

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1994

The Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) met in Budget Workshop, scheduled for 9:00 a.m., in the EPC Conference Room, 1900 Ninth Avenue, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present: Chairman Jan K. Platt and Commissioners Joe Chillura (arrived at 9:16 a.m), Sylvia Kimbell, Lydia Miller, Jim Norman, and Ed Turanchik. The following member was absent: Commissioner Phyllis Busansky.

Chairman Platt called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Roger Stewart, Executive Director, EPC, made brief introductory statements relative to the EPC budget and noted that EPC staff sought no commitment from the Commission at the present time. Staff wanted to apprise the Commission of what would be submitted in terms of the budget, and the budget for the ensuing year was not a departure from previous years; however, there were a couple of exceptions that dealt with high-tech equipment that needed to be upgraded/updated. Mr. Stewart further advised that there were certain activities within the EPC that were phosphate related, and it might be possible those activities could be funded from the phosphate severance tax monies. Some of the requests would not be one-time expenditures and some would be replacements, since staff had already been admonished they should not ask for money twice--if something were funded from ad valorem taxes presently and phosphate money were received, the request for ad valorem should cease. In going over the capital requirements, Mr. Stewart thought it might be appropriate, on a one-time basis, staff would be allowed to fund from ad valorem, but receive the phosphate money also, and the difference would cover the capital that was being sought.

Mr. Tom Koulianos, Director, Finance and Administration, highlighted some of the current fiscal year (1993/94) budget items shown in the backup material provided to the members. Of the total capital outlay of \$173,617, \$126,908 were specific capital items funded through Title V and Section 105 related to air division grants for monitoring equipment; the \$9,000 shown under Ecosystems were paid for out of a DNR grant for purchase of equipment for the Benthic Program. The net amount of the capital for the agency was \$37,490, under administration, to upgrade the computer system. Also highlighted were the revenue sources and the budget expenditures; and a chart showing the agency budget as it had grown since 1989-90, with that growth mainly due to obtaining additional revenue sources, contracts, and grants, and the delegation of responsibilities by other environmental permitting agencies.

In reviewing the items, Commissioner Miller asked for additional information relative to the breakdown of items in order to see where the dramatic increases were in revenues--from contracts, fees, et cetera. Commissioner Norman wanted to see what portion of the monies were derived

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1994

from various fees collected, and initiated discussion relative to revenue sources, which were shown in the backup summary material. Mr. Stewart pointed out that EPC did a very good job of one-stop permitting, and received a percentage of the State fees that were collected, which more than covered the costs. There were some federal fees that EPC had begun collecting that would increase over the next few years and would actually make a profit for the agency. The capital being requested by the agency was mainly for the Water Management Division and administration.

As a food-for-thought item for next year, Mr. Koulianos advised that in the last five years the EPC had paid in the neighborhood of \$1,092,781 in Workmen's Compensation insurance, but had only one claim in all that time that amounted to \$4,000. That might be an area that should be looked at, Countywide. Mr. Stewart remarked that if that were happening throughout the County, someone was building up a large fund and he would like to know where it was going and that the agency was getting its fair coverage and at a fair price. Another factor was that EPC engineers were assessed a greater amount of money than, for instance, a Sheriff's Deputy. Commissioner Turanchik explained that happened within many departments; however, there were many small departments whose claims far exceeded those department pay-ins, and that was the concept of the insurance. In response to those concerns, **Commissioner Turanchik moved to request that staff--Mr. Stewart and Mr. Koulianos--discuss it with the County's new risk manager, to evaluate the situation; and Chairman Platt added that a report be brought back to the Commission, which was seconded by Commissioner Miller.** Commissioner Norman commented he would like to see the risk factor information on all departments. Commissioner Miller also asked they look at the possibility of EPC being an independent agency, which might be less costly. **Commissioner Turanchik included that in the motion, which carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Busansky was absent.)

Continuing with his summary, Mr. Koulianos pointed out that in the last five years the agency had returned to the County general fund money that had been budgeted to it a total of \$847,485, an average of nearly \$200,000 per year. He highlighted some of the capital needs for the coming year, in the total dollar amount of \$335,474. Chairman Platt asked if any of the items could be included in the administrative overhead costs for grants and permitting fees, et cetera, to which Mr. Koulianos stated staff would take another look at the items. One of the larger items was a request that a fence be constructed around the present EPC building. Mr. Stewart reported there had been theft and vandalism to equipment and vehicles that were stored on the premises. He noted that the original design plans for the building had included a fence, which had never been funded; however, the costs had escalated by the time the fence was required, and the money had not been available.

