



Charlie Crist
Governor

Ana M. Viamonte Ros, M.D., M.P.H.
State Surgeon General

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

INFORMATION
HSES 08-001

DATE: January 17, 2008

TO: County Health Department Directors/Administrators
ATTN: Environmental Health and Engineering Directors

THROUGH: Lisa Conti, D.V.M., M.P.H., Dipl. ACVPM, CPH
Director, Division of Environmental Health *[Signature]*

FROM: *[Signature]*
Gerald R. Briggs, Chief
Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs

SUBJECT: Onsite Sewage Program Evaluations 2008

INFORMATION ONLY

Attached is the list of the county health department onsite sewage programs to be evaluated in 2008. For those counties, the assigned evaluator will contact you to schedule a date. The 2006-2008 program evaluation tool is also attached. The evaluations will be scored in five areas consisting of multiple items, which are identified along with the value of each item (See the attached files). The evaluation will receive one score based on the total number of points earned towards the value of each item. If the total score is less than 70%, a re-evaluation will occur to ensure implementation of corrective actions in deficient areas.

Please note travel to conduct program evaluations has been impacted due to current budgetary reductions. To overcome these difficulties, the bureau will schedule half of the program evaluations prior to the end of the current fiscal year (i.e., June 30, 2008), and the remaining after the beginning of the 2008 budget year (i.e., July 1, 2008).

In the event, budget reductions force the bureau to suspend travel, the records review portion of the program evaluation (Attachment A) will be conducted from the data transferred to the Division of Environmental Health in RE-HOST. This includes new systems, repair systems, existing and modification systems, etc. In this case, the field portion of the program evaluation (Attachment B) will not be conducted and will be scored "not applicable".



Division of Environmental Health, Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs
4052 Bald Cypress Way, Bin #A08, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1713

The program evaluation is an important part of the quality improvement review process and in order to expedite the process, you will be asked to provide the following documentation at least one week prior to the evaluation date:

1. Completed Work Load Unit spreadsheet for all Environmental Health Programs;
2. A Table of Organization (indicating employee names and program areas);
3. Performance Standards for all supervisory positions;
4. Copy of written policy for supervision reconciliation of DARS and timesheets; and
5. Copy of written procedure for verification of mileage submitted and inspections completed by field inspectors; and
6. Turnover rate survey.

If the program evaluation is conducted as a record review from electronic data transfers, in addition to the above required items, the county health department will be asked to forward copy of the site plans and surveys for the randomly selected records to be reviewed.

I appreciate the cooperation and assistance that has been extended at every level to the evaluation staff. Comments or suggestions related to the program evaluation procedure should be directed to Ed Barranco at (850) 245-4070 or SC 205-4070.

**PROGRAM EVALUATION SCHEDULE
YEAR 2008 FOR OSTDS**

COUNTY	EVALUATOR ASSIGNED
Broward	Bart Harriss
Clay	Kim Duffek
Dixie	Kim Duffek
Escambia	David Hammonds
Gadsden	David Hammonds
Highlands	Sonia Cruz
Hillsborough	Bart Harriss
Holmes	Ed Barranco
Indian River	Sonia Cruz
Lee	Bart Harriss
Leon	Ed Barranco
Levy	Kim Duffek
Manatee	Bart Harriss
Marion	Kim Duffek
Nassau	Bart Harriss
Okaloosa	David Hammonds
St. Johns	Sonia Cruz
Sarasota	Bart Harriss
Taylor	Kim Duffek
Volusia	Sonia Cruz
Walton	David Hammonds
Washington	Kim Duffek

COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
2006-2008 ONSITE SEWAGE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW

A. **Records Review:** The items identified in each section of the evaluation tool are selected from the program forms, rule and statute requirements. These items represent only part of the total number of items required for compliance in the program. Scoring for the records portion of the program evaluation is divided as follows:

