro				Tes Yes	$\square$ No
e. were initial fugitive emissions no	in non-vent bunding op	enings less than of equal to 770	opacity :		
23. Is a wet scrubber used to control er	nissions from the EU?			Yes	No
If yes, does the owner/operator maint					
a. a device for the continuous measure		oss of the gas stream through th	e		
scrubber and the device has bee					
instructions?				Yes	No
{Note: The monitoring device r					
pascals +1 inch water gauge pre		manufacturer to be accurate with	1111 + 250		
and					
b. a device for the continuous measu	rement of the scrubbing	liquid flow rate to the wet scru	bber and th	e	
device has been calibrated on an					No
{Note: The monitoring device r					
of design scrubbing liquid flow		manufacturer to be accurate with	1111 + 570		
or design serubbing riquid now	Tate. j				
24. When was the last VE test conduct	ed by the owner/onera	tor for this EU? 12/21/2010			
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60			vears?	Xes	No
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpar		te been tested within the past 5	years.		
i. has the EU been tested during		ndar vears?		Xes	□No
ii. has the EU been tested utility				$\boxtimes$ Yes	No
n. has the LO been tested yet w					
25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>ow</i>	ner/onerator for this u	nit during this site visit?		Yes	🖾No
a. Was the VE test conducted by the or				Yes	No
Rate:	beess rate that is represe	situative of the normal rate.			
b. Was the VE test conducted accord	ling to FPA Method 9?			Xes	No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity					
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp				Yes	No
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp	mance with the opacity	mint: (See chart below)			
26. Was a VE test conducted by the ins	nector for this unit du	ring this site visit?		Yes	🖂No
a. Was the VE test conducted by the ms					No
Rate:	beess rate that is represe				
b. Was the VE test conducted accord	ing to FPA Method 92			Yes	No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity					
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp				Yes	No
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp	mance with the opacity	mint? (See chart below)			NO
	VE Opac	ity Limits			
	EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	Subpart	t <b>OOO EU</b>	
	40 CFR 60	constructed, modified,	-	cted, modi	
	Subpart OOO	or reconstructed prior		structed of	
	Suspart 000	to 4/22/2008			
Cruch on with no constant					
Crusher with no capture system	20%	15%		12%	
All other affected EUs	20%	10%		7%	

### **Emissions Unit Section** <u>2 – Diesel Engine for Rock Crusher</u>

	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	question)
<ul> <li>Is the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Process [Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the major is any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Gran Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand an (3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Roci (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chl and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Bora and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Verm. (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.]</li> <li>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?</li></ul>	rity uite, ud Gravel; k Salt; loride, x, Kernite, iculite; - Yes - Yes	□No □No □No □No
If answer to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If 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
<ul> <li>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)?</li> <li>7. Is the EU located at a method and and and any plant or any had stone plant with a second stone plant with a second stone plant with a second stone plant or any had stone plant with a second stone plant with a second stone plant with a second stone plant or any had stone plant with a second stone plant with a second stone plant with a second stone plant or any had stone plant with a second st</li></ul>	Yes	🖾No
<ul> <li>7. 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) ?</li> <li>8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or</li> </ul>	Yes	XNo
equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour) ?	- 🗌 Yes	🖾No

#### **<u>2 – Diesel Engine for Rock Crusher</u>**

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?	ed l ng	Yes	⊠No
<ul> <li>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?</li></ul>		Yes	⊠No
If answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If 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	XNo
If answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20			
<b>13. 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
If answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19			
<ul> <li>14. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?</li></ul>		Yes Yes Yes Yes	□ No □No □No □No
<ul> <li>15. If the EU is a building enclosing any other regulated EUs and all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on each vent control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?</li></ul>		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

#### **<u>2 – Diesel Engine for Rock Crusher</u>**

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;		
$\Box$ uses a bag leak detection system specified in 40 CFR 60.674(d);		
follows the requirements of 40 CFR 63AAAAA Lime Manufacturin	ng	
as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance)		
<b>17.If the EU is an individual, enclosed storage bin controlled by a baghouse,</b> 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?	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	<b>—</b>	
instructions?	Yes	No
{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +250 pascals +1 inch water gauge pressure.}		
<i>and</i> 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 ?		□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 the EU was constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 skip the following		
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?		□No
rious, rans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	105	
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	L.No
d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?	Yes	No

