Sales.	
- 7	
	-]

ANIMAL CREMATORY



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
AIRS ID#: 1170051 DATE: <u>5/4/09</u> AF	RRIVE: <u>8:00</u> DEPART: <u>10:15</u>
FACILITY NAME: SEMINOLE COUNTY ANIMAL CONT	TROL
FACILITY LOCATION: 232 BUSH BLVD.	
SANFORD 32773	
	$\mathbf{X}_{2} = 1$ DIIONIF. (407) CC5 52 01
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Morgan V	
CONTACT NAME: Mary Beth Lake	PHONE: (407)665-5206
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/1/2007 / 1/1/2012 (effective date) (end date)	
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check	☑ only one box)
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIA	NCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REOUIREMEN	TS – Rule 62-296.401. F.A.C.
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMEN</u> (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
(check appropriate box(es))1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected?	Yes X No
 (check appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 	visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)?	visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter → Visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter → Ves □ No was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)?	Yes ⊠ No visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter Section 2012) Section 2012
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification 	Yes ⊠ No visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 ad within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule Yes □ No vere the remaining applicable standards testing n form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) □Yes ⊠No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w 	Yes ⊠ No visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter Was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 ad within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule Were the remaining applicable standards testing n form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) □Yes ⊠No w the requirements of 100 parts per million by
 (check d appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly ave 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	Yes No visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter Section 2014) Yes No was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 nd within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule Section 2014) Yes No vere the remaining applicable standards testing n form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) Yes ⊠No v the requirements of 100 parts per million by erage basis and tested according to EPA Method Section 2014) Yes ⊠ No
 (check d appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly ave 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	Yes ⊠ No visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter → Was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule → Wes □ No Were the remaining applicable standards testing In form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) □Yes ⊠No we the requirements of 100 parts per million by Parage basis and tested according to EPA Method → Wes □ No (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?
 (check d appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly ave 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	Yes ⊠ No visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter → Was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule → Wes □ No Were the remaining applicable standards testing In form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) □Yes ⊠No we the requirements of 100 parts per million by Parage basis and tested according to EPA Method → Wes □ No (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly ave 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	\Box Yes \boxtimes Novisit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter \boxtimes Yes \square Nowas an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 \square Yes \square Noad within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule \square Yes \square Novere the remaining applicable standards testing \square Yes \square Novere the requirements of 100 parts per million by \square Yes \boxtimes Noverage basis and tested according to EPA Method \square Yes \boxtimes No(Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? \square Yes \boxtimes Noo or below the requirements of 0.080 grains per \bigcirc and tested according to EPA Method 5 \bigcirc Qa and tested according to EPA Method 5 \square Yes \square Noerating at the manufacturers recommended \square Yes \square No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly ave 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	\Box Yes \boxtimes Novisit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter \boxtimes Yes \square Nowas an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 \square Wes \square Noad within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (Rule \square Yes \square Nowere the remaining applicable standards testing \square Yes \square Non form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.) \square Yes \boxtimes Now the requirements of 100 parts per million by \square Yes \boxtimes Now the requirements of 100 parts per million by \square Yes \boxtimes No(Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? \square Yes \boxtimes Noo or below the requirements of 0.080 grains per \bigcirc 2 and tested according to EPA Method 5 \bigcirc 2 and tested according to EPA Method 5 \square Yes \square Noerating at the manufacturers recommended \square Yes \square Non of a test report for an identical crematory unit? \square Yes \square No
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Were there any objectionable odor(s) detected? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted during this site v 62-297, F.A.C.)? 3. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance, w days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, an 62-296.401(6)(j), F.A.C.) 4. In order to demonstrate individual source compliance w completed within 60 days prior to the AGP Notification a) Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions equal to or below volume, dry basis, corrected to 7% O₂ on an hourly ave 10 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	YesYesNovisit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: ChapterYesNowas an annual visible emissions test conducted 60YesNond within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? (RuleYesNowere the remaining applicable standards testingYesNon form submission? (Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C.)YesNowere the requirements of 100 parts per million byYesNowere the requirements of 100 parts per million byYesNowere the requirements of 0.080 grains perYesNoO2 and tested according to EPA Method 5YesNowerating at the manufacturers recommendedYesNowon of a test report for an identical crematory unit?YesNowoYesNoNowoYesNoNo