1. A review of new, repair and existing/modification permit application records. Seven of each will be randomly selected from systems receiving final system installation approval in the six months prior to the evaluation. All application packages will be used to generate the report.
2. A review of enforcement actions. A random sample of five complaints from the previous twelve months will be reviewed for compliance with ten specific criteria. The complaints will be comprised of septic tank contracting complaints received through the State Health Office Hotline, sanitary nuisance and rule violation complaints.
3. A review of permit denial and variance applications. A random sample comprising five permit denials and variances will be reviewed for compliance with seven specific criteria. Also, each variance processed through the State Health Office will be reviewed for compliance with items one through four prior to any additional information being submitted. These scores will be retained for use in each program evaluation in an effort to assess variance application packets as they are initially submitted to the State Health Office.
4. A review of operating permit files for each of the following: septic tank cleaning services, portable toilet services, septage treatment and land application facilities, septic tank manufacturers, aerobic treatment units, aerobic treatment unit and performance-based treatment system maintenance entities and commercial, industrial/manufacturing zones and performance-based treatment systems. A random sample of five operating permit files will be reviewed in each of these areas.

B. **Field Assessment: Conformity: Site Evaluation and Inspection**

1. The conformity section will evaluate a combination of seven open and recently closed onsite sewage treatment and disposal systems that have received final system approval within the previous few weeks prior to the scheduled program evaluation. Two of the seven OSTDSs evaluated will be mound systems. The nineteen items in this section were selected for their high impact on the public's health. The information gathered in each of these inspections will be compared to the site evaluation, construction permit and inspection associated with the respective application packet.

C. **Implementation of Previous Recommendations:** A review of the county health department's implementation of recommendations from their previous program evaluation will be conducted. The score will be reported as the percentage of previous recommendations satisfactorily implemented.

The evaluation will also include an interview with the environmental health director to discuss the county health department's activities related to staffing, equipment and references, training, customer satisfaction and internal monitoring and qualitative improvement.

HSES Administrative and Programmatic Evaluation 2006-2008

County Health Department

Sections		Value	Points
I. OSTDS Programmatic Review		80%	
A.	Records Review (see attachments A1 through A-11)	35%	
B.	Field Evaluation (see attachment B)	41%	
C.	Implementation of Previous Recommendations (see attachment C)	24%	
II. Equipment and References		6%	
A.	Availability of current Florida Administrative Code, Florida Statutes, Environmental Health Program Manual DOHM 150-4 and related references (see attachment D).	17%	
B.	All field staff have e-mail and intranet/internet access.	33%	
C.	Availability of inspection equipment (see attachment E)	50%	
III. Training		6%	
A.	All field staff employed over six months with duties in Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System Programs are in compliance with s. 381.0101, Florida Statutes and Chapter 64E-18, Florida Administrative Code.	25%	
B.	All field staff are in compliance with the DOH 150-4 requirement of having to attend Basic EH Orientation within two years of commencing employment or watched the videos.	25%	
C.	All field staff are in compliance with Interoffice Memorandum HSES 00-034, Acknowledgement of Receipt of Procedures for Site Evaluations and Final Inspections.	25%	
D.	Does the county health department have documentation that it participates in coordination / educational meetings with septic tank and/or building contractors (conducted annually)? Documentation includes announcements, agendas or minutes.	25%	
IV. Customer Satisfaction		3%	
A.	Client Satisfaction Surveys are performed on a quarterly basis and kept on file and the results are forwarded to the Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs	100%	
V. Internal Monitoring and Qualitative Improvement		5%	
A.	Did supervisors perform ride along evaluations with each of their inspection field staff on at least two separate occasions in a permit year to observe them performing routine inspections and document the visits either on a checklist or on a separate routine inspection form?	16%	
B.	Over the past three years did the supervisor(s) observe their staff perform routine inspections for the all programs in which they work?	16%	
C.	All supervisory position descriptions and performance standards must clearly address supervisory responsibilities and inspection reports (as stated in informational memo HSEF 2001-006).	16%	
D.	Supervisors reconcile field staff DARS and timesheets at least biweekly	16%	
E.	Supervisors verify field staff mileage accuracy prior to voucher approval. 90% of inspection reports in the random records sample were initialed by supervisors or their designee.	16%	
F.	CENTRAX is used as the principal means of data collection and recording in the onsite sewage treatment and disposal system program. Number of working days to issue permit from receipt of completed application is 8 days or less for new systems and 2 days or less for repairs. Centrax data evaluated is the average days to issue for the evaluation period prior to the evaluation date, found in the performance report.	20%	
Totals		100%	