22. If the EU is a building enclosing an		and all enclosed EUs are not				
individually in compliance with em						
a. Was an initial PM stack test perfor initial startup of the EU?			/ A			
*			A	Yes	∐ No	
{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						
	g air carrying particula	le mailer (FM) emissions from				
one or more affected EUs.} b. Was the EU found to be in compli	ance with the DM limit.	of 0.05 $\alpha/dsom (0.022 \alpha r/dsof)$ ?		Yes	No	
c. Were initial fugitive emissions fro				Yes	$\square$ No	
c. were initial fugitive emissions no	in non-vent building op	chings less than of equal to 770	opacity !		10	
23. Is a wet scrubber used to control er	nissions from the FU?			Yes	No	
If yes, does the owner/operator maint						
a. a device for the continuous measure		oss of the gas stream through th	e			
scrubber and the device has bee						
instructions?				Yes	No	
{Note: The monitoring device r						
pascals +1 inch water gauge pre						
and	,					
b. a device for the continuous measu	rement of the scrubbing	liquid flow rate to the wet scrub	bber and the	e		
device has been calibrated on an	n annual basis in accord	ance with manufacturer's instru	ctions ?	Yes	No	
{Note: The monitoring device r	nust be certified by the 1	manufacturer to be accurate with	nin +5%			
of design scrubbing liquid flow	rate.}					
24. When was the last VE test conduct				<b></b>	_	
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60		U been tested within the past 5	years?	🛛 Yes	No	
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpar					<b>—</b>	
i. has the EU been tested during				$\bowtie$ Yes $\bowtie$ Yes	L.No	
ii. has the EU been tested yet within the current calendar year?					No	
25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit?					🖾No	
a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>bw</i>				Yes Yes	$\square$ No	
Rate:	seess rate that is represe				10	
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 <i>ins</i>	<i>pector</i> for this unit du	ring this site visit?		Yes	🖂No	
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro-				Yes	No	
Rate:						
b. Was the VE test conducted accord	ing to EPA Method 9? -			Yes	No	
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity	of% for the high	est six-minute average.				
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp	liance with the opacity	limit? (See chart below)		Yes	No	
	VE O	it. Timita			]	
VE Opacity Limits           EU not subject to         Subpart OOO EU						
	EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	-			
40 CFR 60 constructed, modified, constru-					· ·	
Subpart OOO or reconstructed prior or recor					n or	
	to 4/22/2008 after 4/22/2008					
Crusher with no capture system	20%	15%		12%		
All other affected EUs	20%	10%		7%		
	·				1	

Is the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants?         {Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majority is any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Granite, Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand and Gravel;         (3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Rock Salt;         (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chloride, and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax, Kernite, and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vermiculite; (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.]         1. 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? Yes YesNo         2. Is the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed after August 31, 1983? Yes YesNo         3. Was the EU one of the following?				
storage crusher minerals e but not inc screeni undersize oversize m and static ( plant are n buildin compliance which the	r, $\Box$ grinding mill, $\Box$ bucket elevator, $\Box$ belt conveyor, $\Box$ bagging operation, e bin, $\Box$ enclosed truck loading station $\Box$ enclosed railcar loading station; r or grinding mill at hot mix asphalt plant that reduces the size of nonmetallic mbedded in recycled asphalt pavement or subsequent emissions unit up to, eluding, the first storage silo or bin; ing operation (a device for separating material according to size by passing material through one or more mesh surfaces (screens) in series, and retaining haterial on the mesh surfaces. Grizzly feeders associated with truck dumping (non-moving) grizzlies used anywhere in the nonmetallic mineral processing tot considered to be screening operations.) ag enclosing any of the above EUs if all enclosed EUs are not individually in e with emissions limits. {A "vent" is any opening through re is mechanically induced air flow for the purpose of exhausting from a building ng particulate matter (PM) emissions from one or more affected EUs.}			
If answer to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5.				
<ul> <li>subpart I (any other I</li> <li>any other I</li> <li>any other I</li> <li>Is the EU I</li> <li>capacity le</li> <li>Is the EU I</li> <li>capacity le</li> <li>Is the EU I</li> </ul>	subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F (Portland Cement Plants) or Hot Mix Asphalt Facilities), or does it follow in the plant process EU that is subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F or subpart I? located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a ess than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)? located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a ess than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour) ? located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour) ?	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>	