In response to Commissioner Norman, Mr. Koulianos stated that of the total \$335,474, about \$105,700 had been identified as phosphate-related and could come from that fund. Chairman Platt questioned if EPC staff had been working with the County Attorney's Office and the County Administrator to identify those items that would come from those monies. Mr. Koulianos stated a legal opinion had been obtained as to what would be appropriate to come

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1994

from the phosphate funds, and those items were shown on the last four pages of the capital equipment requests. They included items having to do with laboratory/monitoring/sampling equipment, a refrigerator in connection with the Benthic Program, and a 4-wheel drive utility vehicle to assist the Water Division in going into remote areas for inspection and permit review work.

Some discussion ensued relative to the target budgets that were requested by the County Administrator each year. Mr. Stewart stated that the agency had in past years adhered to the target budget, and this was the first year that additional equipment was being requested. Commissioner Norman thought that there might be other areas that could be targeted for the phosphate fund, and questioned whether anyone had contacted the Property Appraiser's Office to see what the revenues would be in that area. At the request of Chairman Platt, in order to let the Administrator know that staff had the EPC's support of looking at the utilization of phosphate funds, Commissioner Norman made a motion that the financial requests (as made by EPC staff) be reviewed with the County Administrator to see if the parties could identify more specific line items--bona fide expenditures--that could be covered by the phosphate monies severance tax monies, rather than ad valorem taxes. Commissioner Kimbell seconded the motion.

Additional discussion took place relative to the Benthic Program and related costs and equipment that came from the phosphate fund, as well as activities in other areas and the request for a 4-wheel drive utility vehicle as it related to the phosphate industry, and certain positions that might be justifiably charged to the phosphate fund. Mr. Chris Dunn and Mr. Chuck Courtney, EPC staff members, responded to questions and spoke to various items related to the phosphate industry and use of the funds.

The motion carried six to zero. (Commissioner Busansky was absent.)

In response to questions by Commissioner Chillura, Mr. Stewart addressed the request for a fence, which Chairman Platt and Commissioner Miller felt would not be a deterrent to vandalism and theft. Commissioner Chillura thought the requests should be prioritized in order of need, and Chairman Platt requested that staff should make available information as to why the items were needed. Mr. Stewart stated that most of the lab equipment being requested was important, and that, although staff had already made substantial cuts, staff would take another look at the requests and the budget.

Returning to discussion about the fence, Commissioner Miller questioned if consideration had been given to hiring a security guard on off-duty hours, which might be fairly inexpensive, compared to paying for vandalism and replacement costs. Commissioner Chillura suggested building a small building to house the boats, vehicles, et cetera, to which Mr. Stewart stated there had been a building on the original plans, which was estimated at \$25,000, but it was sacrificed for additional space. He noted that most of the money spent in connection with losses did not come out of the insurance fund, except for an accident for which there had been liability on the part of EPC.

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1994

Commissioner Norman asked for a small paragraph analysis under each request, explaining why things needed to be replaced, what would be the loss to the department should the item not be approved, et cetera. Stating that most of the line items had come out of his department, Mr. Dunn commented that there had not been an increase in capital equipment for over two years; the lab serviced the entire agency and that and the surface water monitoring program required an update and/or replacement of equipment. Most of the items had been prioritized; however, Mr. Stewart stated a brief analysis would be provided for each item.

Mr. Chuck Courtney, Director, EPC Ecosystems, had put together a graphic that explained and showed the streamlining that was taking place at the State level, which had become necessary due to duplicity and multiplicity of agencies that the public had to deal with prior to 1992. The main function of the streamlining was to merge the DNR (Department of Natural Resources) and the DER (Department of Environmental Regulation) into the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection), and one wetland definition and method for the entire state of Florida was to be adopted by July 1994. One environmental resource permit was created that merged all former responsibilities of DEP and the water management districts under two broad areas of surface water and dredge and fill into one type of permit. Also, the State was to develop a rule to delegate to local programs those processes that were being merged at the State level. Staff hoped to have pulled all things under EPC by July 1995, given the time frames involved, and both state and federal agencies had indicated they would like to see the federal work done by the EPC for all of Hillsborough County. Mr. Stewart commented that he and Mr. Courtney had been to Atlanta and to the Corps of Engineers in Jacksonville and were very well received, with positive responses. It was clarified that the chart shown by Mr. Courtney related to wetlands and surface waters only.

Commissioner Turanchik moved that the Board fully support and endorse EPC efforts to try to get delegation of permitting to that level, the principal reason being to maintain the quality of environmental regulation. He commented that so often in the legislative process the issues of monitoring and enforcement were underfunded, and the EPC and County government were committed to ensuring that wetland delineations were done, monitored, and enforced, getting more environmental protection, which had not happened with the water management district nor with DER, both of which had a very poor track record of enforcing permit requirements. The intent of the motion was to reinforce and encourage staff to aggressively pursue delegation of wetlands according to the County's local agency. **Commissioner Miller seconded the motion, which carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Busansky was absent.)

