

# NON-METALLIC MINERAL PROCESSING PLANTS



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<b>INSPECTION <u>TYPE</u>:</b>	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/D	ISCOVERY (CI)	
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLA	AINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 0550054 DA	TE: 11/28/11	ARRIVE: <u>7:45</u>	DEPART:	
	B ENTERPRISES-SEBRING			
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 300 DEER TRAIL E			
	SEBRING 33876-			
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email:	CD REPRESENTATIVE: ED B	OADO	<b>PHONE:</b> (863)655-4448 <b>Mobile:</b>	
CONTACT NAME: S Email:	COTT GWYNN		<b>PHONE:</b> (863)655-4448 <b>Mobile:</b>	
ENTITLEMENT PERI	OD: 4/24/2008 / 4/24/2013 (effective date) (end date)			

**Facility Section** 

PART I: INSPECTION CON	MPLIANCE STATUS (check 🗹 onl	y one box)	
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	

	<b>RT II:</b> <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u> Name(s) of facility representative(s):	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still ED BOADO?	🛛 Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still SCOTT GWYNN? If no, who is?:		□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

<b>Emissions Unit Section</b>
1 –NMMP Plant (stationary crusher) - 80 Tph rated capacity

	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	ı question)
<ul> <li>Is the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Process {Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majo is any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Grau Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand an (3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Roc (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Ch and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Bora and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Verm (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.]</li> <li>Is the EU located at a fixed or portable nonmetallic mineral processing plant or hot mix asphalt plant that has an aboveground crusher or grinding mill?</li></ul>	rity nite, nd Gravel; k Salt; loride, ux, Kernite, niculite; X Yes - X Yes - Yes - Yes	□No □No □No □No
If the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5.		
<ul> <li>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</li> </ul>	<b>V</b>	M N-
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
7. Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour) ?	- 🗌 Yes	🖾No
8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour) ?	🗌 Yes	XNo

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>			
	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 processin	ıg		
	of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wette	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,		V	$\square$ N
	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>lf</i>	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			
-7				
14	. Initial Tests:			
	a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of	_		<b>—</b>
	initial startup of the EU? N/A	=	Yes	No 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	L.No
	c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?	=	Yes	L.No
	d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?		Yes	LNo
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
	$\{A  ``vent'' is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the and the second second$			
	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?		Yes	No
	d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity?	$\Box$	Yes	L.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:		
<ul> <li>a. a device for the continuous measurement of the pressure loss of the gas stream through the scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions?</li></ul>	Yes	No
pascals +1 inch water gauge pressure.}		
<ul> <li>and</li> <li>b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ?         {Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5% of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}     </li> </ul>		□No
19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?		□No
		NO
<ul> <li>If yes:</li> <li>a. Does the owner/operator perform monthly inspections to check that water is flowing to the discharge spray nozzles?</li> <li>b. Does the owner/operator initiate corrective action within 24 hours and complete corrective action as expediently as practical is water is not flowing properly?</li> <li>c. Is each inspection of the spray nozzles, including the date and any corrective action taken, recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)?</li></ul>	Yes	No
If the EU was constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.		
<b>20. Does the EU have a particulate matter</b> <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	Yes	🖾No
<ul> <li>21. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? ∑ N/A</li> <li>b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?</li></ul>	<ul> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> <li>⊠ Yes</li> <li>⊠ Yes</li> <li>⊠ Yes</li> </ul>	□ No □No □No □No

2	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	<b>V</b> ac				
	{A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the	Yes	∐ No			
	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?	TYes	No			
2	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	L.No			
	{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +250					
	pascals +1 inch water gauge pressure.}					
	b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and the	e				
	device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ?		No			
	{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5%					
	of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}					
2	24. When was the last VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this EU? <u>7/6/2010</u>					
	<ul><li>a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years?</li><li>b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO:</li></ul>	Yes	LNo			
	i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years?	Xes	□No			
	ii. has the EU been tested yet within the current calendar year?	$\boxtimes$ Yes	$\square$ No			
2	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?	🛛 Yes	No			
	Rate: 80 tph		<b>—</b>			
	b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	🛛 Yes	No			
	c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	□ Vac				
	d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	Yes	LNo			
2	26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Xes	No			
	a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate?	Yes	No			
1	Rate: <u>80 tph</u>	_	_			
1	b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	🛛 Yes	No			
1	c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	N V				
	d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	🛛 Yes	LNo			
l						
	VE Opacity Limits					
1	<b>EU not subject to Subpart OOO EU Subpart</b>	t OOO EU				

