EMERGENCY RESPONSE

For the calendar year 2000 the Emergency Response program responded to 796 complaints. The amount of material removed or handled is as follows:

- **PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM CONTAMINATED SOILS**
  - The Office was involved with the removal and/or recovery of:
    - **523,938 gallons of petroleum** from the environment or that posed an immediate threat to the environment or the public.
    - **2,759 cubic yards/2691 tons of petroleum contaminated soil** from the environment.

- **HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS AND SOIL CONTAMINATED BY HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS**
  - The Office was involved with the removal and/or recovery of:
    - **52,138 gallons of hazardous chemicals** from the environment or that posed an immediate threat to the environment or the public.
    - **187 cubic yards of chemically contaminated soil** that posed an immediate threat to the environment.
    - **1,356 pounds of hazardous waste** that posed an immediate threat to the environment.

- **CYLINDERS**
  - The Office was involved with the removal of **50 cylinders of propane** and other types of compressed elements. Some of the material was recycled by vendors, used for its intended purpose or burned. These items were removed from locations so they would no longer pose an immediate threat to the public or the environment.

- **ASBESTOS**
  - The Office was involved with the discovery, improper storage and proper disposal of **41 tons of asbestos**. The material was removed from locations to eliminate an immediate threat to the public.

- **MERCURY**
  - The Office was involved with the removal and/or recovery of **30 pounds of Mercury** from the environment or from people who no longer had a use for the material. This material will go to a recycler in New York for reuse.

- **SEPTAGE**
  - The Office was involved with the treatment or removal of **7,200 gallons of sewage** that released into the environment.
BIOHAZARDS
The Office was involved with the incineration or proper disposal of biohazards such as human blood and fermented fish guts.

COST RECOVERY
The Office of Compliance and Inspection’s, Emergency Response Section recovered a total amount of $107,507.88 for cleanup costs from responsible parties and the National Pollution Fund Center.

MAJOR SPILLS AND CLEANUPS
• A portion of the Mobile Pipeline was inadvertently excavated by a backhoe in a new development in Cumberland releasing 7,000 gallons of gasoline on March 11th. More than 20,000 gallons of gasoline and water were removed and disposed of properly. Also, approximately 1,500 tons of gasoline contaminated soil were removed and disposed of properly.

• The Riverside Mills cleanup, that began on May 18th in Providence, involved the removal of 125,000 gallons of petroleum and 1120 tons of oil contaminated soil. The Office made arrangements to obtain funding, hire a contractor and cleanup the site. The cost of the cleanup was $155,424.41. This location will constitute a portion of the Woonasquatucket River Greenway.

• Penn 460 oil spill, which occurred on July 5th, released over 14,000 gallons of #6 oil along the Newport shoreline. Various techniques were instituted to recover approximately 60% of the spilled oil. An international newsletter indicated that it was “a textbook example of how to handle an oil spill”.

• C. White & Sons tanker truck, carrying 11,7000 gallons of jet A fuel, overturned on Interstate 95 and Route 37 on July 20th in Cranston. The spilled fuel ignited incinerating everything in the immediate area. Approximately 1,025 gallons of a mixture of fuel and water were recovered and about 400 cubic yards of fuel contaminated soil were excavated and disposed of properly.

• Personnel from this Office assisted the EPA cleanup of Chase Paint in Warwick during August. EPA spent $191,395 to remove and properly dispose of 194,100 pounds of waste paint.

• Personnel from this Office responded to Northern Environmental, Inc concerning a chemical reaction in their 5,600-gallon tank containing hydrochloric acid, sulfuric acid and phosphoric acid on September 19th. When the company inadvertently added nitric acid to the tank, fumes of poisonous nitrous oxide were produced. The company added four hundred pounds of sodium meta bisulfate to halt the reaction.

