

ANIMAL CREMATORY



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☐ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐			
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO	D: 11413	
AIRS ID#: 0810085 DA	TE: <u>06/30/2009</u>	ARRIVE: <u>12:58pm</u>	DEPART: <u>4:58pm</u>	
FACILITY NAME: BE	ELSPUR OAKS PET CREMAT	ΓORY		
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 6060 28th St E			
	BRADENTON 3420	03-5303		
OWNER/AUTHORIZE	CD REPRESENTATIVE: RA	AYMOND BOUNDS PHON	E: (941)751-5044	
CONTACT NAME:		PHON	Е:	
ENTITLEMENT PERI	OD: 1/8/2006 / 1/8/2011 (effective date) (end date)			
PART I: INSPECTION IN COMPLIAN	N COMPLIANCE STATUS (TCE MINOR Non-COM		NT Non-COMPLIANCE	
PART II: TESTING/RI (check 🗹 appropria		<u>EMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F	A.C.	
(check ☑ appropria 1. Were there any ob	te box(es)) ojectionable odor(s) detected?		Yes 🖂	No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any of Was a visible emi 62-297, F.A.C.)?- 	te box(es)) pjectionable odor(s) detected? ssions test conducted during the	uis site visit according to EPA M	Yes ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any of Was a visible eminimum 62-297, F.A.C.)?- In order to demoniately prior to the American forms. 	te box(es)) pjectionable odor(s) detected? ssions test conducted during the strate individual source compli AGP Notification form submiss	is site visit according to EPA Meliance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any of Was a visible eminimum 62-297, F.A.C.)? In order to demonimum days prior to the factor of the	pjectionable odor(s) detected? ssions test conducted during the strate individual source compliated Notification form submiss F.A.C.)	is site visit according to EPA Meiance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any of Was a visible eminima 62-297, F.A.C.)? In order to demonidays prior to the factor of the facto	te box(es)) ojectionable odor(s) detected? assions test conducted during the astrate individual source compli AGP Notification form submiss F.A.C.) astrate individual source compli 60 days prior to the AGP Notification equal to on	is site visit according to EPA Mariance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to inance were the remaining application form submission? (Rule r below the requirements of 100	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter Yes ssions test conducted 60 each anniversary date? (Rule Help Yes able standards testing 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) Yes Parts per million by	No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any objective Was a visible emit 62-297, F.A.C.)? In order to demondays prior to the acceptance of the following of the followi	te box(es)) pjectionable odor(s) detected? assions test conducted during the astrate individual source compli AGP Notification form submiss F.A.C.) astrate individual source compli 60 days prior to the AGP Notification (CO) emissions equal to one corrected to 7% O ₂ on an hour 62-297, F.A.C.)?	iance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to iance were the remaining application form submission? (Rule r below the requirements of 100 arly average basis and tested according to EPA Members and tested according to EPA Members and the steed according to EPA Members an	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No No No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any of Was a visible emine 62-297, F.A.C.)? In order to demone days prior to the part of th	te box(es)) pjectionable odor(s) detected? ssions test conducted during the astrate individual source compli AGP Notification form submiss F.A.C.) strate individual source compli 60 days prior to the AGP Notification equal to or s, corrected to 7% O ₂ on an hou 62-297, F.A.C.)? erformed according to EPA Me	is site visit according to EPA Mericance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to itance were the remaining application form submission? (Rule r below the requirements of 100 arly average basis and tested according to EPA Mericance.		No No No
 (check ☑ appropria Were there any of Was a visible eming 62-297, F.A.C.)? In order to demondays prior to the factorial formula for the factorial factorial for the factorial for the factorial factoria	pjectionable odor(s) detected? assions test conducted during the astrate individual source compliance AGP Notification form submiss F.A.C.)	is site visit according to EPA Mediance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to diance were the remaining application form submission? (Rule relation form submission? (Rule relation form submission?) (Rule relation form form form form form form form form	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No No No
(check ☑ appropria 1. Were there any of 2. Was a visible emi 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demon days prior to the 62-296.401(6)(j), 4. In order to demon completed within a) Carbon Mono volume, dry basis 10 (Ref.: Chapter b) Oxygen test pe c) Particulate ma dry standard cubic (Ref.: Chapter62- 5. Was all emissions	pjectionable odor(s) detected? ssisions test conducted during the astrate individual source compliated and provided the submission of the AGP Notification form of the AGP Notification of the AGP Notificat	iance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to iance were the remaining application form submission? (Rule r below the requirements of 100 arly average basis and tested accepthod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F equal to 07 below the requirement of 100 arly average basis and tested accepthod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F equal to 07 below the requirement of 100 and 100 arly average basis and tested according to 100 and 100 arly average basis and tested according to 100 and 100 arly average basis and tested according arce operating at the manufacture	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No No No No
(check ☑ appropria 1. Were there any of 2. Was a visible emition of the decoration of the decoratio	pjectionable odor(s) detected? ssions test conducted during the astrate individual source compli AGP Notification form submiss F.A.C.) strate individual source compli 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submiss corrected to 7% O ₂ on an hour feloused according to EPA Me atter emissions test with results of the corrected to full gas, corrected corrected to full gas, corrected to foot (ft³) of flue gas, corrected	iance, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to diance were the remaining application form submission? (Rule r below the requirements of 100 arrly average basis and tested accepthod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F equal to 07 below the requirement of 100 arrly average basis and tested accepthod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F equal to 7% O ₂ and tested according	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter	No No No No No No No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))		
(check v appropriate box(es))		
1. Is there Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) equipment installed on each unit to record t	emperatu	res in the
primary and secondary chambers where there is a 1.0 second gas residence time in the secondary chamber co	mbustion	zone in
accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?		
a) Do temperature probes seem to be properly placed?	Yes	No No
b) Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection for at least two years following the rec		f such
measurements, maintenance, reports and records?	C	
1) All measurements (including CEMS)	⊠Yes	□ No
2) Monitoring device	Yes	□ No
3) Performance Testing Measurements	Yes	□ No
4) CEMS Performance Evaluation		□ No
5) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks	Yes	□ No
6) Adjustments	Yes	☐ No
7) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices	Yes	□ No
8) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices	Yes	□ No
2. Was this crematory unit constructed: (check only one ☑ box)		
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 BEFORE August 30, 1989 is the:		
a) secondary chamber combustion zone providing at least a 1.0 second gas residence time @ 1600°F ?	⊠Yes	□ No
b) actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1400°F		
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	Yes	⊠ No
c) cremation in the primary chamber begun after the secondary chamber combustion zone temperature		
is equal to or greater than 1400° F?	Yes	No No
d) required monitoring equipment installed and operational, and providing continuous monitoring to		
record the temperature at the point or beyond where 1.0 second gas residence time is obtained in the		
secondary chamber combustion zone according to the manufacturer's instructions?	Yes	No No
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	ie.	
@ 1800° F?	⊠Yes	□ No
b) the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600°F		
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	□Yes	No No
c) secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the cremation		
process begins in the primary chamber?		No 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		
their use and for at least two years after their use?	⊠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	Z 105	
materials, including biomedical wastes (Rule 62-210.200, F.A.C.), incinerated at this location?	□Yes	No 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
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
operator o emproyment et for an accisional two years area termination of emproyment.		

PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDUR</u> A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u>	<u>RES</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C.		
Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment? b) alterations to existing process equipment with c) replacement of existing equipment substantial recent notification form? d) If you answered YES to any of the above, did	nout replacement?lly different than that noted on the most	□Yes □Yes	⊠No □No ⊠No
 d) If you answered YES to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, F.A.C.) to the appropriate DEP or local program office? 2. If a crematory unit has been modified to the extent that a Department air construction permit was required, have all operators been retrained to operate the modified unit? 3. In the case of new or modified equipment, where a Department air construction permit was required, has the owner submitted copies of all operator training certificates?		□Yes	□No
		□Yes □Yes	□No □No
Wendy D. Simmons and Joe Panetta	06/30/2009		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
Inspector's Signature			
	after July 15, 2009		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		

COMMENTS: This inspection was conducted in response to a citizen complaint of smoke. Upon driving up to the facility, black smoke was witnessed coming from the stack of emission unit #3(center stack). Upon arrival at the facility, Inspector Simmons conducted a 12 minute Method 9 Visible Emissions (VE) test (See attached). A records review was conducted and revealed that on several days, Emission Unit #1 was operated without proper pen ink on chart recorder for secondary chamber. A Field Warning Notice (FWN) was issued for missing temperature documentation and was signed by Mr. Raymond Bounds. During records review, Inspector Simmons again noted that the facility was not timely recording permit required start time, operator information, and date on chart records. Copies were taken of records that did not have proper documentation. This is the second inspection conducted where proper documentation was not on chart recording forms as required by the facility's permit. Mr. Joe Panetta reviewed facility's records in reference to biomedical waste transport and discussed permit requirements about biomedical waste not being incinerated at the facility. A copy of the facility's last inspection by the Department of Health was scanned and is attached to this inspection report. During this inspection, it was revealed that Mr. Bounds was replacing the floor inside of Emission Unit #1. Photos were taken of this work in progress, and are attached. Inspector Simmons asked Mr. Bounds when he last calibrated the thermocouples (temperature probes) on his cremation units and what method he used to do the calibration. He stated he uses an "ice bath" method for calibrating his temperature probe units. Additionally, when asked, Mr. Bounds stated that he does this temperature probe calibration at least annually and documents this information in his maintenance records. A review of notes taken during my April 6, 2009 inspection supported this statement. Maintenance records were not reviewed during this inspection because Mr. Bounds indicated that no new maintenance had been completed on his units since the last inspection on 04/06/2009. Upon request, Mr. Bounds provided his Operation and Maintenance Manual for Emission Unit #1, this manual was scanned and is attached to this inspection report. Since the last inspection and because of recent anonymous complaints received by the Department, the facility has begun conducting spot checks for smoke and odor during the time following loading of cremation units. The facility gave permission for scanning copies of this log and these copies are also attached to this inspection report. During presentation of FWN, Inspector Simmons requested that Mr. Bounds correct missing information documentation on chart records and contact the Department within 15 days for the purpose of scheduling a reinspection of chart records. Photos were taken of charts currently in units and chart records from June 18th and 26th, 2009 with missing start time documentation in the cremation area. One chart dated, 06/18/2009, was found in the trash with debris from cremation unit(s). Photos were also taken of cremation bags that were ready to be burned and MSDS sheets for bags. At least one cremation conducted in Emission Unit #1 on 06/26/2009 dipped below the 1600 degrees F temperature for more than 1.25 hours. A cremation being conducted in Emission Unit #3 on this day also had several dips below 1600 degrees F and temperature on the unit at 13:26 was 1633 degrees F in the secondary chamber. According to time on chart record and time of photo, this chart has a discrepancy of approximately 45 minutes. The cremation being conducted in Emission unit #2 during our site visit seemed to indicate a possible power failure sometime between 12:15 and 12:30pm, but there was not documentation to that fact on the chart which was still in progress. According to time on chart record and time of photo, this chart has a discrepancy of approximately 15 minutes. The temperature in emission unit #2 was 1643 degrees F at 13:28. Some items not checked in list above are no longer required by facility's general permit entitlement. A follow-up inspection will be conducted to review chart records again for completed documentation.