



CAST POLYMER OPERATIONS

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☒ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 0810172 **DATE:** 09112007 **ARRIVE:** 1348 **DEPART:** 1440
FACILITY NAME: FLORENTINE MARBLE MANUFACTURING CORP
FACILITY LOCATION: 1657 W UNIVERSITY PKWY
SARASOTA 34243-2732
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: WILLIAM JOHNSON **PHONE:** (941)355-9683
CONTACT NAME: Charlie Johnson **PHONE:** (941)355-4683
REMITTANCE YEAR: **ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:** 8/26/2006 / 8/26/2011
(effective date) (end date)

PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☒ only one box)

☒ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: CONTROL TECHNOLOGY/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

1. Does the facility operate any emissions units other than the cast polymer operations and emissions units which are exempt from permitting pursuant to the criteria of paragraph 62-210.300(3)(a) or (b), F.A.C., or have been exempted from permitting under Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)6.a., F.A.C.) ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the facility comply with the objectionable odor prohibition of subsection 62-296.320(2), F.A.C. and not cause, suffer, allow or permit the discharge of air pollutants which cause or contribute to an objectionable odor?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Does the combined quantity of styrene containing resin and gel-coat used exceed 284,000 pounds (142 tons) in any consecutive twelve month period? (Chapter 62-210.300(3)(c)6.c., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
4. Does the owner/operator of the facility maintain records to document the quantity of resin and gel-coat used on a monthly basis? (Chapter 62-210.300(3)(c)6.d., F.A.C.)----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
5. Does the owner/operator retain, and make available for Department inspection, these records for a period of at least five years? (Chapter 62-210.300(3)(c)6.d., F.A.C.)----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
6. Is this cast polymer operation subject to a volatile organic compound (VOC) Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) emission limiting standard of Chapter 62-296.500, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)6.b., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☒ No

PART III: CONTROL/OPERATING/MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.(check ☒ 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?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - b) maintaining spray lay-up equipment to ensure effective application with a minimum of overspray? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - c) monitoring the coating thickness to avoid excessive resin/get coat application?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - d) implementing inventory control practices to prevent spillage?----- ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.(check ☒ appropriate box(es))**A. New or Modified Process Equipment**

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 **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

Joseph V. Panetta

09072007

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

2008

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Inspection was conducted by Joe Panetta and Max Grondahl. Met with Mr Charlie Johnson. We performed a complete walk through of facility. Inspection of facility seemed to be in compliance at time of inspection with the exception of records.

Field Warning notice was giving because Mr. Charlie Johnson did not know how to access records on computer. Mr. William Johnson was on vacation and would back in ten days to send in the records. Records were received for review see attached.