Attachment A

A. RECORDS REVIEW: 2. SYSTEM REPAIRS

	NO.	ITEM	VAL	SCORE	COMMENTS
Appl.	1	ESTABLISHMENT INFORMATION	5	X O	INDICATE THE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS AND BUILDING AREA AND/OR THE APPROPRIATE INFORMATION FROM TABLE I OF THE EXISTING ESTABLISHMENT.
	Site Plan	2	EXISTING OSTDS LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION	5	X O
3		PROPOSED OSTDS LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION	5	X O	INDICATE THE PROPOSED SYSTEM LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION ON THE PROPERTY. LABEL AS PROPOSED AND INDICATE THE SETBACKS TO PROPERTY LINES AND OTHER FEATURES.
4		SURFACE WATER	5	X O N	INDICATE THE LOCATION AND SETBACKS OF ALL SURFACE WATER BODIES ON PROPERTY.
5		ONSITE WELLS	5	X O N	INDICATE THE LOCATION AND SETBACKS OF ALL EXISTING OR PROPOSED ONSITE WELLS.
6		OFFSITE FEATURES	5	X O N	INDICATE THE LOCATION AND SETBACKS OF WELLS, SURFACE WATER BODIES AND OTHER PERTINENT FACILITIES OR FEATURES IN PROXIMITY TO THE OSTDS WHICH RESTRICTS REPLACEMENT OR RELOCATION OF THE DRAINFIELD SYSTEM
Repair Evaluation		7	EXISTING TANK CERTIFICATION	5	X O
	8	EXISTING DRAINFIELD SIZE	5	X O	INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF THE DRAINFIELD EXISTING ON THE SITE.
	9	EXISTING DRAINFIELD ELEVATION	5	X O	INDICATE THE ELEVATION OF THE BOTTOM OF THE DRAINFIELD EXISTING ON THE SITE.
	10	YEAR OF ORIGINAL SYSTEM INSTALLATION	5	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF YEAR OF ORIGINAL SYSTEM INSTALLATION
	11	CAUSE OF FAILURE	5	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE FAILURE WHICH IS OCCURRING.
Site Evaluation	12	ESTIMATED WET SEASON WATER TABLE ELEVATION	5	X O	RECORD THE EWSWT ELEVATION BASED ON SITE EVALUATION, USDA SOIL MAPS AND HISTORICAL INFORMATION. MUST CONFORM WITH SOIL PROFILE INFORMATION.
	13	BENCHMARK	5	X O	A FIXED POINT OF REFERENCE ESTABLISHED RELATIVE TO EXISTING PROPERTY ELEVATION.
	14	SOIL PROFILES	5	X O	A MINIMUM OF TWO SOIL PROFILES USING USDA METHODOLOGY ARE REQUIRED
	15	LOADING RATE OR SIZING TEXTURE	5	X O	RECORD LOADING RATE OR SIZING TEXTURE FOR SYSTEM SIZING. (CHAPTER 64E-6, TABLE III, FOOTNOTES, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE) MUST CONFORM TO PROFILE INFORMATION
Permit	16	TANK CAPACITY	5	X O	REQUIRED. EXISTING TANK MUST BE WITHIN 2 SIZES. APPROVAL OF EXISTING TANK MUST BE DOCUMENTED ON PERMIT IN APPROPRIATE SPACE OR IN "OTHER COMMENTS" INCLUDING CAPACITY.
	17	DRAINFIELD AMOUNT	5	X O	MINIMUM SPECIFICATIONS FROM CHAPTER 64E-6 FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
	18	BOTTOM OF DRAINFIELD ELEVATION	5	X O	MUST CONFORM WITH SITE EVALUATION AND CHAPTER 64E-6 FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE.
	19	APPROVED BY	5	X O	CERTIFIED COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL REVIEWING AND APPROVING PERMIT.
Inspection	20	STATE HEALTH OFFICE APPROVAL NUMBER OF SEPTIC TANK	5	X O N	MUST CONFORM TO OSTDS PERMIT AND CHAPTER 64E-6 FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. INSPECTION DOCUMENTS STATE HEALTH OFFICE APPROVAL NUMBER, MARKED N/A FOR OLDER PRE-LEGEND TANKS
	21	DRAINFIELD AMOUNT	21	X O	MUST CONFORM WITH OSTDS PERMIT AND CHAPTER 64E-6, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. AGGREGATE ABSORPTION BEDS AND INDIVIDUAL TRENCHES MUST BE MEASURED AND DOCUMENTED FOR LENGTH AND WIDTH. FOR ALTERNATIVE DRAINFIELDS: LINE [09] 'DRAINFIELD AREA', COMPARABLE AMOUNT OF STANDARD AGGREGATE DRAINFIELD DOCUMENTED, LINE [48] 'OTHER' BRAND, MODEL AND QUANTITY OF ALTERNATIVE DRAINFIELD UNITS DOCUMENTED.
	22	ELEVATION	21	X O	BOTTOM OF THE DRAINFIELD MUST BE REFERENCED TO THE BENCHMARK.
	23	CONSTRUCTION AND FINAL SYSTEM APPROVAL	21	X O	INSPECTION FORM MUST CLEARLY DOCUMENT CORRECTION OF VIOLATIONS. A SEPARATE FORM IS USED FOR APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL. FORM SIGNED BY CERTIFIED PERSONNEL.

