

## HUMAN CREMATORY COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



				Environment Compliance	
IN	INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)				
Tu-	RE-INSPECTIC	ON (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	<b>_</b>		
FA	CILITY: Director's Services, Inc.		DISTRICT:		
	A/Site Name: Director's Services		Southwest		
AL	<b>DDRESS:</b> 3121 44th Avenue No	orth	CONTACT PHON	E:	
	St. Petersburg, FL		727-527-5667		
AR	RMS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date:	6/24/17	
	1030035 001	1030035-006-AG	<b>Renewal Date:</b>	5/25/17	
	1000000 001		Test Date:	8/9/12	
	<i>MISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION:</i> Un orthernmost unit. Operating temp >/=	nit B: Human Crematory, IE&E, Model IE- = 1400 dF by rule	43 (300 lb max. batcl	h load),	
INS	SPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch	heck 🗆 only one box)		
1	0/7/13	In Compliance; I Minor Non-Compl	liance; Significant	Non-Compliance	
		PART I: General Review:		-	
1.	Permit File Review			Yes No	
2.	Introduction and Entry			Yes No	
	applicable regulations. Mr. Phillipunit.	rformed in order to determine if this facilit p Rouzer (manager) was present during th		of the emission	
3.	Is the Authorized Representative st	-		Yes No	
	<i>Comments: Mr. Rouzer is stills the A</i> The e-mail address is:	uthorized Representative.			
4.	Is the facility contact still: Phillip F	D Douzer?		Yes No	
ч.	Comments: Mr. Rouzer is stills the fa				
	The e-mail address is:				
5.	If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did th [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]	he facility provide an administrative update	within 30 days?	Yes No	
		<u>CSTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296. 40 (x(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would i		ce)	
	mpliance Demonstration [62-296.401(5) New Facility / New Process Equa Did this facility demonstrate initial com		peration?	Yes 🗌 No	
2.	<b>Existing Facilities</b> Was an annual visible emissions compli	iance test conducted on each crematory unit for	• each calendar year:	Xes 🗌 No	
	<i>Test Reports</i> <i>Does the submitted visible emission test(s) demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity</i> , six- minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minutes in any one-hour period? [62-296.401(5)(b)1., F.A.C.] ⊠ Yes □ No The last visible emission test resulted in an opacity of0% for the highest six minute average.				
2.		erating at a capacity of one (1) adult-sized cada			
3.	Was the department notified at least 15	days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A.	. <i>C</i> .]	🖂 Yes 🔲 No	
4.		he department as soon as practical, but no later			

	PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296. 401(5), F.A.C.	\ \	
5.	(check		□ No
6.	Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according to EPA Method 9?	- 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
	a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>n/a</u> % for the highest six minute average.		
	b) Did the test indicate the facility is operating in compliance with the opacity standard?		
7.	Is there any reason to ask for a special test to determine compliance with the PM and CO standards?	- 🗌 Yes	No No
	PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u>		
	(check [] appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance	)	
1.	Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?	- 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
	An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were:		
	Downwind odor level detected- $0_{;}$ Wind direction - South_ Upwind odor level detected- $0_{(1-10)}$		
2.			
	a) Is a continuous temperature monitoring system installed on each unit to record temperatures in the secondary chamber in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?	- 🛛 Yes	$\Box$ No
	b) Is the temperature probe properly placed, at least at the distance where the 1.0 second gas residence		
	time at $\boxtimes 1,800^1 \square 1,600^2$ degrees was determined?	- 🛛 Yes	No No
	c) Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection for at least two years following the recording of such measurements, maintenance, reports and records?		
	1) All temperature measurements	- 🛛 Yes	No
	2) All continuous monitoring systems, monitoring devices, and performance testing measurements;		
	<i>monitoring system all continuous performance evaluations</i> 3) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks (last performed on <u>(10-13-08)</u>		
	<ul> <li>A) Adjustments</li> </ul>	$- \boxtimes Tes$ $- \boxtimes Yes$	$\square No$ $\square No$
	5) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices	- 🛛 Yes	No No
	6) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices	- 🛛 Yes	$\square$ No
	7) Are the temperature charts properly documented with operator name, operator indication of when cremation in the primary chamber was begun, date, time, and temperature markings		□ No
	8) Are all the above records available for at least 2 years?	$- \boxtimes Yes$	$\square$ No
	a) Date range for records reviewed: From: _1-1-13 To:10-4-13		
	9) Was the crematory unit installed after $2/1/07$ ? If yes, go to 9) a) – c)	- 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
	a) Is the crematory unit equipped and operated with a pollutant monitoring system to automatically control combustion based on continuous in-stack opacity measurement?	- $\Box$ Yes	□ No
	<i>b) Is the</i> system calibrated to restrict combustion in the primary chamber whenever any opacity exceeds 15% opacity ?	- 🗌 Yes	No No
	c) Has the opacity measurement system been cleaned and checked for proper operation in accordance with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule?		□ No
	1 – Application received on or after $8/30/89$ ; 2 – Application received prior to $8/30/89$		
3.	Was this crematory unit application to construct: $[62-296.401(5)(c), F.A.C.]$ (check only one $\Box$ box) a) $\boxtimes$ <b>BEFORE</b> August 30, 1989? (If this box checked, continue on to #4 and skip #5)		
	<i>a)</i> $\boxtimes$ <u>BEFORE</u> August 50, 1989? (If this box checked, continue on to #4 and skip #5) <i>b)</i> $\square$ <u>ON</u> or <u>AFTER</u> August 30, 1989? (If this box checked, skip #4 and continue on to #5)		
4.	If the application to construct was <b><u>BEFORE</u></b> August 30, 1989 is the:		
7.	a) secondary chamber combustion zone providing at least a 1.0 second gas residence time @ <b>1600°F</b> ?	- 🖂 Yes	$\square$ 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	$\square$ No
	c) cremation in the primary chamber begun after the secondary chamber combustion zone temperature is equal to or greater than <b>1400°F</b> ?	- 🛛 Yes	$\square No$
5			
5.	<i>If the application to construct <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</i>		
	@ 1800° F?	- 🗌 Yes	No
1	b) actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than $1600^{\circ}F$		
	throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	- 🗌 Yes	∐ No