## <u>3 – Diesel Generator For Rock Crusher</u>

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	es □No
<ul> <li>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?</li></ul>	□ Ye	es 🗌No
If answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If 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?	□ Ye	esNo
If answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20		
<b>13.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?	□ Ye	esNo
If answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19		
<ul> <li>14. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? N/A</li> <li>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?</li></ul>		esNo esNo
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? N/A {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	☐ Ye	es 🗌 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?		es 🔲No

## <u>3 – Diesel Generator For Rock Crusher</u>

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 Manufacturi	ng	
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
	_	_
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		
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 ?	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)?	<b>Yes</b>	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 capture system (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	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>
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	L.No
c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?	L Yes	L.No
d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?	Yes	No

22. 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? N/A	Yes	No No		
{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.}	<b>—</b>			
b. Was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?	Yes	L.No		
c. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity?	Yes	No		
23.Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?				
If yes, does the owner/operator maintain and operate:	Yes	No		
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	ne			
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 +5%				
of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}				
24. When was the last VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this EU?		_		
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years?	Yes	No		
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO:	_	_		
i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years?	L Yes	L.No		
ii. has the EU been tested yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	No		
25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	No		
a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit.	Yes	$\square$ No		
Rate:				
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	No		
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.				
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	Yes	No		
26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	No		
a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate?	Yes	No		
Rate:				
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	□No		
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.	_	_		
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	Yes	No		

<u>RI</u>	EASONABLE 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)? $\square$ N/A	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
	<ul> <li>If no, where are unconfined emissions occurring?</li> <li>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</li> <li>c) Paving and maintaining roads and parking areas? N/A</li> <li>d) Removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes □ Yes	☐ No ☐ 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 particulate matter from stock piles? N/A	<ul><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li></ul>	□ No □ 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

	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ box for each	only one auestion)
1.	<ul> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:</li> <li>a) 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li></ul>	🗌 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) Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	or	XNo
	<ul> <li>b) any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gen 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? <u>Quarry</u></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? Yes	No
	b) 23,000 gallons of gasoline? Yes	No
	c) 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? Yes	No
	d) 1.3 million gallons of propane? Yes	No
	e) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? [] Yes	No
<u>(</u> 27	) gal diesel/yr + ( ) gal gasoline/yr + ( ) MM SCF nat. gas/yr + ( ) MM gal propane/yr $\leq 1.00$ ? 75,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane/yr	
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? Yes	No

GENERAL CONDITIONS		only one
1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, o	box for each	question)
Allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	Yes	XNo
<ul><li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li><li>a) maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li></ul>	Xes	□No
b) ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complie		NO
terms and conditions of the air general permit?		No
<b>3.</b> Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Depart to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the		
permit and Department rules?		No

<u>R</u> ]	ELOCATABLE PLANT	(check 🗹	only one
1.	The facility: $\Box$ is stationary; $\boxtimes$ is relocatable; or $\Box$ consists of both stationary and relocatable	box for each	question)
	NMMP and/or concrete batching plants. (If only stationary, skip the following questions 2 and 3.)		
2.	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?	Yes	🖾No
	b) did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900( to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following relocation?	6)]	—  XNo
	to the Department of Local An Trogram no facer than five business days following relocation.	103	2310
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 not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:	ition	
	a) was the relocatable NMMP plant being used for a non-routine purpose?	- 🗌 Yes	🖾No
	If YES, what was the purpose?		
	{Note: crushing recycled asphalt pavement (rap) at an asphalt plant is considered routine and so therefore must be authorized in the facility's air construction or operation permit.}		
	b) were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at		
	the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in any consecutive 12-month period?		∐No ∏No
		_	

Administrative Changes:	box for each question)
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any er operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the second terms of the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li> </ol>	missions units or facility? □ Yes □No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	
<ul> <li>a) Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ul>	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No iate fee submitted
FRANK DELGADO 4/21	/2011

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

4/2012

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

(check  $\square$  only one

COMMENTS: THE CRUSHER WAS RELOCATED TO THE MAIN QUARRY LOCATED AT 18300 NW 122 AVENUE. A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST WAS CONDUCTED ON 12/21/2010 BY STAFF FROM KOOGLER AND ASSOCIATES. THE FACILITY WILL SUBMIT A RELOCATION NOTICE AND NEW NOTIFICATION FOR THE CRUSHER.

**CHANGES** 

1. V