Mr. Koulianos informed the Commission that for the last four years staff would receive a target budget, that budget would be met, and two years ago they were asked to reduce below target due to financial straits. After the assessment rolls came out in May and there was a better picture of where the County stood and adjustments began to be made to the various budgets, the EPC was dropped out of the system and was stuck with the target budget. During the current year staff was told there would be some money left over and that a capital replacement pool would be established for equipment; staff had

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1994

repeatedly asked if EPC's share of that had been determined, and were told the final numbers were not available. However, it was finally said the numbers were in, but nothing was left for EPC. He requested that EPC be allowed to remain in the process--they wanted their fair share. In response, **Commissioner Chillura made a motion that EPC and the administrative staff be included in all phases of the budget process when the budget cycle begins, to take advantage of all the available adjustments that were being discussed or recommended, seconded by Commissioner Turanchik.** Chairman Platt asked that Mr. Stewart convey all the motions to the County Administrator. **The motion carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Busansky was absent.)

Mr. Stewart informed the Commission that a newspaper article had appeared relative to retirement category, wherein he had been highlighted even though he had not made a request to be on the list. By rights, he felt he should always have been under that particular category (designed for non-tenured people working for elected boards), and he intended to come forward independently to intercede with the Commissioners that he should be in that category, should Mr. Karl not pursue the issue. The purpose of the amendment to the law dealing with the issue was to recognize the special situation of non-tenured people working for elected boards.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: _____
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
RICHARD AKE, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

(Permanent cassette tape(s) of the foregoing proceedings on file in the BOCC Records Department. Meeting recorded and transcribed by Shirley Lockwood, Senior Executive Secretary.)

EPC PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORT
March 1994

	Ad.	Air	Eco.	Waste	Water	Legal	Total
Media contact	2	1	4	2	2	4	15
News releases	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
Materials dist.*	330	28	158	30	100	31	677
Talks given	3	2	10	3	2	2	22
Displays/demos	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

* Includes rules/regulations/newsletter/EPC wrap-up

From January 1, 1994 to Date

Media contact	3	3	8	2	4	9	29
News releases	2	1	2	0	0	1	6
Materials dist.	1080	66	439	108	220	85	1998
Talks given	10	2	16	11	4	4	47
Displays/demos	1	1	3	1	2	0	8

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Scheduled speakers for SERVE presentations
2. Conducted Public Education Committee meeting
3. Sent information packets to public
4. Worked with ACCESS director on project funding application
5. Hosted Recycling Task Force meeting
6. Conducted Earth Day Steering Committee meeting
7. Accepted Earth Day proclamation at EPC meeting
8. Critiqued USF Engineering Exposition
9. Continued work with EPA on Environmental Indicators Project
10. Monitored volunteer and intern
11. Completed updating news clippings
12. Inventoried supplies; reordered for Earth Day display
13. Worked with library officials on distribution of Earth Day fliers

CURRENT PROJECTS

1. Designing enhancements for Earth Day & Conservation Day displays
2. Working with local Boy Scout on merit badge/special award requirements
3. Coordinating Earth Day plans for 1994 with city/county agencies, vendors & sponsors
4. Working on EPC video & quarterly program
5. Coordinating presentation of County environmental awards for Environmental Awareness Committee

FUTURE PROJECTS

1. Organize series of traveling exhibits
2. Plan series of EPC public forums
3. Produce Speaker's Bureau publication
4. Produce & publish agency-wide annual report

MONTHLY ACTIVITIES REPORT
AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION
MARCH

A. Administrative Enforcement

1. Documents Issued:		
a. Notice of Intent to Initiate Enforcement	7	<u>7</u>
b. Citation	0	<u>0</u>
c. Other _____	0	<u>0</u>
2. Total Cases Initiated	6	<u>6</u>
3. Cases Resolved:	0	<u>0</u>
4. Cases Referred to Legal Department:	0	<u>0</u>
5. Consent Orders Signed:	3	<u>3</u>
6. Enforcement Costs Collected:	\$ 2,110.50	<u>\$ 2,110.50</u>
7. Contributions to the Pollution Recovery Fund:	\$ 3,535.00	<u>\$ 3,535.00</u>

<u>Organization Name</u>	<u>Violation</u>	<u>Amount</u>
a. Johnson Controls	Expired Permit	\$1,500.00
b. ARTEC	NESHAP (Asbestos)	\$ 835.00
c. Verlite Co.	Permit Violations	\$1,200.00

B. Industrial Air Pollution Permitting

1. Permit Applications with Fees Received:		
a. Operating:	4	<u>4</u>
b. Construction:	6	<u>6</u>
c. Amendments:	6	<u>6</u>
d. Transfers/Extensions:	0	<u>0</u>
2. Permits Recommended to DEP for Approval and Issued by EPC:		
a. Operating:	1	<u>1</u>
b. Construction:	4	<u>4</u>
c. Amendments:	3	<u>3</u>
d. Transfers/Extensions:	0	<u>0</u>

