

ANIMAL CREMATORY



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	CI)
AIRS ID#: 0250250 DATE: 4/11/2014 ARRIVE: 10:19 AM	DEPART: <u>10:55 AM</u>
FACILITY NAME: PET HEAVEN MEMORIAL PARK	
FACILITY LOCATION: 10901 W FLAGLER ST	
MIAMI 33174	
Email: sesantos@pet-heaven.com Mobile:	305)223-6516 305)223-6516
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT N	on-COMPLIANCE
	on commented
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): SERGIO SANTOS Brief Notes:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still SERGIO SANTOS?	X YesNo
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still CANDY SANTOS? If no, who is?:	
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	

Emissions Unit Section 1 –SIMONDS 404 INCINERATOR-400 LB/HR TYPE IV WASTE-DUAL CHAMBER

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)
1. a. Complete AC application or, if no AC permit, initial GP registration received on or after August 30, 1989?	⊠ Yes	□No
b. If yes, were design calculations provided then to confirm a sufficient volume in the secondary chamber combustion zone to provide for at least a 1.0 second gas residence time		_
at 1800 degrees Fahrenheit?2. Manufacturer's recommended capacity: 400 🖾 lbs for batch unit 🗌 lbs/hr for ram-charged unit.	⊠ Yes	□No
 Crematory unit installed after February 1, 2007?	☐ Yes	⊠No
5. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	□No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		⊠No
operation?	☐ Yes	□No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the facility demonstrate compliance during the last VE test?		□No □No
in no, what was the problem (it known).		
DADE H. MICIDI E EMICCIONO ENCOMINO		
PART II: <u>VISIBLE EMISSIONS TESTING</u>	(check d box for each of	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?a. Operating capacity during test? 94 ⊠ lbs for batch unit □ lbs/hr for ram-charged unit	Yes	□No
b. Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity?		
c. Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations d. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		□No □No
e. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six minute average. f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit?		□No
☐ (5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minute		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector during this site visit?a. Operating capacity during test?	Yes Yes	⊠No
b. Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity?		
c. Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? d. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □		No
e. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six minute average. f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit?		□No
3. Is there any reason to ask for a special test to determine compliance with the PM and CO standa	•	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

PART III: MONITORING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS	(check ☑ box for each	only one
1. Were there any objectionable odors detected?	Yes	iguestion) iguestion)
An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were: Wind direction Downwind odor level detected Upwind odor level detected	Scale: 1-10 (worst)
 2. Continuous Monitoring Systems — 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 ☐ Yes	□No
c. Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection, for at least the past two years? (1) All temperature measurements	Yes	□No
monitoring system all continuous performance evaluations	Yes Yes Yes Yes	□No □No □No □No
 (6) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices d. 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 e. Was the crematory unit installed after 2/1/07? If no, skip e.(1) – (3)	Yes Yes	□No □No □No
(1) Is the crematory unit equipped and operated with a pollutant monitoring system to automatic control combustion based on continuous in-stack opacity measurement?	cally Yes	□No
(3) Has the opacity measurement system been cleaned and checked for proper operation in accordance with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule?		□No
PART IV: SECONDARY COMBUSTION ZONE TEMPERATURES	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
If the application to construct was <u>BEFORE</u> August 30, 1989 is the: a. actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1400°F throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber? b. secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1400°F before the crema process begins in the primary chamber?		□No
2. If the application to construct ON or AFTER August 30, 1989 is the: a. the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600°F throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber? b. secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the crema process begins in the primary chamber?	tion	□No
	(check 🗹	only one
1. Besides animal remains and, if applicable, the bedding associated with the animals and appropriate co are any other materials, including biomedical wastes, incinerated in the unit?		question) ⊠No
2. Do containers contain no more than 0.5 percent by weight chlorinated plastics as certified by the manufacturer?	Yes	⊠No □ No

	(check ☑ box for each	•
1. Is the crematory unit maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications? 2. Is there a written plan onsite which addresses the operating procedures during startup, shutdown and malfunction?	-	NoNoNoNoNo
PART VII: EU INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)		
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPI	LIANCE	

