

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION
OF HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
COMMISSIONER'S BOARD ROOM
June 12, 2003
10 AM – 12 NOON**

AGENDA

**INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO THE AGENDA AND REMOVAL OF CONSENT
AGENDA ITEMS WITH QUESTIONS, AS REQUESTED BY BOARD MEMBERS**

- I. PUBLIC HEARING**
- Conduct Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to Chapter 1-6 (Services Fee Schedule, effective October 1, 2003) 1
- II. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS**
- III. CITIZEN'S ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
- Report from the Chairman, David Jellerson
- IV. CONSENT AGENDA**
- A. Approval of Minutes: March 20, 2003; April 2, 2003;
April 22, 2003; April 23, 2003; May 7, 2003 14
- B. Monthly Activity Reports 24
- C. Legal Department Monthly Report 34
- D. Pollution Recovery Trust Fund 37
- E. Gardinier Settlement Trust Fund 38
- V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**
- VI. AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION**
- Staff Report – Briefing on Recent Ammonia Gas Release 39
- VII. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT**
- HIMP (Hillsborough Independent Monitoring Program)
Update – Lower Hillsborough River

Any person who might wish to appeal any decision made by the Environmental Protection Commission regarding any matter considered at the forthcoming public hearing or meeting is hereby advised that they will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made which will include the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based.

Visit our website at www.epchc.org

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

Date: June 12, 2003

Agenda Item: Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to Chapter 1-6 (Services-Fee Schedule)

Description/Summary:

Staff has completed a review and analysis of the fees charged for services provided by EPC. The proposed fees represent the cost for providing these services.

Staff presented the recommended changes to Rule 1-6 to CEAC on May 5 and June 2, 2003. CEAC voted to support amendments as proposed by staff.

A public workshop was held on May 28, 2003. Staff incorporated many of the recommendations made at the workshop by those affected by the amendments to the EPC Fee Schedule.

An announcement of this public hearing to amend the rule was published on June 2, 2003, at least 10 days prior to the scheduled hearing date as required by Chapter 84-446, Laws of Florida.

Commission Action Recommended:

Conduct a Public Hearing to approve proposed amendments to Chapter 1-6 (Services – Fee Schedule), to be effective October 1, 2003.

**RULES OF THE
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION
OF HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY**

**CHAPTER 1-6
SERVICES-FEE SCHEDULE**

- 1-6.01 Declaration and Intent
- 1-6.02 Air Management
- 1-6.03 Waste Management
- 1-6.04 Water Management
- 1-6.05 Wetlands Management
- 1-6.06 Other Miscellaneous Charges
- 1-6.07 Fee Waivers
- 1-6.08 Prohibitions

1-6.01 DECLARATION AND INTENT

It is the intent of the Commission to establish reasonable fees for services performed by the Environmental Protection Commission Director, and his duly authorized agents and employees in the review of applications and other technical materials, in the investigation of cases involving violation of the enabling act and rules promulgated there under, and in the conduct of inspections.

Said fees are for the purpose of defraying expenses incurred by the Environmental Protection Commission in performing professional services necessitated by the actions of others. All funds collected for said services shall become funds of Hillsborough County and shall be deposited in the General Revenue Fund.

1-6.02 AIR MANAGEMENT

A. Stationary source permitting

1. The following application and compliance fees apply to permits that are to be reviewed pursuant to the authority of Chapter 84-446, Laws of Florida, and not pursuant to full permit delegation from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) except as provided in subsection A.2 below. The fees for the non-delegated facilities are as follows:

- (a) Construction permit for an air pollution source
 - (i) New source review or prevention of significant deterioration \$480
 - (ii) All others \$960

- (b) Operation permit for an air pollution source for 5 yrs
 - (i) Minor facility \$1245
 - (1) Application review \$795
 - (2) Compliance \$450
 - (ii) Synthetic minor facility \$1645
 - (1) Application review \$795
 - (2) Compliance \$850
 - (iii) Major facility \$2645
 - (1) Application review \$795
 - (2) Compliance \$1850
- (c) Revise an air pollution source permit \$380
- (d) Transfer of ownership, name change, and extension of expiration date for each air permit \$45

2. Air permits being reviewed and processed pursuant to full permit delegation from FDEP shall be subject to the processing fees set forth in section 62-4.050 F.A.C., as summarized below, and shared with FDEP as agreed.

- (a) Construction permits
 - (i) Source with PSD or NAA, 100 tons/yr or more \$750
 - (ii) Source without PSD or NAA, 100 tons/yr or more \$5000
 - (iii) Source 50 tons/yr but less than 100 \$4500
 - (iv) Source 25 tons/yr but less than 50 \$2000
 - (v) Source 5 tons/yr but less than 25 \$1000
 - (vi) Source less than 5 tons/yr \$250
 - (vii) Minor modification \$250
 - (viii) Minor modification, original permit fee less than \$30 \$50
 - (ix) Transfer of ownership/permit \$50
 - (x) Time extension on permit \$50
- (b) Operation permits
 - (i) Major source no fee
 - (ii) Minor source - stack sample \$1500
 - (iii) Minor source - other source \$1000
 - (iv) Minor source - no sample \$750
 - (v) Minor modifications \$250
 - (vi) Transfer of permit ownership \$50
 - (vii) Time extension on permit \$50
 - (viii) Variable form permitting standards or conditions \$2000

NOTE: Major sources will pay a Title V fee pursuant to Section 62-213 F.A.C. If EPC and DEP have an

agreement to share this fee, then no additional fee will be required under this rule. However, if there is no fee sharing agreement, then fees listed in section 1-6.02 A.1. above shall apply for Title V sources.

B. Asbestos notification*

- 1. Notification for commercial demolition
 - (a) For structures less than 50,000 gross sq ft \$200
 - (b) For structures 50,000 gross sq ft and greater \$300
- 2. Notification for asbestos abatement
 - (a) Renovation 160 to 1000 sq ft or 260 to 1000 linear feet of asbestos \$300
 - (b) Renovation greater than 1000 linear feet or 1000 sq ft \$500
 - (c) Annual notifications for facilities where renovation of asbestos containing material is expected to exceed 160 sq ft or 260 linear feet in a calendar year \$500

*There is no fee for courtesy notifications. Courtesy notifications are where a notification for a project is provided by the building owner or his contractor, even though it is not required by rule.

C. Open burning authorization

- 1. Two (2) acres or less \$400
- 2. Greater than two (2) acres \$600

1-6.03 WASTE MANAGEMENT

A. Solid waste

- 1. Construction permits
 - (a) Class I or class II facility 5 year permit \$3300
 - (i) Application review \$800
 - (ii) Compliance \$2500
 - (b) Class III facility - 5 year permit \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000
 - (c) Resource recovery/ Incinerator - 5 years \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000

- (d) Construction & demolition debris disposal - 5 year permit \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000
- (e) Waste processing facility - 5 year permit \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
- (f) Compost facility - 5 year permit \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
- (g) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 years \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
- 2. Operation permits
 - (a) Class I or class II facility - 5 years permit \$3100
 - (i) Application review \$600
 - (ii) Compliance \$2500
 - (b) Class III facility - 5 years permit \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000
 - (c) Resource recovery/ Incinerator - 5 years permit \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000
 - (d) Construction & demolition debris disposal - 5 year permit \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000
 - (e) Waste processing facility - 5 year permit \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
 - (f) Compost facility - 5 year permit \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
 - (g) All other solid waste management facilities

- 5 years		\$2000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1500	
3. Closure/long term care permits		
(a) Class I or class II facilities - 5 years permit		\$1000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
(b) Class III facility - 5 years permit		\$1000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
(c) Construction & demolition debris disposal - 5 year permit		\$1000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
(d) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 years permit		\$1000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
4. Director's Authorization - facilities not otherwise requiring a solid waste permit issued by the FDEP		
(a) Old landfill development-5 year permit		\$2800
(i) Application review	\$800	
(ii) Compliance	\$2000	
(b) Recovered materials processing facility		\$2200
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1700	
(c) Yard trash processing facility		\$2200
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1700	
(d) One time on site disposal - residential		\$100
(e) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 year permit		\$2200
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1700	
5. Modifications		
(a) Minor modifications		
(i) Corrections, minor changes which will not involve new work, or new		

(ii) Transfer, time extension, minor changes which involve new work, or new work locations which will alter, replace or eliminate permit requirements. \$100

(b) Substantial modifications shall require the appropriate application review fee in conformance with Section 1-6.03, 1 through 4.