C. Inspections:	
1. Industrial Facilities:	<u>11</u>
2. NESHAPS Facilities:	
a. Asbestos	<u>0</u>
b. Drycleaners	<u>0</u>
3. Asbestos Demolition/Renovation Projects:	<u>37</u>
4. Gasoline Retailers:	<u>0</u>
5. Vehicle Service Facilities:	<u>0</u>
6. Retail Vehicle Dealers:	<u>2</u>
7. Automotive Parts Stores:	<u>0</u>
8. Fleet Operators:	<u>0</u>
9. CFC Facilities:	<u>1</u>
D. Open Burning Permits Issued:	<u>10</u>
E. Total Citizen Complaints Received:	<u>171</u>
F. Noise Sources Monitored:	<u>25</u>
G. Air Program's Input to DRI's:	<u>0</u>
H. Compliance:	
1. Warning Notices Issued:	<u>24</u>
2. Warning Notices Resolved:	<u>23</u>

FEES COLLECTED FOR AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION
MARCH

	Total Revenue
1. Construction Permit for an air pollution source	
(a) New Source Review or Prevention of Significant Deterioration sources	<u>\$ -0-</u>
(b) all others	<u>\$4,750.00</u>
2. Operate an air pollution source	
(a) class B or smaller facility - 5 year permit	<u>\$4,750.00</u>
(b) class A2 facility - 5 year permit	<u>\$ -0-</u>
(c) class A1 facility - 5 year permit	<u>\$ -0-</u>
3. Revise an air pollution source permit	<u>\$ 300.00</u>
4. Transfer ownership of air permit	<u>\$ -0-</u>
5. Notification for commercial demolition	
(a) for structure less than 50,000 sq ft	<u>\$1,995.00</u>
(b) for structure greater than 50,000 sq ft	<u>\$ 180.00</u>
6. Notification for asbestos abatement	
(a) renovation 160 to 1000 sq ft or 260 to 1000 linear feet of asbestos	<u>\$ 480.00</u>
(b) renovation greater than 1000 linear feet or 1000 sq ft	<u>\$1,485.00</u>
7. Annual compliance certification	
(a) automobile retail operations	<u>-0-</u>
(b) automobile repair operations	<u>-0-</u>
(c) automotive parts & supplies retail operations	<u>-0-</u>
8. Open burning authorization	<u>\$3,905.00</u>
9. Enforcement Costs	<u>\$2,110.50</u>

ECOSYSTEMS MANAGEMENT DIVISION AGENDA BACKUP
MARCH 1994

	<u>Initial</u>	<u>Resubmittal</u>
A. <u>Environmental Assessment Section</u>		
1. Land Excavation Permit Applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
2. Rezoning Applications	<u>18</u>	<u>2</u>
3. Subdivision Applications		
a. Master Plan/Preliminary Plat	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>
b. Construction Plan/Final Plat	<u>21</u>	<u>4</u>
c. Waivers	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
d. Minor Reviews	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
e. Easement Access	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
4. Regional, State, Federal Jurisdictions		
a. FDER/SWFWMD - no fees	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
b. IC&R, ACOE - no fees	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
c. TPA	<u>31</u>	<u>2</u>
5. Phosphate Mining Applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
6. Development of Regional Impact	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
7. Site Plan Development (Commercial)		
a. Preliminary	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>
b. Construction	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
8. Wastewater Treatment Plant Reviews-no fee	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>
9. Site Clearing/Land Alteration	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>
10. Wetland Delineation	<u>32</u>	
11. Wetland Survey Reviews - no fees less than 250LF (prorated over 250LF)	<u>16</u>	
12. Miscellaneous Activities in Wetlands	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>
13. Wetland Mitigation Applications	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>
14. Miscellaneous Reviews	<u>3</u>	
15. No-Net Loss of Wetlands (researched from records)		
a. Disturbed (acres)	<u>623.24</u>	
b. Replaced (acres)	<u>927.17</u>	

B. Investigations/Compliance Section

1.	Complaints	
	a. Received	<u>36</u>
	b. Inspections Performed	<u>69</u>
	c. Closed	<u>66</u>
2.	Meetings	
	a. Case Meetings at EPC	<u>6</u>
	b. Admin. Meetings	<u>43</u>
3.	Warning Notices	
	a. Issued	<u>18</u>
	b. Closed	<u>21</u>
4.	Letters	<u>48</u>
5.	Telephone Contacts	<u>534</u>
6.	File Reviews	<u>180</u>
7.	Return Inspections	<u>71</u>
8.	Mitigation/Compliance Reviews	
	a. Reviews	<u>0</u>
	b. Inspections	<u>23</u>
9.	Warning Notices referred to Enforcement Coordinator	<u>1</u>

