



*"Environmental and
Public Health
through leadership,
partnership and
science"*

Volume 4, Issue 2

March of 2005

Chief's Notes 1

HMD
Featured
Employee 1

3-Mile Island
25 Years Ago... 2

Risk
Management
Plans 3

Hazardous
Waste
Containers 4

Designated
Operator
Requirements
for
UST Facilities 6

Administrative
Enforcement
Orders 7

ENVIRONMENTAL PRESS



CHIEF'S NOTES
By Michael Dorsey,
HMD Chief

Most metal plating facilities are small, family owned businesses. Metal plating facilities are establishments primarily engaged in electroplating, plating, anodizing, coloring, and finishing of metals and formed products of trade. This industry provides support to other larger industries, particularly manufacturing. The automotive, electronics, machine equipment, and defense are the four largest industry segments served by metal platers.

The metal plating process can impact the environment, including air, water, and soil in a very intense manner. The chemical processes used in metal plating involve the use of various toxic materials, and generate significant amounts of solid and hazardous waste. Hexavalent chromium, for instance, is a chemical compound intrinsic to the chrome plating process, and a known carcinogen.

The metal plating industry is regulated by various federal, state, and local agencies including the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State Air Resources Board, the State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, the County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District, and the County of San Diego Department of Environmental-HMD.

The HMD has identified 27 metal plating facilities in San Diego County. HMD regulates over 13,000 businesses countywide and takes formal enforcement (criminal/civil/administrative) against approximately 30 businesses each year. Since 2001, the HMD has filed seven criminal/civil cases and two administrative enforcement cases against metal plating facilities within San Diego County. Given the low number of metal plating shops in the county, the number of formal enforcement cases taken against metal plating shops since 2001 is considered to be fairly significant. As a result of the increased level of non-compliance demonstrated within the metal plating industry, the HMD reduced the inspection frequency for metal plating facilities, starting in fiscal year 2003-04, from once every 18 months to annually.

This fiscal year, in an effort to assist small metal plating facilities within San Diego County in obtaining improved compliance with the hazardous materials and hazardous waste regulatory requirements, HMD developed a Plating Shop Manual. In cooperation with the Industrial Environmental Association and Sheffield Platers, HMD presented the first of two Plating Shop Workshops on December 2, 2004. A second workshop was conducted on January 27th to accommodate those who couldn't attend the first session. Each attendee received a copy of the Plating Shop Manual to share with employees. Representatives from a total of 22 plating shops attended at least one of these training sessions. In order to further assist businesses that attended and completed the training in attaining compliance, HMD will conduct a consultation inspection at their shops.

This Plating Shop Project is one of the most recent outreach efforts by the County of San Diego HMD to improve compliance through education. In our next newsletter I'll tell you about the progress in another one of HMD's efforts, the Biotech EPIC Project.



**HMD'S
FEATURED
EMPLOYEE**

Susan Hahn

Susan was born and raised on the northwest side of Chicago. She went to high school just one mile from Wrigley Field and to this day remains a die-hard Cubs fan. After high school, Susan's family moved from Chicago to Phoenix and it took just one summer in the Phoenix heat to convince her that it was time to move to a cooler climate. So Susan packed her backpack and headed north to Alaska. Susan spent the next 8 years working in various jobs throughout Alaska. She was a cook in Metlakatla. She was a fisherman on a commercial trawler out of Sitka.



Metlakatla She winterized a lodge in Unalakleet and she finally settled in Juneau. But after a few years of hiking in and around Juneau, Susan decided it was time to move to San Diego to go to college in a warmer climate.

(continued on page 9)

Three-Mile Island 25 years ago San Onofre Nuclear Plant Today

*By Ron Yonemitsu
Senior Health Physicist*



Those of us who saw “Saturday Night Fever” when it was first released in theatres probably remember the Three Mile Island Nuclear Power Plant incident. Looking back, what happened 25 years ago?

Immediately after the occurrence, there was chaos. The Governor of Pennsylvania considered evacuating Central Pennsylvania, only to be faced with the fact that no evacuation plan for such an event existed anywhere. A partial evacuation was ordered and over 140,000 residents near the power plant were evacuated for a few days. Some of the residents feared that the reactor fuel would make a hole going all the way to China, as theorized in the movie “The China Syndrome”, a movie released shortly before the incident.

The incident **did** not cause long-term effects for the public in the surrounding areas, however, there was a long-lasting effect in the reputation of the nuclear power industry and drastic changes in the way they operated. The damage to their reputation has never been fully repaired.