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable
 System repair permit records represent 25% of the total records score.

Attachment A

A: RECORDS REVIEW: 4. ENFORCEMENT: SANITARY NUISANCE ABATEMENT AND RULE VIOLATIONS

NO.	ITEM	VAL	SCORE	COMMENTS
1	METHOD FOR TRACKING COMPLAINTS	10	X O	ADEQUATE METHOD FOR TRACKING COMPLAINTS (CENTRAX)
2	VALIDATION OF AND TIMELY RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS	10	X O	COMPLAINT IS IDENTIFIED AS VALID OR INVALID UPON INITIAL INVESTIGATION. MUST BE INVESTIGATED WITHIN TWO WORKING DAYS AS STATED IN 150-4 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH-TECHNICAL GUIDE OR DOCUMENT PRIORITY EMERGENCY
3	NOTICE (S) DESCRIBE NATURE OF VIOLATION(S) AND LAW OR RULE ALLEGEDLY VIOLATED	10	X O N	DOCUMENT ALL VIOLATIONS AND LAW OR RULE ALLEGEDLY VIOLATED ON ALL NOTICES
4	NOTICE (S) PROVIDE WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT	10	X O N	WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT PER S. 381.0061 F S MUST BE PROVIDED ON ALL NOTICES.
5	NOTICE (S) DESCRIBE REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTION ALONG WITH SPECIFIC TIME FRAME(S)	10	X O N	DESCRIBE ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN BY PROPERTY OWNER ALONG WITH SPECIFIC TIME FRAME TO ABATE THE VIOLATIONS ON ALL NOTICES.
6	COMPLAINT RECORD CONTAINS COMPLETE DOCUMENTATION	10	X O N	DOCUMENTATION INCLUDES WHO WHAT WHEN WHERE AND HOW. THE DOCUMENT MUST BE LEGIBLE AND COMPLETE.
7	CHD CONSULTED LEGAL COUNSEL PRIOR TO CITATION ISSUANCE	10	X O N	COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT SHOULD CONSULT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL FOR COMMENTS AND CONCURRENCE PRIOR TO CITATION ISSUANCE
8	SANITARY NUISANCE ABATED IN TIMELY MANNER	10	X O N	TIME FRAME OF SANITARY NUISANCE IS HANDLED IN A TIMELY/SEQUENTIAL MANNER AS STATED IN 150-4 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH-TECHNICAL GUIDE WITH PROPER WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION.
9	COMPLAINANT NOTIFIED OF OUTCOME OF INVESTIGATION BY CHD	10	X O N	DOCUMENTATION THAT COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT NOTIFIED COMPLAINANT OF OUTCOME OF INVESTIGATION IF APPLICABLE.
10	ENFORCEMENT ACTION INVOLVING CONTRACTOR IS CONSISTENT WITH DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES AND IS COORDINATED WITH SHO	10	X O N	DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES ARE STATED IN CHAPTER 64E-6.022, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE ALL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS INVOLVING A REGISTERED / MASTER SEPTIC TANK CONTRACTOR SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH THE STATE HEALTH OFFICE

