	CONTROL WORKING
-	an Marta
	FLORIDA

HUMAN CREMATORY



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	IUAL (INS1, INS2) Image: Second Sec	COMPLAINT/DISC ARMS COMPLAIN				
AIRS ID#: 0610077 DATE: 1	2/16/09	ARRIVE: <u>1:52</u>	DEPART: <u>2:44</u>			
FACILITY NAME: LOWTH						
FACILITY LOCATION:		CLS				
FACILITY LOCATION;	1555 27TH ST					
	VERO BEACH 32960					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REI	PRESENTATIVE: THO	MAS LOWTHER P	HONE: (888)775-5795			
CONTACT NAME: Kelly W	adsworth - Operator	P	HONE:			
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:						
(effective date) (end date)					
PART I: INSPECTION COM	IPLIANCE STATUS (ch	neck 🗹 only one box)				
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMP	PLIANCE SIGNI	FICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
Г				1		
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECOR</u> (check ☑ appropriate box(<u>MENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.4	401, F.A.C.			
(check appropriate box)1. Were there any objection	(es)) nable odor(s) detected?			🗌 Yes 🖾 No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 	(es)) nable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this	site visit according to El	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter	□ Yes ⊠ No □Yes ⊠ No		
 (check ☑ appropriate box(1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i 	(es)) nable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this ndividual source compliar	site visit according to El	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter			
 (check ☑ appropriate box(1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 1) 	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar fotification form submissio F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visiblon, and within 60 days pr	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 for to each anniversary date?			
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 day 	(es)) nable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar otification form submissio F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission?	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 rior to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing P (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.)	∐Yes ⊠ No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 14) 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 data a) Carbon Monoxide (Construction of the construction) 	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar otification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? below the requirements o y average basis and teste	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 for to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by ed according to EPA Method	□Yes ⊠ No □Yes □ No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 14) 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 data a) Carbon Monoxide (Construction of the approximate) construction of the approximate of the approximate) of the approximate of the approximate) of the approximate of the approximate) of the approximate of t	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar otification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? below the requirements o y average basis and teste	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 rior to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by	□Yes ⊠ No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 data a) Carbon Monoxide (C volume, dry basis, correr 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-29') b) Oxygen test performance of the completed matter emission 	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar otification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? pelow the requirements o y average basis and teste od 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-2 ual to or below the requi	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 tior to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by ed according to EPA Method 297, F.A.C.)?	□Yes □ No □Yes □ No □Yes □ No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 data a) Carbon Monoxide (C volume, dry basis, correr 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-29') b) Oxygen test performed c) Particulate matter emidry standard cubic foot (Ref.: Chapter.62-297, F.A.C.) 	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar otification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visiblon, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? below the requirements of y average basis and tester od 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-2 jual to or below the require o 7% O_2 and tested according	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 rior to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing P (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by ed according to EPA Method 297, F.A.C.)?	□Yes □ No □Yes □ No □Yes □ No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 dataa) Carbon Monoxide (C volume, dry basis, corre 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297) b) Oxygen test performation of the completed matter emission of the c	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar otification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? below the requirements o y average basis and teste nod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-2 ual to or below the requi to 7% O ₂ and tested according the operating at the manuf	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 rior to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by ed according to EPA Method 297, F.A.C.)?	Yes No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 1) 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 da a) Carbon Monoxide (C volume, dry basis, corre 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297) b) Oxygen test performed c) Particulate matter emidry standard cubic foot (Ref.: Chapter.62-297, F 5. Was all emissions testing capacity?	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar fotification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? below the requirements o y average basis and teste nod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-2 ual to or below the require o 7% O_2 and tested accor- ce operating at the manuf ission of a test report for to the date of the last for	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 for to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing P (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by ed according to EPA Method 297, F.A.C.)?	Yes No Yes No		
 (check appropriate box) 1. Were there any objection 2. Was a visible emissions 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate i days prior to the AGP N (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), 14) 4. In order to demonstrate i completed within 60 date a) Carbon Monoxide (Construction of the construction of the cons	(es)) hable odor(s) detected? test conducted during this individual source compliar fotification form submission F.A.C.)	site visit according to El nce, was an annual visibl on, and within 60 days pr nce were the remaining a cation form submission? below the requirements o y average basis and teste nod 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-2 ual to or below the require o 7% O_2 and tested accor- ce operating at the manuf ission of a test report for to the date of the last for nent as soon as practical,	PA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter e emissions test conducted 60 for to each anniversary date? pplicable standards testing P (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) of 100 parts per million by ed according to EPA Method 297, F.A.C.)?	Yes No Yes No		

