

## **ANIMAL CREMATORY**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	VERY (CI)		
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT	NO: 11313		_
AIRS ID#: 0810085 DA	ATE: <u>03/25/2009</u>	ARRIVE: 2:00pm	DEPART: 3:28 pi	<u>m</u>	
FACILITY NAME: B	ELSPUR OAKS PET CREMATO	ORY			
FACILITY LOCATIO	N: 6060 28TH ST EAST, N	No. 9			
	BRADENTON 34203	3-			
OWNER/AUTHORIZI	ED REPRESENTATIVE: RAY	YMOND BOUNDS PHO	<b>NE:</b> (941)751-5044		
CONTACT NAME:		РНО	NE:		
ENTITLEMENT PERI	IOD: 1/8/2006 / 1/8/2011 (effective date) (end date)				
PART I: INSPECTIO	N COMPLIANCE STATUS (c)	heck 🗹 only one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIAN			CANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
	NCE MINOR Non-COMI				
DA DE H. MESTING (D)					
PART II: TESTING/RI	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRE				
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em</li> </ol>	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRES ate box(es)) bejectionable odor(s) detected? hissions test conducted during this	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401,	, F.A.C.  Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter	Yes	⊠ No
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>In order to demon</li> </ol>	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRED ate box(es)) abjectionable odor(s) detected? aissions test conducted during this above	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401, s site visit according to EPA l	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60	⊠Yes	No No No
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>In order to demondays prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j)</li> </ol>	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRES ate box(es))  objectionable odor(s) detected? uissions test conducted during this constrate individual source compliant AGP Notification form submission, F.A.C.)	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401, s site visit according to EPA I	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (F	⊠Yes	_
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>In order to demondays prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j)</li> <li>In order to demondent to</li></ol>	bjectionable odor(s) detected? issions test conducted during this constrate individual source compliant AGP Notification form submission, F.A.C.)	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401,  s site visit according to EPA I  nnce, was an annual visible en on, and within 60 days prior to  nnce were the remaining applitication form submission? (Ru below the requirements of 10	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Finite of the conducted standards testing ule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) Oparts per million by	— ⊠Yes Rule	□ No
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>In order to demondays prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j)</li> <li>In order to demondement of the completed within a) Carbon Monovolume, dry basis</li> <li>(Ref.: Chapter</li> </ol>	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRED ate box(es)) objectionable odor(s) detected? ussions test conducted during this objectionable odor(s) detected? ussions test conducted during this objection form submission, F.A.C.)	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401,  s site visit according to EPA I  nce, was an annual visible en on, and within 60 days prior in nce were the remaining applia fication form submission? (Ru below the requirements of 10 ly average basis and tested ac	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter date?) icable standards testing ule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) 00 parts per million by ccording to EPA Method	─ ⊠Yes Rule ⊠Yes	□ No
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>In order to demondays prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j)</li> <li>In order to demondem completed within a) Carbon Mondovolume, dry basis 10 (Ref.: Chapter b) Oxygen test pc) Particulate madry standard cubic</li> </ol>	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRED at a box(es))  Objectionable odor(s) detected?  Dissions test conducted during this constrate individual source compliant AGP Notification form submission, F.A.C.)  Instrate individual source compliant 60 days prior to the AGP Notification for a compliant of the AGP Notification of the AGP Notification (CO) emissions equal to or a second to 7% O <sub>2</sub> on an hour of 62-297, F.A.C.)?	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401,  s site visit according to EPA I  cince, was an annual visible en on, and within 60 days prior in  cince were the remaining applification form submission? (Ru below the requirements of 10 ly average basis and tested accordin  hod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, qual to or below the requirement to 7% O <sub>2</sub> and tested accordin	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ferromannia (Ref.) (Property of the Conducted for the Conduc	—    Yes     Yes     Yes     Yes     Yes     Yes     Yes     Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropria</li> <li>Were there any o</li> <li>Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>In order to demondays prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j)</li> <li>In order to demondem completed within a) Carbon Monovolume, dry basis 10 (Ref.: Chapter b) Oxygen test per c) Particulate madry standard cubic (Ref.: Chapter62</li> <li>Was all emission</li> </ol>	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRED at the box(es))  Subjectionable odor(s) detected?	