The facts of the incident are that it caused no injuries, and that at least a dozen studies have found no observable health effects to the population in the surrounding areas. These studies looked at cancer rates, infant death, and other health effects before and after the incident.

At the time, President Carter appointed the Kemeny Commission to investigate the incident. The recommendations of the Commission were endorsed by industry, the President and the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The recommendations proposed set standards of excellence, analysis of the operations, development of training institutions, and a change in Industry’s attitudes toward safety and regulations.

To implement these recommendations the nuclear industry formed the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO). The INPO’s mission is to promote the highest levels of safety and reliability in the operations of nuclear power plants. The INPO has monitored performance indicators since 1981 and has shown a steady improvement in the industry’s performance.



What does this mean for us?

San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), located at the northern end of San Diego County along I-5 has an active emergency planning organization. They work with surrounding cities, county and state organizations through the

Interjurisdictional Planning Committee (IPC) and associated subcommittees. The IPC sets policies that follow Federal Emergency Management Agency and NRC guidance on nuclear emergencies for SONGS and offsite jurisdictions. The committee includes members from several different entities, such as San Diego and Orange Counties, San Clemente, Dana Point, San Juan Capistrano, the California Highway Patrol, the Red Cross, the Capistrano Unified School District, State Parks, and Camp Pendleton.

SONGS drills are also conducted numerous times throughout the year, and are periodically evaluated by FEMA and the NRC. These drills are designed to test the plans and procedures used by SONGS and the surrounding jurisdictions. In a real event, these plans and procedures are designed to protect the public, as well as emergency responders.

Our own Hazardous Incident Response Team (HIRT) is involved in drills that are required by the NRC and is present during many drills the County’s Emergency Operations Center (EOC) conducts to evaluate their performance.

So, Three Mile Island may be remembered as something that happened the last time you wore a polyester suit but the corrective actions from the incident are still being followed today. We have come a long way in emergency preparedness and we keep improving continuously to protect human health and the environment.



Risk Management Plans

By Mark Mc Cabe
Environmental Health Specialist III



On the night of December 23, 1984, the worst industrial disaster in history occurred in the city of Bhopal, India. A series of human and mechanical errors led to the release of about 40 tons of gaseous methyl isocyanate from a Union Carbide pesticide factory. The toxic chemical swept through shantytowns adjacent to the factory killing about 4000 people and injuring as many as 400,000. Back in the United States, people began to look at chemicals used in their own communities and wondered if a similar incident could happen in their neighborhood.

When Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, it required USEPA to publish regulations and guidance for chemical accident prevention at facilities using extremely hazardous substances. The Risk Management Program Rule (RMP Rule) was written to implement Section 112 (r) of these amendments. The rule, which was built upon existing industry codes and standards, requires companies of all sizes that use certain toxic and flammable substances, referred to as *regulated substances*, to develop a Risk Management Program that contains a hazard assessment, an accidental release prevention program, and an emergency response program. These three elements are described in a document called a Risk Management Plan (RMP). The hazard assessment is usually conducted through Process Hazard Analysis and Offsite Consequence Analysis.

During a Process Hazard Analysis, people familiar with the process that

uses the regulated substance meet and review all the possible scenarios that could result in an accidental release. For each scenario, recommendations are made on how to prevent this potential release from occurring and a timeline for implementing the recommendations is made.

An Offsite Consequence Analysis looks at the possible effects of a regulated substance. Computer models are used to determine what area would be impacted by a release. Both a worst-case scenario and an alternative scenario must be addressed in an Offsite Consequence Analysis. The worst-case scenario assumes that the largest container holding a regulated substance releases its entire contents within 10

An Offsite Consequence Analysis looks at the possible effects of a regulated substance.

minutes. The atmospheric conditions are assumed to maximize the hazardous effects of a release. An alternative scenario is a much more realistic release that would happen during an accident. Typical alternative scenarios include valve failures, pipe leaks, and delivery accidents.

Both scenarios are used to determine how far the released regulated substance will travel and still be at a high enough concentration to affect human health. This concentration is called a **toxic endpoint**. The CalEPA Office of Health Hazard Assessment has developed a list of toxic endpoints for the most common regulated substances.

The prevention program must include safety precautions, equipment maintenance program, monitoring, and employee training components. The RMP needs to describe how all these components are conducted and documented.

The emergency response program must describe emergency health care, employee response training, and procedures for working with emergency response agencies. Different businesses plan to handle releases in different ways. Some have specially trained and equipped response teams. Others plan to let outside agencies such as the local fire department remediate the releases. The emergency response plan must reflect the level of response a business will manage.