6. Small quantity hazardous waste generators**

(a) Annual notification/verification fee \$40

****NOTE: These Environmental Protection Commission fees will normally be collected by the Hillsborough County Tax Collector.**

B. Storage tanks

1. Storage tank installation and upgrade plan reviews \$150

1-6.04 WATER MANAGEMENT

A. The following application and compliance fees apply to permits that are to be reviewed pursuant to the authority of Chapter 84-446, Laws of Florida, and not pursuant to permit delegation from the FDEP:

1. Domestic wastewater source permits

(a) Preliminary design report review \$2500

(b) Facility permit for 5 years

(i) types I & II \$2940

(a) application review \$1850

(b) compliance \$1090

activities

(ii) type III \$930

(a) application review \$380

(b) compliance \$550

activities

(c) Permit modifications

(i) Minor modification involving \$750

construction activity

(ii) Substantial \$1750

modification

(d) residual site application \$1445

2. Collection systems

(a) general permit	
(i) less than 10 EDU	\$230
(ii) 10 or more EDU	\$460
(a) application review	\$230
(b) compliance	\$230
(10 or more EDU)	
(b) standard permit	
(i) less than 10 EDU	\$270
(ii) 10 or more EDU	\$500
(a) application review	\$270
(b) compliance	\$230
3. Industrial wastewater source permits	
(a) Preliminary design report	
(i) major facility	\$2500
(ii) minor facility	\$1000
(b) Facility permit for 5 years	
(i) minor facility	\$1000
(ii) major facility	\$3000
(i) application review	\$2455
(ii) compliance activities	\$545
(c) General permits	\$275
(d) Permit modifications	\$750
(i) Minor modification involving construction activity	\$1750
(ii) Substantial modification	
4. EPC authorization for facilities not requiring a FDEP permit which may discharge pollutants or contaminants into waters of the county	\$2200

B. Water permits being reviewed and processed by the Commission pursuant to permit delegation from the FDEP shall be subject to the processing fees set forth in section 62-4.050 F.A.C., although the compliance fees above may also apply as appropriate.

1-6.05 WETLANDS MANAGEMENT

1. Land excavation permits	
*(a) New and expansion	\$870
*(b) Extension and renewal	\$650
2. Rezoning application	\$300
3. Subdivision applications	
*(a) Preliminary	\$370
*(b) Master plan	\$750

*(c) Construction	\$490
*(d) Final plat	\$200
*(e) Minor subdivision plans	\$230
*(f) As-build verification	\$300
4 Tampa Port Authority	
(a) Minor form	\$150
(b) Standard form	\$300
5. Phosphate mining	
*(a) Annual review and inspection	\$375
*(b) Unit review and reclamation	\$3500
*(c) Bimonthly inspections (6 per year)	\$310
*(d) Administrative Review	\$100
*(e) Land Alteration	\$500
*(f) Amendments to Mining/ Reclamation	
(i) Changes within the mining unit	\$1000
(ii) Addition of adjacent acreage	***
*6. Development of regional impact	\$1200
*7. Commercial site development application	\$500
*8. Natural Resources	\$270
*9. Miscellaneous activities in wetlands	
(a) Nuisance species removal	No fee
(b) Dock, boardwalks, riprap, etc.	\$150
10. Wetland delineation	
(a) Less than 250 L.F	\$150
(b) 250 L.F. or greater	\$150 + .20 L.F
11. Wetland mitigation	
(a) Single family homes (review and monitoring reports)	\$850
(i) Review	\$500
(ii) 7 monitoring reports	\$350
** (b) Commercial/subdivision-forested	\$4975
(i) Review	\$2500
(ii) 11 monitoring reports	\$2475
(c) Commercial/subdivision - herbaceous	\$4075
(i) Review	\$2500
(ii) 7 monitoring reports	\$1575
(d) Agricultural - Forested	\$1050

(i) Review	\$500	
(ii) Monitoring	\$550	
(e) Agricultural - Herbaceous		\$850
(i) Review	\$500	
(ii) Monitoring	\$350	
(f) Amendment to mitigation plan		
(i) Changes in configuration/ location	\$500	
(ii) Changes in elevations/ planting scheme	\$100	
(g) Phosphate mining		
(i) Addition of adjacent area to previously approved mitigation application	****	

application fee in circumstances where unfairness would otherwise be the result.

1-6.08 PROHIBITIONS

The fees listed in Sections 1-6.02 through 1-6.05 are due and payable upon submission of a request, application or notification. Whenever a request application or notification is submitted without the required fee, receipt shall be acknowledged and the request, application or notification shall be immediately returned with attachments; no further action shall be taken until the appropriate fees are submitted along with the supporting documents. It shall be a violation to fail to pay a required fee.

*Denotes EPC Fees collected by the Planning and Growth Management Department for EPC.

**Only this subsection of Rule 1-6.05.11 applies if the application contains a request for authorization to impact both forested and herbaceous wetlands.

***Minimum \$500 or Straight Line Pro-Rata Fee whichever is greater calculated using the following formula: the number of acres of land to be added to an approved mining unit divided by 2500, multiplied by the fee required by Rule 1-6.05.5(b)

****Minimum \$700 or Straight Line Pro-Rata Fee whichever is greater calculated using the following formula: the number of acres of land to be added to an approved mitigation application divided by 2500, multiplied by the fee required by Rule 1-6.05.11(b) or (c), as applicable.

[**Publisher's Note:** EPC charges for development and rezoning applications may be submitted to appropriate governmental entities where the review process has been coordinated with EPC]

ADOPTED 2/28/85

Effective 03/15/85

Amended 02/28/86

Amended 12/11/86

Amended 01/13/88

Amended 02/28/90

Effective 04/01/90

Amended 07/10/90

Amended 08/22/90

Effective 10/01/90

Amended 05/22/91

Amended 09/25/91

Amended 11/05/91

Amended 3/24/93

Amended 5/26/93

Amended 1/25/95

Amended 8/21/97

Amended 9/17/98

Amended 6/12/03

1-6.06 OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES

1. Enforcement Costs	\$50/hr
2. Data Processing Data Analysis	\$50/hr
3. Certification of Copies	\$1/pg
4. Copies	.15/pg

1-6.07 FEE WAIVERS

1. Executive Director may waive the appropriate application fee in cases of financial hardship.
2. The Executive Director may modify or waive an

**RULES OF THE
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMISSION
OF HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY**

**CHAPTER 1-6
SERVICES-FEE SCHEDULE**

- 1-6.01 Declaration and Intent
- 1-6.02 Air Management
- 1-6.03 Solid Waste Management
- 1-6.04 Water Management
- 1-6.05 Wetlands Management
- 1-6.06 Other Miscellaneous Charges
- 1-6.07 Fee Waivers
- 1-6.08 Prohibitions

1-6.01 DECLARATION AND INTENT

It is the intent of the Commission to establish reasonable charges fees for services performed by the Environmental Protection Commission Director, and his duly authorized agents and employees in the review of applications and other technical materials, in the investigation of cases involving violation of the Code enabling act and rules promulgated there under, and in the conduct of inspections.

Said charges fees are for the purpose of defraying expenses incurred by the Environmental Protection Commission in performing professional services necessitated by the actions of others. All funds collected for said services shall become funds of Hillsborough County and shall be deposited in the General Revenue Fund.

1-6.02 AIR MANAGEMENT

A. Stationary source permitting

1. The following application and compliance fees apply to permits that are to be reviewed pursuant to the authority of Chapter 84-446, Laws of Florida, and not pursuant to full permit delegation from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) except as provided in subsection A.2 below. The fees for the non-delegated facilities are as follows:

- (a) Construction permit for an air pollution source

- (i) New source review or prevention of significant deterioration \$ 480
- (ii) All others \$ 960
- (b) Operation permit for an air pollution source for 5 yrs*
 - (i) Minor facility \$1245
 - (1) Application review \$795
 - (2) Compliance activities \$450
 - (ii) Synthetic minor facility \$1645
 - (1) Application review \$795
 - (2) Compliance activities \$850
 - (iii) Major facility \$2645
 - (1) Application review \$795
 - (2) Compliance activities \$1850
- (c) Revise an air pollution source permit \$380
- (d) Transfer of ownership, name change, and extension of expiration date for each air permit* \$45

2. Air permits being reviewed and processed pursuant to full permit delegation from FDEP shall be subject to the processing fees set forth in section 62-4.050 F.A.C., as summarized below, and shared with FDEP as agreed.

- (a) Construction permits
 - (i) Source with PSD or NAA, 100 tons/yr or more \$750
 - (ii) Source without PSD or NAA, 100 tons/yr or more \$5000
 - (iii) Source 50 tons/yr but less than 100 \$4500
 - (iv) Source 25 tons/yr but less than 50 \$2000
 - (v) Source 5 tons/yr but less than 25 \$1000
 - (vi) Source less than 5 tons/yr \$250
 - (vii) Minor modification \$250
 - (viii) Minor modification, original permit fee less than \$30 \$50
 - (ix) Transfer of ownership/permit \$50
 - (x) Time extension on permit \$50
- * (b) Operation permits
 - (i) Major source no fee
 - (ii) Minor source - stack sample \$1500
 - (iii) Minor source - other source \$1000
 - (iv) Minor source - no sample \$750
 - (v) Minor modifications \$250
 - (vi) Transfer of permit ownership \$50
 - (vii) Time extension on permit \$50

(viii) Variable form permitting standards or conditions \$2000

(a) — open burning authorization — \$425
 1. Two (2) acres or less \$400
 2. Greater than two (2) acres \$600

*NOTE: Major sources will pay a Title V fee pursuant to Section 62-213 F.A.C. If EPC and DEP have an agreement to share this fee, then no additional fee will be required under this rule. However, if there is no fee sharing agreement, then fees listed in section 1-6.02 A.1. above shall apply for delegated Title V sources. All fully delegated non-Title V source shall pay according to this schedule.

