From: <u>Blandin, Norva</u>
To: <u>Acosta, Kayla</u>

Subject: FW: Case Classification Review: CleanPro Enviro Solutions LLC EPA ID FLR000223503

Date: Thursday, August 30, 2018 2:05:29 PM

Attachments: CleanPro Harm Ranking.xlsx

image002.png CCR CleanPro_slh.pdf Revised CleanPro_IR_Slh.pdf

Importance: High

Kayla

Please submit the inspection report, and all DMA's associated with this case.

Best regards,



Norva Blandin, MSEM

Environmental Manager Compliance Assurance Program (CAP) Florida Department of Environmental Protection Southeast District – West Palm Beach 3301 Gun Club Road, MSC 7210-1

West Palm Beach, FL 33406 Norva.Blandin@floridadep.gov

Office: 561.681.6728 Main: 561.681.6600 Fax: 561-681-6755

From: Horlick, Susan

Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2018 10:01 AM

To: Blandin, Norva < Norva. Blandin@Florida DEP.gov>

Cc: Perrigan, Glen <Glen.Perrigan@dep.state.fl.us>; Fisch, Ben <Ben.Fisch@dep.state.fl.us>; Barrett, Zachary <Zachary.Barrett@dep.state.fl.us>; Walker, Kim (Waste) <Kim.Walker@FloridaDEP.gov>;

Bahr, Tim <Tim.Bahr@FloridaDEP.gov>

Subject: FW: Case Classification Review: CleanPro Enviro Solutions LLC EPA ID FLR000223503

Importance: High

Norva,

The Division conducted a Case Specific Classification Review for CleanPro Enviro Solutions LLC EPA ID FLR000223503. At this time, the Division concurs with the District that formal enforcement is not appropriate. Contact me if you have questions or comments.

Susan Horlick

FL Department of Environmental Protection Permiting and Compliance Assistance 850-245-8778 Susan.Horlick@dep.state.fl.us From: Perrigan, Glen

Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 9:32 AM

To: Horlick, Susan < <u>Susan.Horlick@dep.state.fl.us</u>>

Cc: Barrett, Zachary <<u>Zachary.Barrett@dep.state.fl.us</u>>; Fisch, Ben <<u>Ben.Fisch@dep.state.fl.us</u>>; Acosta, Kayla <<u>Kayla.Acosta@FloridaDEP.gov</u>>; Blandin, Norva <<u>Norva.Blandin@FloridaDEP.gov</u>> **Subject:** FW: Case Classification Review: CleanPro Enviro Solutions LLC EPA ID FLR000223503

Importance: High

Susan,

Please follow up with a case review. Glen

From: Blandin, Norva

Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 9:26 AM

To: Perrigan, Glen <<u>Glen.Perrigan@dep.state.fl.us</u>>; Fisch, Ben <<u>Ben.Fisch@dep.state.fl.us</u>>; Barrett,

Zachary < Zachary.Barrett@dep.state.fl.us >

Cc: Acosta, Kayla < <u>Kayla.Acosta@FloridaDEP.gov</u>>

Subject: Case Classification Review: CleanPro Enviro Solutions LLC EPA ID FLR000223503

Good afternoon Glen and et.al:

The facility was in a state of minor out-of-compliance at the time of the inspection, and two violations were observed. Some of the violations has been resolved but the facility did not returned to compliance.

Today is day 33; our expectation is to close inspection report before day 40.

The District recommends that Compliance Assistance (CA) be pursued in this case. Facility was a recent transporter and never been inspected by the Department.



Norva Blandin, MSEM

Environmental Manager Compliance Assurance Program (CAP) Florida Department of Environmental Protection Southeast District – West Palm Beach 3301 Gun Club Road, MSC 7210-1 West Palm Beach, FL 33406 Norva.Blandin@floridadep.gov

Office: 561.681.6728 Main: 561.681.6600 Fax: 561-681-6755

Hazardous Waste Program CASE REVIEW FORM

Cł	neck Case Review Type: Case Specific Classificati	on Review					
	Enforcement Case Revie	?W					
Cui	rrent Date:	Inspection Date:		Inspector:			
EP	'A ID:	_					
Fa	cility Name:					_	
Fa	cility Address:						
Re	eference Links:						
All	eged Violation Citation/Regula	ator Reference	Manual Guide	Poten for Ha		Extent of Deviation	Check All That Apply
1.			Guide	TOT He	arm	Deviation	Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents
_ 	mments: (Optional)						
Ass 2.	istance.						Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents
Con	mments: (Optional)			L			
3.							Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents
Cor	mments: (Optional)						
4.							Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents
Co	mments: (Optional)						
5.							Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents
Con	mments: (Optional)						
6.							Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW

Version 1_5_15 Page 1

Hazardous Waste Program CASE REVIEW FORM

Comments: (Optional)							
Comments. (Optional)							
7.			Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents				
Comments: (Optional)							
8.			Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents				
Comments: (Optional)							
9.			Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents				
Comments: (Optional)							
10.			Repeat Violations Actual or substantial exposure to HW constituents				
Comments: (Optional)							

DWM Notes:

Note: This staff assessment is preliminary and is designed to assist in the compliance review process, prior to final agency direction. Comments provided herein are not the final position of the Department and may be subject to revision, pursuant to additional information and/or further review.

Version 1_5_15 Page 2

FACILITY NAME: CleanPr	o Enviro Solutions					Date:	08/17/201	
EPA ID No.: FLR00022350	3						Case #	
Violation	Description	Nature of Waste	Amount of Waste	Discharge	People	Threat	Total Points	
40 CFR 279.44(a), 279.44(b)(1), 279.44(d)	Used Oil Rebuttal Presumption	2	1	0	1	0	4	
62-710.600(2)(b) F.A.C	Transporter Training	4	1	0	1	0	6	
							0	
							0	
							0	
							0	
Nature of Waste							Score	
	ely toxic or reactive)						6	
Other HW/Univer	<u> </u>						4	
Used Oil							3	
Used Oil Filters							2	
Amount of Waste								
> 5,000 kg/1,375 {	gal (25 drums) of Waste						8	
1,000 to 5,000 kg/	1,000 to 5,000 kg/275 gal to 1,375 gal (5 to 25 drums) of Waste OR 2.2lbs or > of acutely toxic waste							
>100 kg to 1,000 k	>100 kg to 1,000 kg/25 gal to 275 gal (5 drums) OR <2.2lbs of acutely toxic waste							
<100 kg /<25 gal o	of Waste						1	
Discharge								
	ce water or off site discharge.						12	
Discharge to grou	nd water						10	
Discharge to soil							8 6	
	Discharge to air or Impervious Surface/Containment							
	imus cleanup per 62-780 FAC						2	
No Discharge							0	
Potential Exposures >1,000 people							1	
101 - 1,000 people							3	
10 - 100 people							2	
<10 people							1	
	lect all that apply for a specific violation-Us	e if NO discharge	e observed) (ι	ıse sliding sca	le 0 = no ris	k, 1-4 depen		
Fire or Explosion I	Risk						0-4	
Incompatible Was	ste Storage						0-4	
Risk of Employee	Exposure above PELs						0-4	
Container Integrit	у						0-4	
		i						

SUBSTANTIAL (Major)	Above 20
SIGNIFICANT (Moderate)	13-20
MINIMAL (Minor)	Under 13

Additional Threat Factors Examples:

Fire or Explosion Risk: Highest ranking = fire or explosion is imminent, waste stored near ignition or fuel source; Lowest ranking = no risk of fire or explosion.

Incompatible Waste Storage: Highest ranking = wastes stored inappropriately with incompatibles not physically separated; Lowest ranking = no incompatible waste storage.

Risk of Employee Exposure above PELs: Highest ranking = PELs above exposure limits; Lowest ranking = no risk of exposure. Note, facility's lack of ability to measure PEL if there is a potential issue should be considered.

Container Integrity: Highest ranking = Containers are compromised; Lowest ranking = no containers are compromised.

Inadequate Provisions for Detecting and Preventing Releases: Highest ranking = No containment, no inspections, high potential for release; Lowest ranking = inspections performed, low potential for releases.

Note: This guideline is intended to support Directive 923, the Guidelines for Characterizing Hazardous Waste Violations, and the violation matrix spreadsheet (Guidelines for Characterizing Hazardous Waste, Universal Waste, Used Oil and Drycleaning Violations) to facilitate a consistent way of categorizing Harm and Potential for Harm. In order to account for case-specific circumstances, the default scores for any particular category can be adjusted based on professional judgement to better match the unique site conditions and findings from the inspection or information provided in response to the inspection findings. To help foster consistency and supportable decisions, professional judgement that will result in deviation from the default scores should be discussed with the program office.