

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



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| IN  | SPECTION TYPE:   | ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)                                  | COMPLAINT/I<br>ARMS COMPL |  | (CI)                |    |                       |
|---|--|---|---------------------------|--|---------------------|----|-----------------------|
| ΑI  | (RS ID#: 7775777 DA  | ΓΕ: <u>2/6/14</u>   | ARRIVE: <u>1:00</u>       |  | DEPART: <u>2:00</u> |    |                       |
| FA  | ACILITY NAME: CLI  | IFTON MINE  |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
| FA  | ACILITY LOCATION   | 202 NW 27th Ave   |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
|   |  | OCALA 34475-2937  |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
| CO  | OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: LARRY MANNING Email: lmanning@magnummaterials.net CONTACT NAME: LARRY MANNING Email: lmanning@magnummaterials.net ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/11/2013 / 8/11/2018 (effective date)  (end date)  PHONE: (352)622-2839  Mobile: (352)274-3110  PHONE: Mobile: |   |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
| Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) |  |   |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
|   | ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE  |   |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
|   |  |   |                           |  |                     |    |                       |
|   |  | resentative(s): <u>Larry Manning</u>                                      |                           |  | (check<br>box for   |    | only one<br>question) |
| 2.  |  | esentative still LARRY MANNI  | NG?                       |  | 🔀 Ye                | es | □No                   |
| 3.  |  | ility provide an administrative up till LARRY MANNING?                    |                           |  |                     |    | □No<br>□No            |
| 4.  | Will facility be conduc  | ting VE test(s) during today's inc<br>nnce authority notified at least 15 |                           |  |                     |    | ⊠No<br>□No            |

## Emissions Unit Section 1 –NMMP Plant-crusher#2(limerock)w/dieselpwrunit, 350T/hr

|   |  | (check 🗹  | only one                                      |  |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
|   | ł  | ox for each   | question)                                     |  |  |
| <u>Is</u> 1   | the Emissions Unit (EU) subject to 40 CFR part 60 subpart OOO – Nonmetallic Mineral Processing (Note: "Nonmetallic mineral" means any of the following minerals or any mixture of which the majorities 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 Chlos 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.} | ng Plants? y e, Gravel; Salt; ride, Kernite,        |   |  |  |
| 2.<br>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?   | <ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>               | No<br> No<br> No<br> No                       |  |  |
| If answer to any of the four Questions 1 -4 above is "No" then the EU is not subject to subpart OOO so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.  If the answer to all of the four Questions 1-4 above is "Yes" then continue to Question 5. |  |   |   |  |  |
| 6.<br>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?  | <ul><li>☐ Yes</li><li>☐ Yes</li><li>☐ Yes</li></ul> | <ul><li>□No</li><li>□No</li><li>□No</li></ul> |  |  |
|   | equal to 9 megagrams/hour (10 tons/hour) ?   | Yes   | ⊠No   |  |  |

#### $\underline{1-NMMP\ Plant-crusher\#2(limerock)w/dieselpwrunit,\,350T/hr}$

| 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  |
|            | {Note: "wet screening operation" means a screening operation which removes unwanted material or         |         |      |
|            | 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 materia  |         |      |
|            | with sufficient surface moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from processi |         |      |
|            | of the material through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wet |         |      |
|            | solely by wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.} |         |      |
| 10         | Is the EU a screening operation, bucket elevator or belt conveyor in the production line                |         |      |
|            | downstream of wet mining operation that process saturated material up to the first crusher,             |         |      |
|            | grinding mill or storage bin in the production line?  | Yes     | □No  |
|            | [Note: Wet mining operation means a mining or dredging operation designed and operated to extract       |         |      |
|            | any nonmetallic mineral from deposits existing at or below the water table, where the nonmetallic       |         |      |
|            | mineral is saturated with water. "Saturated material" means mineral material with sufficient surface    |         |      |
|            | moisture such that particulate matter emissions are not generated from processing of the material       |         |      |
|            | through screening operations, bucket elevators and belt conveyors. Material that is wetted solely by    |         |      |
|            | wet suppression systems is not considered to be "saturated" for purposes of this definition.}           |         |      |
|            | answer to any of the six Questions 5 -10 above is "Yes" then the EU is not subject to                   |         |      |
|            | bpart 000 so skip the following questions and go directly to Question 24.                               |         |      |
| <b>I</b> f | the answer to all of the six Questions 5-10 above is "No" then continue to Question 11.                 |         |      |
| 11         | .When was the EU last constructed, modified, or reconstructed?  |         |      |
| 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 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               |         |      |
| 14         | Initial Tests:  |         |      |
|            | a. Was an initial PM stack test performed on the control device within 180 days of                      |         |      |
|            | initial startup of the EU? N/A  | Yes Yes | ☐ No |
|            | b. If yes, was the EU found to be in compliance with the PM limit of 0.032 g/dscm (0.014 gr/dscf)?      | Yes     | □No  |
|            | c. Was an initial VE test performed on any fugitive emissions (escaping capture system)?                | Yes     | □No  |
|            | d. If yes, was the opacity less than or equal to 7% opacity?  | ☐ Yes   | □No  |
| 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 |
|            | $\{A \text{ "vent" is any opening through which there is mechanically induced air flow for the}$        |         |      |
|            | purpose of exhausting from a building air carrying particulate matter (PM) emissions from               |         |      |
|            | one or more affected EUs.}  |         |      |
|            | b. 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?    | Yes     | □No  |
|            |   |         |      |