B. Asbestos notification*

1. Notification for commercial demolition
 - (a) For structures less than 50,000 gross sq ft \$ 115 200
 - (b) For structures 50,000 gross sq ft and greater than 50,000 sq ft \$ 215 300
2. Notification for asbestos abatement
 - (a) Renovation 160 to 1000 sq ft or 260 to 1000 linear feet of asbestos \$ 145 300
 - (b) Renovation greater than 1000 linear feet or 1000 sq ft \$ 200 500
 - (c) Annual notifications for facilities where renovation of asbestos containing material is expected to exceed 160 sq ft or 260 linear feet in a calendar year \$500

* There is no fee for courtesy notifications. Courtesy notifications are where a notification for a project is provided by the building owner or his contractor, even though it is not required by rule.

C. Mobile Source Certification

1. Compliance certification
 - (a) automobile retail operations \$ -75
 - (b) automobile repair operations \$
 - (c) automotive parts and supplies retail operations \$
 - (d) gasoline service stations—VBS \$

D C Open burning authorization

1-6.03 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

A. Solid waste

1. Construction permits
 - (a) Class I or class II facility 5 year permit \$2350 3300
 - (i) Application review \$550 800
 - (ii) Compliance \$1800 2500
 - (b) Class III facility - 5 year permit \$1330 2500
 - (i) Application review \$ 330 500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1000 2000
 - (c) — yard trash/compost facility — 5 years \$1275
 - (i) application review \$ 275
 - (ii) compliance \$1000
 - (d) Resource recovery/ Incinerator - 5 years \$ 960 2500
 - (i) Application review \$ 460 500
 - (ii) Compliance \$ 500 2000
 - (e) Construction & demolition debris disposal - 5 year permit \$2500
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$2000
 - (f) Waste processing facility - 5 year permit \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
 - (g) Compost facility - 5 year permit \$2000
 - (i) Application review \$500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1500
 - (g) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 years \$1530 2000
 - (i) Application review \$ 330 500
 - (ii) Compliance \$1200 1500

2. Operation permits		
(a) Class I or class II facility - 5 years permit		\$2200 3100
(i) Application review	\$ 400	
	600	
(ii) Compliance	\$1800	
	2500	
(b) Class III facility - 5 years permit		\$1275 2500
(i) Application review	\$ 275	
	500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1000	
	2000	
(e) yard trash/compost facility - 5 years		\$1275
(i) application review	\$ -275	
(ii) compliance	\$1000	
(dc) Resource recovery/ Incinerator - 5 years permit		\$ 775 2500
(i) Application review	\$ 275	
	500	
(ii) Compliance	\$ 500	
	2000	
(d) Construction & demolition debris disposal - 5 year permit		\$2500
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$2000	
(e) Waste processing facility - 5 year permit		\$2000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1500	
(f) Compost facility - 5 year permit		\$2000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1500	
(eg) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 years		\$1275 2000
(i) Application review	\$ 275	
	500	
(ii) Compliance	\$1000	
	1500	
3. Closure/long term care permits		
(a) Class I or class II facilities - 5 years permit		\$ 835 1000

(i) Application review	\$ 335	
	500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
(b) Class III facility - 5 years permit		\$ 835 1000
(i) Application review	\$ 335	
	500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
(e) yard trash/compost facility - 5 years		\$ -775
(i) application review	\$ -275	
(ii) compliance	\$ -500	
(c) Construction & demolition debris disposal - 5 year permit		\$1000
(i) Application review	\$500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	
(d) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 years permit		\$ 775 1000
(i) Application review	\$ 275	
	500	
(ii) Compliance	\$500	

4. General permits	
(a) commercial const/demo - 5 years	\$1600
(i) application review	\$ 400
(ii) compliance	\$1200
(b) residential const/demo - 5 years	\$1125
(i) application review	\$ 125
(ii) compliance	\$1000
(c) all other solid waste facilities - 5 years	\$1260
(i) application review	\$ 260
(ii) compliance	\$1000

5. EPC authorization for facilities not requiring DEP permit	
(a) commercial facility - 5 years	\$1530
(i) application review	\$ 330
(ii) compliance	\$1200
(b) residential facility - 1 year	\$ 385
(i) application review	\$ 185
(ii) compliance	\$ 200

4. Director's Authorization - facilities not otherwise requiring a solid waste permit issued by the FDEP

(a) Old landfill development-5 year permit	\$2800
(i) Application review	\$800
(ii) Compliance	\$2000
(b) Recovered materials processing facility	\$2200
(i) Application review	\$500
(ii) Compliance	\$1700
(c) Yard trash processing facility	\$2200
(i) Application review	\$500
(ii) Compliance	\$1700
(d) One time on site disposal - residential	\$100
(e) All other solid waste management facilities - 5 year permit	\$2200
(i) Application review	\$500
(ii) Compliance	\$1700

6-5 Modifications

(a) Minor modifications	
(i) Corrections, minor changes which will not involve new work, or new work locations, which will not alter, replace or eliminate permit requirements	\$0
(ii) Transfer, time extension, minor changes which involve new work, or new work locations which will alter, replace or eliminate permit requirements.	\$ 60
(b) Substantial modifications shall require the appropriate application review fee in conformance with Section 1-6.03, 1 through 4	100

7-6 Small quantity hazardous waste generators**

(a) Annual notification/verification fee	\$40
--	------

****NOTE:** These Environmental Protection Commission fees will normally be collected by the Hillsborough County Tax Collector.

B. Storage tanks

1. Storage tank installation and upgrade plan reviews	\$100
	150

1-6.04 WATER MANAGEMENT

A. The following application and compliance fees apply

to permits that are to be reviewed pursuant to the authority of Chapter 84-446, Laws of Florida, and not pursuant to permit delegation from the FDEP:

1. Domestic wastewater source permits

(a) Preliminary design report review	\$2500
(i) types I & II	\$1030
(ii) type III	\$ 610
(iii) minor modifications	\$ 360
(b) Facility permit for 5 years	
(i) types I & II	\$1470 2940
(a) application review	\$ 380
(b) compliance activities	1850
(c) compliance activities	\$1090
(ii) type III	\$930
(a) application review	\$380
(b) compliance activities	\$550
(c) Permit modifications (transfer, time ext., conditions)	\$ 60
(i) Minor modification involving construction activity	\$750
(ii) Substantial modification	\$1750
(d) residual site application	\$1445
(i) agricultural use plan (AUP)	\$1445
(a) application review	\$ 580
(b) compliance activities	\$ 865
(ii) dedicated site plan (DSP)	\$1745
(a) application review	\$ 700
(b) compliance activities	\$1045

2. Collection systems

(a) general permit	
(i) less than 10 EDU	\$230
(ii) 10 or more EDU	\$460
(a) application review	\$230
(b) compliance (10 or more EDU)	\$230
(b) standard permit	
(i) less than 10 EDU	\$270
(ii) 10 or more EDU	\$500

(a) application review	\$270
(b) compliance	\$230
3. Industrial wastewater source permits	
(a) Preliminary design report	
(i) major facility	\$2500
(ii) minor facility	\$1000
(a) construction permit	
(i) types I & II	\$1200
(ii) type III with groundwater monitoring	\$1200
(iii) type III w/o groundwater monitoring	\$ 780
(b) Facility permit for 5 years	
(i) minor facility	\$1000
(ii) major facility	\$3000
(i) types I & II	\$1415
(a) application review	\$ 870
	2455
(b) compliance activities	\$545
(ii) type III with groundwater monitoring	\$1415
(a) application review	\$ 870
(b) compliance activities	\$ 545
(iii) type III w/o groundwater monitoring	\$1295
(a) application review	\$ 750
(b) compliance activities	\$ 545
(c) General permits	\$275
(d) minor Permit modifications (excluding time extensions)	\$ 360
(i) Minor modification involving construction activity	\$750
(ii) Substantial modification	\$1750

4. EPC authorization for facilities not requiring a FDEP permit which may discharge pollutants or contaminants into waters of the county \$2200

B. Water permits being reviewed and processed by the Commission pursuant to permit delegation from the FDEP shall be subject to the processing fees set forth in section 62-4.050 F.A.C., although the compliance fees above may also apply as appropriate.