• Star Gas on Snake Hill Road in Glocester had a propane release from a 1,000- gallon tank on October 2nd. The company off loaded the liquid into a bulk carrier. Once the liquid was removed the gas phase in the tank was flared off and the valve was repaired.
AIR COMPLIANCE

- **Complaints** received by the Air Section (1/1/00 – 12/31/00) - **2,435** complaints. Note: this is an increase of 30% over the 1,866 complaints received in 1999. **Odors** represent a majority of the complaints received (2,127 or >87% of the total number of complaints)

- Air inspectors spent a significant amount of time responding to odor complaints related to:
  - RI Central Landfill (942 complaints)
  - Metals Recycling, LLC facility at 89 Celia Street, Johnston (193 complaints)
  - New England Ecological Development Corp. facility off Green Hill Road and Shun Pike, Johnston (119 complaints)
  - Recchia Property at 90 Mill Street, Johnston (320 complaints).

- The four-above mentioned sites accounted for 1,574 complaints or 64% of the total complaints received.

- Air inspectors conducted over 907 inspections and over 413 source checks.

- Over 91% of the 2,435 complaints received were addressed.

- **Informal Enforcement Actions:** The Air Section issued 95 informal enforcement actions (63 Letters of Noncompliance and 32 Warning Letters) in an attempt to bring facilities or projects into compliance without resorting to formal enforcement.

- **Formal Enforcement Actions:** The Air Section issued 13 Notices of Violation (one of which was a joint NOV with the UST Program). Of the 13 NOV’s, 5 were issued for violations of Air Pollution Control Regulation No. 24 entitled, “Removal of Lead Based Paint from Exterior Surface”. From 1 January 2000 through 31 December 2000, 7 formal enforcement actions have been resolved; including one issued for lead paint violations. Continuing efforts are underway to resolve additional enforcement actions that were issued in the year 2000. New enforcement cases are currently being developed for recently identified violators of applicable regulations.

- **Penalties Assessed:** The Air Section assessed $110,245.00 in Administrative Penalties.

- **Penalties Collected:** The Air Section collected $65,682.00 in Administrative Penalties.

- **Lead Paint:** In the area of lead paint, the Air Section developed and initiated a 2 part carbonless Notice of Noncompliance citation to be issued on-site to violators of applicable sections of Air Pollution Control Regulation No. 24, entitled “Removal of Lead Based Paint from Exterior Surfaces”. This citation is used to put the lead paint removers on immediate notice of problems that must be expeditiously resolved.
Additionally, a 2 part carbonless Immediate Compliance Order was developed and initiated to be issued on-site for violations of Regulation 24 representing an immediate threat to public health.

Air inspectors investigated 135 lead complaints, conducted over 75 follow-up inspections and verified that 31 lead-contaminated sites have been properly cleaned. Continuing efforts are underway to confirm additional sites cleaned.

Multi-Media Enforcement Coordination - During the summer of 2000, inspectors of the Air Section played an important role in identifying the Recchia Property as an illegal C&D Landfill that was the source of objectionable odors. The source was investigated, identified and monitored to verify noncompliance with applicable regulations. Inspectors played a key role in the Superior Court trial assisting in the court's decision requiring abatement of objectionable odors.

After Hour Citizen Complaints for Odors - Throughout the year, inspectors of the Air Section have made themselves available after-hours for continuing complaint response and investigations involving the RI Central Landfill, the Metals Recycling LLC facility, the New England Ecological Development Corp. facility and the Recchia Property. These responses have been instrumental in documenting violations at these facilities, verifying citizen complaints and providing information to complainants regarding the departments enforcement response process.

SOLID WASTE COMPLIANCE

Complaints

The Solid Waste Program received 171 complaints in the year 2000. The vast majority of solid waste complaints relate to non-permitted facilities and properties.

The Solid Waste Program conducted 171 complaint investigations, and 76 inspections and re-inspections of ongoing cleanup activities.

Informal Enforcement Actions: The Solid Waste Program issued 43 informal enforcement actions (Warning Letters and Letters of Non-compliance) in an attempt to bring properties into compliance without resorting to formal enforcement. The Program was successful in resolving 35 informal enforcement cases this year.

