



SURFACE COATING OPERATIONS

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☒ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 0112518 **DATE:** 07/11/2008 **ARRIVE:** 10.45 **DEPART:** 12.30

FACILITY NAME: SANTI'S AUTOBODY SHOP, INC.

FACILITY LOCATION: 2090 SW 71st Terrace, G1

DAVIE 33317-7322

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: SANTIAGO LATORRE **PHONE:** (954)916-0030

CONTACT NAME: **PHONE:**

ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 2/12/2006 / 2/12/2011
(effective date) (end date)

PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☒ only one box)

☒ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

1. Does the facility operate any emissions units other than the surface coating operations 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)4.a., F.A.C.) ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the owner/operator of the facility maintain records to document the VOC content of the coatings and the quantity of the coatings used?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Does the owner/operator retain, and make available for Department inspection, these records for a period of at least five years?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
4. Is the total quantity of VOC's in such coatings 44 lbs/day or less, averaged monthly?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
5. Does the amount of coatings used, include solvents and thinners used in the process including those used for cleanups?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No

PART III: CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTANANCE REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

1. Is/Are the surface coating operation(s) subject to a VOC Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) emission limiting standard of Chapter 62-296.500, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)4.b., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the facility cause, suffer, allow or permit the discharge of air pollutants which cause or contribute to an objectionable odor? (Rule 62.296.320(2), F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☒ No

PART III: CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C. – (continued)

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

3. Does the owner/operator encourage pollution prevention through such measures as training employees involved in surface coating operations on methods of reducing VOC emissions by:
- a) maintaining spray coating equipment to ensure effective application with a minimum of overspray? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - b) monitoring the coating thickness to avoid excessive coating?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - c) considering the use of low-VOC coatings (e.g., waterborne, ultra-violet cured, or powder coatings)? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - d) implementing inventory control practices to prevent spillage?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - e) implementing management practices to reduce VOC emissions during cleanup by:
 - 1. spraying light colored coatings before dark colored coatings to reduce the number of cleaning cycles?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - 2) recycling cleaning solvents?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - 3) using water based cleaners?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.

A. New or Modified Process Equipment

1. Since the last inspection has there been
- a) installation of any new process equipment?----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?----- ☐ Yes ☒ 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?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Courtney Pitters

07/11/2008

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

07/11/2009

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The facility appears to be operating according to the rules and regulations of permit # 0112518: record keeping was submitted and appeared to be satisfactory, the facility house keeping was very good, and no odors or fugitive emissions were detected at the parimeter of the facility. No environmental air violations were observed during CY 2008 annual inspection.