

$\frac{POLYESTER}{FABRICATION} \frac{PRODUCTS}{FABRICATION}$



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INST		· / 		
AIRS ID#: 1030455 DATE: 2/28/2007 FACILITY NAME: BEACHCAT BOATS FACILITY LOCATION: 120 Pickne OLDSMA RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: ROBERT H CONTACT NAME: RAPHAEL LIRANI REMITTANCE YEAR:	ey Street R 34677 HARWOOD PHON			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ✓ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: CONTROL TECHNOLOGY/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Does the facility operate any emissions units other than the polyester resin plastic products fabrication units and emissions units which are exempt from permitting pursuant to the criteria of paragraph 62-210.300(3)(a) or (b), F.A.C., or have been exempted from permitting under Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)5.a., F.A.C.)				

PART III: CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))				
2.	Does the owner or operator voluntarily encourage pollution involved in product fabrication on methods of reducing evapa) lessening the exposure of fresh resin surfaces to the air?-b) maintaining spray lay-up equipment to ensure effective a c) monitoring the coating thickness to avoid excessive resind) implementing inventory control practices to prevent spill e) managing cleanup solvents?	porative losses by: application with a minimum of overspray? lage? conduct the specific activity authorized by the adjacent property or on public use of the t, including fish, wildlife, natural resources,	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Ne No Ne No Ne No Ne No Ne No Ne No	
3.	Does the owner or operator maintain the permitted facility, e	emission unit, or activity in good condition:	-⊠Yes ∐ No	
(ch	IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Runeck ☑ appropriate box(es)) New or Modified Process Equipment	ale 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.		
,	Since the last inspection has there been			
	a) installation of any new process equipment?		□Yes ⊠No	
	b) alterations to existing process equipment without repla		□Yes ⊠No	
	c) replacement of existing equipment substantially differe	ent than that noted on the most		
	recent notification form?		□Yes ⊠No	
	d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did the owner notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, I local program office?	F.A.C.) to the appropriate DEP or	□Yes ⊠No	
Shea L	. Jackson	2/28/2007		
	Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
		2008		
	Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	_	
	MENTS: Inspection Findings:			
	ual Compliance Inspection was performed for this facility. An ed parameters were: Downwind odor detected- Mild (1); Win			
The Re	sponsible official Robert Harwood was not on site. I met with	the facility foreman, Raphael Lirando.		
The styrene odor level was moderate inside the facility building. Mr. Raphael Lirando was gel coating a boat hull. This facility consists of 2 open warehouse buildings. The containers were covered. The resins and gel coats on site at this time were the same products in use previous inspection. No product changes were noted. I observed containers in a flame proof cabinet. The parts were drying at time of inspection. The facility was in process of lamination of one Beachcat boat hull and parts. The facility has two Magnum guns for the processing of the gel coats, and resin laminations applications. There were no other emission units observed on site. (See photos) There was another boat hull and deck which another employee was working on in the larger building, performing trim work.				

The records were not available at this time. I asked Mr. Lirando to see the records, but he could not get into office.

I gave Mr. Lirando Inspection Summary report and requested he give to Mr. Harwood. I left a note on the inspection summary informing Mr. Harwood the polyester resin records should be available at all times for the inspector, when on site.

3/2/2007 - I called Mr. Harwood, I informed him I needed the records from September 2006 to February 2007. I asked him if the Foreman could not have access to the records. He stated he did not give Mr. Lirando the key to access office and records, due to a lack of trust. I told him that I had noticed he has a bulletin board and other invoices posted on the door. I suggested that he keep his monthly log up to date and posted on the bulletin board so that when the inspector is on site, it will be available as required.

The faxed record log was received 3/2/2007. The highest reported consecutive twelve-month total was 47,414 lbs for the month of June 2006_. The 12 month consecutive totals were reviewed records for the months of April 2004 through January 2007 with a twelve month total of 37,969 lbs. The copy of the records is attached as an example of the record format. There were no exceedances of the 12-month limit of 76,000 lbs for the records reviewed. The permit does not expire and the facility is within permit limits for resin usage, below the 38tons/12month total. There are no changes at this time. There was no non-compliance issues observed at the time of inspection. The permit expires on 05/30/09. A new notification form would be required to be submitted no later than 03/31/09. This in non applicable at this time.