Formal Enforcement Actions: The Solid Waste Program issued 12 Notices of Violations. Continuing efforts are underway to resolve the issues related to the enforcement actions. The Solid Waste Program resolved 6 formal enforcement cases through executed consent agreements. New enforcement cases are currently being developed for recently identified violations.

Penalties Assessed

The Solid Waste Program assessed $1,030,746.00 in administrative penalties.
The Solid Waste Program collected $76,508.06 in administrative penalties, recovered costs of $3,171.08, approved Supplemental Environmental Project worth $69,000.00 and offset $62,256.00 in penalties for a supplemental environmental clean-up project.

❖ Enforcement Action Results

The compliance activities of the program resulted in 86 case files closed this year. Cleanup requirements resulted in approximately 35.7 tons of solid waste removed from the environment to licensed solid waste disposal facilities.

❖ Outreach Program

The Solid Waste Program conducted an outreach program with the seven communities in the Woonasquatucket River Watershed (Glocester, Johnston, Lincoln, North Providence, North Smithfield, Providence, and Smithfield) and the seven of the eight communities (Charlestown, Exeter, Hopkinton, North Kingstown, Richmond, South Kingstown, and Westerly) with watersheds in South County, including the Wood/Pawcatuck watershed. James Ashton, Principal Environmental Scientist and Solid Waste Program supervisor, met with public works directors, planning and zoning officials, code enforcement officers, and environmental officers to explain enforcement capabilities and to provide guidance regarding solid waste illegal disposal problems. OC&I's efforts were supported by and coordinated with the Office of Technical and Customer Assistance.

❖ Tire Piles

- **DAVIS TIRE PILE** - Don Squires, Engineering Technician IV, provided continuous on-site monitoring to insure a smooth removal operation at this difficult site. Removal of the tires was necessary to reduce the potential significant threat to health and the environment should the massive tire pile ignite. The removal of approximately ten million tires from the Davis tire dump and liquid hazardous waste disposal area in Smithfield is essentially completed.
- In cooperation with the Attorney General, DEM obtained a Superior Court order requiring the owner of property containing approximately 40,000 tires and located immediately adjacent to the Scituate Reservoir to begin removal of the tires.
- In cooperation with the Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation (RIRRC), approximately 50,000 used tires were removed from a warehouse building in Providence.
- At least 2 other major tire disposal projects in cooperation with the RIRRC are being discussed.

❖ Superior Court

In cooperation with the Attorney General, several petitions have been filed resulting in Superior Court orders being issued requiring owners to remove solid waste disposed of on their property: A farmer in Tiverton was ordered to remove approximately 33,000 thousand cubic yards of unclean clamshells and associated organic matter from the property. A property owner in Johnston was ordered to remove approximately 58,000 cubic yards of processed construction and demolition debris and other mixed solid waste from his property. Both of these illegal disposal sites were causing nuisance objectionable odors for nearby residents.
The RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Section is responsible for the enforcement of State and Federal laws and regulations pertaining to the management of hazardous waste. Generators, Transporters and Facilities that transport, store and dispose hazardous waste (TSDF’s) are some of the entities that are required to comply with these laws and regulations. Generators are further broken down into Small Quantity Generators (SQG’s) and Large Quantity Generators (LQG’s) by the amount of hazardous waste produced by the facility.

Inspections: The RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Section completed 120 full compliance evaluation inspections. Of these, 25 were facilities that were identified as LQG’s, 92 were identified as SQG’s. Additionally, 3 were non-notifiers (i.e. facilities that were required to register with EPA and RIDEM as a Hazardous Waste Generator, but failed to do so). Through an EPA/RIDEM policy agreement for the year 2000, inspections focused on facilities within the Woonasquatucket Watershed.