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable
 Enforcement records represent 3% of the total records score.

Attachment A

A. RECORDS REVIEW: 9. SEPTAGE TREATMENT AND LAND APPLICATION FACILITIES

NO.	ITEM	VAL	SCORE	COMMENTS
1	AGRICULTURAL USE PLAN	33	X O	REQUIRED TO BE UPDATED ANNUALLY. SHALL DESCRIBE THE MANNER IN WHICH TREATED DOMESTIC SEPTAGE AND SLUDGES ARE TO BE USED AS PART OF A PLANNED AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.
2	INSPECTION 1	33	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF FIRST ANNUAL INSPECTION IS ON FILE, USUALLY AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION. COMPLIANCE WILL BE DETERMINED BY REVIEWING THE LAST FULL PERMITTING CYCLE
3	INSPECTION 2	33	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF SECOND ANNUAL INSPECTION IS ON FILE. COMPLIANCE WILL BE DETERMINED BY REVIEWING THE LAST FULL PERMITTING CYCLE.

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable

Septage treatment and land application facility records represent 3% of the total records score.

A. RECORDS REVIEW: 10. AEROBIC TREATMENT UNITS

a. AEROBIC TREATMENT UNIT OPERATING PERMIT FILES

NO.	ITEM	VAL	SCORE	COMMENTS
1	OPERATING PERMIT	20	X O	CURRENT OPERATING PERMIT IS ON FILE OR DOCUMENTATION THAT ENFORCEMENT ACTION HAS BEEN INITIATED.
2	INSPECTION 1 (BY CHD)	20	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF <i>FIRST ANNUAL INSPECTION</i> IS ON FILE, USUALLY AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION. COMPLIANCE WILL BE DETERMINED BY REVIEWING THE LAST FULL PERMITTING CYCLE.
3	INSPECTION 1 (BY AME)	20	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF <i>FIRST ANNUAL INSPECTION</i> IS ON FILE, USUALLY AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION. COMPLIANCE WILL BE DETERMINED BY REVIEWING THE LAST FULL PERMITTING CYCLE.
4	INSPECTION 2 (BY AME)	20	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF <i>SECOND ANNUAL INSPECTION</i> IS ON FILE. COMPLIANCE WILL BE DETERMINED BY REVIEWING THE LAST FULL PERMITTING CYCLE.
5	MAINTENANCE CONTRACT	20	X O	MAINTENANCE SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH AN APPROVED MAINTENANCE ENTITY (AME) IS CURRENT. ENFORCEMENT ACTION HAS OCCURRED, OR REFERRED TO STATE HEALTH OFFICE WHERE NO MAINTENANCE ENTITY AVAILABLE.

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable

ATU operating permit records represent 2% of the total records score

b. AEROBIC TREATMENT UNIT AND PERFORMANCE-BASED TREATMENT SYSTEM MAINTENANCE ENTITY SERVICE PERMIT FILES

NO.	ITEM	VAL	SCORE	COMMENTS
1	SERVICE PERMIT	50	X O	CURRENT SERVICE PERMIT IS ON FILE OR DOCUMENTATION THAT ENFORCEMENT ACTION HAS BEEN INITIATED
2	CONTRACT TERMINATION REPORT	50	X O N	DOCUMENTATION FROM AME OF ALL RENEWALS OR NON-RENEWALS

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable

Maintenance entity service permit records represent 2% of the total records score