	<b>PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> (check  appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)</b>	
	process begins in the primary chamber? 🗌 Yes 🗌 N	lo
6.	<ul> <li>Are appropriate cremation containers containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated plastics used during the cremation of dead human bodies, as demonstrated by MSD sheet? X Yes Xes (62-296.401(5)(d), F.A.C.]</li> <li>a) If the answer to question 6 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?</li></ul>	lo lo

## PART IV: <u>Equipment Maintenance</u>

(check [] appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)

Equipment Maintenance: – [62-296.401(5)(e), F.A.C.]

1.	Is the crematory unit maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No
2.	Are there maintenance/repair/adjustment records kept onsite for at least 2 years? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No
3.	Is there a written plan onsite which addresses the operating procedures during startup, shutdown and malfunction? X Yes No Does the crematory allow for a visible check on the flame characteristics?
4.	Does the crematory allow for a visible check on the flame characteristics? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No If yes go to a) – b)
	<ul> <li>a) Was the flame characteristic visually checked at least once during each operating shift? X Yes No</li> <li>b) Was the flame adjusted when necessary? X Yes No</li> </ul>

## **PART V:** Special Conditions And Procedures (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)

## **Administrative Changes:**

<ol> <li>Were there any change in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility □ Yes □ No</li> <li>If yes, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] □ Yes □ No</li> </ol>
Permit Effective Period       - [62-210.310(3)(a), F.A.C.]         1. Is the general permit for this facility still within the 5 year effective period?
2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 days prior to permit expiration? 🗌 Yes 🔲 No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership - [62-210.310 (2)(b)2, F.A.C]
C Since the last registration form submittal has there been a) Installation of any new process equipment?
<ul> <li>Noncompliance Notice: - [62-210.310(3)(i), F.A.C.]</li> <li>1. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or limitation of the air general permit? □ Yes □ No If the answer is Yes, proceed to a) and b).</li> <li>a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department? □ Yes □ No b) Did the notification include:</li> </ul>

<ol> <li>A description of and cause of noncompliance? Yes No</li> <li>Dates and times of noncompliance; or if not corrected, the anticipated time noncompliance is expected to continue and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance? Yes No</li> </ol>
PART VI: <u>Comments</u>
An AQD VE test was not performed because the emission unit was not in operation.
Reviewed temperature charts for the months of 1/1/2013 through 10/7/2013 indicated emission unit in compliance.
Certifying documentation from the manufacturer that they are composed of 0.5% or less by weight chlorinated plastic. Note:
The facility used only cardboard for cremation. The emission unit was calibrated on 10-13-2008. See attached calibration data
sheet.
Exit Interview: During the closing conference, I informed Mr. Phillip Rouzer, facility appears to be in compliance at
this time.

Mike Ojo Thomas

Inspector's Name

10-7-2013

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next Inspection H:\USERS\WPDOCS\Airqual\Air\_Compliance\AQI\1030035 001 88156.doc