Informal Enforcement Actions: The RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Section issued 70 informal enforcement actions (70 Letters of Non-Compliance) in an attempt to bring facilities into compliance without resorting to formal enforcement. Noncompliance issues included the failure to label containers of hazardous waste, open containers of hazardous waste, exceeding the ninety (90) day storage time limits, no secondary containment for liquid hazardous waste, no contingency plan for a hazardous waste emergency and no employee hazardous waste training.

Formal Enforcement Actions: The RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Section issued 7 formal enforcement actions. Facilities were cited for the same noncompliance issues referenced above, however the failure to act to timely correct the noncompliance issues, or the repeated occurrence of these failures resulted in an escalated enforcement action. Formal Enforcement Action is taken and penalties are collected to bring recalcitrant violators into compliance and to deter additional significant noncompliance.

Penalties Assessed and Collected: A total of $182,236.00 was assessed in Administrative Penalties. A total of $121,989.51 was collected in Administrative Penalties, which includes both Gravity and Economic Benefit recovery.

Case Resolution: The RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Section executed 11 Consent Agreements to resolve formal enforcement actions. Of the 70 informal enforcement actions, 53 Letters of Compliance where issued, which resulted in bringing 53 facilities into compliance and continuing improved hazardous waste management.

EPA/RIDEM Targeted Industries and Natural Resources: The EPA/RIDEM FFY00 target was facilities within the Woonasquatucket River Watershed, LQGs not inspected and aged unresolved cases. This area was chosen due to the content of Dioxins found in the river in the North Providence area.

FFY01 EPA/RIDEM Target: The EPA/RIDEM FFY01 target is the Boat Building Industry.
The RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Section exceeded all of the EPA’s performance measures mandated for the RCRA/Hazardous Waste Compliance Program.

UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK ENFORCEMENT

Formal Enforcement Actions:
The UST/LUST Compliance Section issued 54 formal enforcement actions. 45 were for USTs (one of which was a multi-media NOV involving the Offices of Emergency Response and Solid Waste and one was a combined UST/Air NOV) and 9 were for LUSTs. Many of the UST NOV’s were issued for the December 22, 1998 corrosion protection deadline, which required facilities to remove or upgrade any tanks that were not protected for corrosion. As a result, 30 UST Facilities were brought into compliance with both State and Federal Regulations; 119 non-compliant UST’s were permanently closed. Nine Facilities included significant contaminated soil removal.

Case resolution:
Twenty-seven cases have agreed to a resolution through Consent Agreements, three additional were dismissed. Four cases included Supplemental Environmental Projects, which involves the implementation of a project or program above and beyond any regulatory requirement in exchange for a reduction in administrative penalties. Four hearings were held at the Division of Administrative Adjudication, two cases were referred to Superior Court.

Penalties Assessed and Collected:
A total of $1,671,895 was assessed in Administrative Penalties. A total of $249,665.65 was collected in Administrative Penalties, which includes both Gravity and Economic Benefit recovery.

Informal Enforcement Actions:
OC&I’s UST program conducted 40 compliance inspections have been conducted by the Office of Compliance and Inspection. These inspections concentrated on compliance issues for facilities with new corrosion protection equipment and have resulted in 21 Letters of Non-compliance being issued to Facility owner/operators, outlining specific requirements to bring the facility into compliance with regulations. Non-compliance issues have included the failure to properly operate leak monitoring equipment, inadequate leak detection testing and overall poor general operations and maintenance.

Multi-Media Enforcement Coordination:
The UST Compliance Section is continuing to put forth a team effort with other offices and sections, such as the Offices of Water Resources and Waste Management, and the Emergency Response, Air and Solid Waste Sections. For example, a recent formal enforcement action involved the combined efforts of the UST, Hazardous Waste, Solid Waste and Emergency Response sections. The UST Section consults regularly with the Office of Waste Management for technical assistance with both formal and informal actions. Through a new EPA/RIDEM policy agreement, The UST Section and the Office of Waste
Management have concentrated efforts in the direction of UST facility compliance inspections. This program will continue through the federal fiscal year to ensure that facilities are operating in compliance with the regulations to prevent petroleum releases to the environment.