C. Administrative Enforcement Activities

1.	New cases received	<u>3</u>
2.	Total ongoing cases	
a.	Active	<u>16</u>
b.	Legal	<u>7</u>
c.	Pending	<u>6</u>
d.	tracking	<u>23</u>
3.	Notices of Intent to Initiate Enforcement issued	<u>2</u>
4.	Citations issued	<u>0</u>
5.	Emergency Orders of the Director issued	<u>0</u>
6.	Consent Orders/Settlement Letters signed	<u>1</u>
7.	Cases closed (not including referral to Legal Dept.)	<u>1</u>
8.	Contributions to the Pollution Recovery Fund	<u>\$ 160.50</u>
9.	Enforcement costs collected	<u>\$ 804.66</u>
10.	Cases referred to Legal Department	<u>0</u>

D. Significant Activities

1. Production of the Annual Status Report on Four Seagrass Recovery Areas and a Management Plan for the Cockroach Bay Aquatic Preserve.
2. Co-Chairing Earth Day Committee and coordinating preparations for the April 23 event.
3. Continued participation in DEP rulemaking process for wetlands definitions, delineation methodology, and permitting delegation.
4. Presentation and discussion by Wade Hurt, State Soil Scientist for the Soil Conservation Service, on SCS responsibility for wetlands protection and work toward wetlands quality-ranking criteria. Discussion included possible delegation of delineations to EPC. See attachment.
5. Presentation to staff by Bill Sumpter of Georgia Pacific, on logging and timber management in wetlands.

COMMISSION
PHYLLIS BUSANSKY
JOE CHILLURA
SYLVIA KIMBELL
LYDIA MILLER
JIM NORMAN
JAN KAMINIS PLATT
ED TURANCHIK

FAX (813) 272-5157



ROGER P. STEWART
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES
AND
WATER MANAGEMENT DIVISION
1900 - 9TH AVENUE
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33605
TELEPHONE (813) 272-5960
AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION
TELEPHONE (813) 272-5530
WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION
TELEPHONE (813) 272-5788
ECOSYSTEMS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
TELEPHONE (813) 272-7104

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 19, 1994

TO: Hooshang Boostani, Director, Waste Management

FROM: *ML* Mike Newman, Enforcement, Waste Management

SUBJECT: WASTE MANAGEMENT'S MARCH AGENDA

The following is a summary of activities for the month of March, 1994. If you would like more information concerning any of these activities please let me know.

WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION

March Agenda

<u>A.</u>	<u>Administrative Enforcement</u>	
1.	New cases received	<u>1</u>
2.	Ongoing administrative cases	
	a. Pending	<u>27</u>
	b. Active	<u>25</u>
	c. Legal	<u>10</u>
	d. Tracking Compliance (Admin.)	<u>7</u>
	e. Tracking Referred cases	<u>2</u>
	f. Criminal compliance tracking	<u>22</u>
3.	NOI's issued	<u>0</u>
4.	Citations issued	<u>0</u>
5.	Settlement Letters signed	<u>0</u>
6.	Administrative cases resolved	<u>0</u>
7.	Civil contrib. to the Pollution Rec. Fund	<u>\$00.0</u>
8.	Criminal contrib. to the Pollution Rec. Fund	<u>\$17.30</u>
8.	Enforcement costs collected	<u>\$78.37</u>
9.	Cases referred to legal	<u>2</u>

B. Solid and Hazardous Waste

Received/Reviewed

1. Permits	<u>2 / 3</u>
2. EPC Authorization For Facilities Not Requiring DEP Permit	<u>1 / 0</u>
3. SQG Surcharges Received	\$ _____
4. Other permits and Reports	<u>89/54</u>
a. County Permits	<u>0/0</u>
b. Other Reports	<u>63/34</u>
c. SQG Surveys	<u>0/0</u>
5. Inspections	<u>233</u>
a. Complaint	<u>114</u>
b. Compliance	<u>46</u>
c. Small Quantity Generator	<u>73</u>
6. Enforcement	
a. Complaints Received/Closed	<u>113/84</u>
b. Warning Notice Issued/Closed	<u>4 / 3</u>
c. Compliance Letters	<u>48</u>
d. Letters of Agreement	<u>0</u>
e. DEP Referrals	<u>0</u>
7. Pamphlets, Rules and Material Distrib.	<u>45</u>