Depending on the quantity of regulated substances used and the extent of possible effects on the surrounding community, a business is classified as a Program 1, Program 2, or Program 3. Program 1 has the least requirements and is limited to businesses with no offsite consequences during a worst-case release and no accidental releases in the past five years. Program 3 has more requirements and is used by certain industrial types or businesses subject the OSHA Process Safety Management. Businesses that do not meet the program 1 or 3 requirements default into Program 2.

The California regulations for these requirements are known as the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program and can be found in Chapter 4.5 of Title 19, California Code of Regulations.

Mark McCabe is the current HMD CalARP inspector. Mark has been on the Hazardous Incident Response Team (HIRT) for eight years and has responded to numerous chemical releases. This experience with chemical releases is a valuable asset Mark brings to the CalARP Program. If you would like more information concerning the CalARP Program, please contact Mark at 619-338-2453.

WASTE CONTAINERS

Best Management Practices Last Part in a Series of Four

Managing and Inspecting Hazardous Waste Storage Areas

By Manon E. Maschue
Env. Health Specialist II



Safe Management:

Hazardous waste must be accumulated and stored in containers that are properly labeled, in good condition and tightly closed. Once a generator of hazardous waste has characterized the waste, selected and labeled an appropriate container*, and moved that container into a storage area, the generator must safely manage the hazardous waste container storage area.

Large Quantity Generators (LQGs-see definition in column three) are **required** to store reactive or ignitable wastes at least 50 feet (15 meters) from the business's property line. For businesses that are Small Quantity Generator of hazardous waste, (SQGs) this is a recommendation, not a requirement. In the event of a small release, keeping ignitable or reactive wastes 50 feet from the property line decreases the risk to passersby and reduces the chance the wastes will get off-site.

Additionally, the owner/operator **must** take precautions to prevent accidental ignition or reaction of ignitable or reactive wastes. Smoking must be avoided near ignitable or reactive wastes and wastes must be kept away from radiant heat and hot surfaces, open flames, welding or cutting operations, static electricity or sparks, friction, and, in some cases, water.



Safe Container Management Includes:

- Keeping wastes away from property boundaries.
- Keeping containers cool and dry.
- Not pushing, dragging, or rolling containers.
- Keeping adequate aisle space.
- Using a spark-proof wrench for opening & closing steel drums.
- Using a dedicated funnel to add liquids to waste drums.
- Transferring waste immediately from any leaking, dented or bulging container.
- Devising a secondary containment area to catch inadvertent spills.

Incompatible Wastes:

Many hazardous wastes when mixed together can produce harmful effects to human health or the environment such as (1) heat or pressure (2) fire or explosion (3) violent reaction (4) toxic fumes or (5) flammable gases. Containers of incompatible wastes **must** be physically separated (walls, berms or dikes) to keep the wastes from reacting with one another. Examples of potentially incompatible wastes are listed in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 66264.801, Appendix V. The constituent's Material Safety Data Sheets are a convenient place to read about potential incompatibilities. Before commingling any wastes, check the *Fire and Explosion, Reactivity* or the *Safe Handling and Storage* sections for useful information.

Weekly Container Inspections:

Section 66265.174 of Title 22 CCR, and section 265.174 of Title 40 CFR, require weekly hazardous waste storage area and container inspections for LQGs and SQGs, respectively. While there is no requirement to document weekly container inspections, it is prudent for all generators to document these inspections. Whether or not the wastes are ignitable or reactive, inspections should, at a minimum, include:

- Looking for staining or leaking containers
- Checking for deterioration of containers (bulges, dents, rust)
- Checking for the deterioration of the containment system.
- Confirming complete labeling
- Determining if adequate aisle space is available
- Storing drums without stacking.

LQG (Large Quantity Generator)

Generates more than 1,000 kg/month or greater than 1 kg of either acutely or extremely hazardous** waste in any calendar month.

SQG (Small Quantity Generator)

Generates less than 1,000 kg/month, never exceeding 6,000 kg at any one time.

CESQG (Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator)

Generates less than 100 kg/month or less than 1 kg acutely hazardous** waste.

*A **container** is a portable device used to accumulate waste, so stationary tanks, trenches, floor sumps and waste piles are NOT considered containers.

The **Acutely hazardous waste list is found in 22 CCR 66261.33(e).