A: RECORDS REVIEW: 11. OTHER OPERATING PERMITS-I/M ZONE / COMMERCIAL / PBTS

NO.	ITEM	VAL	SCORE	COMMENTS
1	OPERATING PERMIT	50	X O	CURRENT OPERATING PERMIT IS ON FILE OR DOCUMENTATION THAT ENFORCEMENT ACTION HAS BEEN INITIATED
2	INSPECTION	50	X O	DOCUMENTATION OF ANNUAL INSPECTION, USUALLY AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION. COMPLIANCE WILL BE DETERMINED BY REVIEWING THE LAST FULL PERMITTING CYCLE

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable

Other operating permit records represent 3% of the total records score.

Attachment C

C. COMPLIANCE WITH PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

NO	ITEM	NUMBER OF ITEMS	NUMBER CORRECTED
1.	COMPLIANCE WITH PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS		

This table represents the 100% of the compliance with recommendations from previous evaluation score

Attachment D

Statutes, Administrative Codes and Manuals / electronic or written		Value	Points
A.	Section 381.0065, Florida Statutes / Onsite Sewage Systems Regulation	1	
B.	Section 489, Florida Statutes / Septic Tank Contractor Registration	1	
C.	Chapter 64E-6, Florida Administrative Code / Standards for OSTDSs	1	
D.	Environmental Health Program Manual DOHM 150-4 / OSTDS	1	
E.	DOH / DEP Interagency Agreement for Onsite Sewage	1	
F.	Program memorandum from the Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs	1	
G.	Approved Product Listings from the Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs	1	
Total		7	

Attachment E

Inspection Equipment / Must be in working order to receive points		Value	Points
A.	Six foot auger with appropriate soil auger bucket (insulated "safety" handle preferred)	1	
B.	Six foot or longer tape measure	1	
C.	100 foot or longer tape measure	1	
D.	Sharpshooter shovel	1	
E.	Probing rod (insulated "safety" probe preferred)	1	
F.	Laser level or surveyor's level with stadia rod (functional)	1	
G.	Soil survey of county (most current edition, printed or electronic)	1	
H.	Munsell Soil Color Book (sheets clean, not laminated, 2 Gley charts present)	1	
Total		8	

HSES Administrative and Programmatic Evaluation 2006-2008

County Health Department

Sections		Value	Points
I. OSTDS Programmatic Review		80%	
A.	Records Review (see attachments A1 through A-11)	35%	
B.	Field Evaluation (see attachment B)	41%	
C.	Implementation of Previous Recommendations (see attachment C)	24%	
II. Equipment and References		6%	
A.	Availability of current Florida Administrative Code, Florida Statutes, Environmental Health Program Manual DOHM 150-4 and related references (see attachment D).	17%	
B.	All field staff have e-mail and intranet/internet access.	33%	
C.	Availability of inspection equipment (see attachment E)	50%	
III. Training		6%	
A.	All field staff employed over six months with duties in Onsite Sewage Treatment and Disposal System Programs are in compliance with s. 381.0101, Florida Statutes and Chapter 64E-18, Florida Administrative Code.	25%	
B.	All field staff is in compliance with the DOH 150-4 requirement of having to attend Basic EH Orientation within two years of commencing employment or watched the videos.	25%	
C.	All field staff are in compliance with Interoffice Memorandum HSES 00-034, Acknowledgement of Receipt of Procedures for Site Evaluations and Final Inspections.	25%	
D.	Does the county health department have documentation that it participates in coordination / educational meetings with septic tank and/or building contractors (conducted annually)? Documentation includes announcements, agendas or minutes.	25%	
IV. Customer Satisfaction		3%	
A.	Client Satisfaction Surveys are performed on a quarterly basis and kept on file and the results are forwarded to the Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs	100%	
V. Internal Monitoring and Qualitative Improvement		5%	
A.	Did supervisors perform ride along evaluations with each of their inspection field staff on at least two separate occasions in a permit year to observe them performing routine inspections and document the visits either on a checklist or on a separate routine inspection form?	16%	
B.	Over the past three years did the supervisor(s) observe their staff perform routine inspections for the all programs in which they work?	16%	
C.	All supervisory position descriptions and performance standards must clearly address supervisory responsibilities and inspection reports (as stated in informational memo HSEF 2001-006).	16%	
D.	Supervisors reconcile field staff DARS and timesheets at least biweekly	16%	
E.	Supervisors verify field staff mileage accuracy prior to voucher approval. 90% of inspection reports in the random records sample were initialed by supervisors or their designee.	16%	
F.	CENTRAX is used as the principal means of data collection and recording in the onsite sewage treatment and disposal system program. Number of working days to issue permit from receipt of completed application is 8 days or less for new systems and 2 days or less for repairs. Centrax data evaluated is the average days to issue for the evaluation period prior to the evaluation date, found in the performance report.	20%	
Totals		100%	