**DAM SAFETY PROGRAM**

- Inspection of the 41 significant hazard dams was completed (10 significant hazard dams inspected during 2000). In addition, 8 low hazard dams and 1 dam not classified were inspected. Five of these inspections were at dams on the Wood-Pawcatuck River, selected in coordination with the Department’s watershed team.

- The Dam Safety Program applied for and was awarded (in June) a FEMA grant for FY2000 for $45,327. We are currently writing a scope to retain a consultant to provide downstream hazard classifications of certain dams.

- Due to a concern with the safety of many of the dams in the state, the Governor created a Dam Safety and Maintenance Task Force in May to comprehensively review and make recommendations for improvements to the Dam Safety Program. A final report of recommendations was issued in December.

- Completed color maps of all the high & significant hazard dams, indicating directions to access the dam.

- Participated as the host state in an annual conference in Providence in September. The conference was held by the Association of State Dam Safety Officials, a national professional organization committed to ensuring the safety of dams in the country, which drew about 600 people. This included a tour of three area dams (Olney Dam in Lincoln Woods, Stillwater Dam in Smithfield and Gainer Dam in Scituate) in which about 90 people participated.

- Completed all but final proofing corrections of locating dams in the Geographical Information System. The information has also been made available to other agencies.

**WATER POLLUTION COMPLIANCE**

- **COMPLAINTS**

  - The Water Pollution Program received 254 complaints between 1/1/00 and 12/31/00.

  - Water inspectors conducted 390 inspections (238 of these were first-time investigations of complaints). The remainder of the inspections were follow-up work (e.g., dye tests, water samples).
• Inspectors found that 159 complaints were unfounded (no violation at all) and no action was taken on an additional 46 complaints because they represented minor infractions of the Water Quality Regulations.

• 100% of the 254 complaints received in 2000 were inspected.

❖ **ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS**

• **Informal Enforcement Actions:** The Water Pollution Program issued 13 informal enforcement actions (11 Notices of Intent to Enforce and 2 Warning Letters) in an attempt to resolve violations without resorting to formal enforcement.

• **Formal Enforcement Actions:** The Water Compliance Program issued 7 Notices of Violation. Two of these were multi media actions (see below). Of the 7 Notices, 1 was resolved and 6 requested administrative hearings. Efforts continued to resolve enforcement actions that were issued in previous years.

• **Mediation:** The Water Program did not negotiate any Alternative Dispute Resolution cases during this past calendar year.

• **Superior Court Actions:** The Water Program did not file any lawsuits in Superior Court this past calendar year.

❖ **PENALTIES**

• **Penalties Assessed:** The Water Pollution Program assessed $100,000.00 in Administrative Penalties.

• **Penalties Collected:** The Water Pollution Program collected $95,000.00 in Administrative Penalties.

❖ **MULTI-MEDIA ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION**

• **DB Properties Management, Inc.**
  Inspectors of the Water Pollution Program worked with the ISDS Program to document violations involving a subsurface leaching system for stormwater and a failing septic system at a gas station/convenience store in the town of Tiverton. This matter is currently pending before the Administrative Adjudication Division. The penalty assessed for the Water Pollution violation is $5,000.

• **Cardi Realty Company, Inc.**
  Inspectors of the Water Pollution Program worked with the Wetlands Program to document a major ongoing sediment discharge into a pond and other wetlands downstream from a gravel operation in the town of Coventry. This matter is currently pending before the Administrative Adjudication Division. The penalty assessed for the Water Pollution violation is $25,000.
WATER POLLUTION DISCHARGES CORRECTED

- Actions taken by the Water Pollution Program resulted in the correction of 18 water pollution violations. These included the elimination of sewage and laundry waste discharges from residences and businesses; chemical discharges from floor drains; and cooking grease discharges from restaurants. The exact volume of these discharges cannot be determined because of the lack of information about the duration of the discharges and the water usage by the property owners.

WETLAND COMPLIANCE

COMPLAINTS

- The Wetlands Program received 548 complaints between 1/1/00 and 12/31/00.