WASTE CONTAINERS

Managing and Inspecting Hazardous Waste Storage Areas (continued from page 4)

SAMPLE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Business Name: _____

Business Address: _____

Inspection Item	Four Week Inspection Period				Comments
	Date _/_/___	Date _/_/___	Date _/_/___	Date _/_/___	
Containers marked properly					
Stored 90 days or less					
No leaks/staining					
Closed tops/bungs					
No dents/corrosion					
Aisle space maintained					
Containment system liquid free					
Inspector's Initials					
Overall Comments: _____					

INCOMPATIBLE WASTES

-Some Deadly Combinations-

- Acids + Oil or Grease = **FIRE**
- Acids + Caustics = **HEAT/SPATTERING**
- Caustics + Epoxies = **EXTREME HEAT**
- Chlorine Gas + Acetylene = **EXPLOSION**
- Flammable Liquids + Hydrogen Peroxide = **FIRE/EXPLOSION**
- Aluminum Powder + Ammonium Nitrate = **EXPLOSION**
- Sodium Cyanide + Sulfuric Acid = **LETHAL HYDROGEN CYANIDE**
- Ammonia + Bleach = **NOXIOUS FUMES**

In General:

- Acids must be segregated from ignitables.
- Acids must be segregated from caustics.
- Corrosives should be segregated from flammables.
- Oxidizers should be segregated from EVERYTHING.
- Many corrosives are water-reactive.
- Most organic reactives must be segregated from inorganic reactives (metals).

Administrative Enforcement Orders

By Maryam Sedghi
Environmental Health Specialist II



Most businesses and people are environmentally conscious and try to do the right thing during their day-to-day operations. However, there is a very small percentage that doesn't operate that way and just tries to avoid getting caught. In the interest of fairness to the vast majority of businesses that spend the time, money and effort to protect human health and the environment, enforcement penalties are often required for the businesses that don't comply with environmental laws and regulations.

There are several different types of enforcement actions, depending on the severity and potential of the violation, or actual harm caused to the public health and/or the environment. In increasing order of severity they are:

- Informal Enforcement
- Administrative Enforcement Order (AEO)
- Permit Revocation or Facility Closure
- Criminal Action

The focus of this article will be to define what an AEO is and how it may be utilized by the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for the purposes of obtaining and maintaining compliance, eliminating economic benefit, punishing the violator, and deterring other potential violators. The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH), Hazardous Materials Division (HMD) is the designated CUPA for San Diego County.

The local CUPA is authorized by Section 25404.1.1 of the Health and Safety Code to issue an order which specifies a schedule of compliance or correction and imposes administrative penalties. In contrast to other enforcement options that are specific to a single program element, the AEO authority is a consistent, formal enforcement option that can be used by CUPAs to address violations in five of the six program elements (Hazardous Waste Generator and Onsite Treatment, Underground Storage Tanks, Aboveground Storage Tanks, Hazardous Materials Business Plan, and Cal/ARP).

The AEO process begins with the detection of a significant violation (class I) or a series of chronic violations (class II). The inspector documents the violations and collects evidence supporting such violation. Once a violation or violations have been identified, the inspector is obligated by law to do the following:

- 1- Prepare a Summary of Violations.
- 2- Prepare a Notice to Comply that lists each violation, the corrective action required, and the manner in which each violation may be brought into compliance.
- 3- Provide a copy of the inspection report to the owner/operator or generator within 5 days of the inspection. In coordination with their Supervisors, inspectors analyze the violation(s) detected before deciding on a course of action. If it is determined that issuance of an AEO is the appropriate response, then an enforcement case is prepared. There are many factors that affect the selection and execution of an enforcement response, including the class of violation, the type

of violator, the circumstances of each case, and the enforcement option chosen.

The intent of the response is to expedite correction of violations and promote compliance. There are several AEO options available to the HMD, such as:

- Show Cause Letter
- Expedited Consent Order
- Draft Unilateral Order
- Unilateral Administrative Order
- Stipulation and Order

The inspector, supervisor, and HMD's enforcement coordinator, after evaluating the enforcement case, recommend the appropriate AEO option to the Chief of HMD. The enforcement case and AEO recommendation must then be reviewed and approved by the Director of DEH.

Although all AEO options are available, HMD most frequently uses the Show Cause Letter alternative. The Show Cause Letter provides the respondent (violator) with an opportunity to settle the enforcement case prior to the issuance of an Order or a hearing. Most settlement meetings are conducted without the presence of attorneys, however, either side has the option of having counsel available during the settlement discussions. If a settlement is agreed upon, a Consent Order or Stipulation and Order is then issued to the respondent. The Consent Order or Stipulation and Order outlines a schedule for compliance, any penalties that must be paid, supplemental environmental projects to be completed in lieu of penalties, and the reimbursement of investigative costs to HMD.