Attachment A

A. RECORDS REVIEW: 2. SYSTEM REPAIRS

	NO.	ITEM	SCORE							
App	1.	ESTABLISHMENT INFORMATION	X O							
Site Plan	2	EXISTING OSTDS LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION	X O							
	3	PROPOSED OSTDS LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION	X O							
	4	SURFACE WATER	X O N							
	5	ONSITE WELLS	X O N							
	6	OFFSITE FEATURES	X O N							
	Repair Evaluation	7	EXISTING TANK CERTIFICATION	X O						
8		EXISTING DRAINFIELD SIZE	X O							
9		EXISTING DRAINFIELD ELEVATION	X O							
10		YEAR OF ORIGINAL SYSTEM INSTALLATION	X O							
11		CAUSE OF FAILURE	X O							
Site Evaluation	12	ESTIMATED WET SEASON WATER TABLE ELEVATION	X O							
	13	BENCHMARK AND ELEVATION	X O							
	14	SOIL PROFILES	X O							
	15	LOADING RATE OR SIZING TEXTURE	X O							
Permit	16	TANK CAPACITY	X O							
	17	DRAINFIELD AMOUNT	X O							
	18	BOTTOM OF DRAINFIELD ELEVATION	X O							
	19	APPROVED BY	X O							
Inspection	20	STATE HEALTH OFFICE APPROVAL NUMBER OF SEPTIC TANK	X O							
	21	DRAINFIELD AMOUNT	X O							
	22	ELEVATION	X O							
	23	CONSTRUCTION AND FINAL SYSTEM APPROVAL	X O							

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable

System repair permit records represent 25% of the total records score.

Attachment A

A: RECORDS REVIEW: 4. ENFORCEMENT: SANITARY NUISANCE ABATEMENT AND RULE VIOLATIONS

NO.	ITEM	SCORE					
1	METHOD FOR TRACKING COMPLAINTS	X O					
2	VALIDATION OF AND TIMELY RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS	X O					
3	NOTICE (S) DESCRIBE NATURE OF VIOLATION(S) AND LAW OR RULE ALLEGEDLY VIOLATED	X O N					
4	NOTICE (S) PROVIDE WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT	X O N					
5	NOTICE (S) DESCRIBE REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTION ALONG WITH SPECIFIC TIME FRAME(S)	X O N					
6	COMPLAINT RECORD CONTAINS COMPLETE DOCUMENTATION	X O N					
7	CHD CONSULTED LEGAL COUNSEL PRIOR TO CITATION ISSUANCE	X O N					
8	SANITARY NUISANCE ABATED IN TIMELY MANNER	X O N					
9	COMPLAINANT NOTIFIED OF OUTCOME OF INVESTIGATION BY CHD	X O N					
10	ENFORCEMENT ACTION INVOLVING CONTRACTOR IS CONSISTENT WITH DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES AND IS COORDINATED WITH SHO	X O N					

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable

Enforcement records represent 3% of the total records score.