1-6.05 WETLANDS MANAGEMENT

1. Land excavation permits

* (a) New and expansion	\$785	\$70
* (b) Extension and renewal		\$650
2. Rezoning application		
* (a) CU, CP, IP, MHP/RVP, conditional use		\$ 85
* (b) all others		\$ 85
3. Subdivision applications		
* (a) Preliminary	\$ 140	370
* (b) Master plan	\$ 550	750
* (c) Construction	\$ 250	490
* (d) Final plat	\$ 90	200
* (e) waivers		\$ 100
* (f) Minor subdivision plans	\$ 100	230
* (g) As-build verification	\$ 255	300
4. Dredge and Fill Permit Applications Tampa Port Authority		
(a) minor form (no site inspection necessary)		\$ 50
(ba) Minor form (site inspection required)		\$150
(eb) Standard form	\$220	300
5. Phosphate mining		
* (a) Annual review and inspection		\$375
* (b) Unit review and reclamation	\$760	3500
* (c) Bimonthly inspections (56 per year)		\$310
* (d) Administrative Review		\$100
* (e) Land Alteration		\$500
* (f) Amendments to Mining/ Reclamation		
(i) Changes within the mining unit		\$1000
(ii) Addition of adjacent acreage		***
*6. Development of regional impact	\$1305	1200
*7. Commercial site development application	\$ 360	500
*8. Site clearing/alteration/bldg. Permit Natural Resources	\$ 100	270
*9. House Bill Application		\$ 100
*9. Miscellaneous activities in wetlands		
(a) Nuisance species removal		No fee

(b) Dock, boardwalks, riprap, etc.	\$150
10. Wetland delineation	
(a) office	\$-120
(b) Field	
(ia) Less than 250 L.F.	\$ 120 150
(ib) 250 L.F. to 3500 L.F. or greater	\$120 + .05/L.F. \$150 + 20 L.F.
(iii) 3501 and up — additional increment of — 3500 L.F. + .05 L.F.	\$100 + 50 for each
(e) nuisance species verification	no fee
11. Wetland mitigation	\$-775
(a) Single family homes (review and monitoring reports)	\$850
(i) Review	\$500
(ii) 7 monitoring reports	\$350
** (b) Commercial/subdivision- forested	\$4975
(i) Review	\$2500
(ii) 11 monitoring reports	\$2475
(c) Commercial/subdivision - herbaceous	\$4075
(i) Review	\$2500
(ii) 7 monitoring reports	\$1575
(d) Agricultural - Forested	\$1050
(i) Review	\$500
(ii) Monitoring	\$550
(e) Agricultural - Herbaceous	\$850
(i) Review	\$500
(ii) Monitoring	\$350
(f) Amendment to mitigation plan	
(i) Changes in configuration/ location	\$500
(ii) Changes in elevations/ planting scheme	\$100
(g) Phosphate mining	
(i) Addition of adjacent area to previously approved mitigation application	****

***Minimum \$500 or Straight Line Pro-Rata Fee whichever is greater calculated using the following formula: the number of acres of land to be added to an approved mining unit divided by 2500, multiplied by the fee required by Rule 1-6.05.5(b)

****Minimum \$700 or Straight Line Pro-Rata Fee whichever is greater calculated using the following formula: the number of acres of land to be added to an approved mitigation application divided by 2500, multiplied by the fee required by Rule 1-6.05.11(b) or (c), as applicable.

1-6.06 OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES

1. Enforcement Costs	\$ 36/hr 50/hr
2. Data Processing Data Analysis	\$ 36/hr 50/hr
3. Certification of Copies	\$ 1/pg
4. Copies	.15/pg

1-6.07 FEE WAIVERS

1. Executive Director may waive the appropriate application fee in cases of financial hardship.
2. The Executive Director may modify or waive an application fee in circumstances where unfairness would otherwise be the result.

1-6.08 PROHIBITIONS

The fees listed in Sections 1-6.02 through 1-6.05 are due and payable upon submission of a request, application or notification. Whenever a request application or notification is submitted without the required fee, receipt shall be acknowledged and the request, application or notification shall be immediately returned with attachments; no further action shall be taken until the appropriate fees are submitted along with the supporting documents. It shall be a violation to fail to pay a required fee.

[Publisher's Note: EPC charges for development and rezoning applications may be submitted to appropriate governmental entities where the review process has been coordinated with EPC]

*Denotes EPC Fees collected by the Planning and Growth Management Department for EPC.

**Only this subsection of Rule 1-6.05.11 applies if the application contains a request for authorization to impact both forested and herbaceous wetlands.

ADOPTED 2/28/85
Effective 03/15/85
Amended 02/28/86
Amended 12/11/86
Amended 01/13/88
Amended 02/28/90
Effective 04/01/90
Amended 07/10/90
Amended 08/22/90
Effective 10/01/90
Amended 05/22/91
Amended 09/25/91
Amended 11/05/91
Amended 3/24/93
Amended 5/26/93
Amended 1/25/95
Amended 8/21/97
Amended 9/17/98
Amended 6/12/03

MARCH 20, 2003 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION - DRAFT MINUTES

The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 20, 2003, at 10:00 a.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present: Chairman Jan Platt and Commissioners Kathy Castor, Pat Frank, Ken Hagan (arrived at 10:43 a.m.), Jim Norman, Thomas Scott, and Ronda Storms.

Chairman Platt called the meeting to order at 10:36 a.m.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Dr. Richard Garrity, EPC Executive Director, added awards for past Citizens Environmental Advisory Committee (CEAC) members and a seagrass conservation plan to the agenda. As requested by Chairman Platt, Dr. Garrity reported Mr. Roger Stewart, former EPC Executive Director, was hospitalized for observation. Commissioner Storms and Dr. Garrity commented on EPC General Counsel Richard Tschantz participating in a roundtable discussion in Washington, D.C.

CITIZENS COMMENTS

Ms. Marilyn Smith, County resident, commented on utility companies manipulating power costs and taking advantage of people in California; she perceived Florida Progress was doing the same thing.

CEAC

Report From the Chairman - Mr. Larry Padgett, chairman, CEAC, reported the new CEAC members had received a staff overview regarding EPC and CEAC. Planning and Growth Management Department (PGMD) staff had discussed the need for more citizen input to request grant money. Mr. Padgett had sent a letter recommending EPC support PGMD in the grant process. CEAC members had recommended denial and were disappointed EPC had approved the request from American Lung Association AirWise for Pollution Recovery Funds (PRF). CEAC was requesting a volunteer from CEAC serve on the Federal Emergency Management Administration committee to help setup water insurance, et cetera. Mr. Padgett outlined issues CEAC would discuss in the upcoming months and reported Mr. Roy Davis, a CEAC member, had been approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) as one of two recipients of the Moral Courage Award.

Awards to Past CEAC Members - Mr. Rick Bateman, January 2001 to February 2003, accepted a plaque, and Messers. John Stickles, May 2002 to February 2003 (absent), and Dan Alberdi, January 2002 to February 2003, accepted awards for service to CEAC.

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003 - DRAFT MINUTES

CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approval of Minutes: February 20, 2003.
- B. Monthly Activity Reports.
- C. Legal Department Monthly Report.
- D. PRF.
- E. Gardinier Settlement Trust Fund.
- F. Request Authority to Take Appropriate Legal Action Against Rae-Mac Investments.
- G. Staff Report - Interaction With Contractors.
- H. Staff Report - Ecopalms.
- I. Staff Report - Rice Creek.
- J. Authorize Executive Director to Execute Contract With Orange County for Laboratory Services.

Commissioner Norman moved the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Storms, and carried seven to zero.

AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Proclamation - Clean Air Month - Mr. Jerry Campbell, EPC staff, introduced Ms. Debra Noel, American Lung Association; Ms. Anne Cazares, United States Postal Service; and Mr. Greg Sylvester, director of parking and transportation, University of South Florida (USF), who accepted a proclamation declaring May 2003 as Clean Air Month in Hillsborough County; the theme was "Riding With Clean Air." Mr. Campbell reported the United States Postal Service had converted a large part of its fleet to compressed natural gas vehicles, and USF had converted the Bull shuttle to a biodiesel fuel using animal fat and grease from restaurants. Ms. Cazares and Mr. Sylvester responded to queries from Commissioner Storms regarding the Bull shuttle and HARTline shuttle buses and circulator route.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Presentation of Environmental Merit Awards - Dr. Garrity reported the EPC sponsored the Environmental Merit Award at the 2003 Hillsborough Regional Science Fair held February 25, 2003, at USF. Four winners were selected. Mr. Gerry Javier, EPC Pollution Prevention Coordinator, introduced Ms. Katie

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003 - DRAFT MINUTES

Kelly, Ms. Elizabeth Woodard, Mr. David Snyder, and Ms. Alexander Grawe, who accepted certificates and savings bonds and gave a brief overview of their science projects.

Introduction - Gerold Morrison, Ph.D., Director, Environmental Resources Management (ERM) Division - Dr. Garrity introduced Dr. Morrison who gave a presentation of where ERM Division fit within EPC.

ERM DIVISION

Authorize Executive Director to Enter into Agreement With Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to Develop a Seagrass Conservation Plan - Dr. Garrity said the conservation plan would benefit the County and the State. Dr. Morrison had worked on the project before joining EPC. The grant was for \$32,000. **Commissioner Norman moved staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Castor, and carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Storms was out of the room.)

Chairman Platt announced the retirement of Mr. Tom Cardinale, EPC Environmental Manager. Mr. Cardinale accepted a plaque for service and offered comments.

WETLANDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Lake Grady - Request for Approval of a Temporary Wetland Impact Beyond One Year - Ms. Jadell Kerr, EPC staff, outlined the requirement and need for EPC action to extend a temporary wetland impact beyond the length of one year. EPC wanted to leave a causeway in place until the water line was extended to residents. **Commissioner Frank moved approval, seconded by Commissioner Storms, and carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Hagan was out of the room.)

