

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Board of Examiners of Environmental Professionals

Board Members:
Denise Ruzicka, PE, Chairman
John Adams, LEP
Christopher Buchholz
Robert F. Good, Jr., LEP
Stephen Holtman PE, LEP
Jeffrey Loureiro, PE, LEP
Kelly Meloy, LEP
Elsie Patton
Alisa Phillips-Griggs
Robert S. Potterton, Jr., LEP
Carol Violette, PhD, CHMM

MINUTES

State Board of Examiners of Environmental Professionals

Regular Meeting - February 19, 2015

A. Call to Order and Sign-In

A regular meeting of the State Board of Examiners of Environmental Professionals ("the Board") was called to order on Thursday, February 19, 2015 at 9:02 am in the Russell Room, 3rd Floor, 79 Elm Street, Hartford, by Chair D. Ruzicka. Board members R. Potterton, E. Patton, S. Holtman, R. Good, S. Holtman, J. Loureiro, K. Meloy and C. Violette were present. K. Maiorano, Board Administrator, N. Walter representing the EPOC, J. Gilbert, J. Czeczotka and R. Robinson of DEEP were also present.

B. Reading and Approval of the Minutes

The draft minutes of the Regular Board meeting of January 15th were read and approved as written; motion by K. Meloy, second: J. Loureiro passed unanimously.

C. Public Participation

N. Walter had no comments.

D. Unfinished Business and General Orders

Notice of Insufficiency Letter

E. Patton, representing Connecticut Fund for the Environment, expressed concerns on behalf of the environmental community that the review of verifications may not be as efficient as possible with the use of this letter. She feels that the Notice of Insufficiency (NOI) format letter is not intuitive and may create a process of back and forth on issues that are minor and aren't substantive. She would rather see a more thorough review of the verification report, and a complete rejection of the verification should items be missing, or a referral to the Board if the verification report is incomplete, or if they don't document how they determined compliance with the RSRs. This checklist is difficult for sites that have a lot of different AOCs, she feels the form is unworkable. It might be better to have a conceptual site model table with all the reports and a description of how the release areas were investigated. As an example, Patton thought the

ELUR form was painful to complete, but it was helpful to the DEEP to get an expedited, more meaningful review of the process.

- J. Czeczotka, DEEP explained that the NOI format letter is not in lieu of the audit process. Lack of resources prohibits a full in-depth review of every verification that is received, there is a screening process that attempts to ensure that before staff start investing too much time into the review, there is a mechanism to evaluate whether DEEP has received the basics. He conceded that no form is going to be perfect, but the NOI format letter functions well as an initial screening tool. It was not designed to waste anyone's time. DEEP would be willing to take suggestions and possibly modify the form.
- J. Loureiro suggested that it might be useful to rephrase the NOI format letter and design it to become a quality control tool that an LEP could utilize to ensure that the LEP has covered all the relevant items and included everything the DEEP is looking for.
- R. Robinson said the NOI format letter was designed to ensure that a certain standard of care is met. DEEP does not have resources for an in depth review of every verification, so a tiered approach has been developed to first determine if the form is complete. The purpose of the NOI format letter is to determine the completeness of the verification package, it is a form prescribed by the commissioner, and was not designed to be a detailed review.
- E.Patton would like to meet with the DEEP to further discuss on behalf of the environmental community, and asked that if discussions continued on the verification report, that the environmental community be included in the review.
- R. Robinson said there were 116 verification received in 2014, up from 86 the previous year. DEEP cannot do a detailed review of every one, but does do the initial screening and sends out letters of no audit, which is not concurrence with the verification, but a letter stating the DEEP will not audit the verification.
- K. Meloy felt that there needed to be more efficiency on the screening process. She felt that the most important thing to review is the verification report. She felt that was the most important task, and that more should be reviewed by the DEEP. She said that consistency with reports is important both with the preparation and subsequent review. She also commented that she felt the letters of no audit were quite clear in their function and could not be deemed concurrence with the verification.

Update on complaint 14-101

C. Violette reported that there was no merit to the complaint and the case was closed. A. Philips-Griggs had reported in detail at the January meeting of the Board that she and C. Violette had completed the investigation and they found no merit to the complaint. The Board authorized no further action letters that went out to the complainant and the LEP on February 11, 2015. K. Maiorano will provide a copy of the letters to the Board members for their records.

Distance learning - status of changes to regulations

Chair Ruzicka reported that the hearing officer's report is done. The revised regulations will be moving along in the next step of the process.

Update on complaints 11-102 & 11-103

- R. Potterton reported that letters to the LEPs went out recommending further action of the Board.
 - J. Loureiro left at 9:46 am.

E. New Business

- Course approval request from LEP for course titled "NRE 5135-Water Transport in Soils" for 32.0 CECs.
 - Motion to approve for 12.0 CECs K. Meloy, this was a college course taken for grade, the LEP regulations allow 4 CECs per semester hour; seconded by E. Patton; passed unanimously.
- Course approval request from Rutgers for course titled "Groundwater in Fractured Bedrock" for 6.0 CECs.
 Motion to approve for 6.5 CECs K. Meloy, seconded by R. Potterton; passed unanimously.
- Course approval request from LEP for course titled "Combining Engineered Contaminant Source Area Treatment Technologies and MNA for Site Cleanup Under the LSRP Program" for 19.5 CECs.
 Motion to approve for 16.5 CECs K. Meloy; second, C. Violette; passed unanimously.
- Course approval request from David Pine for course titled "Investigating
 Environmental Impacts from Fracking" for 8.0 CECs.
 Motion to disapprove S. Holtman, courses need to pertain to Connecticut; seconded by C.
 Violette; passed unanimously. There is currently a fracking moratorium in CT and the geology of CT is not conducive to fracking.
- Motion to add:Course approval request from Rutgers for course titled "Ecological Risk Assessment" for 12.0 CECs.
 Motion to add and approve for 9.5 CECs K. Meloy, removing time on day two relevant to New Jersey; seconded by S. Holtman; passed unanimously.
- S. Holtman left at 10:15.

Review of Applications for Exam

There were 17 new applications for the 2015 LEP exam;

Motion to approve the following 9 for entrance to the examination K. Meloy; seconded C. Violette; passed unanimously.

2015 00835	2015 01025	2015 01032
2015 00966	2015 01027	2015 01061
2015 00973	2015 01031	2015 01064

Motion to request additional information for the following R. Good; seconded C. Violette; passed unanimously.

2015 01004 2015 01066 2015 01067

Motion to deny the following who failed to demonstrate they met the minimum requirements for entrance to the exam R. Good; seconded C. Violette; passed unanimously.

2015 01034 2015 01063

The following applications were not received complete by the deadline and will be held for review for the 2016 examination

2015 01062 2015 01068 2015 01251

Next regular meeting is March 12, 2015.

F. Adjournment

Chair Ruzicka declared the meeting adjourned at 11:43 am.

Minutes approved at meeting rescheduled to March 19th, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Maiorano

Board Administrator