

## <u>HUMAN CREMATORY</u> COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)						
	RE-INSPECTION					
FA	CILITY: Richard E. Sorensen Funer	DISTRICT:				
	<b>BA/Site Name:</b> Gee & Sorensen Fu	Southwest				
AI	<b>DDRESS:</b> 3180 30th. Avenue N	Vorth	CONTACT PHONE:			
	St. Petersburg, FL		727-323-5111			
AF	RMS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 5/10/12			
	1030516 001	1030516-002-AG	Renewal Date:         4/10/12           Test Date:         7/17/00			
<i>EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION:</i> Human Crematory: B&L Systems, Model Phoenix II-1. Must operate at 1,600 degrees F. in the secondary chamber. Nominal batch weight of 300 pounds. Larger weights require special operating procedures.						
IN	SPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (c)	heck only one box)			
3	3/13/09	☑ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Comp	liance; Significant Non-Compliance			
		PART I: General Review:				
1.	Permit File Review		⊠Yes □ No			
2.	Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No			
	Comments: Inspection of the area Gee & Sorensen Funeral home crematory unit was conducted following odor complaint # 68927 received by AQ Division office. This emission unit was inspected in and to attempt to detect any odors or smoke from the incinerator stack. Prior to the onsite inspection up wind and down wind inspection of the facility was conducted. No odor or smoke detected. I met with the crematory manager, Mr. Eric Drew for the inspection of the facility and emission unit.					
	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	manager, Mr. Enc Drew for the			
3.	inspection of the facility and emiss  Is the Authorized Representative st	sion unit.  ill <u>Richard Sorensen</u> ?	Yes □ No			
3.	inspection of the facility and emiss	ill Richard Sorensen? ills the Authorized Representative. Sorensen?				
	Is the Authorized Representative st Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen still Is the facility contact still Richard S Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen still	ill Richard Sorensen? ills the Authorized Representative. Sorensen?	⊠Yes □ No			
4.	Is the Authorized Representative st Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard S Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did t [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]  PART II: TE	ill Richard Sorensen? ills the Authorized Representative. Sorensen? ills the facility contact.				
4. 5. <u>Con</u>	Is the Authorized Representative st Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard S Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did t [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]  PART II: TE (check appropriate bottompliance Demonstration [62-296.401(5)] New Facility / New Process Equations	sion unit.  ill Richard Sorensen?  ills the Authorized Representative.  Sorensen?  ills the facility contact.  the facility provide an administrative update of the solution o	Yes □ No  □ Yes □ No  within 30 days? □ Yes □ No  01(5), F.A.C. indicate noncompliance)			
4. 5. <u>Con</u>	Is the Authorized Representative st Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard Sorensen sta If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did to [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]  PART II: TH (check appropriate bottom limits facility / New Process Equal Did this facility demonstrate initial com  Existing Facilities	sion unit.  ill Richard Sorensen?  ills the Authorized Representative.  Sorensen?  ills the facility contact.  the facility provide an administrative update of the facility provide an administrative update of the facility provide and administrati	Yes □ No    Yes □ No   No   Yes □ No   No   Yes □ No   No   Yes □ No   Yes □ No   No   Yes □ No			
4. 5. Con 1. 2.	Is the Authorized Representative st Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard S Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard S Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did t [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]  PART II: TH (check appropriate both specific properties of the second state of the second state of the submitted visible emission test minute average, except that visible emission test six minutes in any one-hour period? [69]	sion unit.  ill Richard Sorensen?  ills the Authorized Representative.  Sorensen?  ills the facility contact.  the facility provide an administrative update of the facility provide and administrative update of the faci	Yes			
4. 5. Con 1. 2.	Is the Authorized Representative st Comments: Mr. Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard Sorensen sta Is the facility contact still Richard Sorensen sta If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did to [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]  PART II: THE (check appropriate becompliance Demonstration [62-296.401(5)]  New Facility / New Process Equal Did this facility demonstrate initial com Existing Facilities Was an annual visible emissions complete the Submitted visible emission test minute average, except that visible emission test minutes in any one-hour period? [6] The last visible emission test resulted in	ill Richard Sorensen? ills the Authorized Representative.  Sorensen? ills the facility contact. the facility provide an administrative update of the facility provide an administrative				

PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296. 401(5), F.A.C. (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)				
4.	Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the			
	test was completed? [62-297.310(8)(b)			
5.	Was the facility visible emissions test(s) conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-297.401(9)(c), F.A.C]	- 🛚 Yes	∐ No	
6.	Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according to EPA Method 9?	- 🗌 Yes	⊠ No	
	<ul> <li>a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity ofn/a% for the highest six minute average.</li> <li>b) Did the test indicate the facility is operating in compliance with the opacity standard?</li> </ul>	- □ Vos	$\square$ $N_0$	
7	Is there any reason to ask for a special test to determine compliance with the PM and CO standards?			
<i>/</i> ·	is there any reason to ask for a special test to determine compliance with the 1 M and CO standards:		<u> </u>	
	PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance	)		
1.	Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?	- Tyes	⊠ No	
	An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were:  Downwind odor level detected-0; Wind direction - E Upwind odor level detected-0(1-10)			
2				
2.	Continuous Monitoring System – [62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.]  a) Is a continuous temperature monitoring system installed on each unit to record temperatures in the			
	secondary chamber in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions?	- 🛛 Yes	$\square$ No	
	b) Is the temperature probe properly placed, at least at the distance where the 1.0 second gas residence time at $\Box 1,800^1$ $\boxtimes 1,600^2$ degrees was determined?	$\nabla V_{ac}$	$\square$ No	
	c) Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection for at least two years following the	- M Tes		
	recording of such measurements, maintenance, reports and records?	N-4		
	1) All temperature measurements	- ⊠ Yes	$\square$ No	
	monitoring system all continuous performance evaluations	- X Yes	$\square$ No	
	3) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks (last performed on (9-22-08)	- X Yes	$\square$ No	
	4) Adjustments		$\bigcup_{N} No$	
	5) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices 6) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices		$\square$ No No	
	7) Are the temperature charts properly documented with operator name, operator indication of	- 2 163		
	when cremation in the primary chamber was begun, date, time, and temperature markings	- X Yes	$\square$ No	
	8) Are all the above records available for at least 2 years?			
	9) Was the crematory unit installed after 2/1/07? If yes go to 10)a) – c)	- ⊠ Yes	$\square$ No	
	a) Is the crematory unit equipped and operated with a pollutant monitoring system to automatically control combustion based on continuous in-stack opacity measurement?	- X Vos	$\bigcap N_{O}$	
	b) Is the system calibrated to restrict combustion in the primary chamber whenever any opacity	Z 165		
	exceeds 15% opacity?	- X Yes	$\square$ No	
	c) Has the opacity measurement system been cleaned and checked for proper operation in accordance with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule?	- X Yes	$\square$ No	
	1 – Application received on or after 8/30/89; 2 – Application received prior to 8/30/89	Z 105		
3.	Was this crematory unit application to construct: [62-296.401(5)(c), F.A.C.] (check only one box)			
	a) BEFORE August 30, 1989? (If this box checked, continue on to #4 and skip #5) b) On or AFTER August 30, 1989? (If this box checked, skip #4 and continue on to #5)			
1	If the application to construct was <b>BEFORE</b> August 30, 1989 is the:			
7.	a) secondary chamber combustion zone providing at least a 1.0 second gas residence time @ 1600°F?	- Yes	$\square$ 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	$\square$ No	
	c) cremation in the primary chamber begun after the secondary chamber combustion zone temperature is equal to or greater than $1400^{\circ}F$ ?	- 🗌 Yes	☐ No	
5.	If the application to construct <u>ON</u> or <u>AFTER</u> August 30, 1989 is the:			
	a) volume in the secondary combustion zone sufficient to provide at least a 1.0 second gas residence time	N		
	@ 1800° F?b) actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600° F	- ⊠ Yes	$\square$ No	