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401,  s site visit according to EPA I  cince, was an annual visible en on, and within 60 days prior in  cince were the remaining applification form submission? (Ru below the requirements of 10 ly average basis and tested accordin to 7% O <sub>2</sub> and tested accordin  core operating at the manufactu	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Final Standards testing ule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) Of parts per million by ccording to EPA Method F.A.C.)?	Yes Rule  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Ye	
(check ☑ appropria  1. Were there any o  2. Was a visible em 62-297, F.A.C.)?  3. In order to demondays prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j)  4. In order to demondent of the demonden	ECORDKEEPING REQUIRED at the box(es))  Objectionable odor(s) detected? issions test conducted during this constrate individual source compliant AGP Notification form submission, F.A.C.) Instrate individual source compliant 60 days prior to the AGP Notification for the AGP Notification of the AGP Notification (CO) emissions equal to or in the following sequence of the following to the following the	MENTS – Rule 62-296.401,  s site visit according to EPA I  cance, was an annual visible en on, and within 60 days prior to  cance were the remaining applification form submission? (Ru below the requirements of 10 ly average basis and tested according to 7% O <sub>2</sub> and tested according to 7% O <sub>2</sub> and tested according to 100 accordi	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary date? (Ref.: Chapter missions test conducted 60 to each anniversary dat	Yes  Rule  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Y	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>

ART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))		
1. Is there Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) equipment installed on each unit to record to		
primary and secondary chambers where there is a 1.0 second gas residence time in the secondary chamber cor	nbustion	zone in
accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?	Yes	☐ No
a) Do temperature probes seem to be properly placed?	Yes	☐ No
b) Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection for at least two years following the reco	ording of	f such
measurements, maintenance, reports and records?	_	
	□Yes	☐ No
	Yes	☐ No
3) Performance Testing Measurements	Yes	□ No
4) CEMS Performance Evaluation	Yes	No No
5) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks	Yes	□ No
6) Adjustments	Yes	□ No
	Yes	□ No
	Yes	□ No
2. Was this crematory unit constructed: ( <b>check only one ☑ box</b> )		
a) BEFORE August 30, 1989? (If this box checked, continue on to #3 and skip #4)		
b) ON or AFTER August 30, 1989? (If this box checked, skip #3 and continue on to #4)		
3. If constructed <b>BEFORE</b> August 30, 1989 is the:		
	□Yes	□ No
b) actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1400°F	105	
	□Yes	⊠ No
c) cremation in the primary chamber begun after the secondary chamber combustion zone temperature	1 cs	
	⊠Yes	□ No
d) required monitoring equipment installed and operational, and providing continuous monitoring to	<u>∠</u> 1 cs	
record the temperature at the point or beyond where 1.0 second gas residence time is obtained in the		
	Yes	□ No
	☐ 1 cs	
4. If constructed <u>ON</u> or <u>AFTER</u> August 30, 1989 is the:	_	
a) volume in the secondary combustion zone sufficient to provide at least a 1.0 second gas residence time @ 1800° F?		□ N-
	∐Yes	∐ No
b) the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600°F	N 7 7	
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	ĭ Y es	∐ No
c) secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the cremation		
	⊠Yes	∐ No
5. Are appropriate leak-proof containers containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated		
plastics used during the cremation of dead animals?	∐Yes	∐ No
a) If the answer to question 4 above is YES, is certifying documentation from the manufacturer that they		
are composed of 0.5% or less by weight chlorinated plastics kept on file at the site for the duration of	_	
	⊠Yes	☐ No
b) If plastic bags are used for the cremation of animals are they non-chlorinated and no less than 3 mils		
thick?	Yes	☐ No
c) Are dead animals, which have been used for medical or commercial experimentation, or other		
materials, including biomedical wastes (Rule 62-210.200, F.A.C.), incinerated at this location?	⊠Yes	☐ No
6. During this review period, was the largest batch load cremated 500 pounds per hour or less?	∑Yes	☐ No
7. Have all crematory operators been trained and certified by a Department-approved training program?	Yes	No No
a) Are copies of the training certificates all crematory operators kept on file at the facility for the duration		
of the operator's employment & for an additional two years after termination of employment?	□Yes	☐ No

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDULA. New or Modified Process Equipment	RES – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C.		