Designated Operator Requirements for all UST Facilities in California

By Richard Hansen,
Env. Health Specialist II



The passage of SB989 in January 2000 set in motion the development of new regulations by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for underground storage tank (UST) system owners/operators and other UST professionals.

A portion of the new regulations, often referred to as 'Training Plus' regulations, became effective on May 8, 2004. One important component of the new regulations is the requirement that all UST system owners select a 'Designated Operator' for each tank facility they own. The deadline was January 1, 2005, requiring UST owners to formally notify the local UST regulatory agency, or CUPA, of two things:

1-The name(s) of their facility's 'Designated Operator', and

2-A certification that they understand and are in compliance with all applicable State UST regulations. These regulations can now be found in Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 2715.

A *certified* operator is an individual who has demonstrated knowledge in operating a UST in the State of California by passing the International Code Council (ICC) 'California UST System Operator' exam. To remain valid, this certification must be renewed every 24 months, by

retaking the exam.

Operators were required to pass this exam by January 1, 2005 in order to be qualified as a facility's 'Designated Operator.'

A facility's 'Designated Operator' may work for multiple tank owners and facilities, as long as the certified operator fulfills the requirements of the role. He or she may also be a facility's current employee, a contractor, or the tank owner. There are no restrictions on who can serve, as long as he or she becomes certified by passing the exam.

The Designated Operator's job responsibilities are the following:

 **Inspect** on a monthly basis the UST-system monitoring panel, and if there has been, or is, an alarm in any sump or component, inspect that sump by lifting the sump lids. Corrective action measures can then be determined and implemented. (Note: the requirement to lift the lids and inspect the sumps does not apply if a service technician has already responded to and corrected the cause of the alarm.)

 **Inspect** the spill buckets and under dispenser containment pans (UDCs) monthly for the presence of standing fuel, water, or debris, and remove as needed. Any sump or UDC sensor not at its lowest sump position must be repositioned correctly.

 **Record** the observations on a monthly inspection checklist. If there have been no alarms at any of the sumps, raising the sump lids for inspection will not be required.

 **Check** the books to make sure

that all the required tank testing and maintenance has been done.

 **Submit** a copy of the inspection report to the owner or operator each month, and alert the owner/operator of anything that requires follow-up.

 **Notify** the tank owner if any problems are found, such as water or fuel in the sumps.

 **Train** the tank facility's employees annually, and no later than July 1, 2005. A facility employee is defined as "an individual who is employed on-site" and may be called upon to respond to fuel spills, tank overfills, and other emergency situations. Training for employees must be site-specific, and therefore must include:

- Specific procedures to take in the event of spills, overfills, and emergencies as well as emergency contact information;
- UST monitoring-equipment operation and alarm response;
- Ways to operate the tanks using 'Best Management Practices' for that facility.

For new employees- employee training in the above topics must be completed within 30 days of their hire date and refresher training must be given every 12 months.

Promissor and LaserGrade are professional examination companies that administer the tests for the International Code Council (ICC), a company that develops national certification programs in various construction industries. The test is open book and the fee to take the test is \$75. The test administrator will provide the necessary reference material at the exam location.

Administrative Enforcement Orders

(continued from page 6)

On rare occasions the HMD may choose to use an AEO option that requires the issuance of an Enforcement Order prior to entering into settlement. Upon completion of the Enforcement Order, it is properly served to the respondent along with a Notice of Defense. Once the Enforcement Order has been served, the respondent has fifteen days from the date of receipt to request a hearing by submitting a copy of the Notice of Defense. Settlement discussions between the HMD and the respondent can occur at any time in the process.

If agreement is achieved, a Consent Order or a Stipulation and Order is issued. If an agreement is not achieved, an administrative hearing is scheduled. In all administrative enforcement order cases, if the HMD and the respondent can not settle the case within 90 days of issuing an order, the case will go to a hearing as provided in statute or county code, unless an extension is approved by

the Chief of HMD.

There are many steps involved in the penalty assessment phase of the AEOs. In order to assess the penalty, the HMD determines the potential harm the violation poses to the public health, safety and the environment.

