

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



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	_	· · · —	
AIRS ID#: 7775444 DATE: 4/12/12	ARRIVE: <u>0950</u>	DEPART: <u>1140</u>	
FACILITY NAME: F. FILL GROUP/ LOX RAN	CH, LLC		
FACILITY LOCATION: 13200 Lox Road			
PARKLAND 33	3067		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/1/2007 / 12/1/2007 (effective date) (end of the contact o	M PF M 1/2012	HONE: (561)451-2176 Tobile: HONE: Tobile:	
	Facility Section		
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATE IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-		FICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	
DADE IL ONGUEE INEDODIJOZODA METERIA			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes:	<u>\G</u>	(check 🗹 box for eac	only one ch question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still LUZ FARA If no, who is?:	АСНЕ?	Xes	□No
If different, did the facility provide an administra 3. Is the facility contact still? If no, who is?:			□No □No
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during tod If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least			□No □No

Emissions Unit Section

		(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	question)
S	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 majoris any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Grant 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) Vermic (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.} Is the EU located at a fixed or portable nonmetallic mineral processing plant	ity te, l Gravel; Salt; oride, t, Kernite, culite;	
	or hot mix asphalt plant that has an aboveground crusher or grinding mill?		∐No
3.	Is the EU located above ground (i.e., not in an underground mine)?	⊠ Yes	□No □No □No
	 ☐ crusher, ☐ grinding mill, ☐ bucket elevator, ☐ belt conveyor, ☐ bagging operation, ☐ storage bin, ☐ enclosed truck loading station ☐ enclosed railcar loading station; ☐ crusher or grinding mill at hot mix asphalt plant that reduces the size of nonmetallic minerals embedded in recycled asphalt pavement or subsequent emissions unit up to, but not including, the first storage silo or bin; ☐ screening operation (a device for separating material according to size by passing undersize material through one or more mesh surfaces (screens) in series, and retaining oversize material on the mesh surfaces. Grizzly feeders associated with truck dumping and static (non-moving) grizzlies used anywhere in the nonmetallic mineral processing plant are not considered to be screening operations.) ☐ building enclosing any of the above EUs if all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits. {A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from one or more affected EUs.} 		
su [f	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	□ V ₂₂	⊠ Na
6	any other EU that is subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F or subpart I?	☐ Yes	⊠No
	capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)?	Yes	⊠No
	capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)? Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or	Yes	⊠No
٠.	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?	ated ial sing etted	Yes	⊠No
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
{Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract any nonmetallic mineral from deposits existing at or below the water table, where the nonmetallic mineral is saturated with water. "Saturated material" means mineral material with sufficient surface moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from processing of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wetted solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.}			
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? 2007			
12. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?		Yes	⊠No
If answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20			
13.Does the EU have a particulate matter <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?		Yes	□No
If answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19			
a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?	- 🗌	Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐No ☐No ☐No
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		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

	$\overline{}$	17	
16. Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?	· Ш	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? \[\Delta \text{N/A} \]		Yes	☐ No
were initial ragilitie comparions less than of equal to 770 options.		105	
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?		Vac	□ Na
	- Ш	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,		3 7	
recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)?	Ш	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? \[\sqrt{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
a. 11 jus, was the opining test than or equal to 170 opining.		200	

22. If the EU is a building enclosing any	y other regulated EUs	and all enclosed EUs are not			
individually in compliance with emi	issions limits:				
a. Was an initial PM stack test perfor					
initial startup of the EU?			/A \(\sum \) \(\text{Y}	es No	
$\{A \text{ "vent" is any opening through whith}\}$	ich there is mechanicall	y induced air flow for the			
purpose of exhausting from a building	g air carrying particula	te matter (PM) emissions from			
one or more affected EUs.}					
b. Was the EU found to be in complia	ance with the PM limit	of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?	Y	esNo	
c. Were initial fugitive emissions from	n non-vent building op	enings less than or equal to 7%	opacity? 🗌 Y	esNo	
23.Is a wet scrubber used to control en	niccione from the FII?		Пν	es \[\]No	
If yes, does the owner/operator mainta			1	C3	
a. a device for the continuous measur		oss of the gas stream through the	۵.		
scrubber and the device has been					
instructions?				es \[\] No	
{Note: The monitoring device m				C3	
pascals +1 inch water gauge pre	-	nanuracturer to be accurate with	IIII 1230		
and	BBUIC. J				
b. a device for the continuous measur	ement of the scrubbing	liquid flow rate to the wet scrul	ober and the		
device has been calibrated on an				es \square No	
{Note: The monitoring device m					
of design scrubbing liquid flow		The state of the s			
8 1	,				
24. When was the last VE test conducte	ed by the owner/operat	tor for this EU? <u>9/24/2008</u>			
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 s	subpart OOO, has the E	U been tested within the past 5	years? Y	esNo	
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart					
i. has the EU been tested during	geach of the past 4 cale	ndar years?	Y	es 🖾No	
ii. has the EU been tested yet wi	thin the current calenda	r year?	X	esNo	
25. Was a VE test conducted by the own	nor/onergtor for this w	nit during this site visit?	× Y	es \[\]\No	
Rate: 25	1				
	ing to FPA Method 97 -		X Y	es \[\] No	
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?					
				esNo	
26. Was a VE test conducted by the ins				=	
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro	ocess rate that is represe	ntative of the normal rate?	Y	esNo	
Rate:			_	_	
b. Was the $\overline{\text{VE}}$ test conducted according			<u> </u>	esNo	
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity					
d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp	liance with the opacity	limit? (See chart below)		esNo	
	VE Opac	ity Limits			
	EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	Subpart OOC	EU	
	40 CFR 60°	constructed, modified,	constructed, r		
	Subpart OOO	or reconstructed prior	or reconstruct	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		to 4/22/2008	after 4/22/200		
Crusher with no capture system	20%	15%	12%		
All other affected EUs	20%	10%	7%		
In other affected Bos	2070	10/0	1 70		

Facility Section (continued)

<u>R</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)? ————————————————————————————————————	☐ Yes	⊠ No	
	b) Use of water trucks equipped with spray bars to apply water or effective dust suppressant(s) on a regular basis (to all stockpiles, roadways and work yards)? N/A c) Paving and maintaining roads and parking areas? N/A d) Removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No	
	of the owner/operator to prevent re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? 🖂 N/A	Yes	☐ No	
	e) Reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles? N/A	Yes	⊠ No	
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a) Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? N/A b) If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c) What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □No	
	c) what caused the problem(s) (if known):			
	e) what caused the problem(s) (if known):			
	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	,	only one	
	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	box for each of - ⊠ Yes - ⊠ Yes	•	
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a) 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b) 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?	box for each of the control of the c	uuestion) NoNo	

<u>(</u> 27	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	ne/yr ption	Yes Yes Yes Yes ≤ 1.00°	No No No No
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(che	ck 🗹	only one
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or			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?	\boxtimes	Yes	□No
3	b) ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?		Yes	□No
J.	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	, 	Yes	□No
	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.)			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(6 to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following relocation?	<u>[</u>]		□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? 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?		Yes Yes	□No
	11 1 ES, were any periods more man o months in any consecutive 12-month period?		Yes	∐No

<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ✓ only one box for each question)			
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not				
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes \int \text{No} 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? Yes \int \text{No}				
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been				
a) Installation of any new process equipment? b) Alterations to existing process equipment without replac c) Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that d) A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new reg 30 days prior to the change?	ement?			
Art Pennetta	4/12/12			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	4/13			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
COMMENTS:				