Commissioner Frank pointed out EPC was not represented in the Executive Policy Group. With potential terrorism activities, chemical spills, et cetera, Commissioner Frank suggested asking the BOCC Chairman to invite EPC to be present at those meetings and have input.; Commissioner Storms suggested EPC send a letter to the BOCC. **Commissioner Frank so moved, seconded by Commissioner Storms, and carried five to zero.** (Commissioners Hagan and Norman were out of the room.) Dr. Garrity noted the EPC was serving on the Domestic Security Task Force.

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003 - DRAFT MINUTES

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: _____
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
RICHARD AKE, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

sw

APRIL 2, 2003 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING -
DRAFT MINUTES

The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Special Meeting to consider the Tampa Bay Water Optimized Regional Operations Plan Annual Report for 2003, scheduled for Wednesday, April 2, 2003, at 2:05 p.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present: Chairman Jan Platt and Commissioners Kathy Castor, Pat Frank, Ken Hagan, Thomas Scott, and Ronda Storms.

The following member was absent: Commissioner Jim Norman.

Chairman Platt called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Attorney Rick Muratti, EPC Legal Department, said EPC had completed its own review along with the Water Resource Team and concurred with the Water Resource Team recommendation not to arbitrate. **Commissioner Scott moved staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Castor, and carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Norman was absent.)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:07 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: _____
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
RICHARD AKE, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

SW

APRIL 22, 2003 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING -
DRAFT MINUTES

The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Special Meeting to provide staff guidance on the EPC position regarding Florida Legislative Senate Bill (SB) 1660 and House Bill (HB) 1075 regarding the Agricultural Lands and Practices Act, scheduled for Tuesday, April 22, 2003, 11:30 a.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present: Chairman Jan Platt and Commissioners Kathy Castor, Pat Frank, Ken Hagan, Jim Norman, Thomas Scott, and Ronda Storms.

Chairman Platt called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m.

EPC General Counsel Richard Tschantz reported Legislative Bills SB 1660 and HB 1075 were moving quickly through the legislature. Expressing concern about repercussions for EPC and Hillsborough County, Attorney Tschantz proposed sending a letter to the Legislative Delegation and other appropriate legislators in a position to have influence on the bills. The proposed letter was provided in a packet to EPC members. Both bills were identical until April 21, 2003, when a Senate committee changed the language of the SB.

Attorney Tschantz perceived the HB remained the same and the SB, having changed, moved from committee to the Senate floor. The result would be the same in each bill and would attack the County's powers under Chapter 125 to a bonafide farm activity if a best-management practice for that activity were in place. Additional language added: or if there was a State, regional, or federal program in place to regulate that farm activity. Attorney Tschantz reported all those programs were in place.

Attorney Tschantz opined the bill would not apply retroactively to current Chapter 111 laws. However, if the EPC amended the act or its rules--Chapter 111, wetland rules had to be amended soon--it would remove EPC from regulating farms for wetland impacts. Attorney Tschantz asked that EPC oppose the legislation. Commissioner Frank moved to adopt some language that would satisfy both the SB and HB and express concern about the affect the bill would have upon limiting the powers of the County and particularly the EPC from regulating agricultural lands, seconded by Commissioner Castor. (The motion was not voted on.)

Commissioner Storms respected the opinions of the sponsors and understood the perspective of over-regulating the agricultural industry out of business. She asked if the issue had been referred to or if EPC had received input from the

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2003 - DRAFT MINUTES

asked if the issue had been referred to or if EPC had received input from the Agriculture Economic Development Council (AEDC). Attorney Tschantz had not spoken to the AEDC. Commissioner Storms would not support the motion before hearing from the AEDC; EPC staff had a liaison to the agricultural community. Commissioner Norman asked if Attorney Tschantz could contact the AEDC within the next two to three hours and return later that day. Attorney Tschantz would do that. **Commissioner Norman moved to continue until the last item of the day and let Attorney Tschantz reach out to contact the agriculture community and deliver comments, seconded by Commissioner Storms.** Commissioner Castor appreciated the sentiment but pointed out the need to move quickly.

Commissioner Frank perceived the Farm Bureau would support the bill, because the property owner would have to be compensated if the agricultural land use classification were changed and the permitted density were lowered. She did not perceive that as a pro-agriculture business. Chairman Platt would not support the motion, because the EPC was a regulatory agency and was different from the Board of County Commissioners. **The motion carried five to two; Commissioners Frank and Platt voted no.**

Chairman Platt called a recess at 11:49 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 4:29 p.m.

Without objection, Chairman Platt continued the meeting to April 23, 2003, at 9:00 a.m., to consider the farm bill issue.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: _____
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
RICHARD AKE, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

sw

APRIL 23, 2003 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING - DRAFT
MINUTES

The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Special Meeting to provide staff guidance on the EPC position regarding Florida Legislative Senate Bill 1660 and House Bill 1075 Regarding the Agricultural Lands and Practices Act, scheduled for Wednesday, April 23, 2003, at 9:00 a.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present: Chairman Jan Platt and Commissioners Pat Frank, Ken Hagan, Jim Norman, and Thomas Scott.

The following members were absent: Commissioners Kathy Castor and Ronda Storms.

Chairman Platt called the meeting to order at 9:14 a.m.

Chairman Platt recalled Board discussion at the April 22, 2003, land use meeting and direction to staff to determine if representatives of the agricultural community had taken positions. EPC General Counsel Richard Tschantz said the Agriculture Economic Development Council had not taken a position, and the Hillsborough County Farm Bureau supported the bill. Ms. Jadell Kerr, Director, EPC Wetlands Management Division, raised concerns with the loose description of agriculture in different versions of the bill; potential for noncompliance to wildlife habitat, tree, and wetland ordinances; and whether the bill pertained to existing or future activities. **Commissioner Frank moved that the Board support EPC staff position in opposition to the bills, which would restrain the County from any regulation over agricultural lands. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott.** Commissioner Norman supported the bill but saw issues with the agricultural community and County enforcement, greenbelt, and economic future for agriculture. **The motion carried five to zero.** (Commissioners Castor and Storms were absent.)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 2003 - DRAFT MINUTES

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:19 a.m.

READ AND APPROVED: _____

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

RICHARD AKE, CLERK

By: _____

Deputy Clerk

lm

MAY 7, 2003 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING - DRAFT
MINUTES

The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Special Meeting, to consider Arbitration of Tampa Bay Water's (TBW) Application to Modify the Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Dredge and Fill Permit to Allow Realignment of the Water Pipeline Within the Tampa Bay Regional Reservoir Property, scheduled for Wednesday, May 7, 2003, at 2:05 p.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida.

The following members were present: Chairman Jan Platt and Commissioners Kathy Castor, Pat Frank, Ken Hagan, Jim Norman, Thomas Scott, and Ronda Storms.

Chairman Platt called the meeting to order at 2:14 p.m.

Attorney Rick Muratti, EPC Legal Department, said staff concurred with the Water Resource Team recommendation not to arbitrate the item. **Commissioner Frank moved staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Scott, and carried six to zero.** (Commissioner Norman was out of the room)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

READ AND APPROVED: _____
CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
RICHARD AKE, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

kar

MONTHLY ACTIVITIES REPORT
AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION
MAY

A. Public Outreach/Education Assistance:		
1. Phone Calls:		<u>291</u>
2. Literature Distributed:		<u>1629</u>
3. Presentations:		<u>9</u>
4. Media Contacts:		<u>5</u>
5. Internet:		<u>70</u>
6. Host/Sponsor Workshops, Meetings, Special Events (Tomato Festival, Clean Air Fair, County Center)		<u>3</u>
B. Industrial Air Pollution Permitting		
1. Permit Applications Received (Counted by Number of Fees Received):		
a. Operating:		<u>2</u>
b. Construction:		<u>5</u>
c. Amendments:		<u>0</u>
d. Transfers/Extensions:		<u>3</u>
e. General:		<u>0</u>
f. Title V:		<u>1</u>
2. Delegated Permits Issued by EPC and Non-delegated Permits Recommended to DEP for Approval (¹ Counted by Number of Fees Collected) - (² Counted by Number of Emission Units affected by the Review):		
a. Operating ¹ :		<u>5</u>
b. Construction ¹ :		<u>6</u>
c. Amendments ¹ :		<u>0</u>
d. Transfers/Extensions ¹ :		<u>7</u>
e. Title V Operating ² :		<u>16</u>
f. Permit Determinations ² :		<u>13</u>
g. General:		<u>1</u>
3. Intent to Deny Permit Issued:		<u>0</u>
C. Administrative Enforcement		
1. New cases received:		<u>5</u>
2. On-going administrative cases:		
a. Pending:		<u>6</u>
b. Active:		<u>11</u>
c. Legal:		<u>4</u>
d. Tracking compliance (Administrative):		<u>24</u>
e. Inactive/Referred cases:		<u>0</u>
	Total	<u>45</u>
3. NOIs issued:		<u>9</u>
4. Citations issued:		<u>0</u>
5. Consent Orders Signed:		<u>4</u>
6. Contributions to the Pollution Recovery Fund:		<u>\$11,395.00</u>
7. Cases Closed:		<u>2</u>