#### $\underline{1-NMMP\ Plant-crusher\#2(limerock)w/dieselpwrunit,\ 350T/hr}$

| 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 Manufacturias 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                      |
| <b>18.Is a wet scrubber used to control emissions from the EU?</b> If yes, does the owner/operator maintain and operate:  | Yes                              | □No                       |
| 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                       |
| b. a device for the continuous measurement of the scrubbing liquid flow rate to the wet scrubber and the device has been calibrated on an annual basis in accordance with manufacturer's instructions? {Note: The monitoring device must be certified by the manufacturer to be accurate within +5% of design scrubbing liquid flow rate.}  |                                  | □No                       |
| 19. Is wet suppression used to control emissions from the EU?   | ☐ 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                       |
| 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?   | ☐ Yes<br>☐ Yes<br>☐ Yes<br>☐ Yes | ☐ No<br>☐No<br>☐No<br>☐No |

#### $\underline{1-NMMP\ Plant-crusher\#2(limerock)w/dieselpwrunit,\,350T/hr}$

| 22. If the EU is a building enclosing ar              | y other regulated EUs                           | and all enclosed EUs are not                |                 |                 |  |
|---|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| individually in compliance with em                    |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| a. Was an initial PM stack test perfo                 | rmed on each vent conti                         | rol device within 180 days of               |                 |                 |  |
| initial startup of the EU?                            |   |   | V/A Ye          | es No           |  |
| $\{A \text{ "vent" is any opening through wh}\}$      |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| purpose of exhausting from a buildin                  | ig air carrying particula                       | te matter (PM) emissions from               |                 |                 |  |
| one or more affected EUs.}                            |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| b. Was the EU found to be in comple                   | iance with the PM limit                         | of 0.05 g/dscm (0.022 gr/dscf) <sup>4</sup> | ? Ye            | es 🔲No          |  |
| c. Were initial fugitive emissions fro                | om non-vent building op                         | penings less than or equal to 7%            | opacity? Ye     | esNo            |  |
| 23. Is a wet scrubber used to control e               | missions from the EU?                           | ·   | Ye              | es $\square$ No |  |
| If yes, does the owner/operator main                  |   |   | _               | _               |  |
| a. a device for the continuous measu                  |   | oss of the gas stream through the           | ne              |                 |  |
| scrubber and the device has bee                       |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| instructions?   |   |   |                 | es $\square$ No |  |
| {Note: The monitoring device                          |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| pascals +1 inch water gauge pro                       |   |   | · <b></b> ·     |                 |  |
| and   | - · · · · · <del> ·</del> j                     |   |                 |                 |  |
| b. a device for the continuous measu                  | rement of the scrubbing                         | liquid flow rate to the wet some            | ibber and the   |                 |  |
| device has been calibrated on a                       |   |   |                 | es $\square$ No |  |
| {Note: The monitoring device                          |   |   |                 | 10              |  |
| of design scrubbing liquid flow                       |   | manufacturer to be accurate with            | 11111 1370      |                 |  |
| or design serusomy riquid now                         | race. j   |   |                 |                 |  |
| 24. When was the last VE test conduct                 | ed by the owner/onera                           | tor for this EU? 12/17/13                   |                 |                 |  |
| a. If EU is not subject to 40 CFR 60                  |   |   | years? X Ye     | es 🗌No          |  |
| b. If EU is subject to 40 CFR subpar                  |   | 20 been tested within the past 5            | years: 🖂 Te     | 110             |  |
| i. has the EU been tested durin                       |   | andar vaare?                                | X Ye            | es $\square$ No |  |
| ii. has the EU been tested duffi                      | ig each of the past 4 care                      | or voor?                                    | X Ye            | _               |  |
| n. has the EO been tested yet w                       | runn the current calcinu                        | ar year:                                    | ·····           | 110             |  |
| 25. Was a VE test conducted by the on                 | uner/onerator for this u                        | nit during this site visit?                 | \ \ Ye          | es 🖾No          |  |
| a. Was the VE test conducted by the or                |   |   |                 | =               |  |
| Rate:   | ocess rate that is represe                      | entative of the normal rate:                | L               | 110             |  |
| b. Was the VE test conducted accord                   | ding to EDA Mothod 02                           |   | \ \ Ye          | va □ No         |  |
| o. The VE test resulted in an anasity                 | of 0/ for the high                              | and six minute evene                        |                 | es ∐No          |  |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity                 | of% for the high                                | lest six-minute average.                    |                 | . D.M.          |  |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp                   | pliance with the opacity                        | limit? (See chart below)                    | L Ye            | esNo            |  |
| 26. Was a VE test conducted by the <i>in</i> .        | anaatan fan thia unit du                        | wing this site visit?                       | □ v.            | ng ⊠ Ng         |  |
|   |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| a. Was the VE test conducted at a pr                  | ocess rate that is represe                      | entative of the normal rate?                | L Ye            | esNo            |  |
| Rate:   | 1' 4 . EDA M. 4 1.00                            |   |                 | . D.M.          |  |
| b. Was the VE test conducted accord                   |   |   | Ye              | esNo            |  |
| c. The VE test resulted in an opacity                 |   | •   | □ <b>3</b> 7    |                 |  |
| d. Did the VE test demonstrate comp                   | pilance with the opacity                        | iiiiit? (See chart below)                   | Ye              | esNo            |  |
|   |   |   |                 |                 |  |
|   | VF Onac   | rity Limits                                 |                 |                 |  |
| VE Opacity Limits                                     |   |   |                 |                 |  |
|   | EU not subject to Subpart OOO EU Subpart OOO EU |   |                 |                 |  |
|   | 40 CFR 60                                       | constructed, modified,                      | constructed, m  | · ·             |  |
|   | Subpart OOO                                     | or reconstructed prior                      | or reconstruct  | ed on or        |  |
|   |   | to 4/22/2008                                | after 4/22/2008 | 3               |  |
|   |   |   |                 |                 |  |
| Crusher with no capture system                        | 20%   | 15%   | 12%             |                 |  |
| Crusher with no capture system All other affected EUs | 20%   | 15%<br>10%                                  | 12%<br>7%       |                 |  |

