| WHEITAL PROTECTION |
|--------------------|
| Same Man |
| FLORIDA |
| |

NON-METALLIC MINERAL PROCESSING PLANTS



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| INSPECTION TYPE: | ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) | COMPLAINT/D | | (CI) | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| AIRS ID#: 7775353 DA | TE: <u>7/31/2012</u> | ARRIVE: <u>08:45</u> | | DEPART: <u>10:36</u> | |
| FACILITY NAME: CE | ENTRAL CRUSHER-ROCKET B | LVD PLANT | | | |
| FACILITY LOCATION | N: 11041 ROCKET BLVD | | | | |
| | ORLANDO 32824-851 | 1 | | | |
| OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: CONTACT NAME: H Email: ENTITLEMENT PERI | | ANT MAHARAJ | PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile: | (407)438-3830 (407)466-8714 (407)438-3830 (407)466-8714 | |
| <u> </u> | (chechve date) (chid date) | | | | |

Facility Section

| PART I: INSPECTION CON | IPLIANCE <u>STATUS</u> (check ☑ only on | ie box) |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| IN COMPLIANCE | MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE | SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE |

| PA | ART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u> | (check 🗹 | 2 |
|----|--|---------------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>HEMANT MAHARAJ</u> | box for each | question) |
| | Brief Notes: | | |
| 2. | Is the Authorized Representative still HEMANT MAHARAJ? | Xes Yes | □No |
| 3. | If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still HEMANT MAHARAJ? | \boxtimes Yes \boxtimes Yes | □No □No |
| 4. | Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? | ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes | □No □No |

| Emissions Unit Section |
|--|
| 1-NMMP Plant-crusher w/diesel RICE, 200 T/hr machine-rated cap |

| | | (check 🗹 | only one |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | box for each | question) |
| 1. 2. 3. 4. | the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processin {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, 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 Chlo and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Punice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax, and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vernice (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, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite, culite; Xes | □No □No □No □No |
| su | 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. | | |
| | 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 | XNo |
| | 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 | XNo |
| 0. | equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour) ? | Yes | XNo |

| - | | | | |
|------------|--|--------|------------|--------------|
| 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? | П | Yes | 🖾No |
| | <i>Note: "wet screening operation" means a screening operation which removes unwanted material or</i> | _ | | _ |
| | which separates marketable fines from the product by a washing process which is designed and operate | | | |
| | at all times such that the product 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 wetter | | | |
| | solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.} | ea | | |
| | | | | |
| 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 |
| | <i>{Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract</i> | | | |
| | 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.} | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 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. | | | |
| I f | 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? 3/2006 | | | |
| 12 | . Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008? | | Yes | 🖾No |
| | | | | |
| lf | 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 |
| 1f | answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19 | | | |
| IJ | unswer to Question 15 is 140° ship the jouowing questions and go atteeny to Question 17 | | | |
| 14 | . Initial Tests: | | | |
| | a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of | | N 7 | |
| | initial startup of the EU? N/A b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? | Н | Yes Yes | ∐ No □No |
| | c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)? | Н | Yes | \square No |
| | d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity? | \Box | Yes | No |
| 1. | | | | |
| 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 | | Yes | 🗌 No |
| | $\{A \text{ "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the } A$ | | | |
| | purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | | |
| | <i>one or more affected EUs.</i> } b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? | | Yes | No |
| | c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? | = | Yes | \square No |
| | d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity? | _ | Yes | No |
| 11 | | | | |

| 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) | _ | |
| | | |
| 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 ? {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 |
| 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, | | |
| | Xes 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? \square 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)? | T Yes | 🖾No |
| c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)? | Yes | XNo |
| d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity? | ☐ Yes | XNo |
| | | |

| 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 | | | |
| $\{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. 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 | LNo | | | |
| 23. 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 th | e | _ | | | |
| device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ? | Yes | LNo | | | |
| {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? $2/1/2012$ | | | | | |
| a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years? | X 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? | Yes | 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? | Xes | □No | | | |
| a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit: | \boxtimes Yes | No | | | |
| Rate: ~150TPH | | | | | |
| b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | Xes | □No | | | |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of 0.0% for the highest six-minute average. | | | | | |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below) | Xes | 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: <u>~150TPH</u> | | | | | |
| b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | 🛛 Yes | No | | | |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. | | _ | | | |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below) | 🛛 Yes | No | | | |
| | | | | | |
| VE Opacity Limits | | | | | |
| EU not subject to Subpart OOO EU Subpart | t OOO EU | | | | |

