# MDEStat Meeting May 17, 2010



### Table 1: Backlogged Lead Rental Registration Progress

|   | 4/15/10                  | 4/22/10                 | 4/29/10     | 5/6/10      | 5/11/10    |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Original Number of<br>Backlogged<br>Boxes/Forms | 39 Boxes<br>(3500 Forms) |                         | 4800 Forms* | 4951 Forms  | 4951 Forms |
| Number of<br>Boxes/Forms Left                   | 17 Boxes                 | 845 Forms<br>(10 boxes) | 1300+ Forms | 508 Forms** | 0          |
| Number of Forms<br>Completed                    | 1,847                    | 2,655 Forms             | 3,524 Forms | 4,443 Forms | 4951+      |

<sup>\*</sup>Some boxes had more forms in them that were not included in the initial estimate.

<sup>\*\*</sup> These forms were completed on May 7-8, and included forms submitted as recently as April 27, 2010.

### Table 2: Addressing Unregistered Pre-1950 Residential Rental Properties

| Task  | Target Completion Date | 5/10 Status   |
|---|------------------------|---|
| Use information from City to reduce target universe of pre-1950 rentals.                | 4/30/10                | Obtained the number of vacant units. Requested a listing of the 16,594 units. Will use data to identify Baltimore City unregistered units. Will do remainder of State next. |
| Compare Lead Rental Registry and SDAT Registry and send letters to unmatched addresses. | 6/15/10                | Not yet underway.   |
| Review responses to letter to determine number of units still unregistered.             | 8/1/10                 | Not yet underway.   |

### Table 3: CAFO/MAFO Activity

(Continued on Next Slide)

|  | 3/1/10 | 3/29/10 | 5/10/10 |
|--|--------|---------|---------|
| 1. Number of CAFO NOIs received  | NR     | 518     | 524     |
| 2. Number of CAFO NOIs received that changed from CAFO to MAFO                                       | 71     | 83      | 98      |
| 3. Number of CAFO NOIs received that were subsequently withdrawn, if any                             | NR     | 14      | 15      |
| 4. Number of CAFO NOIs received and still classified as CAFOs  | 445    | 421     | 411     |
| 5. Number of MAFO-from-the-start NOIs received* (due 3/1/10)   | 0      | 0       | 0       |
| 6. Number of CAFO sites for which a Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans (CNMP) has been received | 66     | 72      | 91      |
| 7. Number of CAFO sites that have passed initial review, prior to public participation               | NR     | NR      | 8*      |

### Table 3: CAFO/MAFO Activity

(Continued on Next Slide)

|   | 3/1/10 | 3/29/10 | 5/10/10 |
|---|--------|---------|---------|
| 8. Number of CAFO sites that have completed the public review process   | NR     | NR      | 0       |
| 9. Number of CAFO sites for which a compliance schedule has been received (initial deadline 1/4/10; followup deadline 3/12/10)                            | 220    | 254     | 279     |
| 10. Number of CAFO sites with compliance schedules executed and in force  | NR     | NR      | 99      |
| 12. Number of CAFO sites for which neither a CNMP nor a compliance schedule has been received   | 159    | 95      | 60      |
| 13. Number of CAFO sites that have submitted both a CNMP AND a compliance schedule  | NR     | NR      | 21      |
| 14. Number of CAFO sites for which neither a CNMP nor a compliance schedule has been received but have sent in the supplementary form or CNMP status form | NR     | NR      | 17      |

### Table 3: CAFO/MAFO Activity

(Continued on Next Slide)

| 15. Number of CAFO sites that have not responded since original submittal of NOIs in February 2009 | NR | NR | 49                      |
|--|----|----|-------------------------|
| 16. Number of registered CAFOs inspected (targets are 50 in FY10 and 100 in future years)          | NR | NR | N/A, none<br>registered |
| 17. Number of other CAFO inspections conducted, e.g. of unregistered sites, if any                 | NR | NR | 1                       |

<sup>&</sup>quot;NR" means not requested.

<sup>\*</sup>Eight CAFO permits went out for public comment on May 10.

