

ANIMAL CREMATORY



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0970005 DATE: 1/15/10 ARRIVE: DEPART:		
FACILITY NAME: KISSIMMEE ANIMAL DISEASE DIAGNOSTIC LAB		
FACILITY LOCATION: 2700 N JOHN YOUNG PKWY		
KISSIMMEE 34741-1266		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: MARTIN TIER PHONE: (321)697-1404		
CONTACT NAME: Dr. Herman Reid PHONE: (321)697-1404		
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/26/2009 / 3/26/2014 (effective date) (end date)		
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) □ IN COMPLIANCE ☑ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE □ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	}	
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))		
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?	Yes	🖂 No
(check 🗹 appropriate box(es))	☐ Yes □Yes	
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	Yes	
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	Yes	
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (F 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.)	□Yes Rule □Yes	No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (F 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.)	☐Yes Rule ☐Yes ☐Yes ☐Yes	 No No No No No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	☐Yes Rule ☐Yes ☐Yes	 No No No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Fe 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.)	☐Yes Rule ☐Yes ☐Yes ☐Yes ☐Yes	 No No No No No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (F 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance were the remaining applicable standards testing completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below the requirements of 100 parts per million by volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly average basis and tested according to EPA Method 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	□Yes Rule □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes	 □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?	□Yes Rule □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes	 No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?	□Yes Rule □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Yes □Ye	 □ No

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

1. Is there Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) equipment installed on each unit to record temperatures in the primary and secondary chambers where there is a 1.0 second gas residence time in the secondary chamber combustion zone in				
	∐ No			
Yes	No No			
ording of	such			
Yes	🛛 No			
Yes	🛛 No			
Yes	No No			
Yes	🗌 No			
Yes	No No			
⊠Yes	🗌 No			
⊠Yes	🗌 No			
⊠Yes	🗌 No			
_				
Yes	□ No			
TYes	□ No			
⊠Yes	□ No			
	🛛 No			
م				
	🗌 No			
$\Box \mathbf{V}_{\alpha\beta}$	🖂 No			
	□ No			
∐ i es				
	🗌 No			
<u>Y</u> es	∐ No			
—	—			
Yes	l No			
	No No			
=	No No			
	l No			
n				
Yes	l No			
	nbustion Yes Yes ording of Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes			

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

A. <u>New of Wouncu Process Equipment</u>		
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	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
recent notification form?	⊠Yes	∐No
d) 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
2. If a crematory unit has been modified to the extent that a Department air construction permit	_	_
was required, have all operators been retrained to operate the modified unit?	Yes	∐No
3. In the case of new or modified equipment, where a Department air construction permit was	—	<u> </u>
required, has the owner submitted copies of all operator training certificates?	Yes	
a) submitted within the 15 day required window following the training?	Yes	∐No

Allen Rainey

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

1/15/10

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS:

 I, Allen Rainey, performed an INS2 compliance inspection for the Keller Mechanical & Engineering crematory, model #KM2400S, serial #62209685. The unit is fueled by natural gas. Dr. Herman Reid, Pathologist and Mr. Angel Sapuleuda, crematory operator, escorted me to the crematory and provided requested records. Use of the Keller unit began in August 2009; it took the place of the old crematory which is still on-site. A notification form was submitted to the Department on 2/26/09.
 The crematory was not operating upon my arrival. Mr. Sapuleuda stated that before my arrival, the unit was loaded with two horses and a cow before it was started. The temperature chart shows the unit was started at 8:30 a.m., but it turned off 15 minutes later after reaching 1,350 degrees F. The Schneider Electric LCD control panel showed no system errors. Mr. Sapuleuda stated two weeks ago, the unit began cutting off 4 to 5 times a day.

3. The first cremation done this year was on 1/6/10 or 1/7/10. Cremation temperatures for both dates overlap on the same chart; Mr. Sapuleuda said the 1/7/10 cremation was of the remains of the previous day. The temperature chart was on the chart recorder, and it appears that the unit cut off about five hours after the 1/7/10 cremation started. Mr. Sapuleuda reported that there was a problem with the fuel valve, which was repaired.

4. I reviewed cremation temperature charts from January 2008 to the present. From January to December 2008, 69 cremations were done. Approximately 95% of the charts in that period have either incomplete or no temperature markings. From January to December 2009, many of the charts show either incomplete or no temperature markings, and one on 8/4/09 shows evidence that the crematory shut down while cremating. The new unit records two marks per cremation: one red (temperature), the other green (Mr. Sapuleuda is not sure what it is for). Obtained copies of selected temperature charts for Department files.

5. Reviewed maintenance/repair records in an EXCEL spreadsheet (QA Report). It shows that on 8/25/09, the small primary chamber door actuation switch that was loose was tightened. On 12/24/09, gas lines failed and regulators were replaced. On 12/28/09, the gas valves were replaced again because they were shutting off when the gas moved too fast. Obtained some copies of invoices for crematory work performed for Department flies.

6. The thermocouple is located approximately 12 feet high from ground level in the secondary chamber, which is located above the primary chamber. It was not checked for temperature or measures because of height safety concerns and the unit was not operating.7. Red body bags are incinerated. A Material Safely Data Sheet (MSDS) for the body bags was not provided upon request. Dr. Reid stated the bag manufacturer, Fisher Scientific, is having trouble providing an MSDS.

 A crematory System and Operation Procedures (SOP) manual prepared by the facility is currently in draft form and is revised annually (copy obtained for Department flies). It is for the crematories at two locations: Kissimmee and Live Oak, Florida.
 Summary of noncompliance items discussed with Dr. Alice Agasan, Bureau Chief, Dr. Reid, and Mr. Sapuleuda: (1) no indication of start of cremation, (2) unit containing a defect was not shut down, (3) no temperature markings, (4) no MSDS (requested they be provided by 1/19/10).

10. Questions 3 - 8 in Part II, 3 & 7 in Part III, and 2 & 3 in Part IV are not applicable. Question 5 in Part III is unknown.