| | EU not subject to 40 CFR 60Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed prior to 4/22/2008 | | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 |
|--------------------------------|--|-----|---|
| Crusher with no capture system | 20% | 15% | 12% |
| All other affected EUs | 20% | 10% | 7% |

| Emissions Unit Section |
|--|
| 2-NMMP Plant-350 Hp diesel RICE pwr unit for crusher operation |

| | | (check 🗹 | only one |
|----------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| | | box for each | question) |
| 1. 2. 3. 4. If | <pre>the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processi (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, Grani 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 Chla 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) Vernite (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.]</pre> 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? | ng Plants? ty te, Gravel; Salt; oride, Kernite, culite; Yes ∑ Yes ∑ Yes ∑ Yes | question) □No □No ⊠No |
| If | the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5. | | |
| 6. | 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? | YesYes | □No |
| | capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour) ? | YesYes | □No □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 |
| | <i>{Note: "wet screening operation" means a screening operation which removes unwanted material or</i> | | 103 | |
| | which separates marketable fines from the product by a washing process which is designed and operate | d | | |
| | at all times such that the product is saturated with water. "Saturated material" means mineral material | | | |
| | with sufficient surface moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from processir | | | |
| | of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wett | | | |
| | solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.} | | | |
| | | | | |
| 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 |
| | | | | |
| | <i>{Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract</i> | | | |
| | 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.} | | | |
| 10 | | | | |
| | 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. | | | |
| IJ | 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? 3/2006 | | | |
| 1.7 | Was the FU constructed modified on mean structed on an effect 4/22/20082 | | Vac | |
| 14 | 2. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008? | | Yes | LNo |
| 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, | | N 7 | |
| | 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 | . 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 | Ц | 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)? | Ц | Yes | L.No |
| | c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)? | Ц | Yes | L.No |
| | d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity? | | Yes | No |
| 15 | If the FU is a building englosing any other regulated FUs and all englosed FUs are not | | | |
| 1. | . 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 |
| | {A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the | | 1.00 | |
| | purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | | |
| | 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)? | | Yes | No |
| | c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? | П | Yes | No |
| | d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity? | | Yes | No |
| 1 | | | | |

| 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 Manufacturin as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance) | ng | _ |
| 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, | | |
| | U Vac | |
| recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)? | Yes | L.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 | L.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? 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 |
| | | |

| 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 | s 🗌 No |
| $\{A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the and the second s$ | | |
| purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | |
| one or more affected EUs.} | — | — |
| b. Was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)? | Yes | |
| c. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity? | Yes | s []No |
| 23. Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | s 🗌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 | s 🗌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 th | e | |
| device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ? | Yes | s 🗌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? 2/1/2012 | | |
| a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years? | 🛛 Yes | s []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? | | |
| ii. has the EU been tested yet within the current calendar year? | Yes Yes | s []No |
| 25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit? | X Yes | s 🗌No |
| a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate? | Xes Yes | s 🗌No |
| Rate: <u>~150TPH</u> | | _ |
| b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | 🛛 Yes | s 🗌No |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. | _ | _ |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below) | Yes Yes | sNo |
| 26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit? | X Yes | s ПNo |
| a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit: | \boxtimes Tes | |
| Rate: ~150TPH | | |
| b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | X Yes | s 🗌No |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of 0.0% for the highest six-minute average. | | |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below) | Xes Yes | s 🗌No |
| a. Die die vie est demonstrate compnance with the opacity mint. (See chart below). | | |
| | | |
| VE Opacity Limits | | |

| | EU not subject to 40 CFR 60 Subpart OOO | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed prior to 4/22/2008 | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Crusher with no capture system | 20% | 15% | 12% |
| All other affected EUs | 20% | 10% | 7% |

Emissions Unit Section <u>3 –NMMP Plant-30'' x 50' transport conveyor belt</u>

| | | (check 🗹 | only one |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| | | box for each | question) |
| 1. 2. 3. 4. | <pre>the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processin {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, Grani, Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzie, 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) Gypsun (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) Vernic (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?</pre> | ng Plants? ty te, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite, ulite; ∑ Yes ∑ Yes | □No □No □No □No |
| su | 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 | XNo |
| δ. | 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 |

