

Case No.	Respondent	Summary of Findings	Summary of Board Action
SEPTEMBER 25, 2007			
DL07-024	Ed Smith Enterprises, Inc. DBA ServiceMaster by Ed Smith – Non-registrant.	Respondent is not registered as a drug laboratory site remediation firm in the State of Arizona: On or about March 3, 2004, Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office/High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Task Force conducted a seizure of a clandestine drug laboratory at 4000 N. Central #734, Phoenix, Arizona – Hilton Gardens Hotel; On March 4, 2004, Respondent offered to provide drug laboratory remediation services by providing a meth lab clean-up estimate to the Hilton Gardens Hotel in violation of A.R.S. § 32-145(1); Respondent provided meth lab clean up services and received payment of \$3,703 from the Hilton Gardens Hotel; Respondent conducted removal of contents and provided cleaning services in an attempted drug laboratory site remediation in violation of A.R.S. § 32-145(1); and Respondent performed services identified in their estimate as meth lab clean-up.	<p>Assurance of Discontinuance</p> <p>Civil Penalty – Pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$6,000.00.</p> <p>Restitution – Pay restitution to Hilton Gardens Hotel in the amount of \$3703.00.</p> <p>Costs of Investigation – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$520.00.</p>
NOVEMBER 27, 2007			
DL08-002	Helping Hand Restoration, L.L.C. and Helping Hand Fire & Water Restoration, L.L.C. – Non-registrant.	In September 2007 Board staff was made aware that Respondent was advertising meth lab clean up on Respondent’s website. Respondent is not registered as a drug laboratory site remediation firm in the State of Arizona. Respondent states that the information on the website was placed by the Respondent’s webmaster without the review and approval of the Respondent. Respondent states on October 1, 2007 they immediately removed all reference to methamphetamine remediation from their website. On October 9, 2007 Board staff verified that Respondent’s website has been revised and all reference to methamphetamine remediation has been removed.	<p>Assurance of Discontinuance.</p> <p>Civil Penalty – Pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$1,000.00.</p> <p>Cost of Investigation – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$142.00.</p>
FEBRUARY 26, 2008			
DL07-014	Arthur and Christine King – Non-registrants.	Respondent is not registered as a drug laboratory site remediation firm in the State of Arizona. On or about October 22, 2004, Phoenix Police Department conducted a seizure of a clandestine drug laboratory at 2324 E. Beverly Lane, Phoenix. Respondents conducted removal of contents and provided cleaning services in an attempted drug laboratory site remediation for which they are not authorized to perform. Respondents then sold the property. New property owner had the required remediation performed by one of the drug laboratory site remediation firms registered with the Board of Technical Registration.	<p>Restitution – Restitution in the amount of \$10,855.00 was paid to Ms. Lisa Trent.</p>

JUNE 23, 2009

<p>DL08-004 DL08-025 DL08-027</p>	<p>Kary Environmental Services, Inc., #12826 and Jeff Kary, #41596</p>	<p>On or about July 11, 2007 Respondent performed a drug laboratory site remediation and prepared a final report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: Failed to report on waste characterization; Failed to provide supporting waste disposal documentation; Robert Rehm, Arizona registered Engineer #18503, supervised the remediation sampling and testing activities but the Respondent failed to include the documentation in the final report, which was submitted to all required entities.</p> <p>On or about January 4, 2008 Respondent performed a drug laboratory site remediation and prepared a final report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: Failed to deliver, or send by certified mail, notice of remediation to the State Board of Technical Registration; Failed to notify the State Board of Technical Registration within twenty-four (24) hours after the final report had been prepared; Failed to deliver, or send by certified mail, notice of remediation to the Tempe Police Department; Failed notify the Tempe Police Department within twenty-four (24) hours after the final report had been prepared; Failed to Deliver, or send by certified mail, notice of remediation to the Tempe Fire Department.</p> <p>On or about November 30, 2007 Respondent performed a drug laboratory site remediation and prepared a final report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: Failed to deliver, or send by certified mail, notice of remediation to the State Board of Technical Registration; Failed to notify the State Board of Technical Registration within twenty-four (24) hours after the final report had been prepared; Failed to deliver, or send by certified mail, notice of remediation to the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office / High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Task Force; Failed notify the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office / High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Task Force within twenty-four (24) hours after the final report had been prepared;</p>	<p><i>Letter of Reprimand.</i></p> <p><i>Administrative Penalty</i> – Pay an administrative penalty in the amount of \$2,000.00.</p> <p><i>Cost of Investigation</i> – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$1,332.00.</p>
---	--	---	--

JULY 28, 2009

DL08-009	Efrain and Maria Contreras – Non-registrants.	Respondents’ are not registered as a drug laboratory site remediation firm in the State of Arizona. On or about July 11, 2006, Glendale and Phoenix Police Departments conducted a seizure of a clandestine drug laboratory at 3007 N. 46 th Drive in Phoenix. Respondents’ owned the home at the time of seizure and contacted Board staff to inquire about how to remediate the property. Respondents’ proceeded to attempt to clean up the property themselves. Respondents’ did not remediate the property by one of the active Board registered drug laboratory site remediation firms. Respondents’ then sold the property without providing the required disclosure in writing that methamphetamine was manufactured on the property.	<p>Civil Penalty – Pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$8,000.00.</p> <p>Cost of Investigation – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$1,956.00.</p>
----------	---	---	---