D.	Inspections:	
1.	Industrial Facilities:	<u>18</u>
2.	Air Toxics Facilities:	
a.	Asbestos Emitters	<u>0</u>
b.	Area Sources (i.e. Drycleaners, Chrome Platers, etc...)	<u>14</u>
c.	Major Sources	<u>0</u>
3.	Asbestos Demolition/Renovation Projects:	<u>17</u>
E.	Open Burning Permits Issued:	<u>5</u>
F.	Number of Division of Forestry Permits Monitored:	<u>298</u>
G.	Total Citizen Complaints Received:	<u>44</u>
H.	Total Citizen Complaints Closed:	<u>30</u>
I.	Noise Sources Monitored:	<u>2</u>
J.	Air Program's Input to Development Regional Impacts:	<u>5</u>
K.	Test Reports Reviewed:	<u>71</u>
L.	Compliance:	
1.	Warning Notices Issued:	<u>22</u>
2.	Warning Notices Resolved:	<u>18</u>
3.	Advisory Letters Issued:	<u>5</u>
M.	AOR's Reviewed:	<u>1</u>
N.	Permits Reviewed for NESHAP Applicability:	<u>3</u>

FEES COLLECTED FOR AIR MANAGEMENT DIVISION
MAY

	Total Revenue
1. Non-delegated construction permit for an air pollution source	
(a) New Source Review or Prevention of Significant Deterioration sources	\$ -0-
(b) all others	<u>\$ -0-</u>
2. Non-delegated operation permit for an air pollution source	
(a) class B or smaller facility - 5 year permit	\$ -0-
(b) class A2 facility - 5 year permit	\$ -0-
(c) class A1 facility - 5 year permit	<u>\$ -0-</u>
3. (a) Delegated Construction Permit for air pollution source (20% of the amount collected is forwarded to the DEP and not included here)	<u>\$1,520.00</u>
(b) Delegated operation permit for an air pollution source (20% of the amount collected is forwarded to the DEP and not included here)	<u>\$2,040.00</u>
(c) Delegated General Permit (20% is forwarded to DEP and not included here)	<u>\$ -0-</u>
4. Non-delegated permit revision for an air pollution source	<u>\$ -0-</u>
5. Non-delegated permit transfer of ownership, name change or extension	<u>\$ -0-</u>
6. Notification for commercial demolition	
(a) for structure less than 50,000 sq ft	<u>\$1,725.00</u>
(b) for structure greater than 50,000 sq ft	<u>\$ -0-</u>
7. Notification for asbestos abatement	
(a) renovation 160 to 1000 sq ft or 260 to 1000 linear feet of asbestos	<u>\$ 580.00</u>
(b) renovation greater than 1000 linear feet or 1000 sq ft	<u>\$ 800.00</u>
8. Open burning authorization	<u>\$2,260.00</u>
9. Enforcement Costs	<u>\$4,774.20</u>

COMMISSION
 Kathy Castor
 Pat Frank
 Ken Hagan
 Jim Norman
 Jan K. Platt
 Thomas Scott
 Ronda Storms




Administrative Offices,
 Legal & Water Management Division
 The Roger P. Stewart Environmental Center
 1900 - 9th Ave. • Tampa, FL 33605
 Ph. (813) 272-5960 • Fax (813) 272-5157
 Air Management Fax 272-5605
 Waste Management Fax 276-2256
 Wetlands Management Fax 272-7144
 1410 N. 21st Street • Tampa, FL 33605

Executive Director
 Richard D. Garrity, Ph.D.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 4, 2003

TO: Tom Koulianos, Director of Finance and Administration

FROM:  Joyce H. Moore, Executive Secretary, Waste Management Division through
 Hooshang Boostani, Director of Waste Management

SUBJECT: WASTE MANAGEMENT'S MAY 2003
 AGENDA INFORMATION

A. ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT

1. New cases received	12
2. On-going administrative cases	115
a. Pending	33
b. Active	53
c. Legal	5
d. Tracking Compliance (Administrative)	24
3. NOI's issued	0
4. Citations issued	3
5. Settlement Documents Signed	6
6. Civil Contributions to the Pollution Recovery Fund	\$3,590
7. Enforcement Costs collected	\$1,591
9. Cases Closed	1



B. SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE

1. Permits (received/reviewed)	45/58
2. EPC Authorization for Facilities NOT requiring DEP permit	0/1
3. Other Permits and Reports	
a. County Permits	0
b. Reports	45/57
4. Inspections (Total)	162
a. Complaints	12
b. Compliance/Reinspections	21
c. Facility Compliance	18
d. Small Quantity Generator	111
5. Enforcement	
a. Complaints Received/Closed	30/30
b. Warning Notices Issued/Closed	2/3
c. Compliance letters	15
d. Letters of Agreement	0
e. DEP Referrals	7
6. Pamphlets, Rules and Material Distributed	160

C. STORAGE TANK COMPLIANCE

1. Inspections	
a. Compliance	85 Estimated
b. Installation	17
c. Closure	9
d. Compliance Re-Inspections	14
2. Installation Plans Received/Reviewed	3/2
3. Closure Plans & Reports	
a. Closure Plans Received/ Reviewed	5/5
b. Closure Reports Received/Reviewed	5/6
4. Enforcement	
a. Non-compliance Letters Issued/Closed	25/26
b. Warning Notices Issued/Closed	0/11
c. Cases referred to Enforcement	4
d. Complaints Received/Investigated	2/2
e. Complaints Referred	0
5. Discharge Reporting Forms Received	2
6. Incident Notification Forms Received	10
7. Cleanup Notification Letters Issued	2
8. Public Assistance	200+

D. STORAGE TANK CLEANUP

1. Inspections	42
2. Reports Received/Reviewed	103/83
a. Site Assessment	26/23
b. Source Removal	2/2
c. Remedial Action Plans (RAP's)	18/14
d. Site Rehabilitation Completion Order/ No Further Action Order	5/4
e. Others	52/40
3. State Cleanup	
a. Active Sites	NO LONGER ADMINISTERED
b. Funds Dispersed	

E. RECORD REVIEWS 37

F. PUBLIC INFORMATION PROJECTS 2

SQG Workshop presentations
Basic Crimes Workshop presentation

**ACTIVITIES REPORT
WATER MANAGEMENT DIVISION**

MAY, 2003

A. ENFORCEMENT

1. New Enforcement Cases Received:	2
2. Enforcement Cases Closed:	2
3. Enforcement Cases Outstanding:	43
4. Enforcement Documents Issued:	3
5. Warning Notices:	12
a. Issued:	7
b. Resolved:	5
6. Recovered costs to the General Fund:	\$ <u>307.00</u>
7. Contributions to the Pollution Recovery Fund:	\$ <u>1273.93</u>

Case Name	Violation	Amount
a. Sonic	Placement of C/S in service W/out acceptance letter	\$500.00
b. Rainbow Forest MHP	Improper operation/failure to maintain/violation of permit conditions	\$473.93
c. Bloomingdale Ridge	Placement of C/S in service w/out acceptance letter	\$300.00

B. PERMITTING - DOMESTIC

1. Permit Applications Received:	27
a. Facility Permit:	2
(i) Types I and II	1
(ii) Type III	1
b. Collection Systems-General:	15
c. Collection Systems-Dry Line/Wet Line:	10
d. Residuals Disposal:	0
2. Permit Applications Approved:	28
a. Facility Permit:	0
b. Collection Systems-General:	17
c. Collection Systems-Dry Line/Wet Line:	11
d. Residuals Disposal:	0
3. Permit Applications Recommended for Disapproval:	0
a. Facility Permit:	0
b. Collection Systems-General:	0
c. Collection Systems-Dry Line/Wet Line:	0
d. Residuals Disposal:	0
4. Permit Applications (Non-Delegated) Recommended for Approval:	1

5. Permits Withdrawn:	0
a. Facility permit:	0
b. Collection Systems-General:	0
c. Collection Systems-Dry Line/Wet Line:	0
d. Residuals Disposal:	0
6. Permit Applications Outstanding:	48
a. Facility Permit:	17
b. Collection Systems-General:	29
c. Collection Systems-Dry Line/Wet Line:	2
d. Residuals Disposal:	0
C. INSPECTIONS - DOMESTIC	104
1. Compliance Evaluation:	10
a. Inspection (CEI):	0
b. Sampling inspection (CSI):	9
c. Toxics Sampling Inspection (XSI):	0
d. Performance Audit Inspection (PAI):	1
2. Reconnaissance:	55
a. Inspection (RI):	18
b. Sample Inspection (SRI):	5
c. Complaint Inspection (CRI):	28
d. Enforcement Inspection (ERI):	4
3. Special:	39
a. Diagnostic Inspection (DI):	0
b. Residual Site Inspection (RSI):	0
c. Preconstruction Inspection (PCI):	10
d. Post Construction Inspection (XCI):	29
D. PERMITTING - INDUSTRIAL	
1. Permit Applications Received:	1
a. Facility Permit:	0
(i) Types I and II	0
(ii) Type III with groundwater monitoring	0
(iii) Type III w/o groundwater monitoring	0
b. General Permit:	1
c. Preliminary Design Report:	0
(i) Types I and II	0
(ii) Type III with groundwater monitoring	0
(iii) Type III w/o groundwater monitoring	0
2. Permits Recommended to DEP for Approval:	3
3. Permit Applications Outstanding:	28
a. Facility Permits:	27
b. General Permits:	1

