

## Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District Office 2353 Jenks Avenue Panama City, Florida 32405-4389 Rick Scott Governor

Jennifer Carroll
Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr. Secretary

February 24, 2012

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL citymanager@cityoflynnhaven.com

Mr. John B. Lynch City Manager Lynn Haven Animal Control 1825 Ohio Avenue Lynn Haven, Florida 32444

Dear Mr. Lynch:

On February 13, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected the Lynn Haven Animal Control crematory ID 0050078. A copy of the inspection report is enclosed. The inspection and a review of Department records indicate the facility was in compliance at the time of the inspection for those items specifically noted in the inspection report.

This letter applies only to activities covered by the Air Resource Management Program. If you have any questions, please contact C. Mark Sumner at 850/767-0046, or by email at <a href="mark.c.sumner@dep.state.fl.us">mark.c.sumner@dep.state.fl.us</a>.

Sincerely,

Clifford D. Wilson III, P.E.

Panama City Branch Administrator

CDW/ms

Enclosure

c: Ms. Mary Beth Curle, FDEP Pensacola (<u>mary.beth.curle@dep.state.fl.us</u>)
Ms. Carol Melton, FDEP Pensacola (<u>carol.melton@dep.state.fl.us</u>)



## **ANIMAL CREMATORY**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DIS  ARMS COMPLAI	, ,				
AIRS ID#: 0050078 DATE: <u>2/13/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>11:12</u>	<b>DEPART:</b> <u>12:03</u>				
FACILITY NAME: LYNN HAVEN ANIMAL CO	ONTROL					
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 1751 Recreational	Dr					
LYNN HAVEN	32444-					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CITYMANGER@CITYOFLYNNHAVE CONTACT NAME: Ramona Bibbs Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/24/2007 / 3/24/ (effective date) (end decomposition)	EN.COM	PHONE: (850)265-2121 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:				
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Ramona Bi	<u>ibbs</u>	(check ☑ box for each	•			
Brief Notes: <u>I met with Ramona Bibbs anf the re</u>						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still JOHN LYN If no, who is?: NA	VCH?	X Yes	□No			
If different, did the facility provide an administrat  3. Is the facility contact still Ramona Bibbs If no, who is?: NA	tive update within 30 days?		□No □No			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at le			⊠No □No			

## Emissions Unit Section 1 –Power-Pak Junior Animal Crematory (1.3 MMBtu/hr nat. gas)

PA	ART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹	only one
			question)
l.	a. Complete AC application or, if no AC permit, initial GP registration received on or		
l	after August 30, 1989?	Yes	⊠No
	b. If yes, were design calculations provided then to confirm a sufficient volume in the		
	secondary chamber combustion zone to provide for at least a 1.0 second gas residence time		
	at 1800 degrees Fahrenheit? N/A	. Yes	□No
2.	Manufacturer's recommended capacity: <u>120</u> ⊠ lbs for batch unit □ lbs/hr for ram-charged unit.		
	Crematory unit installed after February 1, 2007?	☐ Yes	⊠No
	Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/24/2011}{2}$		
	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	□No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		⊠No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		<u></u>
	operation? N/A	☐ Yes	□No
	d. Date of last VE test: 2/24/2011	L	
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	⊠ Yes	□No
	f. Did the facility demonstrate compliance during the last VE test?	⊠ Yes	□No
	If no, what was the problem (if known)? NA	Z 1 C5	
	11 no, what was the problem (it known).		
_			
PA	ART II: VISIBLE EMISSIONS TESTING		1
_	7 20222		only one
		box for each o	luestion)
1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	⊠No
	Operating capacity during test? $\underline{0}$ $\square$ lbs for batch unit $\square$ lbs/hr for ram-charged unit	L 1+0	Z3 ( )
	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity?	□ Yes	□No
	Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations?		es □No
	Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		No
	The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six minute average.	1 🔲 105	□1
	Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit? $\mathbb{N}$ $\mathbb{N}$	□ Ves	□No
1.	(5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minutes		
	(3% opacity, SIX-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 13% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minutes	In any one-nour,	
2	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector during this site visit?	Yes	⊠No
	Operating capacity during test? $\underline{0}$ $\square$ lbs for batch unit $\square$ lbs/hr for ram-charged unit	1 CS	∠ <u>\</u> 1 <b>\</b> U
a. h	Operating capacity during test? $\underline{0}$ $\underline{\square}$ its for valentinit $\underline{\square}$ its/in for rain-charged unit		
	Was the energing connecting reports then the manufacturer's recommended connective?	□ v <sub>es</sub>	$\square$ No
	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? N/A		□No
c.	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity?	Yes	□No
c. d.	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity?	Yes	
c. d. e.	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? $\boxtimes$ N/A Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? $\boxtimes$ N/A The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $0\%$ for the highest six minute average.	Yes Yes	□No □No
c. d. e.	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? $\bigcirc$ N/A Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? $\bigcirc$ N/A The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six minute average. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit? $\bigcirc$ N/A	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□No
c. d. e.	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? $\boxtimes$ N/A Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? $\boxtimes$ N/A The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $0\%$ for the highest six minute average.	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□No □No
c. d. e. f. l	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? $\bigcirc$ N/A Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? $\bigcirc$ N/A The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six minute average. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit? $\bigcirc$ N/A (5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minutes	Yes Yes Yes in any one-hour)	□No □No
c. d. e. f. l	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? $\bigcirc$ N/A Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? $\bigcirc$ N/A The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six minute average. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit? $\bigcirc$ N/A	Yes Yes Yes in any one-hour)	☐No ☐No ☐No
c. d. e. f. 1	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity?	Yes Yes Yes in any one-hour)	□No □No
c. d. e. f. 1	Was the operating capacity greater than the manufacturer's recommended capacity? $\bigcirc$ N/A Was the test conducted with the unit operating at a capacity that is representative of normal operations? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? $\bigcirc$ N/A The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six minute average. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the limit? $\bigcirc$ N/A (5% opacity, six-minute average, except that visible emissions not exceeding 15% opacity shall be allowed for up to six minutes	Yes Yes Yes in any one-hour)	☐No ☐No ☐No