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))

	the						
primary and secondary chambers where there is a 1.0 second gas residence time in the secondary chamber combustion zone i							
accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?							
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 recording of such							
measurements, maintenance, reports and records?							
1) All measurements (including CEMS) IVes IVes IVes IVes IVes IVes IVes IVes)						
2) Monitoring device 🗌 Yes 🗌 No)						
3) Performance Testing Measurements Yes 🗌 No	Э						
4) CEMS Performance Evaluation Type San No.	Э						
5) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks	Э						
6) Adjustments Yes No	С						
7) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices)						
8) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices Yes Ves	С						
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 <u>BEFORE</u> 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?)						
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? \Box Yes \Box No)						
4. If constructed ON or AFTER 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? □Yes ⊠ No	0						
b) the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600°F							
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?)						
c) secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the cremation							
process begins in the primary chamber? Xer Section 2010 Notes Sec	С						
5. Are appropriate cremation containers containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated							
plastics used during the cremation of dead human bodies?)						
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?)						
b) Are there any other materials, including biomedical wastes (Rule 62-210.200, FAC) incinerated at							
this location? \Box Yes \boxtimes No)						
6. Have all crematory operators been trained and certified by a Department-approved training program? $\overline{\square}$ Yes $\overline{\square}$ No	С						
a) Are copies of the training certificates for 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? Xes 🗌 No)						

PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C. A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u>

 Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment? b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most 	□Yes □Yes	⊠No ⊠No
 recent notification form?	Yes	No
 If a crematory unit has been modified to the extent that a Department air construction permit 	Yes	∐No
was required, have all operators been retrained to operate the modified unit?In the case of new or modified equipment, where a Department air construction permit was	Yes	No
required, has the owner submitted copies of all operator training certificates? a) submitted within the 15 day required window following the training?	Yes Yes	□No □No

Wanda Parker-Garvin

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Inspector's Signature

Date of Inspection

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

12/16/09

COMMENTS: On December 16, 2009, Ms. Wanda Parker-Garvin of FDEP visited the subject facility to conduct a level 2 compliance inspection. Contact was made with Mr. Tom Lowther, Owner and Mr. Kelly Wadsworth, Crematory Operator. 1. An inspection of the crematory unit (Power Pak II;Model #IE43-PPII; Serial #0250397) was conducted. The location of the thermocouple was identified and documented in a subsequent site visit on 1/25/10.

2. The temperature readings from the program logic controller (PLC), analog temperature chart, and the Department's digital thermometer were in agreement with each other. The crematory unit was cooling down from a recent burn of a 230 pound body. The following temperature readings were documented: Program Logic Controller = 1159 degrees F; Analog Temperature Chart = 1148 degrees F; Digital Thermometer = 1119 degrees F.

3. The opacity reader was operating and continually on. The stack for the unit was observed. No visible emissions were observed; a Method 9 evaluation was not necessary. No objectionable odors were detected.

4. Temperature charts, maintanence records, and MSDS sheets were reviewed. The operator licenses/certifications were reviewed and obtained. The temperature charts indicated cremations were conducted at temperatures above 1600 degrees F. Maintenance records indicated a rebricking was done on 10/29/09 and new thermocouple was installed in September 2009. 5. Question 4 in Part II, questions b) 1), and 3 in Part III, and questions 1d, 2, and 3 in Part IV are not applicable.