	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>2 –NMMP Plant Power Unit-Cummins gen set</u>

(check 🗹	only one
hav fan aaal	and and

	box for each	question)
<ul> <li>Is the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Pro {Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the mis any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, O Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand (3) Clay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) I (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including E and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) V (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.}</li> <li>1. Is the EU located at a fixed or portable nonmetallic mineral processing plant or hot mix asphalt plant that has an aboveground crusher or grinding mill?</li></ul>	Cessing Plants?         ajority         Granite,         d and Gravel;         Rock Salt;         Chloride,         Porax, Kernite,         ermiculite;          Yes          Yes          Yes          Yes          Yes          Yes	n question) ⊠No □No ⊠No ⊠No
<ul> <li>Is the EO one of the following?</li></ul>	Tes	
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>If the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5.</li> <li>5. Is the EU subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F (Portland Cement Plants) or</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>5. Is the EU subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F (Portiand 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?</li> <li>6. Is the EU located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)?</li> <li>7. Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)?</li> <li>8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour)?</li></ul>	🗌 Yes	⊠No ⊠No ⊠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>		105	
	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,		17	
	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.}			
1£	answer to any of the six Questions 5, 10, above is "Ves" then the EU is not subject to			
	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.			
-J				
11	. When was the EU last constructed, modified, or reconstructed?			
12	. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?		Yes	XNo
If	answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20			
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?		Yes	No
If	answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19			
1 /	. Initial Tests:			
14	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)?	H	Yes	$\square$ No
	c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?	H	Yes	$\square$ No
	d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?		Yes	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		Yes	🗌 No
	{A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the		1.05	
	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)?	$\square$	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

16. Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?	Yes	No
If yes, the owner operator: conducts quarterly 30-minute VE tests using Method 22; uses a bag leak detection system specified in 40 CFR 60.674(d); follows the requirements of 40 CFR 63AAAAA Lime Manufacturi 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	LNo
pascals +1 inch water gauge pressure.}		
<i>and</i> b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and the	0	
device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ?		No
{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5% of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}		
	<b>—</b>	
<b>19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?</b>	Yes	LNo
a. Does the owner/operator perform monthly inspections to check that water is flowing to the discharge spray nozzles?		
b. Does the owner/operator initiate corrective action within 24 hours and complete		
corrective action as expediently as practical is water is not flowing properly?		
c. Is each inspection of the spray nozzles, including the date and any corrective action taken,		
recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)?	Yes	No
If the EU was constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008 skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.		
<b>20. Does the EU have a particulate matter</b> <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures,		
Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	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? 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)?	Yes Yes	∐ No ∏No
c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?	Yes	$\square$ 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	l 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	L.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 the	_	_
device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ?	Yes	L.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 sumer/energy for this EU2 7/6/2010		
<b>24. When was the last VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this EU?</b> <u>7/6/2010</u> a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years?	Xes	No
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO:		NO
i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	□No
ii. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calcular years?	$\boxtimes$ Yes	$\square$ No
II. has the EO been tested yet within the entrent calendar year?		
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?	Yes	No
Rate:	_	_
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	🖾No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.		
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	Yes	No
26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit?	X Yes	□No
a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>unspector</i> for this unit during this site visit:	$\boxtimes$ Yes	$\square$ No
Rate:		
	Xes	No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.		
	Xes	No
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 screening operation</u>

(check 🗹	only one
an fan aasle	augustion)

	1	box for each	question)
	<u>missions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processi</u>		·
is any Trap (3) C (5) G and S and C (17)	e: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majority of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Granit rock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzite, Marl, Marble, Slate, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Sand and lay including Kaolin, Fireclay, Bentonite, Fuller's Earth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Rock ypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chlo Sodium Sulfate; (7) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax, Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vermic Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andalusite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.}	te,   Gravel; Salt; ride,   Kernite,	
or ho 2. Is the 3. Was s 4. Is the ☐ cr ☐ st ☐ cr ☐ is the ☐ cr ☐ is sc ☐ cr ☐ under overs and s plant ☐ bu comp whic	EU located at a fixed or portable nonmetallic mineral processing plant t mix asphalt plant that has an aboveground crusher or grinding mill?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No □No □No
subpart If the an	er to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. Iswer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5. EU subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F (Portland Cement Plants) or		
subpa any o 6. Is the capac 7. Is the	art I (Hot Mix Asphalt Facilities), or does it follow in the plant process ther EU that is subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F or subpart I? EU located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a sity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)?	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes □ Yes	⊠No □No ⊠No
8. Is the	EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour) ?	Yes	⊠No

