

CHROMIUM ELECTROPLATING/ANODIZING



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INST		
AIRS ID#: 0951287 DATE: <u>5/19/2006</u> FACILITY NAME: ORLANDO PLATIN	ARRIVE: 10:10 AM DEPART: 10:30 AM IG COMPANY	
FACILITY LOCATION: 601 N Orange Blossom Trail ORLANDO 32802		
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: THOMAS	SCOTT PHONE: (407)843-1140	
CONTACT NAME: Brian L. Venables REMITTANCE YEAR: 2005	PHONE: (407)843-1140 ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 5/16/2005 / 5/16/2010 (effective date) (end date)	
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: CLASSIFICATION – Rule 62-213.300 FAC Facility type(s)/applicable standard as indicated on notification form: 1. Hard Chromium Plating a. Existing Large (0.015 mg/dscm)		
 2. Decorative Chromium Plating/Anodizing a. Chromic Acid Bath 1) Emissions of ≤ 0.01/mg/dscm (4.4x10⁻⁶ gr/dscf) 		
b. <u>Trivalent Chromium Bath</u> c. <u>Chromium Anodizing</u>	2) Surface tension of ≤ 45 dynes/cm (3.1x10 ⁻³ lb-f/ft) (<i>May only be selected if a wetting agent is used.</i>) 1) With wetting agent	

PART III: CONTROL TECHNOLOGY - Rule 62-213.300 FAC	
(Select control	
	DEVICE IN USE?
<u>device</u>)	DEVICE IN USE:
1. Composite Mesh Pad	∏Yes ∏No
2. Fiber Bed Mist Eliminator	Yes No
3. Packed Bed Scrubber	Yes No
4. Packed Bed Scrubber/Composite Mesh Pad	Yes No
5. Foam Blanket Fume Suppressant	∏Yes ∏No
6. Fume Suppressant w/ Wetting Agent	⊠Yes □No
Has the facility conducted an initial performance test to establish monitoring parameters? (Not required for sources using a wetting agent or 1-inch foam blanket thickness)	□Yes □No □N/A
PART IV: <u>RECORDKEEPING/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-213.300	0(3)
Has the responsible official maintained the following records?	
1. Quarterly inspection records for add-on air pollution control devices and	
monitoring equipment. (applicable only to a facility using a packed bed scrubbed	r, fiber-bed
mist eliminator, or composite mesh pad)	- ☐Yes ☐No ⊠N/A
2. Operations and Maintenance Plan (OMP). (applicable only to a facility using a	packed bed
scrubber, fiber-bed mist eliminator, or composite mesh pad)	- □Yes □No ⊠N/A
3. Maintenance records for the source, add-on pollution control devices, and	
monitoring equipment (equipment identified, date performed, description)	- ⊠Yes □No
4. Records of date of occurrence, duration, cause, and corrective action of each	
malfunction of process, add-on pollution control device, and monitoring equipment	nt. ⊠Yes □No
5. Results of all performance tests	
6. Records of monitoring data. (not applicable to trivalent chromium baths using	
agent)	□Yes □No ⊠N/A
Composite Mesh Pad	
Measure the pressure drop across the CMP daily	- ∐Yes ∐No
Packed Bed Scrubber	
Measure the pressure drop across the PBS and the inlet velocity daily.	Yes No
Fiber-Bed Mist Eliminator	
Measure the pressure drop across the FBME and the upstream device daily	☐Yes ☐No
Packed Bed Scrubber/Composite Mesh Pad	
Measure the pressure drop across the CMP daily	Yes No
Foam Blanket Fume Suppressant	Dv. Dv.
Measure the foam blanket thickness at the appropriate interval	☐Yes ☐No
Fume Suppressant w/ Wetting Agent Measure the surface tension at the appropriate interval	Yes No
7. Purchase records of wetting agent components	
8. Records of the date and time that fume suppressants are added to the bath	
9. Records of rectifier capacity, if used to determine facility size	
10. Records of the total process operating time	
11. Records identifying specific periods of excess emissions	
12. Startup, Shutdown & Malfunction Plan	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>

Ilka Bundy	5/19/2006
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
	5/19/2007
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Muhammed Jilani, Assistant Manager, was present during the inspection. Brian Venables, General Manager, was off for the day. The surface tension of the baths are measured weekly, according to the records. The facility has been at this location for over 20 years. The Start-Up, Shutdown, Malfunction plan was faxed to the inspector, as requested. Tom Bessa, OCEPD inspector, was also present during the inspection. All other supporting records appeared to be adequate.