Emissions Unit Section 2 –PROPANE FIRED POWER-PAK II MODEL IE43-PPII INCINERATOR

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		(check ☑	only one
		box for each of	
1. a. Complete AC application or, if no AC permit, initial GP registration	received on or	_	
after August 30, 1989?		Yes	□No
b. If yes, were design calculations provided then to confirm a sufficient secondary chamber combustion zone to provide for at least a 1.0			
at 1800 degrees Fahrenheit?		Yes	□No
2. Manufacturer's recommended capacity: ⊠ lbs for batch unit	lbs/hr for ram-charged unit.		
3. Crematory unit installed after February 1, 2007?		☐ Yes	□No
4. Date of last inspection: $\underline{4/26/2013}$			
5. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:			_
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? -		⊠ Yes	□No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		Yes Yes	⊠No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of operation?	N/A	□ Vos	□ No
d. Date of last VE test: 4/26/2013	N/A	☐ Yes	□No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later t	han 45 days after the test?	☐ Yes	□No
f. Did the facility demonstrate compliance during the last VE test?		⊠ Yes	□No
If no, what was the problem (if known)?		_	_
PART II: VISIBLE EMISSIONS TESTING		(check ☑	only one
		box for each of	
			•
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit d		Yes	□No
a. Operating capacity during test? 198 \(\subseteq \) lbs for batch unit \(\subseteq \subseteq \subseteq \subseteq \) here we are a factor of the manufacturer's recommendation.			
b. Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommend YesNo	ed capacity?		
c. Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is repre	esentative of normal operations?	⊠ Yes	□No
d. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		Yes	□No
e. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest s			
f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit?		Yes	□No
\square (5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opac	ty shall be allowed for up to six minutes	in any one-hour)	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector during this	site visit?	□ Yes	⊠No
a. Operating capacity during test? lbs for batch unit lbs/hr			ZJ (0
b. Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommend			
YesNo	1		
c. Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is repre			□No
d. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		D-D-D-D	
YesNo	agt siv minute everege		
e. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the high f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit?	lest six illilitie average.	Yes	□No
☐ (5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opac		_	
		-	
3. Is there any reason to ask for a special test to determine compliance	e with the PM and CO standar		⊠ N
If you what reason?		☐ Yes	⊠No
If yes, what reason?			

PA	RT III: MONITORING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS	(ch	eck 🗹	only one
			for each o	
1.	Were there any objectionable odors detected?		Yes	⊠No
	An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were:	_		
	Wind direction Downwind odor level detected Upwind odor level detected	Scal	e: 1-10 (v	worst)
2	Continuous Monitoring Systems –			
	Is a continuous temperature monitoring system installed on each unit to record temperatures in the			
	secondary chamber in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?	\boxtimes	Yes	□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?	Ш	Yes	□No
	(Application of initial notification. Tecerved on of after 6/30/67, Tecerved before 6/30/67)			
c.	Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection, for at least the past two years?	_		
	(1) All temperature measurements	\boxtimes	Yes	□No
	(2) All continuous monitoring systems, monitoring devices, and performance testing measurements; monitoring system all continuous performance evaluations	- 🖂	Yes	□No
	(3) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks (last performed on)		Yes	□No
	(4) Adjustments		Yes	□No
	(5) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices		Yes	□No
	(6) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices	Ш	Yes	∐No
d.	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		Yes	□No
e.	Was the crematory unit installed after $2/1/07$? If no, skip e.(1) – (3)		Yes	□No
	control combustion based on continuous in-stack opacity measurement?		Yes	⊠No
	(2) Is the system calibrated to restrict combustion in the primary chamber whenever any opacity			
	exceeds 15% opacity?		Yes	⊠No
	(3) Has the opacity measurement system been cleaned and checked for proper operation in accordance with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule?		Yes	□No
	accordance with the manufacturer processmentate maintenance senedare.			4
TD 4	DE W. CECONDA DV. COMPLICATION ZONE TEMPEDA EVIDEC			only one question)
P	RT IV: SECONDARY COMBUSTION ZONE TEMPERATURES	COM	Tor cucir	question
1.	If the application to construct was BEFORE August 30, 1989 is the:			
	a. actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1400°F		V	□ Na
	throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?b. secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1400°F before the cremater than 1400		Yes	□No
	process begins in the primary chamber?		Yes	□No
2.	If the application to construct ON or AFTER August 30, 1989 is the:			
	a. 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
	b. secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the cremat		Yes	□No
	process begins in the primary chamber?			
			neck 🗹	only one
PA	RT V: <u>ALLOWED MATERIALS</u>	DOX	Tor each	question)
1.	Besides animal remains and, if applicable, the bedding associated with the animals and appropriate cor	tai <u>ne</u> i	rs,	
	are any other materials, including biomedical wastes, incinerated in the unit?		Yes	⊠No
	If yes, what other materials?			
	,,			l I
2.				
2.	Do containers contain no more than 0.5 percent by weight chlorinated plastics as certified by the manufacturer?		Yes	⊠No