C. Underground Storage Tank - Cleanup Department

1. Inspections:	<u>49</u>
a. Investigation	<u>44</u>
b. SUPER Act	<u>5</u>
2. Reports Received/Reviewed	<u>67/65</u>
a. Contamination Assessment (CARs)	<u>10/14</u>
b. Initial Remedial Action (IRA)	<u>4 / 4</u>
c. Remedial Action Plans (RAPs)	<u>4 / 6</u>
d. Site Rehabilitation Completion (SRCRs)	<u>0 / 0</u>
e. Others	<u>49/41</u>
3. Reimbursement Applications	
a. Received	<u>0</u>
b. Reviewed	<u>5</u>
4. State Cleanup Site Activities	
a. Active Sites	<u>79</u>
b. Funds Disbursed	<u>≈\$2.6 million</u>

D. Underground Storage Tank Compliance Department

1.	Inspections	<u>277</u>
	a. UST Compliance	<u>179</u>
	b. AST Compliance	<u>25</u>
	c. UST Installation	<u>7</u>
	d. AST Installation	<u>4</u>
	e. UST Closure	<u>6</u>
	f. AST Closure	<u>0</u>
	g. Other Inspections	<u>56</u>
2	Installation Plans Reviewed	<u>5</u>
	a. USTs	<u>4</u>
	b. ASTs	<u>1</u>
3.	Closure Plans/Reports Reviewed	<u>23</u>
	a. UST Closure Plans	<u>5</u>
	b. AST Closure Plans	<u>6</u>
	c. UST/AST Closure Reports Reviewed	<u>12</u>
4.	Enforcement	
	a. Noncompliance Letters	<u>15</u>
	b. Warning Notices	<u>2</u>
	c. Cases referred for Enforcement	<u>1</u>
	d. Complaints received/investigated	<u>0/0</u>
	e. Complaints referred	<u>0</u>
	f. Cases Referred to DEP	<u>0</u>
5.	FPLIRP Checklists Completed	<u>7</u>
6.	Cleanup Notification Letters Issued	<u>5</u>
7.	Public Assistance	<u>500+</u>

E. Record Reviews 87

F. Public Information Projects 4

1. Gordon Leslie & Dianne Crigger were judges at the Hillsborough County Public School Regional Science Fair.
2. Greg Cowden and Carol Key spoke to 4th graders at Alexander Elementary School.
3. Chuck Heintz spoke with Jane Martinez (Tampa Tribune) concerning the Hillsborough County waste-to-energy facility's ash residue management.
4. Chuck Heintz spoke with Jane Martinez (Tampa Tribune) concerning the former Hillsborough County Mosquito Control on Harbour Island - contaminated soil removal/disposal.

ACTIVITIES REPORT
WATER MANAGEMENT DIVISION
MARCH, 1994

A. Enforcement

1. New Enforcement Cases Received:	2
2. Enforcement Cases Closed:	4
3. Enforcement Cases Outstanding:	39
4. Enforcement Documents Issued:	19
5. Warning Notices:	
a. Issued:	8
b. Resolved:	15
6. Contributions to the Pollution Recovery Fund:	\$13,066.90
7. Recovery Cost:	\$ 537.96

B. Permitting - Domestic

1. State Permit Applications Received:	24
a. Operation:	4
(i) Types I and II	0
(ii) Type III	4
b. Construction:	0
(i) Types I and II	0
(ii) Type III	0
c. Temporary Operation:	2
(i) Types I and II	0
(ii) Type III	2
d. Collection Systems-General:	12
e. Collection Systems-Dry Line:	6
f. Residuals Disposal:	0
2. State Permit Applications Recommended for Approval:	22
a. Operation:	6
b. Construction:	2
c. Temporary Operation:	1
d. Collection Systems:	8
e. Collection Systems-Dry Line:	5
f. Residuals Disposal:	0
3. State Permit Applications Recommended for Disapproval:	0
a. Operation:	0
b. Construction:	0
c. Temporary Operation:	0
d. Collection Systems-General:	0
e. Collection Systems-Dry Line:	0
f. Residuals Disposal:	0
4. State Permit Applications Outstanding:	57
a. Operation:	27
b. Construction:	5
c. Temporary Operation:	5
d. Collection Systems-General:	17
e. Collection Systems-Dry Line:	3
f. Residuals Disposal:	0