#### <u>**3**-NMMP Plant screening operation</u>

9. Is the EU a wet screening operation or subsequent screening operation, bucket elevator or belt conveyor in a production line that processes saturated material up to the first crusher, grinding mill or storage bin in the production line?	l 1g	⊠No
<ul> <li>10. Is the EU a screening operation, bucket elevator or belt conveyor in the production line downstream of wet mining operation that process saturated material up to the first crusher, grinding mill or storage bin in the production line?</li></ul>	☐ Yes	⊠No
If answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If the answer to all of the six Questions 5-10 above is "No" then continue to Question 11.		
11. When was the EU last constructed, modified, or reconstructed?		
12. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?	Yes	🖾No
If answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20		
<b>13.Does the EU have a particulate matter</b> <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	Yes	🖾No
If answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19		
<ul> <li>14. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? N/A</li> <li>b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	□ No □No □No □No
15. If the EU is a building enclosing any other regulated EUs and all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits:		
a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on each vent control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? 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?	<ul><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li></ul>	□No □No □No

#### <u>3 – NMMP Plant screening operation</u>

16. Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?	Yes	No
If yes, the owner operator: <ul> <li>conducts quarterly 30-minute VE tests using Method 22;</li> <li>uses a bag leak detection system specified in 40 CFR 60.674(d);</li> <li>follows the requirements of 40 CFR 63AAAAA Lime Manufacturin as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or</li> <li>none of the above (i.e., out of compliance)</li> </ul>		
<b>17. If the EU is an individual, enclosed storage bin controlled by a baghouse,</b> were initial fugitive emissions less than or equal to 7% opacity? N/A	Yes	🗌 No
<b>18. Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?</b>	Yes	No
<ul> <li>a. a device for the continuous measurement of the pressure loss of the gas stream through the scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions?</li></ul>	Yes	No
<ul> <li>and</li> <li>b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ?         {Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5% of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}     </li> </ul>		No
19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?	Yes	No
<ul> <li>If yes:</li> <li>a. Does the owner/operator perform monthly inspections to check that water is flowing to the discharge spray nozzles?</li> <li>b. Does the owner/operator initiate corrective action within 24 hours and complete corrective action as expediently as practical is water is not flowing properly?</li> <li>c. Is each inspection of the spray nozzles, including the date and any corrective action taken, recorded in the written or electronic logbook as required by 40 CFR 60.676(b)?</li> </ul>	Yes	XNo
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
<ul> <li>21. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU?</li></ul>	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □No □No □No

ir						
	EU is a building enclosing any		and all enclosed EUs are not			
	ually in compliance with emi					
	an initial PM stack test performitial startup of the EU?		ol device within 180 days of	/A 🗌	Yes	□ No
	nt" is any opening through whi			_		
purpos	e of exhausting from a building	air carrying particulat	e matter (PM) emissions from			
one or	more affected EUs.}					
			of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?		Yes	No
c. Wer	e initial fugitive emissions from	n non-vent building ope	enings less than or equal to 7%	opacity?	Yes	No
				🗌	Yes	🖾No
	does the owner/operator mainta					
			oss of the gas stream through the			
			l basis in accordance with man			
			f		Yes	L.No
	ascals +1 inch water gauge pres		nanufacturer to be accurate with	m + 250		
and	ascals +1 men water gauge pres	ssure.}				
	vice for the continuous measur	ement of the scrubbing	liquid flow rate to the wet scrul	bber and the		
			ince with manufacturer's instru-		Yes	No
			nanufacturer to be accurate with			
-	f design scrubbing liquid flow i	•				
	was the last VE test conducte			• □		
			U been tested within the past 5	years?	Yes	L.No
	U is subject to 40 CFR subpart		ndar years?		Yes	□No
			r year?		Yes	$\square$ No
11	. has the EO been tested yet wi				105	NO
25.Was a	VE test conducted by the own	<i>ner/operator</i> for this ur	nit during this site visit?	🖂	Yes	No
a. Was	the VE test conducted at a pro-	cess rate that is represent	ntative of the normal rate?	🖂	Yes	No
	ate: <u>80 tph</u>			_		
				🖂	Yes	L.No
	VE test resulted in an opacity		e e	_		<b>—</b>
d. Did	the VE test demonstrate compl	liance with the opacity I	imit? (See chart below)	····· Ц	Yes	L.No
26 Was a	VE test conducted by the <i>ins</i>	<i>nector</i> for this unit dur	ing this site visit?	🕅	Yes	□No
					Yes	$\square$ No
a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate? Xes [ Rate: <u>80 tph</u>						
		ing to EPA Method 9? -		🗌	Yes	No
	VE test resulted in an opacity of					
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below) 🛛 Yes				No		
		VE Opac		L		
		EU not subject to	Subpart OOO EU	Subpart O		
		40 CFR 60	constructed, modified,	constructed	l, modifi	ed,
		Subpart OOO	or reconstructed prior	or reconstr	ucted on	or

