CHARGER PROTECTION	
Some Carte	
FLORIDA	

## NON-METALLIC MINERAL PROCESSING PLANTS



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)					
AIRS ID#: 7775747 DATE: <u>2/7/2013</u> A	RRIVE: <u>12:05 PM</u> DEPART: <u>12:40 PM</u>					
FACILITY NAME: BISCAYNE LANDING PROJECT						
FACILITY LOCATION: 15045 Biscayne Blvd						
NORTH MIAMI 33181-12	219					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:       RICARDO RODRIGUEZ*       PHONE:       (305)681-9424         Email:       dcequipmentcorp@bellsouth.net       Mobile:       (786)229-3207         CONTACT NAME:       RICARDO RODRIGUEZ*       PHONE:       (305)681-9424         Email:       dcequipmentcorp@bellsouth.net       Mobile:       (786)229-3207         ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:       11/19/2012       /       11/19/2017         (effective date)       (end date)       (end date)						
Faci	lity Section					
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check	only one box)					
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIA	ANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(abaak 🗹 _ anly ana					

	Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>ALLEN FIELDS</u>	(check <b>V</b> only one box for each question)	
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still RICARDO RODRIGUEZ*?	Yes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still RICARDO RODRIGUEZ*?		□No ⊠No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	Yes Yes	⊠No □No

**Emissions Unit Section** <u>1 –NMMP Plant-screening operation,w/spraybar, 300 T/hr</u>

	(check 🗹	only one
1	oox for each	question)
<ul> <li>Is 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 majoritis any of the following minerals: (1) Crushed and Broken Stone, including Limestone, Dolomite, Gramit 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) Tale 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.]</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>	ng Plants? ty te, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite,	Question)
If the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5.		
<ol> <li>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> </ol>		
any other EU that is subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart F or subpart I?	Yes	🖾No
<b>6.</b> 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
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	XNo
<ul> <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

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	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 processi			
	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			
	motivation motivation with water. Saturated material means mineral material with sufficient surface motivation motivation material means mineral material material with sufficient surface			
	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.			
lf	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?	$\boxtimes$	Yes	No
If	answer to Question 12 is "No" skip the following questions and go directly to Question 20			
13	<b>5. 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			
IJ	unswer to Question 15 is 140 skip the jouowing questions and go alrectly to Question 17			
14	. Initial Tests:			
	a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of		Vac	
	initial startup of the EU? $\Box$ N/A h. If was use the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.022 g/dsem (0.014 gr/dsef)?	_	Yes Yes	
	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)?	H	Yes	∐No □No
	d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?	H	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
	<i>A "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the</i>		103	
	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)?	$\Box$	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?		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 Manufactu as specified in 40 CFR 60.674(e); or none of the above (i.e., out of compliance)		
<b>17.If the EU is an individual, enclosed storage bin controlled by a baghouse,</b> were initial fugitive emissions less than or equal to 7% opacity? N/A	Yes	🗌 No
<b>18.Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?</b>	- 🗌 Yes	No
<ul> <li>a. a device for the continuous measurement of the pressure loss of the gas stream through the scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer instructions?</li></ul>		No
<ul> <li>and</li> <li>b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and t 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	□No
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)? d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?</li></ul>	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? 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)?	T Yes	□No
c. Were initial fugitive emissions from non-vent building openings less than or equal to 7% opacity?	$\square$ Yes	$\square$ No
e. Were mittal fugitive emissions from for vent building openings less than of equal to 7% opacity.		
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	0	
device for the continuous measurement of the serubbing inquit now rate to the wet serubber 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%		NO
of design scrubbing liquid flow rate. }		
24. When was the last VE test conducted by the owner/operator for this EU?		
a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60 subpart OOO, has the EU been tested within the past 5 years?	T Yes	□No
b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpart OOO:		N0
i. has the EU been tested during each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	L.No
ii. has the EU been tested yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	No
25. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit?	T Yes	XNo
a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>owner/operator</i> for this unit during this site visit.	$\square$ Yes	$\square$ No
		NO
Rate:b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		
	Yes	LNo
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.		
d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)	Yes	No
26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	🖾No
a. Was the VE test conducted by the <i>inspector</i> for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	$\square$ No
Rate:b. Was the VE test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	T Yes	□No
c. The VE test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.		v
<ul> <li>d. Did the VE test demonstrate compliance with the opacity limit? (See chart below)</li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□No
a. Die die +D test demonstrate compnance with the opacity mint: (See chait below).		L
VF Onacity Limits		1

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 d	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>	⊠ 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 b) 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? ------ 🗍 Yes ...No c) 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? ------ TYes ...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

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	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
	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	S	
	permit and Department rules?	- 🛛 Yes	No

	<b>ELOCATABLE PLANT</b> 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.	<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(4) to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following relocation?</li></ul>	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 <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		□No
	<ul> <li>therefore must be authorized in the facility's air construction or operation permit.}</li> <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
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?	🗌 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	omitted	
	30 days prior to the change?	_	No

## FRANK DELGADO

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

2/7/2013

Date of Inspection

2/2014

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** THIS EXTEC PORTABLE CRUSHER IS LOCATED AT A CONSTRUCTION SITE. A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST WILL BE PERFORM BY EUGENE SCHALTENBRAND FROM BROOKS AND ASSOCIATES ON 2/18/2013. THEY CRUSHER WAS NOT OPERATIONAL AT THE TIME OF THE INSPECTION.

**REVIEWED** By Ray Gordon at 1:58 pm, Mar 08, 2013