C. Inspections - Domestic:	<u>126</u>
1. Compliance Evaluation:	<u>26</u>
a. Inspection (CEI):	<u>0</u>
b. Sampling inspection (CSI):	<u>26</u>
c. Toxics Sampling Inspection (XSI):	<u>0</u>
d. Performance Audit Inspection (PAI):	<u>0</u>
2. Reconnaissance Inspection:	<u>58</u>
a. Inspection (RI):	<u>7</u>
b. Sample Inspection (SRI):	<u>10</u>
c. Complaint Inspection (CRI):	<u>34</u>
d. Enforcement Inspection (ERI):	<u>7</u>
3. Special Inspection:	<u>42</u>
a. Diagnostic Inspection (DI):	<u>0</u>
b. Residual Site Inspection (RSI):	<u>0</u>
c. Preconstruction Inspection (PCI):	<u>14</u>
d. Post Construction Inspection (XCI):	<u>20</u>
D. Permitting - <u>Industrial</u>	
1. State Permit Applications Received:	<u>2</u>
a. Operation:	<u>1</u>
(i) Types I and II	<u>0</u>
(ii) Type III with groundwater monitoring	<u>0</u>
(iii) Type III w/o groundwater monitoring	<u>1</u>
b. Construction:	<u>1</u>
(i) Types I and II	<u>0</u>
(ii) Type III with groundwater monitoring	<u>0</u>
(iii) Type III w/o groundwater monitoring	<u>1</u>
c. Temporary Operation:	<u>0</u>
(i) Types I and II	<u>0</u>
(ii) Type III with groundwater monitoring	<u>0</u>
(iii) Type III w/o groundwater monitoring	<u>0</u>
d. Other(s):	<u>0</u>
2. State Permit Applications Recommended for Approval:	<u>1</u>
a. Operation:	<u>0</u>
b. Construction:	<u>1</u>
c. Temporary Operation:	<u>0</u>
d. Other(s):	<u>0</u>
3. State Permit Applications Recommended for Disapproval:	<u>0</u>
a. Operation:	<u>0</u>
b. Construction:	<u>0</u>
c. Temporary Operation:	<u>0</u>
d. Other(s):	<u>0</u>
4. State Permit Applications Outstanding:	<u>17</u>
a. Operation:	<u>9</u>
b. Construction:	<u>4</u>
c. Temporary Operation:	<u>4</u>
d. Withdrawn:	<u>0</u>

E. Inspections - Industrial:	<u>27</u>
1. Compliance Evaluation:	<u>0</u>
a. Inspection (CEI):	<u>0</u>
b. Sampling Inspection (CSI):	<u>0</u>
c. Toxics Sampling Inspection (XSI):	<u>0</u>
d. Performance Audit Inspection (PAI):	<u>0</u>
2. Reconnaissance Inspection:	<u>27</u>
a. Inspection (RI):	<u>7</u>
b. Sample Inspection (SRI):	<u>0</u>
c. Complaint Inspection (CRI):	<u>20</u>
d. Enforcement Inspection (ERI):	<u>0</u>
3. Special Inspection:	<u>0</u>
a. Diagnostic Inspection (DI):	<u>0</u>
b. Preconstruciton Inspection (PCI):	<u>0</u>
c. Post Construction Inspection (XCI):	<u>0</u>
F. Citizen Complaints:	
1. Domestic:	
a. Received:	<u>24</u>
b. Closed:	<u>26</u>
2. Industrial:	
a. Received:	<u>5</u>
b. Closed:	<u>6</u>
3. Water Pollution:	
a. Received:	<u>5</u>
b. Closed:	<u>3</u>
G. Environmental Analyses:	
1. Air Management:	<u>117</u>
2. Ecosystems Management:	<u>2</u>
3. Waste Management:	<u>4</u>
4. Water Management:	<u>163</u>
H. Special Projects Review:	<u>7</u>
1. DRI's:	<u>0</u>
2. Others:	<u>7</u>
I. Record Reviews:	<u>13</u>
1. Permitting:	<u>8</u>
2. Enforcement:	<u>5</u>
J. Water Quality Monitoring Special Studies	<u>2</u>
1. Oyster Reef Project	<u>1</u>
2. Sulphur Springs	<u>1</u>

**LEGAL DEPARTMENT MONTHLY REPORT
APRIL 20, 1994**

A. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

1. NEW CASES [1]

EPC v. DEP: (Tarpon Springs Lake Kathleen Transmission line) Administrative appeal of DEP certification that Florida Power's post-corridor certification submittals meet all state requirements.

2. EXISTING CASES [3]

Ugenti, Angelo: Appealed Citation for solid waste violation. Final Hearing continued, and because DEP initiated parallel permit revocation proceedings, a comprehensive settlement agreement is under review.

Marks: Appealed Citation for wetland destruction; settlement negotiations continue.

DiGerlando, et al: Appealed Citation for solid waste violation. Appeal abated pending State Attorney's case. One defendant dismissed, other going to trial in May.

3. CASES RESOLVED [0]

B. LITIGATION CASES

1. NEW CASES [4]

Hilaga, Arnold B.: Received authority on 3/23/94. Commission staff has been working with Hilaga since 2/89 to properly close the abandoned tanks on the property. Tanks were removed on 8/16/93 and a Closure Assessment received 9/21/93, but Mr. Hilaga has refused to pay penalties or EPC's costs.