| - | | | | |
|------|--|-----------|-----|------|
| 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 |
| | <i>{Note: "wet screening operation" means a screening operation which removes unwanted material or</i> | | 103 | 210 |
| | which separates marketable fines from the product by a washing process which is designed and operate | <i>pd</i> | | |
| | 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 processi | | | |
| | 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.} | cu | | |
| | | | | |
| 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 |
| | | _ | | — |
| | <i>{Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract</i> | | | |
| | 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.} | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 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. | | | |
| 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? 3/2006 | | | |
| | | | | |
| 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 | Describe Dillerence and the later and the section of the section o | | | |
| 13 | . Does the EU have a particulate matter <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, | | Vaa | |
| | 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 | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 14 | .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 | D 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)? | | Yes | No |
| | c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)? | Ц | Yes | L.No |
| | d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity? | \Box | Yes | No |
| 15 | If the FU is a building analoging and other negative FUs and all analoged FUs are not | | | |
| 13 | 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 |
| 1 | <i>A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the</i> | | 105 | |
| | purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | | |
| 1 | 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)? | | Yes | No |
| 1 | c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? | = | Yes | No |
| 1 | d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity? | | Yes | No |
| lí | | | | |

| 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 Manufacturin as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance) | | |
| 17 If the TILL's on individual enclosed stars as his controlled by a backgroup | | |
| 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? {Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +250 | Yes | 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 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? | Ves | □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 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? X 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)? | \square Yes | ⊠No |
| c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)? | \square Yes | \square No |
| d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity? | \square Yes | \square No |
| | | |

| {Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5% of design scrubbing liquid flow rate. } When was the last VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this EU? 2/1/2012 a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years? b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO: i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years? ii. has the EU been tested yet within the current calendar year? Was a VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate? | Yes | N N N N N N N N N |
|--|---|---|
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N N N N N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N N N N N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N N N N N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N NN NN NN NN NN |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N NN NN NN NN NN |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N N N N N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | N N N N N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes Xes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | NN N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | NN N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes Xes Xes Yes Xes Yes Yes | NN N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes Xes Xes Yes Xes Yes Yes | NN N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes Xes Xes Yes Yes Yes | N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes Xes Xes Yes Yes Yes | N N N N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes Xes Xes Yes | N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ⊠ Yes | □N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ⊠ Yes | N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes Yes | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | Yes | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | _ | □N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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? | _ | □N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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? | _ | N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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? | _ | . . |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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? [{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +250 | | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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? | | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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 | | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [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 | Yes | N |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? [If yes, does the owner/operator maintain and operate: | | |
| Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU? | | |
| | Yes | ⊠N |
| c. were initial lugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity? L | — •• | |
| \mathbf{W}_{res} initial functions and for an event building angula scheme and the 70° and 12° | Yes | N |
| b. Was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)? | Yes | N |
| one or more affected EUs.} | | |
| purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | |
| <i>A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the</i> | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 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 N/A | Yes | □ N |

| | EU not subject to 40 CFR 60 Subpart OOO | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed prior to 4/22/2008 | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Crusher with no capture system | 20% | 15% | 12% |
| All other affected EUs | 20% | 10% | 7% |

Emissions Unit Section <u>4 –NMMP Plant-30'' x 90' stacker conveyor belt</u>

| | | (check 🗹 | only one | | |
|----------------|---|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| | t | ox for each | question) | | |
| Is | the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processin | g Plants? | • | | |
| 1. 2. 3. | <pre>the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOC – Nonmetallic Mineral Processing {Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majorit is 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 3: (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) Vernice; (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?</pre> | y e, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite, ulite; W Yes X Yes | □No □No □No □No | | |
| su If | 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. 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 | ☐ Yes | No | | |
| 7. | capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)? 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 | | |
| δ. | 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 | | |
| | | | | | |