<ul> <li>d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, die notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 6</li> </ul>	hout replacement?		□No □No □No □No □No □No
Wendy D. Simmons	03/25/2009		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	04/06/2009		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	<u> </u>	

**COMMENTS:** Pre-inspection: On 12/31/2008, chart recording records were not marked with operator's name and some start/stop times were not completed at each batch creamation. On Wednesday, March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2009 the Department received a complaint that Belspur was having black smoke and very bad odor...smelled of burning flesh & hair. On March 20, 2009, I attempted an inspection at this facility but no one was at the location. Inspection Findings: Upon approach of the facility, I observed black smoke coming from one of the Belspur Oaks crematory stacks. Since I was driving, I was unable to look back to see which stack was smoking and I was unable to stop to conduct an immediate Visible Emissions Test. I proceeded to the facility and pulled in behind the neighboring building for the purpose of conducting a Method 9-Visible Emissions (VE) observation, before informing the company I was at the location. Upon exiting the vehicle I noted no objectionable odors. I immediately conducted a 15 minute VE test on the facility's three crematory stacks (see attached VE forms). After conducting the VE testing, I proceeded to the facility to look at chart records and review operations at the facility. Mr. Bounds greeted me and stated he was just about to leave. I explained to Mr. Bounds that the Department had received an anonymous complaint that there was black smoke and objectionable odor. Mr. Bounds stated he works for the local Fire Department 3 days on/3 days off. Mr. Bounds introduced me to a gentleman who also operates the units when he is not able. I asked Mr. Bounds for the chart records so that I could review them. Mr. Bounds stated that the chart records are at his home office location and stated that I should notify him in advance when I need to see them. I then asked Mr. Bounds if there had been any recent repair work done on any of his cremation units. He stated no new work had been done. I asked Mr. Bounds if he had acquired the necessary MSDS Sheets for plastic bags being used and he said just the ones that he had last time. Mr. Bounds then escorted me to the cremation units and I looked at each unit as described: At 2:40pm, Emission Unit(EU) #3 had a secondary chamber temperature of 1610 degrees, but did drop to 1597 degrees while I observed. The primary chamber temperature was 1501 degrees. A photo was taken of chart recording in progress. At 2:45pm, after a photo was taken of chart recording in progress, EU #2 had a secondary chamber temperature of 1689 degrees. At 2:57pm, the temperature on the front of EU #1 indicated approximately 1200 degrees. I asked Mr. Bounds about the temperature and he stated that this unit has some gas flow issues, but he has been unable to find a company willing to work on the unit. Mr. Bounds took a ladder and proceeded to shake something on the top of the cremation unit. He then stated, "Now you should see the temperature go up." This did make the temperature indicator on the front of the unit rise. The owner is knowingly operating this unit with maintenance issues. The digital reading on the side of the unit then indicated 1445 degreees. Mr. Bounds stated he would take EU #1 off line until repairs are made. Photos were taken of front temperature indicator before "shaking on top of unit" and chart recordings in progress. I also took photos of chart records hanging from a clipboard on EU #3. These records did not have complete information on them; no dates, operator names, start indications, and batch weights. I told Mr. Bounds that I would need to review a full two years of his chart records and requested that he send me a copy of the chart records for today, via fax or email right away. I informed Mr. Bounds I would revisit the facility soon and committed to contacting him with the full permit number and a date I plan to return to review the facility's records. On 03/25/2009, Mr. Bounds faxed a copy of the requested chart records for March 25, 2009, but the portions of the chart records that were faxed did not have load start times indicated or batch weights. Another inspection is planned for 04/06/2009. I will contact Mr. Bounds on Thursday, April 2<sup>nd</sup> to let him know when the follow-up inspection is planned for.