### **Facility Section (continued)**

| REASONABLE PRECAUTIONS FOR UNCONFINED EMISSIONS  | (check 🗹<br>box for each | •                  |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 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)?  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<br>⊠ Yes           | ☐ No<br>☐ 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? \[ \] N/A   | ⊠ Yes                    | ☐ No               |
| 2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:  a) Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?   b) If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?  c) What caused the problem(s) (if known)?  | ☐ Yes<br>☐ Yes           | □ No<br>□No        |
|  |                          |                    |
| CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY   | (check 🗹 box for each o  | only one question) |
| 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?      | X Yes<br>X Yes           | □No<br>□No<br>□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.)?  If YES, what non-exempt units or activities? | or                       | ⊠No                |
| b) any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gene permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities?  |                          | ⊠No                |

| 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<br> No<br> No<br> No<br> No |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| GENERAL CONDITIONS  | /.1 1 <b>E7</b>              | 1                              |
| 1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or  | (check <b>v</b> box for each | only one<br>question)          |
| Allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?  | - Yes                        | ⊠No                            |
| <ul><li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li><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                        | □No                            |
| 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?   | _                            | □No                            |
| RELOCATABLE PLANT   |                              |                                |
| 1. The facility: ☐ is stationary; ☐ is relocatable; or ☐ 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 <b>v</b> box for each | only one<br>question)          |
| <ul> <li>2. 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. 62-210.9000 to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following relocation? -</li> </ul>   | (6)]                         | □No                            |
| 3. If the relocatable NMMP plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air oper 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?  If YES, what was the purpose?  {Note: crushing recycled asphalt pavement (rap) at an asphalt plant is considered routine and so therefore must be authorized in the facility's air construction or operation permit.}  b) were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? |                              | □No                            |
| 11 123, were any periods more than 6 months in any consecutive 12-month period?   | ∐ Yes                        | □No                            |

| CHANGES  Administrative Changes:   | (check box for each  | only one ach question)  |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone no associated with a change in ownership or with a physical operations comprising the facility; or any other similar m</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within</li> </ol>   | relocation of the facility or any emissions units or inor administrative change at the facility? Yes | _                       |
| New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownershi  3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a) Installation of any new process equipment? b) Alterations to existing process equipment without repl c) Replacement of existing equipment with equipment th d) A change in ownership? | lacement?  | i ⊠No<br>i ⊠No<br>i ⊠No |
| Patrick Farris   | 2/6/14   |                         |
| Inspector's Name (Please Print)  | Date of Inspection   |                         |
| fature 2   |  |                         |
| Inspector's Signature  | Approximate Date of Next Inspection  |                         |

**COMMENTS:** Fuel records were provided after the inspection. VE test results were submtted to the Department with the incorrect AG permit/entitlement number. All has been corrected since the date of the inspection.