# Table 4: LMA Use of ARRA Funds for LUST Cleanup

|  | Target*                          | 11/16/09 | 12/14/09 | 1/25/10 | 2/22/10 | 3/26/10           | 5/10/10        |
|--|----------------------------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|-------------------|----------------|
| Percent obligated                                      | 35%                              | 18%      | 23%      | 33%     | 35.4%   | 36.9%             | 38.2 %         |
| Percent expended                                       | 15%                              | 2%       | 4.6%     | 7.5%    | 12.3%   | 13.2%             | 15.18%         |
| Number of file reviews                                 | Number of file reviews performed |          |          |         |         |                   | 37             |
| Number of final file reviews submitted to MDE          |                                  |          |          |         |         | 10                | 10<br>10 draft |
| Number of UST excavations performed                    |                                  |          |          |         |         | 2                 | 3              |
| Number of UST excavation reports received              |                                  |          |          |         | 1       | 1final<br>1 draft |                |
| Number of cases closed after cleanup work done at site |                                  |          |          |         | NR      | None              |                |
| Total number of cases closed                           |                                  |          |          |         |         | NR                | None           |

<sup>\*</sup> States that don't meet these targets by 4/30/10 may be reviewed by EPA, but EPA has stated that as long as Maryland meets the "obligated" target, MDE will receive full funding. If the "expended" target is not met, EPA will require the program to provide a revised spending plan.

#### Table 5: LMA Enforcement Cases in OAG by Priority Level

| Priority Category             | 12/14/09   | 1/26/10   | 3/1/10   | 3/29/10  | 5/10/10  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 5                             | Lead – 5   | Lead – 1  | Lead - 1<br>SWP-0<br>OCP - 3<br>HWP - 0                      | Lead -4<br>SWP - 0<br>OCP - 3<br>HWP - 0                   | Lead -3<br>SWP -0<br>OCP-3<br>HWP - 0                  |
| 4                             | Data not requested.  | Lead - 14<br>OCP - 3                                      | Lead - 14<br>SWP-0<br>OCP – 7<br>HWP- 0                      | Lead - 22<br>SWP - 1<br>OCP - 9<br>HWP - 0                 | Lead - 26<br>SWP -2OCP-1<br>HPW - 0                    |
| 3                             |  | Lead - 66<br>SWP - 7<br>OCP - 1                           | Lead - 66<br>SWP-7<br>OCP – 1<br>HWP – 0                     | Lead -107<br>SWP - 7<br>OCP - 1<br>HWP - 0                 | Lead-110<br>SWP - 7<br>OCP-6<br>HWP -0                 |
| 2                             |  | Lead - 39   | Lead - 39<br>SWP-0<br>OCP - 1<br>HWP - 0                     | Lead- 79<br>SWP – 0<br>OCP – 0<br>HWP - 0                  | Lead –74<br>SWP - 1<br>OCP-4<br>HWP - 1                |
| 1                             |  | Lead - 48<br>SWP - 3 OCP<br>- 3<br>HWP - 2                | Lead - 48<br>SWP-3<br>OCP - 3<br>HWP - 2                     | Lead- 36<br>SWP – 3<br>OCP – 3<br>HWP - 2                  | Lead – 33<br>SWP - 3<br>OCP-4<br>HWP - 5               |
| No Priority Level Designated* |  | Lead – 82*  | Lead – 82*<br>SWP – 0<br>OCP – 0<br>HWP – 0                  | Lead-0<br>SWP - 0<br>OCP - 2<br>HWP - 0                    | Lead – 0<br>SWP - 0<br>OCP-0<br>HWP - 0                |
| Total                         | Lead – 112<br>SWP - 18<br>OCP – 11<br>HWP – 1<br>All – 142 | Lead – 250<br>SWP - 10<br>OCP – 7<br>HWP – 2<br>All - 269 | Lead - 250<br>SWP - 10<br>OCP - 15<br>HWP - 2<br>Total - 277 | Lead -248<br>SWP - 11<br>OCP - 16<br>HWP - 2<br>Total -277 | Lead-246<br>SWP - 13<br>OCP-18<br>HWP - 6<br>Total-283 |

# Table 6: Backlogged Groundwater Monitoring Reports

|       | 11/16/09 | 12/14/09 | 1/26/10 | 3/1/10 | 3/29/10 | 5/10/10 |
|-------|----------|----------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| SWP   | 145      | 145      | 113     | 106    | 80      | 66      |
| OCP   | 0        | 0        | 0       | 0      | 0       | 0       |
| Total | 145      | 145      | 113     | 106    | 80      | 66      |

### Table 7: Mining Program

|                               | Number<br>of<br>Permits | Number of<br>Active Permits<br>in Effect | Target Inspection Frequency* | Number<br>Inspecte | of Sites                 |           | er of Sites<br>ignificant<br>ons | Number<br>Enforced<br>Actions | ment                     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                               | in<br>Effect            |  |                              | FY09               | First<br>Half of<br>FY10 | FY09      | First<br>Half of<br>FY10         | FY09                          | First<br>Half of<br>FY10 |
| Coal<br>Mining –<br>total     | 66                      | 66                                       | Monthly                      | 83                 | 134                      | 5         | 3                                | 5                             | 4                        |
| Coal<br>Mining –<br>surface   | 60                      | 60                                       | Monthly                      | Disaggre           | egation no               | t current | ly available                     |                               |                          |
| Coal<br>Mining –<br>deep      | 6                       | 6  | Monthly                      |                    |                          |           |                                  |                               |                          |
| Non-Coal<br>Mining –<br>total | 325                     | 325                                      | Weekly to<br>Yearly          | 181                | 89                       | 2         | 0                                | 2                             | 0                        |

<sup>\*</sup> If frequency target varies with another factor such as size or whether active, please explain.

### Table 8: LMA Vacancies of Concern

(Continued on next slide)

| PIN   | Vacancy Date | Reason(s) for Delay, Current Status, and EDC for Next Step   |
|---|--------------|--|
|   |              |  |
| 019732<br>Nursing<br>Prog/Consultant<br>Admin III | 9/30/08      | Program was holding this PIN. The money saved by not hiring at this time will go towards the purchase of a much needed IT server. LMA decided to use this PIN for a contractual conversion of an Admin Spec in the Technical Services and Operations Program. PRF went to Executive Staff 1/4/2010 but request was put on hold until contractual conversion criteria is applied.   |
| 060441<br>Agency Grants<br>Spec Trainee           | 6/1/09       | PRF Form approved by Executive Staff 11/9/09. OHR contacted the Administration on 11/19/09 and requested that the hiring exception, MS-22 and interview questions to be submitted to OHR by 12/4/09. Exception sent to MDE Office of Budget on 11/10/09; Exception submitted to DBM 12/28/09 and approved 1/29/2010. MS-22 submitted to DBM 12/16/09 with approval granted 1/21/2010. Will use previously approved interview questions. Recruitment letters mailed 2/24/2010 with a closing date of 3/15/2010. 41 applications approved. Applications screened and forwarded to hiring manager. Interviews completed 4/9/2010. Selection made. First and second selected candidates were asking for a salary way above base (Step 20). TSOP's budget cannot cover the salary. Administration decided to downgrade position to an Agency Grants Specialist Trainee. Letters will be mailed the week of May 10 <sup>th</sup> . New interview questions and screening criteria are being developed. |

#### Table 8: LMA Vacancies of Concern

| PIN                    | Vacancy Date      | Reason(s) for Delay, Current Status, and EDC for Next Step  |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 074044<br>ADMIN II     | 7/3/09            | Incumbent resigned for a Leave of Absence and was to return in December 2009. Haven't heard from incumbent. Land would like to change class to a toxicology classification but DBM needed to determine appropriate classification. MS-22 submitted to DBM 2/25/2010. DBM determined position was an Admin II. PRF needs to be submitted to ASA. |
| 083385<br>Admin Spec I | 12/29/08          | Program was holding this PIN for budgetary reasons. LMA decided to use this PIN for a contractual conversion of an Admin Spec in the Oil Control Program. PRF went to Executive Staff 1/4/2010 but put request on hold until contractual conversion criteria is applied.  |
| Recruitments Overdue f | for Action by LMA | \(\text{(no need to repeat those listed above)}\)   |
| 015853<br>Env Spec I   | 2/1/2010          | Position was moved to the Technical Services and Operations Program. Interview questions need to be developed.  |
| 080143<br>Geo III      | 2/24/2010         | Need to determine where PIN will be housed. Once determined, PRF and MS-22 need to be submitted.  |