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 t 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?		
b) Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection for at least two years following the records	ording of	
measurements, maintenance, reports and records?	orung of	Such
	W v.	
1) All measurements (including CEMS)	\boxtimes Yes	
2) Monitoring device	\boxtimes Yes	
3) Performance Testing Measurements	∐Yes	
4) CEMS Performance Evaluation	⊠Yes	
5) All CEMS or monitoring device calibration checks	Yes	
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 <u>BEFORE</u> August 30, 1989 is the:		_
a) secondary chamber combustion zone providing at least a 1.0 second gas residence time @ 1600°F?	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 ON or AFTER August 30, 1989 is the:		
a) volume in the secondary combustion zone sufficient to provide at least a 1.0 second gas residence time	e	
@ 1800° F?	Yes	No No
b) the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than 1600°F	—	_
throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	⊠Yes	□ No
c) secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the crematio		_
process begins in the primary chamber?	⊠Yes	□ No
5. Are appropriate leak-proof containing no more than 0.5 % (percent) by weight chlorinated		_
plastics used during the cremation of dead animals?	Yes	🗌 No
a) If the answer to question 4 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?	Yes	□ No
b) If plastic bags are used for the cremation of animals are they non-chlorinated and no less than 3 mils	<u> </u>	
thick?	Yes	□ No
c) Are dead animals, which have been used for medical or commercial experimentation, or other		
materials, including biomedical wastes (Rule 62-210.200, F.A.C.), incinerated at this location?	Yes	🖂 No
6. During this review period, was the largest batch load cremated 500 pounds per hour or less?		No
7. Have all crematory operators been trained and certified by a Department-approved training program?		
a) Are copies of the training certificates all crematory operators kept on file at the facility for the duration		
of the operator's employment & for an additional two years after termination of employment?		
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>Ivew of Mounted 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	No
a) submitted within the 15 day required window following the training?	Yes	No

Allen Rainey

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS:

1. This INS03 inspection was performed to witness visible emissions testing performed by Kevett Mickle of Grove Scientific & Engineering. The single Crawford model CB1200 crematory was installed in 2006. It has serial #P/0608/567/CB1200/00. It burns natural gas, has a load capacity of 1,200 lbs. and a cremation rate of 300 lbs./hour. It is equipped with a Partlow model MRC 5000 chart recorder. Three photographs of the unit were taken.

2. The unit was off and at ambient outdoor air temperature upon my arrival. It had been preloaded with 1,100 lbs. of animal carcasses in a plastic bag. After the unit was turned on, the temperature in the secondary chamber attained 1,600 degrees F. within 25 minutes. The primary chamber temperature was 223 degrees F. at that point. The digital display monitor temperatures and chart temperatures were always in agreement.

3. Temperature charts were reviewed; only charts from 10/1/08 to 4/30/09 were available. According to Ms. Lake, older ones are archived. Ms. Lake stated in a subsequent phone call that she would contact me by 5/14/09 about providing copies of the archived charts (susequently received copies from January to October 2008). There are no indications of when cremations in the primary chamber begin. The unit Operating Instructions indicate the unit is programed to prevent ignition of the the primary chamber burner until the secondary chamber has reached 1,600 degrees F. According to a Matthews repair sheet, the touch screen and PLC were replaced by non OEM screen and PLC on 3/20/08. However, there is no indication on the temperature charts that the primary chamber burner ignited before the secondary chamber reached 1,600 degrees.

4. There are either no temperature markings or time gaps in the markings on the charts on the following dates: 2/25/08, 2/27/08, 10/21/08, 12/11/08, 12/13/08, 12/18/08, 12/24/08, 12/27/09, 1/10/09, 1/14/09, 1/15/09, 1/20/09, 1/24/09, 1/29/09, 3/25/09, 3/29/09 and 4/27/09. Ms. Lake subsequently reported that the chart pen was incorrectly installed.

5. Operation of the unit below 1,600 degrees F. occurred on the following dates: 1/4/08, 1/7/08, 1/9/08, 1/10/08, 1/13/08, 1/17/08, 2/14/08, 3/19/08, 5/14/08, 7/16/08, 8/22/08, 8/24/08, 10/9/08, 11/24/08, 12/1/08, 12/3/08, 12/7/08, 12/9/08, 2/6/09, 2/10/09, 2/13/09, 2/18/09, 3/12/09, 3/16/09 and 3/18/09. On eight of those days, "flame-out" is written on the chart. Ms. Lake stated nobody constantly watches the unit while it operates and that some operators return to find the unit has flamed-out. She stated within two weeks, operators will constantly supervise the unit.

6. According to the charts, cremations are not performed every day. All cremations are in bulk at 7 - 8 hours long per load and one load per day.

7. Animal remains are cremated in plastic bags. The Material Safety Data Sheet for Regrind-21382, from which the bags are made, indicates the bags contain no chlorinated plastics. The sheet was provided for the Department's files.

8. Ms. Lake reported that in February 2007, there was an electrial fire in the building adjacent to the unit. The unit was subsequently taken out of service.

9. Records obtained for the Department's file show (1) that Matthews Cremation Division equipped the unit with a non-OEM program logic controller (PLC) touch-screen monitor on 3/20/08, (2) the software installed on the PCL by Matthews was for a

human crematory, and (3) that Steve Bunker of Incinerator Repair Specialists replaced the non-OEM PLC with a Crawford OEM PLC touch-screen monitor on 8/7/08. Ms. Lake said that Mr. Bunker is a former Mathhews employee.