- Wetland inspectors conducted 1007 inspections (647 of these were first-time investigations of complaints and 15 were permit compliance checks). The remainder of the inspections were follow-up work (e.g., defining restorations, checking restorations).

- Inspectors found that 211 complaints were unfounded (no violation at all) and no action was taken on an additional 148 complaints because they represented minor infractions of the Freshwater Wetlands Act.

- The backlog of uninspected complaints, which was at 202 in 1999, was addressed. There is no longer any backlog of uninspected complaints.

- Almost 100% of the 548 complaints received in 2000 were inspected.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

- Informal Enforcement Actions: The Wetlands Program took 91 informal enforcement actions (65 Notices of Intent to Enforce, 4 Letters of Noncompliance, 13 Warning Letters, and 9 Field Citations) in an attempt to resolve violations without resorting to formal enforcement.

- Formal Enforcement Actions: The Wetlands Program issued 8 Notices of Violation. Two of these were multi media actions (see below). Of the 8 Notices, 2 were resolved, 3 requested administrative hearings, 1 is currently in court, and the other 2 will require court action if the issues raised in the NOV’s are not resolved. Efforts continued to resolve additional enforcement actions that were issued in previous years. Twenty-three older enforcement actions were closed in the year 2000.
• **Mediation**: The Wetlands Program negotiated two Alternative Dispute Resolution cases during the past year.

• **Superior Court Actions**: The Wetlands Program filed 2 lawsuits in Superior Court to correct long-standing wetland violations. 1 lawsuit was resolved and the wetland was restored while the other lawsuit is still pending in court.

▶ **PENALTIES**

• **Penalties Assessed**: The Wetlands Program assessed $15,300.00 in Administrative Penalties.

• **Penalties Collected**: The Wetlands Program collected $61,725.00 in Administrative Penalties.

▶ **REVIEW FEES**

• **Review Fees Assessed**: The Wetlands Program assessed $5,968.80 in Administrative Review Fees.

• **Review Fees Collected**: The Wetlands Program collected $9,448.80 in Administrative Review Fees.

▶ **MULTI-MEDIA ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION**

• **Robert and Tracey Recchia**
  Inspectors of the Wetlands Program worked with the Solid Waste Program to document solid waste and wetland violations on an illegal landfill in the town of Johnston. They played an important role in the Superior Court trial to obtain a mandate from the court to clean up the property.

• **Cardi Realty Company Inc**
  Inspectors of the Wetlands Program worked with the Water Pollution Program to document a major ongoing sediment discharge into a pond and other wetlands downstream from a gravel operation in the town of Coventry. This matter is currently before the Administrative Adjudication Division.

▶ **WETLAND RESTORATIONS**

• Actions taken by the Wetlands Program resulted in 36 wetland restorations. These included the removal of fill material, removal of unauthorized culverts and bridges, reconstruction of water control structures, planting of trees and shrubs, revegetation of disturbed soils, the requirement to prevent erosion and sedimentation, and the necessity to allow restored areas to revegetate to a natural wild condition. Approximately 4.2 acres of actual wetland was restored and/or required to revegetate to a wild condition. Additionally, 8.2 acres of adjacent regulated upland that serves as a buffer to protect wetland values was restored and/or required to revegetate to a wild condition.
ISDS (SEPTIC SYSTEM) COMPLIANCE

❖ COMPLAINTS

• The ISDS Program received 454 complaints between 1/1/00 and 12/31/00.

• ISDS inspectors conducted 735 inspections (266 of these were first-time investigations of complaints and 112 were second investigations of complaints). The remainder of the inspections were follow-up work (e.g., dye tests, checking septic system repairs).

• Inspectors found that 171 complaints were unfounded (no violation at all) and no action was taken on an additional 27 complaints because they represented minor infractions of the ISDS Regulations.

• 100% of the 454 complaints received in 2000 were inspected.