40 CFR 60 Subpart OOO	constructed, modified, or reconstructed prior to 4/22/2008	constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008
20%	15%	12%
20%	10%	7%
	Subpart OOO 20%	40 CFR 60constructed, modified, or reconstructed prior to 4/22/200820%15%

# Emissions Unit Section <u>4 –NMMP Plant Conveyor 30'' X 60''</u>

#### (check $\square$ only one c

box i	tor	each	ques	tion)	)
-------	-----	------	------	-------	---

Is the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonnetallic Mineral Processing Plants?           [Note: "Nonnetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majority is any of the following minerals: (1) Cristele and Broken Stone, including Linestone, Dolonite, Granite, Traprock, Sandstone, Quartz, Quartzie, Marl, Marble, State, Shale, Oil Shale, and Shell; (2) Stand and Gravel; (3) Clay including Kaolin, Firelex, Pathonite, Fuller's Farth, Ball Clay, and Common Clay; (4) Rock Satt; (5) Gypsum (natural or synthetic); (6) Sodium Compounds, including Sodium Carbonate, Sodium Chloride, and Sodium Sulfate; (7) Punice; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15) Perilie; (10) Vernicultie; (17) Mica; (18) Kyanite, including Andatasite, Sillimanite, Topaz, and Dumortierite.]           1. Is the EU located at a fixed or portable nonmetallic mineral processing plant or hot mix asphalt plant that has an aboveground crusher or grinding mill?         Yes           2. Is the EU located above ground (i.e., not in an underground mine)?         Yes         No           3. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed after August 31, 1983?         Yes         No           4. Is the EU noe of the following?         Yes         No         Yes         No           4. Is the EU no e of the following?         Yes         No         Yes         No           3. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed after August 31, 1983?         Yes         No           4. Is the EU no e of the following?         Yes         No         Yes         No			box for each	question)
<ul> <li>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.}</li> <li>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.</li> <li>If the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5.</li> <li>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 SNo</li> <li>6. Is the EU located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)? Yes SNo</li> <li>7. Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)? Yes Xes SNo</li> <li>8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or</li> </ul>	1. 2. 3.	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) Pumice; (8) Gilsonite; (9) Talc and Pyrophyllite; (10) Boron, including Borax, and Colemanite; (11) Barite; (12) Fluorospar; (13) Feldspar; (14) Diatomite; (15)Perlite; (16) Vermice (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, rulite; Yes Yes Yes	□No □No □No
<ul> <li>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 SNo</li> <li>6. Is the EU located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)? YesNo</li> <li>7. Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)? YesNo</li> <li>8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or</li> </ul>	su	air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from one or more affected EUs.} 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.		
<ul> <li>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 SNo</li> <li>6. Is the EU located at a fixed sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 23 megagrams/hour (25 tons/hour)? YesNo</li> <li>7. Is the EU located at a portable sand and gravel plant or crushed stone plant with a capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour)? YesNo</li> <li>8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or</li> </ul>				
capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour) ? YesNo 8. Is the EU located at a common clay plant or pumice plant with capacity less than or	6.	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? 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)?		—
		capacity less than or equal to 136 megagrams/hour (150 tons/hour) ?		_