2 of 3 Revised 05/08

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS				
(check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance				
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	X Yes   No			
c) secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than $1600^{\circ}F$ before the cremation process begins in the primary chamber?	$\nabla V_{ac} \square N_{a}$			
process begins in the primary chamber:	\( \text{Ies} \) \( \text{Ivo} \)			
6. Are appropriate cremation containers containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated				
6. Are appropriate cremation containers containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated plastics used during the cremation of dead human bodies, as demonstrated by MSD sheet?	X Yes \ \ No			
[62-296.401(5)(d), F.A.C.]	Z 105			
a) If the answer to question 6 above is YES, is certifying documentation from the manufacturer that they				
are composed of 0.5% or less by weight chlorinated plastics kept on file at the site for the duration of				
their use and for at least two years after their use?	$\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No			
b) Are there any other materials, including biomedical wastes (Rule 62-210.200, FAC) incinerated at	$\square v_{-} \nabla v_{-}$			
this location?	Yes No			
DADENT E . AM . A				
PART IV: <u>Equipment Maintenance</u> (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)	a)			
	<del>(</del> )			
<b>Equipment Maintenance:</b> – [62-296.401(5)(e), F.A.C.]				
1. Is the crematory unit maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications?	🛛 Yes 🔲 No			
2. Are there maintenance/repair/adjustment records kept onsite for at least 2 years?	🛛 Yes 🔲 No			
3. Is there a written plan onsite which addresses the operating procedures during startup,				
shutdown and malfunction?	🛛 Yes 🔲 No			
4. Does the crematory allow for a visible check on the flame characteristics?	X Yes  No			
If yes go to $a = b$				
a) Was the flame characteristic visually checked at least once during each operating shift?b) Was the flame adjusted when necessary?	$Yes \square No$			
b) was the fame adjusted when necessary.	Z 1es			
PART V: Special Conditions And Procedures  (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance	o)			
	<u>e)                                    </u>			
Administrative Changes:				
1. Were there any change in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative				
not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility	$\square V_{as} \boxtimes N_{a}$			
2. If yes, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]				
Permit Effective Period – [62-210.310(3)(a), F.A.C.]  1. Is the general permit for this facility still within the 5 year effective period?	$\bigvee V_{as} \square N_{a}$			
2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 prior to permit expiration?	<u> </u> Yes <u> </u> No			
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership				
C Since the last registration form submittal has there been [62-210.310 (2)(b)2, F.A.C				
a) Installation of any new process equipment?	Tes No			
b) Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes X No			
c) Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?d) A change in ownership?	$\neg \neg \sqcup Yes \boxtimes No$			
If the any of the answers to $1a - 1$ is <u>Yes</u> to any, a new registration form and appropriate fee should	🗀 Tes 🖂 No			
have been submitted 30 days prior to the change	🗌 Yes 🔲 No			
Noncompliance Notice: - [62-210.310(3)(i), F.A.C.]  1. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or				
limitation of the air general permit?				
If the answer is <u>Yes</u> , proceed to a) and b).				

3 of 3 Revised 05/08

Inspector's Signature H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\1030516 001 6	Approximate Date of Next Inspection 66816.doc
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection
Mike Ojo Thomas	3/13/09
this time.	
Exit Interview: During the closing conference, I informed Mr	Patrick O' Neal, facility appears to be in compliance at
_	
Reviewed temperature charts for the months of 10/1/2008 through	gh 3/13/2009.
No Visible Emissions test was performed. The unit was not in ope	
	: <u>Comments</u>
continue, and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent	recurrence of the noncompliance?
2. The period of noncompliance, including dates and times; or if n	not corrected, the anticipated time the noncompliance is expected to
b) Did the notification include:  1. A description of and cause of noncompliance?	

4 of 3 Revised 05/08