| - | | | | |
|------------|--|-----------|------|------|
| 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 |
| | <i>{Note: "wet screening operation" means a screening operation which removes unwanted material or</i> | | 1.00 | |
| | which separates marketable fines from the product by a washing process which is designed and operate | ed | | |
| | at all times such that the product is saturated with water. "Saturated material" means mineral material | | | |
| | with sufficient surface moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from processin | ıg | | |
| | of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wett | ed | | |
| | solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.} | | | |
| 10 | | | | |
| 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 |
| | grinding min or storage on in the production line? | | ies | ⊠IN0 |
| | <i>{Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract</i> | | | |
| | 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.} | | | |
| 10 | | | | |
| | 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. | | | |
| IJ | 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? <u>3/2006</u> | | | |
| 12 | . Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008? | | Yes | XNo |
| lf | answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20 | | | |
| 13 | .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? | \square | Yes | No |
| | | | | |
| If | answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19 | | | |
| 14 | .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 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 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 |
| 1.5 | | | | |
| 12 | If the EU is a building enclosing any other regulated EUs and all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits: | | | |
| l | a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on each vent control device within 180 days of | | | |
| l | initial startup of the EU? N/A | | Yes | 🗌 No |
| l | <i>A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the</i> | | | |
| l | purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | | |
| l | one or more affected EUs.} | | | |
| l | b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? | | Yes | No |
| l | c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? | = | Yes | No |
| Í | d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity? | \Box | Yes | 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 Manufacturin as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance) | ng | |
| 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 |
| 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.} | | No |
| 19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU? | X 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. | | |
| 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 | XNo |
| 21. Initial Tests: a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? X N/A 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)? | Yes Yes Yes Yes | □ No ⊠No ⊠No ⊠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? \square N/A | | Yes | No |
| $\{A \text{ ``vent'' is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the }$ | | | |
| purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from | | | |
| one or more affected EUs.} | | | |
| b. Was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)? | | Yes | 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? | | 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 th | | | |
| 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 we the last VE test conducted by the symposium for this EU9 2/1/2012 | | | |
| 24. When was the last VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this EU ? <u>2/1/2012</u> a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years? | | Vac | |
| b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO: | | ies | No |
| i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years? | | Yes | No |
| i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar year? | | | \square No |
| II. has the EO been tested yet within the current calendar year? | | ies | 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 at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate? | \boxtimes | Yes | No |
| Rate: <u>~150TPH</u> | _ | | |
| b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | \boxtimes | Yes | No |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % 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: <u>~150TPH</u> | | | |
| b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9? | | Yes | No |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of 0.0% for the highest six-minute average. | <u> </u> | | |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below) | | Yes | No |
| ······································ | م لا سے | | |
| VE Opacity Limits | | | |
| | | | |

| VE Opacity Limits | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | EU not subject to 40 CFR 60 Subpart OOO | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed prior to 4/22/2008 | Subpart OOO EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 |
| Crusher with no capture system | 20% | 15% | 12% |
| All other affected EUs | 20% | 10% | 7% |

| <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)? 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 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 | ⊠ Yes □ Yes ⊠ Yes □ Yes | □ No □ 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 |

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY (check \square only one box for each question) 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? ------ Yes ...No ...No c) 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? ------ Xes ...No 2. Does this facility include: a) any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception of units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? ------ Yes X..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 general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? ----- Yes X..No If YES, what other general permit units or activities?

| 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 |
| | | |
| (|) gal diesel/yr + () gal gasoline/yr + () MM SCF nat. gas/yr + () MM gal propane/yr $\leq 1.00?$ | |
| 27 | 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 |

| G | ENERAL CONDITIONS | (check 🗹 | - |
|----|--|------------------------|------|
| 1. | Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or | box for each question) | |
| | Allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices? | Yes | 🖂No |
| 2. | Does the owner or operator: | _ | |
| | a) maintain the authorized facility in good condition?b) ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all | - 🛛 Yes | L.No |
| | terms and conditions of the air general permit? | | No |
| 3. | Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general | SS | |
| | permit and Department rules? | - 🛛 Yes | No |

| | ELOCATABLE PLANT The facility: is stationary; is relocatable; or consists of both stationary and relocatable NMMP and/or concrete batching plants. (If only stationary, skip the following questions 2 and 3.) | (check 🗹 box for each | only one question) |
|----|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 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? 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? | 5)] | □No □No |
| 3. | If the relocatable NMMP plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operate 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? | | ⊠No |
| | 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? | ⊠ Yes □ Yes | □No ⊠No |

| | HANGES Iministrative Changes: | (check 🗹 box for each | only one question) |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions up operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? | nits or | No |
| 2. | If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? | Yes | No |
| Ne | ew 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? | 🗌 Yes | 🖾No |
| | b) Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? | 🗌 Yes | 🖾No |
| | c) Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? | 🗌 Yes | 🖾No |
| | d) A change in ownership? | 🗌 Yes | 🖾No |
| 4. | If the answer to any question 3a d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sul | bmitted | |
| | 30 days prior to the change? | 🗌 Yes | No |

Assefa Hailemariam

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

7/31/2012

Date of Inspection

~12/31/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The inspector, Assefa Hailemariam, met with Mr. Dart Morales, consultant from Grove Scientific and Engineering, on 7/31/2012 to audit the compliance test being conducted on the mobile crusher. All of the points on the crusher had an Observed opacity of 0.0%. The crusher was operating at ~150 TPH. The facility workers, were also present during the VE test. The facility uses water a truck to wet the dirt roads. No PM was observed leaving the property. No objectionable odors were detected during the compliance test. The facility failed to conduct compliance testing for 2011, so this compliance test was conducted to satisfy an enforcement case. Facility has an Eagle crusher with a serial number 30410.