PA	ART III: MONITORING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS	(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
1	Were there any objectionable odors detected?	Yes	question) ⊠No
1.	An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were:	L 1 es	☑N0
	Wind direction - North Downwind odor level detected- Upwind odor level detected- Scale: 1-1	10 (worst)	
	Continuous Monitoring Systems –		
	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	□No
b	Is the temperature probe properly placed, at least at the distance where the 1.0 second gas residence time at $\square$ 1,800 $^1$ $\boxtimes$ 1,600 $^2$ degrees was determined?	⊠ Yes	□No
c.	Are the following records kept on file, available for inspection, for at least the past two years?  (1) All temperature measurements	⊠ Yes	□No
	monitoring system all continuous performance evaluations	- ⊠ Yes ☐ Yes	□No ⊠No
	(4) Adjustments		□No
	(5) Preventive maintenance performed on systems/devices		□No
	(6) Corrective maintenance performed on systems/devices	⊠ Yes	□No
	Are the temperature charts properly documented with operator name, operator indication of when cremation in the primary chamber was begun, date, time, and temperature markings	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□No ⊠No
	<ul> <li>(1) Is the crematory unit equipped and operated with a pollutant monitoring system to automatic control combustion based on continuous in-stack opacity measurement?</li></ul>	☐ Yes	□No
	exceeds 15% opacity? N/A  (3) Has the opacity measurement system been cleaned and checked for proper operation in		□No
	accordance with the manufacturer's recommended maintenance schedule?	Yes	□No
		(check <b></b> ✓	only one
PA	ART IV: SECONDARY COMBUSTION ZONE TEMPERATURES	box for each	
	If the application to construct was <b>BEFORE</b> August 30, 1989 is the: a. actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than <b>1400°F</b>		
	throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	Yes	□No
2	process begins in the primary chamber? N/A  If the application to construct <b>ON</b> or <b>AFTER</b> August 30, 1989 is the:	☐ Yes	□No
۷.	a. the actual operating temperature of the secondary chamber combustion zone no less than <b>1600°F</b> throughout the combustion process in the primary chamber?	⊠ Yes	□No
	b. secondary chamber combustion zone temperature equal to or greater than 1600°F before the cremat process begins in the primary chamber?		□No
	r		
DA	ART V: ALLOWED MATERIALS	(check <b>✓</b> box for each	only one question) 1
FA	IRT V: ALLOWED MATERIALS	oon for <b>cuc</b> in	question)
	Besides animal remains and, if applicable, the bedding associated with the animals and appropriate corare any other materials, including biomedical wastes, incinerated in the unit? $$		⊠No
2.	Do containers contain no more than 0.5 percent by weight chlorinated plastics as certified by the manufacturer?	⊠ Yes ∨ ⊠ Yes	□No

PART VI: EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE		(check 🗹 only one box for each question)			
<ol> <li>Is the crematory unit maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications?</li> <li>Is there a written plan onsite which addresses the operating procedures during startup,</li> </ol>		□No			
shutdown and malfunction?	Yes Yes	□No ⊠No			
a. Was the flame characteristic visually checked at least once during each operating shift? - N/A b. Was the flame adjusted when necessary? N/A	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□No □No			
PART VII: EU INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)					
☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPL	JANCE				
Facility Section (continued)					
SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES	(check ☑ box for each q	only one question)			
Administrative Changes:	,-				
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representat associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions uni operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>If yes, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ol>	its or	⊠No □No			
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:  3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been  a. Installation of any new process equipment?  b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?  c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?  d. A change in ownership?	-	⊠No ⊠No ⊠No ⊠No			
If the any answer to 3a. – d. is Yes, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted 30 days prior to the change? ————————————————————————————————————	Yes	□No			
C. Mark Sumner 2/13/2012					
Inspector's Name (Please Print)  Date of Inspection					
Mark Sen	ry 2013				
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next Insp	pection				
COMMENTS: The bags used at this facility are manufactured by Fortune Plastics, and the facility has a manufacture stating that there are no clorinated plastics in their products.  The facility operator (Ramona Bibbs) received training on the cremarory unit on 11/2/2000.	letter from the				

During the VE test performed at the time of the previous inspection the crematory was operating with approximatly 120lbs. (Full Capacity), and the VE result was 0% opacity. The department was notified on 2/3/2011 that the VE testing would be performed on

4

2/24/2011. This report was submitted timely to The Department, and according to the operator another VE test is scheduled for March of this year.

The temperature recording charts are maintained and avaliable for inspection. A review of these charts revealed that the unit appears to operate at 1650 degrees during all cremations.

The use of a maintenance log for the crematory was discussed with the operator for documenting the maintenance of the equipment.

According to the operator the crematory is scheduled for a major overhaul on 2/27/2012.