Attachment A

A. RECORDS REVIEW: 9. SEPTAGE TREATMENT AND LAND APPLICATION FACILITIES

NO.	ITEM	SCORE					
1	AGRICULTURAL USE PLAN	X O					
2	INSPECTION 1	X O					
3	INSPECTION 2	X O					

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable
 Septage treatment and land application records represent 3% of the total records score

A. RECORDS REVIEW: 10. AEROBIC TREATMENT UNITS

a. AEROBIC TREATMENT UNIT OPERATING PERMIT FILES

NO.	ITEM	SCORE					
1	OPERATING PERMIT	X O					
2	INSPECTION 1 (BY CHD)	X O					
3	INSPECTION 1 (BY AME)	X O					
4	INSPECTION 2 (BY AME)	X O					
5	MAINTENANCE CONTRACT	X O					

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable
 ATU operating permit records represent 2% of the total records score

b. AEROBIC TREATMENT UNIT AND PERFORMANCE-BASED TREATMENT SYSTEM MAINTENANCE ENTITY SERVICE PERMIT FILES

NO.	ITEM	SCORE					
1	SERVICE PERMIT	X O					
2	CONTRACT TERMINATION REPORT	X O N					

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable
 Maintenance entity service permit records represent 2% of the total records score.

A: RECORDS REVIEW: 11. OTHER OPERATING PERMITS- I/M ZONE / COMMERCIAL / PBTS

NO.	ITEM	SCORE					
1	OPERATING PERMIT	X O					
2	INSPECTION	X O					

X = Full Credit, O = No Credit, N = Not Applicable
 Other operating permit records represent 3% of the total record score

Attachment C

C. COMPLIANCE WITH PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

NO	ITEM	NUMBER OF ITEMS	NUMBER CORRECTED
1.	COMPLIANCE WITH PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS		

This table represents the 100% of the compliance with recommendations from previous evaluation score.

Attachment D

Statutes, Administrative Codes and Manuals / electronic or written		Score
A.	Section 381.0065, Florida Statutes / Onsite Sewage Systems Regulation	
B.	Section 489, Florida Statutes / Septic Tank Contractor Registration	
C.	Chapter 64E-6, Florida Administrative Code / Standards for OSTDSs	
D.	Environmental Health Program Manual DOHM 150-4 / OSTDS	
E.	DOH / DEP Interagency Agreement for Onsite Sewage	
F.	Program memorandum from the Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs	
G.	Approved Product Listings from the Bureau of Onsite Sewage Programs	

Attachment E

Inspection Equipment / Must be in working order to receive points		Score
A.	Six foot auger with appropriate soil auger bucket (insulated "safety" handle preferred)	
B.	Six foot or longer tape measure	
C.	100 foot or longer tape measure	
D.	Sharpshooter shovel	
E.	Probing rod (insulated "safety" probe preferred)	
F.	Laser level or surveyor's level with stadia rod (functional)	
G.	Soil survey of county (most current edition, printed or electronic)	
H.	Munsell Soil Color Book (sheets clean, not laminated, 2 Gley charts present)	

Turnover Rate Survey

In total, how many employees worked in the CHD's Environmental Health (EH) section at one time or another during the past 12 months?

Total EH employees past 12 months: _____

How many in EH resigned: _____

How many EH retired: _____

How many in EH terminated: _____

In total, how many employees worked in the Onsite Sewage Program (OSTDS) at one time or another during the past 12 months? Please check reason for employee resignation.

Total OSTDS employees past 12 months _____

How many in the OSTDS were:

1. Support staff that resigned? _____

Other State or County Agency with higher salary and greater benefits;

Private industry with higher salary and greater benefits;

Unknown;

Other _____

Support staff that retired? _____

Support staff that was terminated? _____

2. Field staff that resigned? _____

Other State or County Agency with higher salary and greater benefits;

Private industry with higher salary and greater benefits;

Unknown;

Other _____

Field staff that retired: _____

Field staff that were terminated: _____

3. Supervisory staff that resigned: _____

Other State or County Agency with higher salary and greater benefits;

Private industry with higher salary and greater benefits;

Unknown;

Other _____

Supervisory staff that retired: _____

Supervisory staff that were terminated: _____

4. Of these, how many had multiple Environmental Health Program duties? _____

Other Comments (if necessary, add another sheet):

Completed By: _____ **Date:** _____

County Health Department: _____