For hazardous waste violations, the 'Extent of Potential' harm presented by the violation may be categorized as major, moderate, or minimal. Step two in the process is to determine how far the violation departed from the legal requirements. This is called the 'Extent of Deviation' and is categorized as major, moderate, or minimal. The next step is to determine the amount of the initial penalty for each violation using a penalty matrix provided in section 66272.62 (d), Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Later, the initial penalty may be adjusted based upon the violator's intent to commit the violation. Depending on the economic benefit gained or cost of compliance avoided by the violator, the initial penalty can be increased to the statutory maximum. If the vio-

time, a separate penalty may be assessed for each day the violation continued. Other adjustments may be made based on the following factors: the violator's 'Cooperation and Effort' to return to compliance, the 'Prophylactic Effect' of the penalty, the 'Compliance History' of the violation, and the violator's 'Ability to Pay'.

The final step in the penalty determination process is the calculation of the final penalty. However, the penalty calculated by HMD is not always the final penalty assessed. The final penalty assessed is usually that which is agreed upon during settlement negotiations or following a hearing.

At first glance, the AEO process appears to be a daunting and complicated process. However, a closer look at the process will prove it not to be as difficult as some of the other enforcement options. In this article we have outlined AEO basics and explained the process utilized by HMD. Additional detailed information will be provided in future issues of the Environmental Press.

Designated Operator Requirements for all UST Facilities in California

(continued from page 7)

Additional information and study material references about how to become a Designated UST Operator may be found at:

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/deh/hmd/docs/ust-training-requirements-04-30-04.doc>

Designated Operators can obtain blank facility inspection forms at: www.sdcounty.ca.gov/deh
Information on the exam can be found at: www.iccsafe.org/certification/bulletin.html

The complexity of the current UST regulations in California has left many UST owner/operators overwhelmed and confused. As always, a tank facility owner/operator that has questions or needs assistance on the tank regulations should feel free to call his or her assigned County inspector for help. Additionally, the availability of a Designated Operator on each facility will now bring new regulatory knowledge and organization that will help in achieving compliance for those tank owners who do not have time to be experts in UST regulations.



Susan Hahn

(continued from page 1)

Susan studied microbiology at San Diego State University where she did independent study work in environmental microbiology under the direction of Dr. B.B. Hemmingsen. Susan graduated from San Diego State University with a Bachelors of Science degree in Microbiology. After graduation Susan worked as a microbiologist with a couple of biotech companies and the Naval Health Research Center. Susan met Mike Dorsey, the Chief of the Hazardous Materials Division while taking an Environmental Health course at a local community college. Soon after this meeting, Susan decided that she was well suited to work in environmental

health. She would not have to spend all of her workday inside a laboratory and it was safer than fishing in Alaska. Susan began her career with San Diego County as an Environmental Health Specialist I. She has since been promoted to EHS II and has become a California Registered Hazardous Materials Specialist. Susan inspects businesses for compliance with the Unified and Medical Waste Programs in the Sorrento Valley area of San Diego, so she spends most of her time inspecting businesses that are involved in biotechnology. Her experience working in various laboratories and ability to listen and then practically apply regulatory requirements makes her well suited to this inspection route. Susan is a

keen observer, who is quick to laugh. She is well liked and considered a very valuable resource by her colleagues.

In her spare time, Susan likes to read true crime, especially Ann Rule. She also continues to enjoy the outdoors, spending many weekends in Big Bear with her husband of 12 years and their two dogs. This past summer Susan went to Yosemite and hiked Half Dome. Next summer she will tackle Mt. Whitney. Susan and her husband also find time to attend Padres baseball games, but at least for the near future, she remains a loyal Chicago Cubs fan.

January 1st, 2005 was the deadline to choose a UST Designated Operator

USEFUL HMD PHONE NUMBERS

Hazardous Materials
Duty Desk
619-338-2231

Hazardous Materials
Business Plan Check
619-338-2232

HMD Permitting Section
619-338-2251

General Underground Storage
Tank (UST) Permitting Info.
619-237-8451

UST Appointment Scheduling
619-338-2214

UST Plan Check
619-338-2207

HMD SUPERVISORS

Matt Trainor Supervising EHS Operations/Permits	Ron Yonemitsu Senior Health Physicist Radiological Health	Sylvia Mosse Supervising EHS UST Program
Ed Slater Supervising EHS North County	Michael Dorsey HMD Chief	John Misleh Supervising EHS East County
John Kolb Supervising EHS South County	Nick Vent Supervising EHS Emergency Response	Mike Vizzier Supervising EHS Central County

VISIT HMD's WEBSITE

<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/deh/hmd/index.html>