E. INSPECTIONS - INDUSTRIAL	<u>31</u>
1. Compliance Evaluation:	<u>10</u>
a. Inspection (CEI):	<u>10</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:	<u>21</u>
a. Inspection (RI):	<u>13</u>
b. Sample inspection (SRI):	<u>0</u>
c. Complaint Inspection (CRI):	<u>8</u>
F. CITIZEN COMPLAINTS	
1. Domestic:	<u>37</u>
a. Received:	<u>18</u>
b. Closed:	<u>19</u>
2. Industrial:	<u>4</u>
a. Received:	<u>2</u>
b. Closed:	<u>2</u>
3. Water Pollution:	<u>0</u>
a. Received:	<u>0</u>
b. Closed:	<u>0</u>
G. RECORD REVIEWS	
1. Permitting:	<u>6</u>
2. Enforcement:	<u>0</u>
H. ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES ANALYSED FOR:	
1. Air Division:	<u>107</u>
2. Waste Division:	<u>0</u>
3. Water Division:	<u>32</u>
4. Wetlands Division:	<u>0</u>
5. ERM Division:	<u>131</u>
I. SPECIAL PROJECT REVIEWS	
1. DRI's:	<u>0</u>
2. Permitting:	<u>0</u>
3. Enforcement:	<u>0</u>
4. Other:	<u>0</u>

**EPC WETLANDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
BACKUP AGENDA
May 2003**

A. General	Totals
1. Telephone Conferences	1153
2. Unscheduled Citizen Assistance	57
3. Scheduled Meetings	180
4. Correspondence	70
B. Assessment/Reviews	
1. Wetland Delineations	45
2. Surveys	61
3. Miscellaneous Activities in Wetland	43
4. Impact/ Mitigation Proposal	23
5. Tampa Port Authority Permit Applications	63
6. Wastewater Treatment Plants (FDEP)	0
7. DRI Annual Report	3
8. Land Alteration/Landscaping	2
9. Land Excavation	2
10. Phosphate Mining	1
11. Rezoning Reviews	30
12. CPA	1
13. Site Development	36
14. Subdivision	82
15. Wetland Setback Encroachment	0
16. Easement/Access-Vacating	2
17. Pre-Applications	24
18. On-Site Visits	56
C. Investigation and Compliance	
1. Complaints Received	28
2. Complaints Closed	30
3. Warning Notices Issued	15
4. Warning Notices Closed	16
5. Complaint Inspections	38
6. Return Compliance Inspections	
7. Mitigation Monitoring Reports	22
8. Mitigation Compliance Inspections	25
9. Erosion Control Inspections	56
D. Enforcement	
1. Active Cases	39
2. Legal Cases	5
3. Number of "Notice of Intent to Initiate Enforcement"	2
4. Number of Citations Issued	1
5. Number of Consent Orders Signed	3
6. Administrative - Civil Cases Closed	8
7. Cases Referred to Legal Department	2
8. Contributions to Pollution Recovery	\$8,355
9. Enforcement Costs Collected	\$942

EPC LEGAL DEPARTMENT MONTHLY REPORT
June 2003

A. ADMINISTRATIVE CASES

NEW CASES [0]

EXISTING CASES [7]

FIBA/Bridge Realty [LBRI95-162]: EPC issued a citation to the owner, Bridge Realty and former tenant FIBA Corp., for various unlawful waste management practices. It was ordered that a contamination assessment must be conducted, a report submitted and contaminated material appropriately handled. Bridge Realty and FIBA appealed. Bridge Realty initiated a limited assessment and staff requested additional information only a portion of which was delivered. However, an alternate remedial plan was approved and staff is reviewing the final report. (RT)

Cone Constructors, Inc. [LCONB99-006]: (*See related case under Civil Cases*). Citation for Noise Rule violations during the construction of the Suncoast Parkway was appealed. On September 14, 2000, Mr. Cone signed a Settlement Letter to resolve this case. In addition to prohibiting Mr. Cone from conducting night time operation of heavy duty rock hauling, the Settlement Letter provided for payment of \$1,074.00 as reimbursement for costs and expenses associated with the investigation and resolution of this matter. To date, Mr. Cone has not paid the agreed upon amount. Options for collection of the agreed upon amount are being investigated. (RT)

Tampa Bay Organics [LTBOF00-007]: Tampa Bay Organics, a wood and yard waste recycling facility, filed a Notice of Appeal of EPC's citation for causing a dust nuisance and for operating an air pollution source without valid permits. The appeal is being held in abeyance pending settlement discussions. A civil complaint was filed June 29, 2001. (*See related case under Civil Cases*). (RT)

Sapp, Richard [LSAP01-016] & [LSAP01-033]: On July 9, 2001, an applicant for an Executive Director's Authorization for wetland impacts filed a Notice of Appeal regarding the Executive Director's denial of the application. The Appeal has been referred to a Hearing Officer for an Administrative Hearing. Limited discovery has been sent by the EPC in the case. The EPC also issued a citation and order to correct regarding alleged wetland violations currently on the property. The citation was appealed and a new case was opened and referred to the Hearing Officer. The EPC has asked the hearing officer to consolidate the two cases. The parties attended mediation on November 5, 2001 and November 27, 2001. Discovery is ongoing in the case. The EPC Wetlands staff have conceptually approved the mitigation package and the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has taken the lead in providing the site specific plans to demonstrate justification for the proposed project. The parties have reached a tentative agreement authorizing impacts and for settlement of the enforcement case. This settlement is pending approval by the fee simple property owner. (AZ)

CSX Transportation v. EPC [LCSX02-018] EPC issued a Citation of Violation and Order to Correct on May 3, 2002. CSX spilled 150 gallons of diesel fuel on railroad tracks and adjacent soil in Plant City, therefore the EPC seeks corrective measures and penalties. CSX challenged the Citation, but appears willing to settle that matter, thus the case is in abeyance. A settlement letter is pending signature by all parties. (RM)

Roy & Edith Rock and MNH, Inc.: [LROC02-031]: Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal on October 7, 2002 challenging a Citation alleging improper handling of wastes and finding of soil and groundwater contamination on the property. The matter has been referred to a Hearing Officer and a case management conference was scheduled for November 18, 2002. The matter is being held in abeyance pending a circuit court litigation case that may resolve the liability issue for the contamination. On May 21, 2003, the circuit court judge, in a property dispute case, determined that the Respondents are responsible for cleanup of petroleum contamination located at the property. The abeyance will be lifted in the case and the matter will be set for hearing. (AZ)

North Star Recycling Company [LNSR02-034] EPC issued a letter to North Star Recycling determining that the facility needed a permit for its metal scrap handling operation. North Star filed a petition to challenge the determination. The petitioned is being amended. Nonetheless, North Star has filed for a permit, and the parties are discussing settlement. Northstar intends to sell the facility, but the new owner will seek a permit. (RM)

RESOLVED CASES [0]

B. CIVIL CASES

NEW CASES [0]

EXISTING CASES [7]

FDOT & Cone Constructors, Inc. [LCONB99-007]: (*See related case under Administrative Cases*) Authority granted in March 1999 to take appropriate legal action to enforce the agency's nuisance prohibition and Noise Rule violated during the construction of the Suncoast Parkway. On September 14, 2000, Mr. Cone signed a Settlement Letter to resolve this case. In addition to prohibiting Mr. Cone from conducting night time operation of heavy duty rock hauling, the Settlement Letter provided for payment of \$1,074.00 as reimbursement for costs and expenses associated with the investigation and resolution of this matter. To date, Mr. Cone has not paid the agreed upon amount. Options for collection of the agreed upon amount are being investigated. (RT)

Georgia Maynard [LMAYZ99-003]: Authority to take appropriate action against Ms. Maynard as owner and operator of an underground storage tank facility was granted August 1999. A prior Consent Order required certain actions be taken to bring the facility into compliance including the proper closure of out-of-compliance tank systems. The requirements of the agreement have not been met. The EPC filed suit for injunctive relief and penalties and costs on March 8, 2001. The Defendant has failed to respond to the complaint and on July 9, 2001 the court entered a default against the Defendant. On August 28, 2001 the court entered a Default Final Judgment in the case. On March 12, 2002 the EPC obtained an amended Final Judgment that awarded the EPC \$15,000 in penalties and allows the agency to complete the work through Pollution Recovery Fund (PRF) money and to assess these costs back to the Defendant. On April 12, 2002 Ms. Maynard applied for state assistance for cleanup of any contamination at the site. The Defendant has become eligible for state assistance to cleanup any contamination on the property. The parties are attempting to negotiate a sale of the property and have the buyers perform the corrective actions. The federal IRS is preparing to liquidate the property to pay unpaid tax liens assessed on the property. The EPC Legal staff is negotiating with the IRS to satisfy the terms of the judgment and get the site into compliance. (AZ)

