

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



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPLA	AINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 7775444 DATE: <u>12/5/13</u> ARRIVE: <u>1445</u> DEPART: <u>1600</u>					
FACILITY NAME: F. FILL GROUP					
FACILITY LOCATION: 1385 Hammondville Rd					
Pompano Bch. 33069-					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: LUZ Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/8/2012 / 10/8/2017 (effective date) (end date)		PHONE: (561)451-2176 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:			
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)					
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
DADT II. ONGITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Luz Farache Brief Notes:		(check l box for ea	✓ only one ach question)		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still LUZ FARACHE If no, who is?:	*?	X Yes	□No		
If different, did the facility provide an administrative up 3. Is the facility contact still?If no, who is?:	pdate within 30 days?	Yes Yes	□No □No		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's in If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15			□No □No		

Emissions Unit Section

		(check 🗹	only one
	1	box for each	question)
S	the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processi	ng Plants?	
	{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, Granic Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand and (3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Rock (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chlo and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax, and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vermic (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.}	ty te, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite,	
2. 3.	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?	X Yes	⊠No □No □No
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.		
6. 7.	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 ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□No □No
3.	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? ————————————————————————————————————	l ng	□No
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
If	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		
su	bpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. the answer to all of the six Questions 5-10 above is "No" then continue to Question 11.		
11	.When was the EU last constructed, modified, or reconstructed?		
12	. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?	☐ Yes	□No
If	answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20		
13	.Does the EU have a particulate matter <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	☐ Yes	□No
If	answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19		
14	a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?	☐ Yes ☐ 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?	☐ Yes	□ No
	one or more affected EUs.} b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□No □No □No

16.Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?		Yes	□No
If yes, the owner operator: conducts quarterly 30-minute VE tests using Method 22; uses a bag leak detection system specified in 40 CFR 60.674(d); follows the requirements of 40 CFR 63AAAAA Lime 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?	П	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.} 		Yes	No
19.Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?		Yes	□No
a. Does the owner/operator perform monthly inspections to check that water is flowing to the discharge spray nozzles?			
 b. Does the owner/operator initiate corrective action within 24 hours and complete corrective action as expediently as practical is water is not flowing properly? c. Is each inspection of the spray nozzles, including the date and any corrective action taken, recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)?		Yes	□No
If the EU was constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.			
20.Does the EU have a particulate matter <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?		Yes	□No
21. Initial Tests:			
a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?		Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐No ☐No ☐No

22. If the EU is a building enclosing any	other regulated EUs	and all enclosed EUs are not			
individually in compliance with emi	ssions limits:				
a. Was an initial PM stack test perform	med on each vent contro	ol device within 180 days of			
initial startup of the EU?		N	/A Yes	☐ No	
$\{A \text{ "vent" is any opening through whith}$	ch there is mechanicall	y induced air flow for the			
purpose of exhausting from a building	air carrying particulai	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	of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?	Yes	□No	
c. Were initial fugitive emissions from	n non-vent building ope	enings less than or equal to 7%	opacity? Yes	□No	
23. Is a wet scrubber used to control en	pissions from the FII2			□No	
If yes, does the owner/operator mainta			<u> </u>	110	
a. a device for the continuous measur		ass of the ass stream through the	2		
scrubber and the device has been					
instructions?				□No	
{Note: The monitoring device m					
pascals +1 inch water gauge pres	•	nandracturer to be accurate with	IIII 1230		
and	ssure. 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				□No	
{Note: The monitoring device m					
of design scrubbing liquid flow		nanaractarer to be accurate with	1370		
	,				
24. When was the last VE test conducte					
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 s	subpart OOO, has the E	U been tested within the past 5	years? 🛛 Yes	□No	
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart				_	
i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years? YesNo					
ii. has the EU been tested yet wi	thin the current calenda	r year?	Yes	∟No	
25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit? YesNo					
				□No	
Rate:	<u> </u>				
	X Yes	□No			
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.					
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)				□No	
	, , ,,	(20000000000000000000000000000000000000			
26. Was a VE test conducted by the insp				⊠No	
a. Was the VE test conducted at a pro	cess rate that is represe	ntative of the normal rate?	Yes	□No	
Rate:					
b. Was the VE test conducted accordi			Yes	□No	
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity			_	_	
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compl	liance with the opacity l	limit? (See chart below)	Yes	□No	
	VE Opac	ity Limits			
	EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	Subpart OOO EU	Ţ	
	40 CFR 60	constructed, modified,	constructed, mod	fied,	
	Subpart OOO	or reconstructed prior	or reconstructed		
		to 4/22/2008	after 4/22/2008		
Crusher with no capture system	20%	15%	12%		
All other affected EUs	20%	10%	7%		
I III outer attended Deb	2070	1 *************************************	1 70		

Facility Section (continued)

REASONABLE PRECAUTIONS FOR UNCONFINED EMISSIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1. Does the owner/operator of the NMMP Plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by:		
a) Use of water suppression system(s) with spray bars located wherever unconfined emissions occur (at the feeder(s), the entrance and exit of the crusher(s), the classifier screens, and the conveyor drop points)? N/A 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	☐ 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	⊠ Yes	☐ No
particulate matter from stock piles?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a) Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? N/A b) If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c) What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □No
CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one
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? c) 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?		⊠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) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	or	⊠No
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	U Yes	<u> </u>

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?		∷.No∴.No∴.No∴.No∴.No
GENERAL CONDITIONS 1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one 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	□No
terms and conditions of the air general permit?	Yes	□No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		□No
RELOCATABLE PLANT	(-11- 1	
1. 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 of	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? 	5)]	□No
3. If the relocatable NMMP plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air opera permit, and the relocatable NMMP plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a) was the relocatable NMMP plant being used for a non-routine purpose?		⊠No

CHANGES Administrative Changes:		box for each o	only one question)
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numb associated with a change in ownership or with a physical rele operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 	ocation of the facility or any emissions unitadministrative change at the facility?		⊠No □No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a) Installation of any new process equipment?	ment?s substantially different?s substantially different?istration form and the appropriate fee subr	Yes Yes Yes mitted	NoNoNoNoNo
Art Pennetta	12/5/13		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	12/14		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Insp	pection	
COMMENTS:			