A AND	
FLORIDA	

## HUMAN CREMATORY



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:       ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)       Image: Comparison of the second secon	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 1090453 DATE: 2/5/08	ARRIVE: <u>1005</u>	DEPART: <u>1115</u>		
FACILITY NAME: PONTE VEDRA VALLEY				
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 4750 Palm Valley Road				
PONTE VEDRA BEAC	Н 32082-			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: PAT	RICIA WEST PHONE:	(904)285-3392		
CONTACT NAME:	PHONE:			
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/8/2007 / 4/8/2012 (effective date) (end date)				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch	neck 🗹 only one box)			
IN COMPLIANCE IMINOR Non-COMP	LIANCE SIGNIFICANT	Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C.				
	<u> 1ENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.	С.		
<ul> <li>(check d appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> </ul>	site visit according to EPA Metho	☐ Yes ⊠ No od 9 (Ref.: Chapter ⊠Yes □ No		
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	site visit according to EPA Methonice, was an annual visible emission, and within 60 days prior to eac	□ Yes ⊠ No         od 9 (Ref.: Chapter       □ Yes □ No          ⊠Yes □ No         ons test conducted 60       □ Yes □ No         ch anniversary date?       □ Yes □ No		
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>3. In order to demonstrate individual source complian days prior to the AGP Notification form submission (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)</li> <li>4. In order to demonstrate individual source complian completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or box</li> </ul>	site visit according to EPA Metho ace, was an annual visible emission on, and within 60 days prior to eac ace were the remaining applicable cation form submission? (Rule 62 below the requirements of 100 par	□ Yes ⊠ No         od 9 (Ref.: Chapter       □ Yes □ No         ons test conducted 60       □ Yes □ No         ch anniversary date?       □ Yes □ No          □ Yes □ No         e standards testing       □ Yes □ No         2-210.300(4), F.A.C.)       □ Yes □ No         rts per million by       □ Yes □ No		
<ul> <li>(check d appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	site visit according to EPA Metho nce, was an annual visible emission on, and within 60 days prior to eac nce were the remaining applicable cation form submission? (Rule 62 below the requirements of 100 par y average basis and tested according od 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.	□ Yes ⊠ No         od 9 (Ref.: Chapter       □ Yes □ No         ons test conducted 60       □ Yes □ No         ch anniversary date?       □ Yes □ No         e standards testing       □ Yes □ No         c-210.300(4), F.A.C.)       □ Yes □ No         rts per million by       □ Yes □ No         ing to EPA Method       □ Yes □ No         C.)?       □ Yes □ No		
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	site visit according to EPA Metho ince, was an annual visible emission on, and within 60 days prior to each ince were the remaining applicable cation form submission? (Rule 62 below the requirements of 100 part y average basis and tested accordin od 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.0 ual to or below the requirements to 7% $O_2$ and tested according to F			
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliant days prior to the AGP Notification form submission (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)</li> <li>4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliant completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notifica a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or b volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O<sub>2</sub> on an hourly 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	site visit according to EPA Metho ace, was an annual visible emission on, and within 60 days prior to eac ace were the remaining applicable cation form submission? (Rule 62 below the requirements of 100 par y average basis and tested accordin od 3 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A. ual to or below the requirements to 7% $O_2$ and tested according to F re operating at the manufacturers to ission of a test report for an identi- to the date of the last formal com	□ Yes ⊠ No         od 9 (Ref.: Chapter       □ Yes □ No         ons test conducted 60       □ Yes □ No         ch anniversary date?       □ Yes □ No          □ Yes □ No         ce standards testing       □ Yes □ No         2-210.300(4), F.A.C.)       □ Yes □ No         rts per million by       □ Yes □ No         ing to EPA Method       □ Yes □ No          □ Yes □ No         of 0.080 grains per       □ Yes □ No         EPA Method 5       □ Yes □ No         recommended       □ Yes □ No         ical crematory unit?       □ Yes □ No         pliance test?       □ Yes □ 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	
primary and secondary chambers where there is a 1.0 second gas residence time in the secondary chamber co	
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 re	cording of such
measurements, maintenance, reports and records?	
1) All measurements (including CEMS)	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
2) Monitoring device	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
3) Performance Testing Measurements	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
4) CEMS Performance Evaluation	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
5) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks	Yes 🗌 No
6) Adjustments	Yes 🗌 No
7) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices	Yes 🗍 No
8) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices	Yes 🗍 No
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 <b><u>BEFORE</u></b> August 30, 1989 is the:	
a) secondary chamber combustion zone providing at least a 1.0 second gas residence time @ <b>1600°F</b> ?	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?	Yes No
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?	Yes No
4. If constructed <b>ON</b> or <b>AFTER</b> August 30, 1989 is the:	
a) volume in the secondary combustion zone sufficient to provide at least a 1.0 second gas residence tir	
@ 1800° F?	Yes 🗌 No
b) the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than $1600^{\circ}F$	
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	⊠Yes 🗌 No
c) secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than <b>1600°F</b> before the crematic	
process begins in the primary chamber?	Yes 🗌 No
5. Are appropriate cremation containers containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated	
plastics used during the cremation of dead human bodies?	⊠Yes 🗌 No
a) If the answer to question 4 above is YES, is certifying documentation from the manufacturer that the	У
are composed of 0.5% or less by weight chlorinated plastics kept on file at the site for the duration o	f
their use and for at least two years after their use?	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
b) Are there any other materials, including biomedical wastes (Rule 62-210.200, FAC) incinerated at	
this location?	🔤 Yes 🔯 No
6. Have all crematory operators been trained and certified by a Department-approved training program?	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
a) Are copies of the training certificates for all crematory operators kept on file at the facility for the du	
of the operator's employment & for an additional two years after termination of employment?	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

## PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 62-296.401, F.A.C.

A. <u>New or Modified 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 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	_	
required, has the owner submitted copies of all operator training certificates?	Yes	<u>No</u>
a) submitted within the 15 day required window following the training?	Yes	No

Raymond Barata

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

2/5/08

Date of Inspection

2/5/09

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** Met with Jacqueline Headrick/ Office Manager and brent Headrick/ Funeral Director Operator. The cremation unit is in operation for scheduled visible emission testing. Mark Gierke from Southern Environmental Sciences, Inc. conducted the VE testing. No visible emissions and objectionable odor noted.