WENTA PROTECTION	
Same December	
FLORIDA	

CAST POLYMER OPERATIONS



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE ARMS COMPLAINT NO				
AIRS ID#: 0951320 DATE: <u>11/20/13</u>	ARRIVE: <u>1:45 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>2:08 PM</u>			
FACILITY NAME: CENTRAL FLORIDA MARBLE					
FACILITY LOCATION: 4170 MERCY INDUSTR	RIAL CT				
ORLANDO 32808-381	1				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: CHA Email: CONTACT NAME: SUSAN GUSTAFSON Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/6/2013 / 4/6/2018 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile	E: (407)298-3065			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box) IN COMPLIANCE IN COMPLIANCE IN COMPLIANCE					
 PART II: <u>CONTROL TECHNOLOGY/RECORDKEE</u> (check appropriate box(es)) 1. Does the facility operate any emissions units other which are exempt from permitting pursuant to the chave been exempted from permitting under Rule 62 2. Does the facility comply with the objectionable odd not cause, suffer, allow or permit the discharge of a odor?	than the cast polymer operation riteria of paragraph 62-210.30 2-4.040, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210 or prohibition of subsection 62 ir pollutants which cause or co- esin and gel-coat used exceed 62-210.300(3)(c)6.c., F.A.C.)- cords to document the quantity (b.d., F.A.C.)	ons and emissions units 00(3)(a) or (b), F.A.C., or 0.300(3)(c)6.a., F.A.C.) ☐Yes ⊠ No 2-296.320(2), F.A.C. and ontribute to an objectionable 			

PART III: <u>CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.

(check \blacksquare appropriate box(es))

1.	Does the owner or operator voluntarily encourage pollution prevention through such measures as training employees involved in product fabrication on methods of reducing evaporative losses by:
	a) lessening the exposure of fresh resin surfaces to the air? Xyes No
	b) maintaining spray lay-up equipment to ensure effective application with a minimum of overspray? $\overline{\square}$ Yes $\overline{\square}$ No
	c) monitoring the coating thickness to avoid excessive resin/get coat application? Xes Ves Ves
	d) implementing inventory control practices to prevent spillage?
	e) managing cleanup solvents? 🖾 Yes 🗌 No
2.	Does the owner or operator make every reasonable effort to conduct the specific activity authorized by the
	general permit in a manner that minimizes adverse effects on adjacent property or on public use of the
	adjacent property, where applicable, and on the environment, including fish, wildlife, natural resources,
	water quality, or air quality? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
3.	Does the owner or operator maintain the permitted facility, emission unit, or activity in good condition? Xes 🗌 No

PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u>	
 Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment? 	Yes No
 b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form? d) If you answered YES 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

Norma Ali

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

11/20/2013

Date of Inspection

12/31/2014

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The OCEPD inspector Norma Ali, met with Susan Gustafson, who provided the amount of resin and gel coat usage for the last twelve months from October 2012 to September 2013 as follows: Gel coat 2,537 lbs and Resin 91,730 lbs, a total of 94,267 lbs (47.13 tons), this amounts were taken from adding up all the purchase receipts made during this period. The usage amount is below permit limit of 284,000 lbs (142 tons); and Mr. Charles Gustafson, who together with the inspector, conducted a walkhtrough of the facility. The facility has a spray booth and the filters appeared to be in good condition. An sanding area was observed, two small vacuums/dust collectors were observed. Only one employee was observed polishing some culture marble trims. According to Mr. Gustafson, business is picking up, but still the facility went from 35 to 7 employees. The waste is picked up by Environmental Enterprise Co. The building is still for sale. No objectionable odors were noted or dust leaving the property was observed. The facility appears to be in compliance with the air general permit at the time of inspection.