<ul> <li>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?</li></ul>	l ng	⊠No
<ul> <li>10. Is the EU a screening operation, bucket elevator or belt conveyor in the production line downstream of wet mining operation that process saturated material up to the first crusher, grinding mill or storage bin in the production line?</li></ul>	Yes	⊠No
If answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24. If the answer to all of the six Questions 5-10 above is "No" then continue to Question 11.		
11. When was the EU last constructed, modified, or reconstructed?		
12. Was the EU constructed, modified, or reconstructed on or after 4/22/2008?	Yes	🖾No
If answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20		
<b>13.Does the EU have a particulate matter</b> <i>capture system</i> (equipment including enclosures, Hoods, fans, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device?	Yes	No
If answer to Question 13 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 19		
<ul> <li>14. Initial Tests:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? N/A</li> <li>b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?</li></ul>	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐No ☐No ☐No
<ul> <li>15. If the EU is a building enclosing any other regulated EUs and all enclosed EUs are not individually in compliance with emissions limits:</li> <li>a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on each vent control device within 180 days of initial startup of the EU? 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</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
one or more affected EUs.} b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)? c. Was an initial VE test performed on fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings? d. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity?	<ul><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li><li>Yes</li></ul>	□No □No □No

4 –NMMP Plant Conveyor 30" X 60"
----------------------------------

	_	
16. Is a baghouse used to control emissions from the EU?	Yes	No
If yes, the owner operator: conducts quarterly 30-minute VE tests using Method 22; uses a bag leak detection system specified in 40 CFR 60.674(d); follows the requirements of 40 CFR 63AAAAA Lime Manufacturi 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	L.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	e	
device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions ?		No
{Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5%		
of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}		
19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?	∐ Yes	L.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)?	L 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?		🖾No
floods, fails, dampers, etc.) to capture and transport particulate matter to a control device.		
21 Initial Terrates		
21. Initial Tests:		
a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of	<b>—</b> -	<b>—</b> -
initial startup of the EU? 🕅 N/A	Yes	∐ No
b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf)?	Yes	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?	T 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? $\sim$ N/A	Yes	No No			
{A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the					
purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from					
one or more affected EUs.}					
b. 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	L.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	L.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? 7/6/10					
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years?	Yes	🖂No			
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO:					
i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years?	Xes Yes	No			
ii. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar year?	$\boxtimes$ Yes	$\square$ No			
II. has the EO been tested yet within the current catendar year?		NO			
25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	No			
a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate?	Xes Yes	No			
Rate:					
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes Yes	No			
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.					
	Yes				
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	∐ Tes	LNo			
26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Xes	No			
a. Was the VE test conducted at a process rate that is representative of the normal rate?		No			
Rate: 80 tph					
b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes	No			
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}\%$ for the highest six-minute average.					
<ul><li>d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)</li></ul>	Xes	□No			
a. Did the vE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit: (See chart below)		110			
VE Opacity Limits					
FU not subject to Subpart OOO FU Subpar	HOOO FU				

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 c	only one question)
1.	<ul> <li>Does the owner/operator of the NMMP Plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by:</li> <li>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</li> <li>If no, where are unconfined emissions occurring?</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
	<ul> <li>b) Use of water trucks equipped with spray bars to apply water or effective dust suppressant(s) on a regular basis (to all stockpiles, roadways and work yards)? N/A</li> <li>c) Paving and maintaining roads and parking areas? N/A</li> <li>d) Removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to prevent re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? N/A</li> <li>e) Reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles? N/A</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	⊠ 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: 🖾..No a) 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? ----- Yes b) 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? ------X..No c) 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? ------ TYes X..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? YesNo	
	b) 23,000 gallons of gasoline? YesNo	
	c) 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? YesNo	
	d) 1.3 million gallons of propane? YesNo	
	e) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? YesNo	
(	) 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 X.No	

G	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹	only one
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	XNo
2.	Does the owner or operator:		
	<ul><li>a) maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li><li>b) ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li></ul>	- 🛛 Yes	LNo
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- 🛛 Yes	No

1.	<b>LOCATABLE PLANT</b> The facility: $\boxtimes$ is stationary; $\square$ is relocatable; or $\square$ consists of both stationary and relocatable NMMP and/or concrete batching plants. ( <i>If only stationary, skip the following questions 2 and 3.</i> )	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	<ul> <li>For a relocated NMMP plant:</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>	6)]	□No □No
	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
	<ul> <li>b) were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	□No □No

	HANGES dministrative 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?		⊠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?		🖾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 su		
	30 days prior to the change?	🗌 Yes	🖾No

Sherrill Culliver

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

## Inspector's Signature

COMMENTS: Facility is not keeping recods of fuel use and tonnage of crushed stone recommend records be started . Need to draft non-compliance letter.

20

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

11/28/11

Date of Inspection