❖ ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

• **Informal Enforcement Actions**: The ISDS Program issued 228 informal enforcement actions (48 of these were second notices) in an attempt to resolve violations without resorting to formal enforcement.

• **Formal Enforcement Actions**: The ISDS Program issued 5 Notices of Violation. One of these was a multi media action (see below). Of the 5 Notices, 1 was resolved and 4 requested administrative hearings. Efforts continued to resolve enforcement actions that were issued in previous years.

• **Mediation**: The ISDS Program negotiated 3 Alternative Dispute Resolution cases during the past year.

• **Superior Court Actions**: The ISDS Program filed 6 lawsuits in Superior Court to correct long standing septic system sewage overflows and/or enforce administrative orders that were entered against the violator. Of these 6 lawsuits, 4 were resolved and 2 are still pending in court.

❖ PENALTIES

• **Penalties Assessed**: The ISDS Program assessed $11,250.00 in Administrative Penalties.

• **Penalties Collected**: The ISDS Program collected $10,500.00 in Administrative Penalties.
MULTI-MEDIA ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION

- DB Properties Management, Inc.
  Inspectors of the ISDS Program worked with the Water Pollution Program to document violations involving a subsurface leaching system for stormwater and a failing septic system at a gas station/convenience store in the town of Tiverton. This matter is currently pending before the Administrative Adjudication Division. The penalty assessed for the ISDS violation is $1,500.

ISDS VIOLATIONS CORRECTED

- Actions taken by the ISDS Program resulted in the correction of 168 ISDS violations. These included the elimination of sewage and laundry waste overflows from residences and businesses; repair of illegal septic systems that were installed; disciplinary actions against licensed ISDS installers for failing to follow legal requirements; and upgrade of septic systems to accommodate building renovations. The volume of sewage overflows that was eliminated by these actions cannot be determined because of the lack of information about the duration of the discharges and the water usage by the property owners.

MEDICAL WASTE

COMPLAINTS

Response to medical waste complaints was shared by OC&I's Emergency Response Program and its Solid Waste Program. OC&I responded to 4 complaints. Emergency Response handled 2 of the complaints involving biological mediums. Solid Waste responded to 2 complaints related to sharps or needles.

ENFORCEMENT

The OC&I issued one informal enforcement letter and one formal enforcement letter in 2000. The OC&I assessed administrative penalties in the amount of $7,500.00.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OC&amp;I Accum. Statistics Report</th>
<th>AIR</th>
<th>ER</th>
<th>ISDS</th>
<th>RCRA</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>UST/LUST</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>WET</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints Received</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>4561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Investigated</td>
<td>2229</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>4362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints Unfounded</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections Completed</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>4227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMITTED FACILITIES</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-PERMITTED FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspections</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning Letters</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Violations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Mediation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Criminal Investigation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalties Assessed</td>
<td>$110,245.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$11,250.00</td>
<td>$182,236.00</td>
<td>$1,030,746.00</td>
<td>$1,671,895.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$21,268.80</td>
<td>$3,127,640.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalties Collected</td>
<td>$65,682.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
<td>$121,989.51</td>
<td>$76,508.06</td>
<td>$249,665.65</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
<td>$71,173.80</td>
<td>$690,519.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Agreement Entered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Agreement Resolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP Number of Agreed To</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP Monitary Value</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$155,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$224,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP Completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAD Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Recommended for Superior Court</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action To Be Taken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery (Outstanding)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$209,582.15</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,235.89</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$213,818.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery Collected</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$110,444.63</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,171.08</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$113,615.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Permitted Facilities include RCRA Generators. **Site Remediation (SR) & Multimedia (MM) statistics effective 9/00 included in Total of Notices of Violations and Total of Penalties Assessed. SR NOV = 1, MM NOV = 5.

"Complaints Received" represents the total number of complaints received including multiple complaints per location or alleged violation. NA = Not Applicable for this Program.

"Complaint Investigations" are counted only once even though one Investigation may address multiple complaints received.
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