Integrated Health Services [LIHSF00-005]: IHS, a Delaware corporation, filed for bankruptcy and noticed EPC as a potential creditor. IHS is a holding company that acquired a local nursing home, which operation includes a domestic wastewater treatment plant that is not in compliance. The Debtor filed a motion requesting that utility companies be required to continue service to the Debtors so that their residents can continue without relocation. (RT)

Tampa Bay Organics [LTBO01-015]: Authority was requested and received by the EPC on April 19, 2001 to initiate judicial enforcement with respect to failure to comply with a Director's Authorization and failure to obtain an air pollution source permit for the operation of a wood and yard waste recycling facility. EPC filed a civil complaint on June 29, 2001. A motion to dismiss was denied on October 24, 2002. Settlement discussions are ongoing. (*See related case under Administrative Cases*). (RT)

Louis and Jeanie Putney [LPUT01-007]: The Plaintiffs Louis and Jeanie Putney filed suit against the EPC alleging inverse condemnation by denying them authorization for impacts to wetlands on their property. The Plaintiffs filed

suit against Hillsborough County in 2001 and on August 9, 2002 they amended their complaint to include the EPC. The EPC filed its response to the Plaintiffs' lawsuit and is currently proceeding in discovery. The EPC has filed a Motion for Summary Judgment seeking a ruling in its favor based on there being no disputed facts in the case. The motion was heard by the Court on March 3, 2003. The judge entered summary judgment in favor of the EPC and provided the Plaintiffs 20 days to file an amended lawsuit. The deadline for filing an appeal is April 16, 2003. The Plaintiffs have filed a Motion for a Re-hearing on the summary judgment. The hearing date has been scheduled for July 18, 2003. (AZ)

Flamingo Apartments/Abe Vaknin [LGOO02-004]: EPC approved suit against this carwash facility in 2002. After repeated attempts to settle this matter, the EPC staff filed suit against the former owner and president of the facility that discharged carwash facility wastewater into waters of the County without a permit. Flamingo Apartments and Mr. Vaknin have been served. EPC now only seeks penalties and costs, because the facility has been closed. (RM)

Rae-Mac Investments Corporation [LRAE003-003]: The EPC Board approved suit against the purchaser of the former Star Service gasoline station that is the subject of the closed Nutmeg lawsuit described below. On May 16, 2003, the EPC Legal Department filed a lawsuit against Rae-Mac Investments Corporation to compel corrective actions and to resolve all outstanding violations and liens at the site. The EPC is currently waiting for a response to the offer of settlement or a response to the lawsuit. (AZ)

RESOLVED CASES [2]

Nutmeg LLC C/O Roundhill Capital [LNUT01-021]: Authority was requested and received by the EPC on July 12, 2001 to initiate judicial enforcement to close and remove abandoned underground storage tank systems (USTs) and to obtain civil penalties and costs. A judicial complaint was filed on July 31, 2001. On April 30, 2002 the circuit court awarded the EPC \$43,000.00 in penalties and \$764.00 in administrative costs for the failure to properly close the abandoned USTs on the property. In addition, the court awarded the EPC injunctive relief requiring the USTs to be closed by a set deadline and provided the opportunity to the EPC to do the work and be reimbursed by an additional lien on the property, in the event the Defendant does not comply with the judgment. In January 2003 a company purchased the property at a tax sale. That entity is now responsible for payment of penalties and costs set forth in the pre-existing judgment and for corrective actions. The EPC Legal staff has contacted the company regarding the status and are awaiting a response. This case has been closed based on the abandonment of the property and subsequent purchase by Rae-Mac Investments Corporation. (see the above Rae-Mac Investments Corporation case) (AZ)

Qasem J. v. EPC, et al. [LQAS98-161]: In foreclosing a mortgage on a UST facility, Plaintiff named EPC as a Defendant because of our recorded judgment against the former owner/operator, a relative of the current Plaintiff (*EPC case against Emad Qasem*). EPC has asserted the priority of our judgment lien. Defendant, property owner HJEM, Inc., filed a motion for summary judgment asserting the Plaintiff's mortgage was entered into fraudulently and that it has priority over all lien holders. EPC responded by asserting the priority of its judgment over the Defendant, HJEM, Inc.'s ownership of the property as the property was sold to HJEM, Inc. subject to EPC's judgment. The attorney for the property owner HJEM, Inc. has contacted the EPC regarding purchasing the EPC's interest in the property and settling the matter. The EPC has agreed to convey its judgment lien on the property to HJEM, Inc. in consideration for payment of \$7,500.00. The foreclosure case has been resolved and the matter has been closed. (AZ)

COMMISSION
 Kathy Castor
 Pat Frank
 Ken Hagan
 Jim Norman
 Jan K. Platt
 Thomas Scott
 Ronda Storms



Administrative Offices,
 Legal & Water Management Division
 The Roger P. Stewart Environmental Center
 1900 - 9th Ave. • Tampa, FL 33605
 Ph. (813) 272-5960 • Fax (813) 272-5157
 Air Management Fax 272-5605
 Waste Management Fax 276-2256
 Wetlands Management Fax 272-7144
 1410 N. 21st Street • Tampa, FL 33605

Executive Director
 Richard D. Garrity, Ph.D.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION
 OF HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
 POLLUTION RECOVERY TRUST FUND
 AS OF MAY 31, 2003

Fund Balance as of 10/01/02	\$1,601,788
Interest Accrued FY03	34,967
Deposits FY03	214,794
Disbursements FY03	56,680
Fund Balance	\$1,794,869

Encumbrances Against Fund Balance:

Art. Reef FY03	44,248
(66) Asbestos Abatement	4,486
(73) Balm Road Scrub	300,000
(84b) Cockroach Bay Aerial Photos	16,188
(90) Upper Tampa Bay Trail	71,339
(91) Alafia River Basin	25,233
(92) Brazilian Pepper	26,717
(93) Rivercrest Park	15,000
(95) COT Stormwater Improvement	37,800
(96) H. C. Parks/Riverview Civic	- 0 -
(97) COT Parks Dept/Cypress Point	100,000
(98) AirWise	10,000
(99) Seagrass Restoration CR Bay	58,020
(100) Ag Pesticide Collection Day	39,000
(101) Pollution Prevention Program	98,657

Total Encumbrances 846,688

Minimum Balance 120,000 *

Fund Balance Available May 31, 2003 \$ 828,181

*\$20,000 to be used for City of Tampa Parks Department



COMMISSION
 Kathy Castor
 Pat Frank
 Ken Hagan
 Jim Norman
 Jan K. Platt
 Thomas Scott
 Ronda Storms



Administrative Offices,
 Legal & Water Management Division
 The Roger P. Stewart Environmental Center
 1900 - 9th Ave. • Tampa, FL 33605
 Ph. (813) 272-5960 • Fax (813) 272-5157
 Air Management Fax 272-5605
 Waste Management Fax 276-2256
 Wetlands Management Fax 272-7144
 1410 N. 21st Street • Tampa, FL 33605

Executive Director
 Richard D. Garrity, Ph.D.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMISSION
 OF HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
 ANALYSIS OF GARDINIER SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND
 AS OF MAY 31, 2003

Fund Balance as of 10/01/02	\$1,265,455
Interest Accrued FY03	25,981
Disbursements FY03	21,416

Fund Balance	\$1,270,020
--------------	-------------

Encumbrances Against Fund Balance:

SP462 Port Redwing	300,000
Sp464 Davis Tract	-0-
SP591 Mechanical Seagrass Planting	3,584
SP597 Fantasy Island Restoration	1,633
SP602 Apollo Beachhabitat Restoration	100,000
Marsh Creek/Ruskin Inlet	47,500
SP604 Desoto Park Shoreline	150,000
SP610 H.C. Resource Mmt/Apollo Beach Restoration	35,000
Tampa Bay Scallop Restoration	127,900
SP611 COT Stormwater Improvements	21,000
SP612 Riverview Civic Center	120,000
SP615 Little Manatee River Restoration	50,000
SP616 Manatee Protection Areas	40,147
SP614 Manatee & Seagrass Protection	27,200
Fantasy Island	20,000
E.G. Simmons Park	43,200
Cockroach Bay ELAPP Restoration	182,856

Total of Encumbrances	1,270,020
-----------------------	-----------

Fund Balance Available	May 31, 2003	\$ - 0 -
------------------------	--------------	----------

AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

Date: June 12, 2003

Agenda Item: Briefing on Recent Ammonia Gas Release

Description Summary:

Early on Tuesday, May twenty-seventh, a motorist noticed a large white cloud above Fish Hawk Boulevard and reported it to the authorities. It turns out that large white cloud was a concentration of ammonia gas that had escaped from a nearby pipeline owned and operated by Tampa Bay Pipeline. The leak which lead to the cloud was most probably caused by vandals who broke into a secured valve box on the pipeline itself. The leak continued into the next day before the line was repaired.

The County's Fire Rescue took charge of the scene and used water to knock down the ammonia cloud. Local schools and roads were closed.

EPC staff is conducting a follow up investigation and the purpose of this briefing is to bring the Board up to date on the incident. Fire Rescue will participate as well.

Commission Action Recommended:

Accept the briefing.

Commission Action Taken: