



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C1		Conducting disposition inspections on “no-permit” violations is not efficient. If a source does not have a permit, the only value of the disposition is to confirm that they applied for a permit. If the case is immediately referred to enforcement the source can verify they have applied for a permit through that process. If not, an inspection takes place every two weeks until the source obtains a permit.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require the submittal of an application within a specified time frame.</li> <li>2. Enter receipt of an application into EMS. Inspectors will then check EMS to determine if a facility has submitted an application instead of conducting a disposition inspection.</li> <li>3. If an application for a permit is not submitted within the allowed time period, the facility will face escalated enforcement.</li> <li>4. Develop/augment Standard Operational Procedure to effect this action.</li> <li>5. Consider encouraging inspectors to provide applications while at the site. Call in fee payments using credit card.</li> </ol>	<p>Most elements of the recommendation have been addressed through the development of a “No-Permit” protocol. Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 have been completed.</p> <p>Inspectors routinely email permit applications to facilities who need to complete them.</p> <p>Item 5 is a permitting responsibility.</p>	100%	Kim Butler	July 2012	
C2		Inspections are documented on several different spreadsheets, as well as EMS documentation. The result is overlapping and duplicative data entry. Multiple inspection report forms are unnecessary.	Eliminate unnecessary elements of the form and reconfigure and add elements necessary to make a universal form.	A new inspection form has been developed and is now in use. Multiple data entry has been significantly reduced. Vacant lot database entry remains an area for improvement.	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C3		Records requests are being made using a variety of formats. This can lead to confusion and the “form” of the request may not meet a legal standard making the request enforceable.	Standardize the records request form.	The issue was reviewed and it was determined that there is a form available for use specific to certain sources. Given the variety of situations where records requests are made, the use of a single form, applicable for all circumstances, was determined to be unnecessary.	100%			
C4	w/C20	Standard Operating Procedures – there may be too many (at this point a general comment not a specific suggestion to eliminate any particular SOP).	Many current SOPs are no longer valid and should be discarded. Initiate a workgroup tasked with the responsibility to conduct a review of existing SOPs and crafting updated SOPs as needed.	Division SOPs are being modified and a team is in place to address this task.	30%	Kim Butler	July 2013	
C5		Documenting time - submittal of daily activity reports in EMS is repetitive and time consuming.	Revisit the purpose of the “daily activity reports” to ascertain whether a different approach can be used.	The protocol for entry of daily activity reports has been changed resulting in the similar use of the Daily Activity Report by all supervisors. Data entry is now focused on essential information required for EMS.	100%			
C6		Issue deleted as replicate of C5		Not applicable	N/A			
C7		The department does not have the ability to immediately close a facility for non-compliance. In contrast, Environmental Services has the ability to close businesses for certain violations of public health rules.	Obtain the ability to immediately close a facility for non-compliance under certain, specified conditions.  The department should have stronger	Fundamental changes in the language of the authorizing statute would be necessary to fulfill this recommendation. No further action is planned at this time	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			abatement authority/language					
C8	w/C9 and C12	Inspectors are assigned inspections on the basis of area assignments. This approach may not be the best way of making assignments. (combine w/ C9 and C12)	Develop District Maps for inspectors to conduct inspections	A new inspection assignment paradigm is being tested and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2012. Inspectors will be assigned to geographically-based zones in which their team will be responsible for completing all inspections.	100%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2012	
C9	w/C8 and C12	The number of sites requiring inspection can be overwhelming.	Reduce the scope of review required.	A new inspection assignment paradigm is being tested and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2012. Inspectors will be assigned to geographically-based zones in which their team will be responsible for completing all inspections.	100%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2012	
C10		For vacant lot inspections there are significant data entry requirements to document “no action” observations.	Develop a system that allows the data to be entered only once.	The investigation of vacant lots consumes a large amount of inspector time and is undergoing a comprehensive review.  Accela is necessary to significantly implement this recommendation.	20%	Kim Butler Yvonne Bishara	2103 dependent on Accela	

**Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status**

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C11		Vacant lot inspections conducted during “sweeps” result in a high level of observed compliance.	Review vacant lot program approach to improve efficiency.	Vacant lots – a GIS map has been developed of those lots that are 10 acres or more. Additionally, we can use GIS to locate smaller lots. The investigation of vacant lots consumes a large amount of inspector time and is undergoing a comprehensive review.	100% new protocol developed and linked with HPA/high risk events	Kim Butler Yvonne Bishara	July 2012	
C12	w/C8 and C9	Some inspection units may have a lighter workload compared to others.	Evaluate the workload among various units - small source, large source, and asbestos.	A new inspection assignment paradigm is being tested and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2012. Inspectors will be assigned to geographically-based zones in which their team will be responsible for completing all inspections.	100%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2012	
C13		GIS capability for analysis of vacant lots is lacking.	Create a GIS capability for vacant lots allowing each to be monitored and tracked more efficiently.	GIS for vacant lots is under active development.  high risk lots have been mapped – additional expansion being evaluated	100%	Yvonne Bishara	Jan 2013	
C14		While a permit is being developed, there should be a means for compliance/source testing to document and communicate outstanding/ongoing compliance issues to the permitting division. Compliance does have an opportunity to review permits but not enough time to do it because of other tasks.	Prior to permit issuance, compliance should be given an opportunity to review permit conditions as a means of ensuring enforceability. This might be limited to a subset of permits that represent those sources with high potential emissions or	Coordination between permitting and compliance supervisors has been enhanced. There are periodic meetings to share information and draft permits are being distributed to compliance supervisors with those of	100%			



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			sources of special concern.	special interest being highlighted for attention.				
C15		Issuance of a permit can result in the requirement to conduct a performance test within a specified timeframe (often within 60 days of permit issuance). However, sources may not meet this schedule and the delay may not be identified until long after the deadline has passed.	There should be a means of tracking source testing permit conditions in order to better ensure compliance. Create a database that prints out performance test completion dates.	Permitting division is providing a weekly listing of new permits and is highlighting those with performance test requirements. This mechanism allows the addition of new permits with performance test requirements to a tracking system.	100%			
C16		The fee payment system is not geared to providing the “customer” with a convenient manner of payment.	Issue deferred to Permitting	Issue deferred to Permitting Not applicable to compliance	N/A			
C17		Title V synthetic minor form (formatting)	Decrease number of forms to one or two forms.	The content of the Title V inspection documentation has been streamlined with one form containing all required information.	100%			
C18		Is a separate inspection form and inspection rights form required?	Consolidate inspection rights and inspection report form.	Recommendation determined to be unnecessary. Decision made to continue with use of a separate inspection rights form.	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C19		Related to especially Title V permits. OCR (capturing text within permits (image documents SIRE). Difficult to transfer information, e.g., copying, from SIRE. Makes drafting inspection reports more difficult.	Easier on file reviews and the permitting department.	Requires department-level decision on changing SIRE use. No change to current approach expected.	N/A			
C20	w/C4 and C31	Standardization of SOPs		Developing a review of existing SOPs and creating a compilation of all SOPs underway	30%	Kim Butler	July 2013	
C21	w/C24 and C25	Unannounced inspections (other than in response to a complaint) result in scrambling by the source to identify a person to participate in the inspection and, on occasion, the designated air quality staff is not available.	Provide advance notice to a source in advance of an inspection (except for complaint investigations).	The department is obligated through legal agreements to conduct unannounced inspections. However, the department does offer the opportunity for courtesy inspections where an inspection is arranged in advance. Courtesy inspections allow the inspector to explain rule provisions and to help guide a facility into greater compliance.	N/A			
C22		Standardize sample collection forms.	Make sample collection forms (rule) specific. Refers specifically to Title V sampling.	The sample request form is provided by the laboratory under contract to perform the analysis. The sample collection form is standardized.	100%			
C23		If records are received after the fact how should they be retained? Records part of inspection report? NOV?	Issue related specifically to voluminous records submitted as part of a records	Decision made to not retain records unless necessary to support/document	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			request. If the documents do not represent a violation there appears to be little reason to maintain the records.	a violation. Now part of the universal inspection report guidance.				
C24	w/C21	When inspectors visit a site they often will not be working with the same person from the facility. This leads to confusion and a lack of consistency.	Inspectors should remain in communication with the same site contact to the extent practical.	A new inspection assignment paradigm is being tested and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2012. Inspectors will be assigned to geographically-based zones in which their team will be responsible for completing all inspections. Inspectors will be encouraged to inspect the same facility if a more complex site.	100%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2012	
C25	w/C21 and C24	From the facility point of view not receiving notice of an inspection creates various difficulties, e.g., a key contact may not be available for the inspection, the appearance of an inspector creates confusion and shuffling of staff that can be difficult to accommodate.	Unless an inspection is being conducted in response to a complaint, provide advance notice of the inspection.	Unannounced inspections are an integral part of the compliance assurance paradigm. Recommendation determined to be impractical given policy guidance requiring unannounced inspections.	N/A			
C26		Compliance inspections – response to records requests should be electronic submittals (when possible) and duplicate requests (e.g., providing a semiannual report which would have been required to already be submitted) should be limited.	Generally, duplicate submittal of information is discouraged	Records submitted by a source are discarded after review unless used as evidence of a violation. Records that are relevant to a violation are scanned and used as evidence. Subsequently, some records may be requested again (if previously discarded) but the occurrence is infrequent.	100%			



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C27		Inspection rights are provided during all inspections except NESHAP.	Extend the provision of inspection rights to NESHAP inspections (now mandated by HB 2665) Modify inspection rights form (if necessary) to reflect concerns about split samples. Obtain evidence bag tape to ensure reliability of sample integrity. Update sampling protocol to include asbestos.	Inspection rights form is now being provided during NESHAP inspections. The inspection rights form has been modified. Evidence bag tape has been secured.	100%			
C28		A facility may require safety training for each visitor. If multiple inspectors visit a site then each must take this training.	Send a single inspector to avoid having multiple inspectors go through the training.	Single inspectors will be sent to most facilities. When necessary and appropriate, multiple inspectors may be present depending on the complexity of the inspection. Also, more complex facilities will generally be inspected by the same inspector resulting in the need for less redundant on-site safety training.	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C29		When access to conduct an inspection is denied there is no immediate information available to present that summarizes the steps the department may take to ensure future access.	Develop an informational fact sheet that can be presented to a facility in the event access is denied.	The fact sheet may provide sufficient information to allow the facility to better understand the rights to access held by the department and influence the facility to grant immediate access. Allowing immediate access would save time and make the inspection more efficient.	0%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2013	
C30		Following an inspection, the facility should have a contact number for the department, ideally the small business liaison.	Add the Small Business Office contact number listed on an inspector's business card.	The small business advisor contact is being added to the inspection report cover letter.	100%			
C30A		It is very difficult for anyone to know who to contact within the department for assistance. There is no staff directory online and most published numbers only get you to a voice mail system.	Additional contact information needs to be added to the department's website with regard to the compliance division.	The department's main line is now assigned a full time receptionist. A division directory has posted onto the department's website. Additionally, a contact list is provided in the department's 310 and 316 training.	100%	Dennis Dickerson		
C31	w/C20	Expectations for completion of inspection reports may differ among inspector supervisors, e.g., details of how a site was in compliance with their permit conditions, no violations noted are okay for dust inspections but source inspections need more details.	Establish consistent expectations for the level of detail that should appear in an inspection report.	Greater consistency for reports developed by inspectors. Developing training for inspectors including expectations for legal sufficiency of NOVs  Will be addressed through an SOP.	50%	Kim Butler	July 2013	



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
				Combined with C20				
C32		Should every instance of a no permit violation result in a notice of violation vs. a notice to comply? There are instances where a facility has attempted to identify all appropriate permits but did not identify the need for an air quality permit.	In some cases, allow an Opportunity to Correct (OTC) to be issued to unpermitted sites. Establish a set period of time for unpermitted business owners to submit an application. Upon expiration of the set period, the OTC will be converted to NOV	A no-permit enforcement approach has been developed providing greater flexibility.	100%			
C33		The department uses a shift log, an extremely time consuming record keeping device, that <u>does not add much value</u> if any to our Department	Eliminate the Shift Log that keeps track of inspectors SCK, VAC and OT. Matching leave slips to PeopleSoft records should be sufficient. Eliminating this system would save hundreds of hours per year for Compliance Staff. Refers to changes in employee's work schedule.	Upon review, the Shift Log has been determined to be an essential management tool allowing supervisors to know and document when field deployed staff are taking time off allowing the ability to assign work, e.g., complaints.	100%			
C34		Permitting is not advised nor do they have the ability to determine if a performance test has been completed/passed.	Only the department's performance test engineer will have the test results. In some cases, the assigned test engineer makes no notation anywhere in EMS to share results with Permitting.	A comprehensive review of permits will be conducted with the shift to the area inspection model. All permits will be reviewed to determine whether any performance testing compliance concerns exist. Inspectors are now evaluating performance testing as part of inspections.	100%	Area Supervisors		
C35		Facilities may have multiple sources, e.g., IC engines, gasoline tanks, fuel burning equipment, and solvent	Documentation of inspections should indicate whether the inspection is solely for	The department and the facility would have a record of the entire	100%	Kim Butler	July 2012	



**Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status**

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
		cleaning operations which may be addressed through permit conditions. An inspection of a sand and gravel facility covered by Rule 316 may not refer to these other sources in the inspection reports. The facility's comprehensive compliance status is, therefore, not fully understood on the basis of reviewing the inspection report.	compliance with Rule 316 or Rule 310.	compliance status or whether the inspection was narrowly focused on only a portion of the rules.  Address through an SOP				
C36	w/C37	State law requires that a copy of the report generated from an inspection be shared with a facility. Photos taken during an inspection are not normally attached unless separately requested. An NOV may also be sent without photos.	The photographs associated with inspection reports and NOVs should be provided at the time the documents are provided to a facility. One possibility is to use website posting so that only the facility can access the photos.	Increased awareness on the part of a facility of the evidence collected during an inspection. Inspection reports need to clearly indicate the availability of photos upon request. Once a request is received, photos will be emailed to the facility.  The SOP needs to be modified	100% discussed at division mtg with direction	Kim Butler	July 2012	
C37	w/C36	The descriptive content of an NOV may differ from that contained in a referral report or later versions of an NOV.	A facility should always have the most complete description of a violation. If the descriptive content of the NOV has changed, the facility should receive a copy.	The cover letter transmitting the NOV will be modified to clarify that a referral report is prepared and may differ from the NOV (additional content).	10%	Kim Butler	March 2013	



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C38	C75	The department's governing statute allows, under certain circumstances, deficiencies (violations) to be corrected without recourse to imposing a penalty. The department is vested with considerable discretionary authority. The current approach imposes a penalty on many, if not most, violations.	<p>The department should reevaluate its enforcement policy to consider greater use of the opportunity to correct.</p> <p>The department should have a wider range of enforcement options and, where a facility did not knowingly cause a violation, greater flexibility to require compliance in lieu of a penalty.</p>	<p>Guidance has been developed regarding the specific instance of a facility not having a permit. The department's penalty policy is being revised.</p> <p>The Asbestos Penalty policy has been updated and is now in use (May 2012)</p>	100% asbestos policy revised, justice court, SEP	Dennis Dickerson	Sept 2012	
C38A		The determination whether a site will receive a Notice of Violation or a Notice to Comply appears to be left to the discretion of the inspectors.	Develop a set of guidelines that help inspectors determine whether an NOV or an NTC should be issued to provide consistency across facilities and inspectors.	The department has developed an Opportunity to Correct policy containing specific examples to provide additional clarity regarding violations that qualify for an OTC.	100%			
C39		Asbestos compliance reveals that some non-compliant actions are taken, in part, in response to a government directive. Some people remain unaware that additional regulatory obligations exist and believe the directive should have advised them of any additional requirements.	Work with other governmental entities to increase the awareness of asbestos requirements.	<p>Outreach to communities has been taken to address this issue. Additional outreach is required.</p> <p>Asbestos process improvement has identified a number of recommendations to pursue.</p> <p>Outreach is occurring at periodic asbestos training events – enforcement staff attend on a</p>	50%	Scott MacDonald	June 2013	



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
				monthly basis to convey the importance of remaining compliant to avoid penalties.				
C40		Title V facilities are being inspected quarterly: ¼ = one full routine inspection (site visit) ¼ = one control device inspection (site visit) ¼ = one semi-annual monitoring report ¼ = one semi-annual monitoring report	Conduct one full inspection each year as noted in the fee table. Eliminate control device inspection which is not covered under the current fees.	The duplicative control device inspection has been eliminated.	100%			
C41		Inspectors are now rotated from one coverage area to another about every three months. This rotation is very inefficient and inspectors are only just learning their area when they need to move on.	Eliminate the 3 month rotation of assignment areas for inspectors.	A new inspection assignment paradigm is being tested and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2012. Inspectors will be assigned to geographically-based zones in which their team will be responsible for completing all inspections. This will eliminate map rotation. The portion of the recommendation addressing constant rotation of staff has been addressed – the three month rotation has been dropped.	100%			
C42		Is there a need to collect a \$100 late fee for unpermitted sources? Collecting the fee and a penalty seems to be double punishment when the enforcement process can assess a penalty greater than \$100.	Eliminate late fee for unpermitted sources.	A change in the rule is required.	N/A			
C43		At the end of an inspection, it may not be clear to the entity inspected what comes next.	A fact sheet or FAQ should be developed to provide information about what can be expected following an inspection. Greater awareness of what may occur as a result	Resolved through development of a new cover letter	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			of an inspection and when.					
C44A	w/C44B	<p>Conducting a disposition inspection after a “No Permit Violation” is issued (to assure a permit application has been submitted) does not always mean the site/facility is in compliance. They may submit incomplete applications, and engineering may not be able to communicate with them.</p> <p>Conducting disposition inspections is not a solution; it only demonstrates that the “No permit violation” is a “non-issue”.</p>	<p>After the site/facility has submitted a permit application, compliance should conduct a disposition inspection to determine that a permit application has been submitted.</p>	<p>A disposition inspection may not be necessary since the no permit violation can be clarified through EMS (checking to see if a permit application was submitted and a permit was issued). However, a disposition inspection may be necessary to determine additional compliance with requirements beyond the permit requirement alone.</p> <p>If a permit engineer requires additional information during permit review, an additional inspection can be conducted.</p>	100%			
C44B	w/C44A	<p>Discovery of an unpermitted source may not lead to a complete determination of compliance with all applicable rules.</p>	<p>Determination of full compliance should be achieved at the time of inspection. If non-compliance is discovered follow the compliance assurance model and follow-up as needed.</p>	<p>The compliance assurance model provides guidance to evaluate compliance any time an inspection is conducted.</p> <p>Unpermitted task force should remind inspectors of need to evaluate full compliance</p>	100% This has been a point of focus – direction provided to staff	Kim Butler	July 2012	
C45		<p>Response Letters received by department without a received stamp. Site/Facilities have 10 days to request</p>	<p>All received letters should have a date received stamp.</p>	<p>All documents received are being date stamped.</p>	100%			



**Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status**

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
		Ombudsman review. The only way to determine if the letter was received within the 10 days is if the letter is stamped by the department. Dates included with the letter may not always be accurate.						
C46		Employees want a forum where they can express problems they see with a process or rule - somewhere where their voice will be heard and where they can receive feedback. Although the process improvement group is a place to do this, it will not always be available.	Establish a team tasked to read issues and come up with solutions.	A monthly forum is provided for staff who were engaged in the process improvement review to continue to provide input to the division manager.  A division suggestion/comment board has been established electronically.	100%			
C47		When issuing No Permit Violations the site is obligated to pay a 100 dollar late fee per Rule 280, and they are also charged a greater penalty through the enforcement process. The enforcement penalty may include a collection of fees for those years they operated without a permit. We should not collect these fees as services were not rendered (inspections were not conducted).	The 100 dollar late fee should suffice.	A No Permit policy has been developed to provide some leeway in enforcement.	100%			
C48		Permits contain complicated requirements/conditions that may not be understood or complied with and may lead to difficulty in proving a violation if not identified early on.	Schedule compliance assistance (courtesy) style inspection prior to or just after permit issuance. This would be for all types of permits to ensure ongoing compliance through the lifetime of the permit. Early compliance is assured. Ability to prove a violation is enhanced.	Courtesy inspections are offered on a case by case/request only basis.	100%			



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C49A	w/C49B	The “inspections required” report in EMS appears to be missing some parameters. i.e. Inspections not being counted; such as Complaint Inspections are not being considered as a “comprehensive” Inspection. And there’s also an issue of next inspection dates and purposes. In many cases we are finding that those dates aren’t accurate.	Consider counting a complaint inspection as a required inspection for some permit categories. Benefit: Avoid duplicate inspections for some sources.	EMS source inspection lists have been modified to use last inspection date as the driver to determine when a new inspection is required. Additional modifications made to ensure inspection lists are accurate and timely.	100%			
C49B	w/C49A	It appears that other agencies may count a complaint inspection as an inspection for purposes of meeting EPA’s once in five year inspection guidelines.		The derivation of this comment appears to be the distinction between an inspection that is driven by a complaint and one that is a full inspection. A complaint inspection may not address all provisions required in a full compliance inspection and, as a result, should not be counted as an inspection for purposes of a full compliance determination.	100%			
C50		Unclear what to do if a vapor certification test fails. How long of a wait is allowed? What if a test needs to be rescheduled?	Establish/augment the performance testing standard operating procedure to resolve these questions.	A Vapor Test is comprised of three separate tests all of which must be completed within 15 days of start. If all tests are not completed, the whole series of tests must begin anew. A company must notify the department if retesting is necessary (See R352	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
				section 302.3). A retest is a very infrequent occurrence and is noted as a second notice in permits plus. A 2 <sup>nd</sup> notice may happen because parts are not available or the work is quite extensive and maybe it was cost prohibitive and the tanker was put out of service.				
C51	C58	Higher priority items requiring supervisor review may languish in an “in-box” for an extended period of time. Particularly associated with review of NOVs.	Supervisors should have two in boxes – one for normal and one for high priority reviews, e.g, NOVs and closures	Supervisors required to process referral reports within 60 days of receipt. Standard being revised to 30 days in new PMPs in effect July 2012	100%			
C52	C3	Inconsistency/uncertainty in making records requests.	Records request form needs to be standardized	<i>See C3 for resolution</i>	100%			
C53		Current complaint line procedure is inadequate. Given supervisor schedules some complaints are not responded to in a timely manner	Ensure that during office hours the complaint line is manned so there is no extended lag time in response.	Developed improved complaint response – responding to urgent issues in a timely fashion.	100%			
C54		Inconsistencies exist in the approach of some supervisors to some issues. Creates confusion and inconsistent application of the regulations.	Inspectors and supervisors need a common knowledge base. Emphasize in training and in protocols the need to ensure consistency of approach. Also, identify and encourage the development of subject matter experts.	Supervisors have been given specific program responsibility. Teams have been established to provide a core or staff with expertise in certain areas. <i>Related to P34</i>	100%			



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C55		When inspectors issue a “no permit” NOV, they use a separate form.	Send a draft of the NOV to OSS to avoid duplication of entry.	Inspectors now use the NOV form instead of creating a new form.	100%			
C56		Documentation for closing an NOV without a disposition inspection? How long to process?	<i>From P78</i>	<i>An SOP is required and will be developed</i>	20%	Kim Butler	July 2013	
C57	P34, C51	Is the universal inspector program efficient? Is expertise being diluted? Is it taking more time for supervisors to review NOVs as a result of their not being familiar with some program areas?		Universal inspector program is moving to maturity, greater efficiency is being realized as inspectors have more experience across programs. Supervisors have gained additional cross program experience.	100%			
C58	C51	Supervisors are taking too long to review NOVs.	Establish a deadline by which NOVs must be reviewed.	Supervisor PMPs now have a standard that NOVs must be reviewed and sent to enforcement within 60 days of receipt	100%			
C59		Inspectors are not allowed to change a complaint’s status.	Inspectors should be allowed to change status after being assigned a complaint.	Resolved by allowing inspectors to change status.	100%			
C60		Individuals at many sites have no idea of what we are inspecting and what we look at during an inspection. Should we create some kind of inspection summary to include with the permit conditions and or permit so sites know what to expect?	Develop a pre-inspection checklist which lists the various elements to achieve compliance – may not be totally comprehensive but could address 90% of common potential violations.	Ideally a small business function, there are a number of checklists and upgraded factsheets that would be very helpful to encourage compliance. A fact sheet that covers the topic of	30%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2013	



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
				<p>required records and content is considered to be the primary need.</p> <p>The 310 handbook provides some of the information suggested in this recommendation. Also, the new 316 handbook will be useful in this regard. Will require development of a new flyer to provide to facilities during an inspection and will need to be targeted to specific permit types.</p>				
C61		<p>Registered contractors frequently plead ignorance to the federal Asbestos NESHAP which regulates the renovation or demolition of public, commercial, industrial, institutional, and residential facilities and installations.</p> <p>Contractors in the renovation and demolition industry cannot compete with contractors who make bids not in compliance with the Asbestos NESHAP.</p>	Open dialogue with the State of Arizona Registrar of Contractors to put the Asbestos NESHAP on the test for obtaining a license, which would achieve a result of producing informed contractors.	<p>Letter sent to State of Arizona Registrar of Contractors requesting support as part of registration testing.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there has been no substantive response from State of Arizona Registrar of Contractors.</p>	100%			
C62		How long should each type of permittee be given to submit an application after an NOV is issued?		Resolved through the No Permit policy	100%			
C63	w/C69	Performance testing has a backlog of completed test report reviews. The activity of performance testing is inherently more of an engineering task than a compliance task.	For any report older than 2 years (negotiable), a preliminary review will be done to identify any egregious errors. The validity of issuing a violation on a test older than 2 years would be subject to a great	A new protocol for report completion was developed and is being implemented to increase the number of reports generated.	N/A perf testing moved to permitting	Kim Butler	July 2012	



Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			deal of questioning to which we may not have a good answer.  Require the electronic submittal of all test protocols and reports including data spreadsheets. This will allow a quicker QA/QC of test data and protocols and would relieve our storage issue.	Performance tests have been prioritized so that those with a high level of confidence of being accurate are given the lowest priority for review.  Many reports are submitted electronically.  <i>Transferred from Permitting</i>				
C64		Emergency generator inspections require a large amount of time relative to the potential emissions.	Consider a change in approach where an annual report is required with ownership information and spot checks.	On-site inspections are required of permitted facilities and the option of an annual report is not possible under the current framework.	100%			
C65		The placement of performance testing in a division separate from Permitting creates the opportunity for miscommunication and represents an inefficient use of resources.	Performance Testing should be repositioned in the Permitting Division since permit writers and testing staff are all engineers by education.	Decision to not implement recommendation.	100%			
C66	w/C10	The process for documenting vacant lot inspections (especially those that are compliant is cumbersome.	Modify form or approach to a new documentation format.	Ultimate resolution contingent upon conversion to Accela. Resolution may be addressed in upcoming initial phase in of Accela.	20%	Kim Butler Yvonne Bishara	June 2013	
C67		When any inspection is conducted, the party being inspected is interested in having documentation of any compliant conditions.	When conducting any inspection activity, prepare a checklist or form to document the observations – especially noting observations of compliance, and provide a copy to the inspected party. Allows the inspected party to know when any	An inspection report is provided, however, it alone does not provide the detail to meet the expectation of this concern.  The 310 handbook provides some of	40%	Kim Butler Dennis Dickerson	July 2013	



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			inspection activity occurred and the results/specific observations made.	the information suggested in this recommendation. Also, the new 316 handbook will be useful in this regard. Will require development of a new flyer to provide to facilities during an inspection and will need to be targeted to specific permit types.				
C68		When a permit close out is requested via permitting, should an inspector be notified to conduct a final closeout walk through of a facility; verify lock out tag out and equipment break down?	A policy for permit closeouts should be developed addressing both permit and compliance-related concerns.	<i>Transferred from permitting. Policies have been developed</i>	100%			
C69	w/C63	Performance testing is facing a significant workload backlog. A formal written report (data entry and report writing) are time intensive and contribute to the backlog given the staff allocation.	Conduct a cursory review of test reports. Data and calculations would undergo an abbreviated review and consistency check.  A 1-page summary memo (highlighting what equipment was tested, the type of tests done and the emission results) may substitute for a full blown multi-page test report review.	A new protocol for report completion was developed and is being implemented to increase the number of reports generated.	N/A perf testing moved to permitting	Kim Butler	July 2012	
C70		Expired permits may be in an expired status for months or even years.	If a permit is expired more than 6 months, conduct a site inspection to verify the status of the facility. If no longer present, close the permit. If still operating, issue NOV and request a new app.  Inspectors should conduct a review of expiration dates of permits in their area.	Expired Permit List: an updated report is generated every month for expired permits. These are assigned to inspectors to survey.	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C71		Permit holders may be required to submit sampling data, or monitoring reports, to the department but there is not always acknowledgement by the department of receipt, acceptability, or compliance. This can leave sources open to changes in rule/report interpretations later when the data/report is reviewed at that time and it is discovered that there is something missing or in error, etc.	Establish a protocol that will acknowledge receipt of submittals to ensure source is in compliance or address source compliance in a timely manner.	An inspection form is provided to the permittee to acknowledge receipt of a report. These are logged into EMS. The methodology used is developed but remains to be codified.  Remaining task: A protocol will be developed to acknowledge receipt of reports either through an email or a courtesy phone call.	90%	Kim Butler	June 2013	
C72	w/C55	When a “no permit” NOV is issued, it is necessary to obtain a permit number from the One Stop Shop prior to issuing the NOV (so it (the NOV) has a home in the database system). Currently, a separate form is completed and sent to One Stop to obtain a permit number. Why can’t the NOV be used since it has the required information. Completing a separate form is duplicative and inefficient.	Send the draft NOV in place of the current duplicative form.	Inspectors now use the NOV form instead of creating a new form.	100%			
C73		Permit holders may not be cognizant of upcoming permit expiration or other matters that may be discernible to an inspector during an inspection.	Inspectors should proactively highlight issues of concern to a permit holder when discovered.	Permit holders are made more aware of matters they need to address to avoid a future NOV.  Direction contained in inspection report guidance to address topics the source needs to be aware of.	100%			



### Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C74		There is a need for a formal ombudsman policy and adherence to the policy. It seems that the ombudsman request not always takes the path that it should. A written formal request for ombudsman review is required in order for the ombudsman to review a case. It seems this formal request doesn't always happen. How many times can a source request his services, when can a site request his services (when violations are issued, or anytime there is an issue(NTC, compliant))? What should the formal request include (identify problem)?	Have a written policy of the procedure for ombudsman services. Policy should clarify the following: When must the formal request be made (or received)? How should the request be made? (there should be a form to fill out) What should the formal request include? A description of what there is a question about? A copy of the formal written request (received by the ombudsman) should be provided to the inspector and supervisor. The inspector and supervisor are made aware of possible issues during the inspection or interpretation of rule (enhance communication). Can serve as a training tool for compliance (consistency). It will also provide transparency within the department, no questions raised on whether a formal request was made.	Policy was developed and is being implemented	100%			



**Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status**

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
C75	C38	The current use of enforcement is a negative tool to achieve compliance. Is there an alternative method that can be used to create a compliance incentive?	Establish an incentive program that would extend a discount on annual fees to those facilities that are found to be compliant for an entire year.	Guidance has been developed regarding the specific instance of a facility not having a permit. The department's penalty policy specific to asbestos has been revised. Other specific measures have been taken to review enforcement penalties. A SEP policy has been developed to provide greater options. A policy on self-reporting has been developed.  Remaining major task is revision of omnibus enforcement policy.	90%	Dennis Dickerson	July 2013	
C76		Some complaint response may not be of value (effective use of resources) given circumstances associated with the event, e.g., ag, no burn, rural roads.	Review current complaint protocols. Revise protocol to reflect results of evaluation.  Ensure complaints are referred to agencies that are able to address the problem. Reduce situations where a complaint response has very little value, i.e., no ability of department to effect any change, no department authority to change conditions causing a problem.	Zone teams are now engaged in direct assignment of complaints. This system is working well and response time is believed to be improving (yet to be documented).  Some complaints being resolved at division manager level when appropriate (repetitive and the department has no direct ability to influence outcome)	40%	Kim Butler Dennis Dickerson	June 2013	
C77		Multiple compliance inspectors visit a site which may result in inconsistency in communications and interpretations.	Identify one or two inspectors who will be designated for a certain facility. Benefit: Avoid continual confusion with differing communication and	A new inspection assignment paradigm is being tested and will be fully implemented by July 1, 2012. Inspectors will be assigned to	100%	Kim Butler	July 2012	



**Compliance Process Improvement Recommendations – Implementation Status**

Issue	Combine	Issue	Recommendation/Proposed Solution	Implementation Status	% Complete	Follow-Up Assignment	Timeline	Quantification
			interpretations. Alleviate unnecessary use of time, reduce miscommunication, etc.	geographically-based zones in which their team will be responsible for completing all inspections.				
C78		When an error (e.g., EMS, P+, and/or paperwork) is discovered the tendency is to resolve the concern for the immediate circumstance without addressing the underlying cause.	Create an expectation that any data entry issue is brought to the attention of the appropriate manager and that a system fix is initiated to resolve the problem to avoid recurrences. Benefit: Will help to create a more professional impression externally.	Partly addressed through hiring of new management analyst (Feb 2013). Also, Increased emphasis on data entry accuracy in compliance and enforcement division.	100%	Dennis Dickerson		
C79		Compliance division meetings are not productive.	Ensure that compliance division meetings have agenda items that add value for the time invested.	Compliance division meetings now following an agenda/focused topics.	100%			
C80		Asphalt Plant compliance stack testing and a contemporaneous full inspection with multiple air quality staff imposes a significant demand on a facility to meet multiple and contemporaneous expectations.  No reports on the outcome of the inspection are received.  In addition to inspection staff – permit writer staff may also attend on the same day further challenging the ability of the facility to meet expectations.  Plant operators cannot be distracted from operations during stack testing to obtain information.	Inspections should not be attended by multiple staff such that the facility is unable to both conduct its operations and meet multiple/simultaneous requests.	This circumstance was largely the result of a single unique event and should not be repeated.	100%			