SEPTEMBER 22, 2009

DL08-005	Spray Systems Environmental, Inc., #11693	On or about December 4, 2006 Respondent performed a drug laboratory site remediation and prepared a final report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: Failed to document the specific preliminary procedures that were conducted by the on-site supervisor during the initial entry and inspection; Failed to report if the dwelling was connected to a local sewer system or to an on-site septic system; Failed to report the on-site supervisor’s observation for evidence of burn areas, burn or trash pits, debris piles or stained areas; Failed to provide supporting waste disposal documentation; The detection level used for lead was above the remediation standard.	<p>Letter of Reprimand.</p> <p>Cost of Investigation – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$292.00.</p>
----------	---	---	---

MAY 24, 2011

DL09-018 DL10-013	Meth Lab Cleanup, L.L.C.	On or about January 27, 2010, Respondent performed a drug laboratory site remediation and prepared a final report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: Failed identify the owner of the property, the correct property address, to include the names and certification numbers of the on-site supervisor and on-site worker, and the registration number of the drug laboratory site remediation firm; Failed to include the results of any waste characterization sampling and testing on the disposed items and to identify the location of these items prior to removal; Failed to have the post remediation sample testing performed by an analytical laboratory licensed in any state in the United States to perform GC/MS testing; Failed to indicate whether the ventilation system was sampled and analyzed after it was cleaned; Failed to maintain control and custody of the samples at all times; Included a statement that the property is considered safe for habitation according to the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices, however Arizona rules	<p>Administrative Penalty – Pay an administrative penalty in the amount of \$5,000.00</p> <p>Cost of Investigation – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$2, 131.00.</p>
----------------------	--------------------------	--	--

		<p>do not provide that properties are safe for habitation; Failed to indicate whether the dwelling was connected to the local sewer system or an on-site septic system; Failed to indicate whether the surrounding areas were observed for indications of burn areas, burn or trash pits, debris piles, or stained areas; Failed to indicate that the final report, or a separate document stating that the residually contaminated portion of the real property has been remediated, was submitted to the required entities and in the required time frame.</p> <p>On or about March 12, 2010, Respondent performed a preliminary assessment and prepared a report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in following areas: Failed to identify the correct property address, to include the names and certification numbers of the on-site supervisor and on-site worker, and the registration number of the drug laboratory site remediation firm; Failed to address initial entry, work plan preparation and approval, and structural integrity assessment. Included a statement that the sampling was completed in accordance with the sampling methodologies summarized in the Standards, however it failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: The laboratory report failed to differentiate between the five compounds, detection limits and results; Failed to have the sample testing performed by an analytical laboratory licensed in any state in the United States to perform GC/MS testing; Failed to indicate that the collection of wipe samples was conducted under the direct supervision of a Certified Industrial Hygienist, a Certified Safety Professional, Arizona-registered geologist or an Arizona-registered engineer; Failed to indicate the wipe samples were wiped at least five times in perpendicular directions and that the sampler wore new gloves for each sample; Failed to obtain composite samples from the same room; Failed to maintain control and custody of the samples at all times; Failed to maintain chain of custody of the samples; Failed to indicate that the ventilation system samples were obtained and analyzed; Failed to indicate that volatile organic compound testing, lead testing or mercury vapor testing were conducted; Failed to indicate if the plumbing inlets were assessed, if the dwelling is connected to the local sewer system or an on-site septic system, and to indicate that the surrounding areas were observed for evidence of burn areas, burn or trash pits, debris piles or stained areas;</p> <p>On or about March 30, 2010, Respondent performed a preliminary assessment, prepared a report and included a statement that the sampling was completed in accordance with the sampling methodologies summarized in the Standards, however it failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and</p>	
--	--	---	--

		Practices in the following areas: Failed to document testing for all five required compounds; Failed to have the sample testing performed by an analytical laboratory licensed in any state in the United States to perform GC/MS testing; Failed to accurately indicate how the wipe samples were obtained; Failed to accurately indicate how the composite samples were collected from each living space; Failed to accurately indicate the pH results; Failed to conduct volatile organic compound testing, lead testing or mercury vapor testing; Failed to comply with the sampling, handling, and testing protocols.	
MAY 10, 2012			
DL10-002	Biopro, L.L.C., #11695 Dale Cillian, #39655	On or about July 12, 2010, Respondent performed a drug laboratory site remediation and prepared a final report that failed to meet the Drug Laboratory Site Remediation Best Standards and Practices in the following areas: Failed to indicate that the surrounding areas were observed for evidence of burn areas, burn or trash pits, debris piles or stained areas. Respondent's report states under Supervisor's Observation "Upon visual inspection there were no signs of staining, discoloration, or burns within unit #307."; The final report indicates that carpet, VCT tile, lightweight concrete flooring, drywall and ceiling materials were removed. The report failed to indicate whether these items were sampled for potential asbestos prior to removal; Failed to indicate waste characterization or waste sampling and testing of the removed and disposed items; The final report indicates that the drug laboratory site was remediated however, it failed to reference the correct Arizona rule for the drug laboratory site remediation best standards and practices.	<p><i>Letter of Reprimand.</i></p> <p><i>Administrative Penalty</i> – Pay an administrative penalty in the amount of \$1,000.00</p> <p><i>Cost of Investigation</i> – Pay cost of investigation in the amount of \$355.00.</p>