Mudd's Land Clearing, Inc.: Received authority on 3/23/94. Mudd's Land Clearing, Inc. (MLC) conducted illegal open burning as part of land clearing activity associated with construction of the Northwest Expressway.

Rathbone, Gale L. vs. Coulter/EPC: Mortgage holder seeks to foreclose interest in Coulter's property on Sand Pond in Brandon. EPC is among several defendants who hold an interest in the property. EPC's interest arises by virtue of judgments obtained during litigation concerning landholders environmental violations going back to 1979.

Slusmeyer, Boyce E.: Received authority on 3/23/94. Tanks have been out of service since 1990. Commission staff has attempted to work with the property owner, Boyce E. Slusmeyer, who has not cooperated. Citation was issued 12/30/93, no appeal was filed.

2. EXISTING CASES [12]

Martinez, Pedro: Final Judgment was entered October 1992 requiring correction and reimbursement of costs for solid waste violation. Defendant has obtained new counsel who is working with staff to resolve the situation. To date no corrective work has been done and additional problems may have occurred. Defendant has divided property and is trying to obtain permit for second mobile home.

Cudlipp; Sherwood Forest: Complaint filed 2/6/90, (discharge of effluent from WWTP, and operating without a DEP permit). New owner has corrected violations. Settlement with prior owner/operator at stalemate.

Carmichael: Received authority on 2/27/91, (solid waste violation). Pollution Recovery Funds approved for correction conditioned upon lien. Defendant has declined Pollution Recovery Fund monies, review of financial records reflect no assets from which collection of penalties likely.

Rainbow Rock: Received authority 7/31/91, (violations at its waste water treatment plant). Renovations performed are not adequate; proposing Settlement Letter.

Oakview Estates: Received authority 7/31/91, (violations at the waste water treatment plant). County is maintaining facility as receiver; hopes to obtain title. The County is proceeding to foreclose on tax liens; sale anticipated within 30 days.

Savich: Received authority 1/29/92, (solid waste violations). Holding complaint against Pert Group (Savich is resident) pending outcome of charges filed by state attorney. Legal staff has met with State Attorney's office and defense counsel to discuss further action and possible settlement.

Cast Crete v DEP: DEP filed a complaint to enforce prior court order requiring industrial wastewater permit. EPC seeking recovery of our investigation costs.

Hughes Hard Chrome, Inc.: Authority granted 1/27/93 to pursue compliance with Consent Order resolving water violations.

Larret Mobile Home Park: Authority granted 1/27/93 (wastewater discharge violations). Settlement negotiations continue despite Chapter 11 Bankruptcy, waiver request denied.

A.G. Equipment: Authority received February 1993, to enforce proper closure of abandoned underground storage tanks.

Qasem: Authority granted 8/93 to require Underground Storage Tank equipment to meet regulatory standards.

Carey: Authority received August 1993 to enforce wetland mitigation agreement. Preparing suit for breach of contract.

3. CASES RESOLVED [1]

Lowes Nursing Home: New Owner has renovated wastewater treatment plant, obtained an operating permit from DER and has paid EPC penalties and reimbursed EPC for costs of their enforcement. No further action is warranted.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION
OF HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE POLLUTION RECOVERY FUND
FISCAL YEAR 93/94**

MONTH	AIR MGMT DIV	ECOSYSTEMS DIV	WASTE MGMT DIV	WATER DIV	TOTAL
OCTOBER	2,250.00	0.00	0.00	2,424.76	4,674.76
NOVEMBER	14,400.00	30.00	0.00	504.74	14,934.74
DECEMBER	2,400.00	30.00	335.41	6,374.76	9,140.17
JANUARY	0.00	0.00	135.32	74.76	210.08
FEBRUARY	2,150.00	30.00	18.68	666.90	2,865.58
MARCH	3,535.00	160.50	17.30	13,066.90	16,779.70
APRIL					0.00
MAY					0.00
JUNE					0.00
JULY					0.00
AUGUST					0.00
SEPTEMBER					0.00
TOTAL	24,735.00	250.50	506.71	23,112.82	48,605.03

ENFORCEMENT COST RECOVERY

OCTOBER	327.08	0.00	0.00	871.19	1,198.27
NOVEMBER	917.08	40.00	0.00	1,474.76	2,431.84
DECEMBER	1,579.66	40.00	0.00	969.40	2,589.06
JANUARY	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.11	92.11
FEBRUARY	826.87	574.08	176.33	0.00	1,577.28
MARCH	2,110.50	804.66	78.37	537.96	3,531.49
APRIL					0.00
MAY					0.00
JUNE					0.00
JULY					0.00
AUGUST					0.00
SEPTEMBER					0.00
TOTAL	5,761.19	1,458.74	254.70	3,945.42	11,420.05

Current available balance in Pollution Recovery Fund as of 4-20-94 = \$ 436,424.61