	*	only one
PART VI: <u>EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE</u>	box for each	question)
1. Is the crematory unit maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications? 2. Is there a written plan onsite which addresses the operating procedures during startup, shutdown and malfunction? 3. Does the crematory allow for a visible check on the flame characteristics? If no, skip a. – b. a. Was the flame characteristic visually checked at least once during each operating shift? b. Was the flame adjusted when necessary?	Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNo
PART VII: EU INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)		
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPL	LIANCE	

Emissions Unit Section 3 –New Natural Gas Fired Power Pak II INCINERATOR

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
a. Complete AC application or, if no AC permit, initial GP registration received on or after August 30, 1989? b. If yes, were design calculations provided then to confirm a sufficient volume in the	⊠ Yes	□No
secondary chamber combustion zone to provide for at least a 1.0 second gas residence time at 1800 degrees Fahrenheit?	☐ Yes	□No
2. Manufacturer's recommended capacity:	☐ Yes	□No
 4. Date of last inspection: 4/26/2013 5. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		□No ⊠No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	☐ Yes	□No
 d. Date of last VE test: 4/26/2013 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the facility demonstrate compliance during the last VE test?		□No □No
PART II: <u>VISIBLE EMISSIONS TESTING</u>		
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?a. Operating capacity during test? 135 ⊠ lbs for batch unit □ lbs/hr for ram-charged unit b. Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? □ □ □ □ □ □ □		□No
Yes \(\sigma\)No c. Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations d. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		□No
e. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six minute average. f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit? [(5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minute		□No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector during this site visit? a. Operating capacity during test?		⊠No
b. Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? YesNo Was the test conducted with the unit appreciate at a capacity; that is representative of narrael apprecians		
c. Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? d. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? Yes No		∐No
e. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six minute average. f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit?		□No
3. Is there any reason to ask for a special test to determine compliance with the PM and CO standa	rds?	⊠No

PART III: MONITORING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS		
Were there any objectionable odors detected? An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were: Wind direction Downwind odor level detected Upwind odor level detected		⊠No
This direction Bownwing odds level detected epwing odds level detected	_ Searc. 1 10	(Worst)
 2. Continuous Monitoring Systems — 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? ————————————————————————————————————	_	□No
 c. Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection, for at least the past two years? (1) All temperature measurements		□No
monitoring system all continuous performance evaluations	-	□No □No □No □No
 (6) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices	- X Yes	□No □No
 (1) Is the crematory unit equipped and operated with a pollutant monitoring system to automati control combustion based on continuous in-stack opacity measurement?	🔲 Yes y	□No
accordance with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule?	Yes	□No
PART IV: SECONDARY COMBUSTION ZONE TEMPERATURES 1. If the application to construct was BEFORE August 30, 1989 is the: a. actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1400°F throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?		□No □No
 2. If the application to construct ON or AFTER August 30, 1989 is the: a. the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600°F throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber? b. secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the crema process begins in the primary chamber? 	ation	□No
		=
PART V: <u>ALLOWED MATERIALS</u> 1. Besides animal remains and, if applicable, the bedding associated with the animals and appropriate coare any other materials, including biomedical wastes, incinerated in the unit? ————————————————————————————————————		⊠No
2. Do containers contain no more than 0.5 percent by weight chlorinated plastics as certified by the manufacturer?	Yes	⊠No □No

		5
e during each operating shift?	Yes Yes	□No □No □No □No □No
check 🗹 only one box)		
NCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPL	IANCE	
tion (continued)		
	(check v box for each	only one ch question)
ocation of the facility or any emissions uni r administrative change at the facility?	ts or Yes	⊠No □No
eplacement? that is substantially different? ation form and the appropriate fee	- Yes - Yes - Yes	□No□No□No□No□No
4/11/2014		
Data Classicalian		
Date of Inspection		
Date of Inspection 4/2015		
	ber of the facility or authorized representate ocation of the facility or any emissions unior administrative change at the facility?	procedures during startup,

COMMENTS: STEPHANIE BROOKS OF BROOKS AND ASSOCIATES PERFORMED THREE (3) VISIBLE EMISSIONS TESTS ON THE THREE (3) ANIMAL CREMATORIES. THE AFTERBURNER TEMPERATURE FOR THE TWO POWER-PAK II INCINERATORS WAS GREATER THAN 1600 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT DURING THE ONE HOUR VE TEST. THE AFTERBURNER TEMPERATURE FOR THE SIMONDS 404 INCINERATOR WAS 1465 DEGREES FAHRENHEIT. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS DURING THE VE TESTS.

REVIEWED

By Ray Gordon at 8:40 am, Jul 28, 2014