auto	ATAL PROTECTION	Sec.
-domon.	N	Calue
FLO	RIDA	-
FLO	RIDA	1

SURFACE COATING OPERATIONS



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV					
AIRS ID#: 1030498 DATE: <u>2/13/09</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:40 a.m.</u>	DEPART: <u>10:25 a.m.</u>				
FACILITY NAME: PROTECT FINISHING						
FACILITY LOCATION: SUITE M, 12900 A	UTOMOBILE BLVD					
CLEARWATER 3	33762					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:	TOBY TENORIO PHON	NE: (727)572-8681				
CONTACT NAME:	PHON	NE:				
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/19/2008 / 10/1 (effective date) / end date	9/2013 te)					
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?						
 4. Is the total quantity of VOC's in such coatings 5. Does the amount of coatings used, include sol for cleanups? 	vents and thinners used in the pro-	thly? Yes X No cess including those used				
PART III: <u>CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTANANCE REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))						
 Is/Are the surface coating operation(s) subject emission limiting standard of Chapter 62-296 Does the facility cause, suffer, allow or perm an objectionable odor? (Rule 62.296.320(2), 	5.500, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3) it the discharge of air pollutants w	(c) (c) 4.b., F.A.C.) \Box Yes \boxtimes No which cause or contribute to				

PART III: <u>CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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 employee	s
	involved in surface coating operations on methods of reducing VOC emissions by:	
		0

a) maintaining spray coating equipment to ensure effective application with a minimum of overspray?	
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)?	Xes 🗌 No
d) implementing inventory control practices to prevent spillage?	Xes 🗌 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

2) recycling cleaning solvents :------ A res A ros A r

	<u>ECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C. <u>Modified Process Equipment</u>		
1. Since	the last inspection has there been		
	1	Yes	No
		Yes	No
1		Yes	No
I	If you answered <u>YES</u> 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
Jeff Morris	2/13/09		

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

2/13/10

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: 2/13/09 - The inspection performed by AQD revealed the facility continues to be deficient with its recordkeeping. Although, the facility provided its total usage of solvent material, it did not maintain records to document the VOC content of the coatings and the quantity of the coatings used. Additionally, the facility did not determine the total quantity of VOC's in such coatings was less than 44 lbs/day averaged on a monthly basis.

AQD provided a spreadsheet on 9/2/08 (see Enforcement Case Detail, compliance file). Additionally, the notes on 9/2/08 by Bill Froberg, AQD staff, states that "data entry has begun.". The facility did not provide this spreadsheet during this inspection and only had its usage records. No reason given by the RO as to why it did not follow the recordkeeping requirements.

Therefore, the facility is in violation for improper recordkeeping, Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C..[jm]