



Jared Blumenfeld
Secretary for
Environmental Protection



Department of Toxic Substances Control



Gavin Newsom
Governor

Meredith Williams, Ph.D.
Acting Director
1001 "I" Street
P.O. Box 806
Sacramento, California 95812-0806

September 27, 2019

Certified Mail No.: 7018-0680-0000-9827-9553

Mr. Bryan Hill
Bakersfield Transfer Inc.
1620 E Brundage Lane
Bakersfield, California 93307

NOTICE OF PROVISIONAL INSPECTION VIOLATION SCORES, 2019 FACILITY VIOLATION SCORING PROCEDURE SCORE, AND 2019 COMPLIANCE TIER ASSIGNMENT

Dear Mr. Bryan Hill:

2019 Facility Violations Scoring Procedure (VSP) Score: 38.40
2019 Compliance Tier Assignment: Conditionally Acceptable

The purpose of this letter is to provide Bakersfield Transfer INC DBA Coles Environmental, CAL000282598, located at 1620 E Brundage Ln., Bakersfield, CA 93307 (hereinafter, the "Facility") with a provisional inspection violation score for each compliance inspection that was conducted during the preceding ten (10) year period beginning January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2018, the Facility's 2019 VSP Score, and compliance tier assignment pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 22, section 66271.53, subdivision (b)(2) and section 66271.54, subdivisions (c).¹

The provisional inspection violation scores for the Facility are provided in the enclosed Inspection Violation Scoring Matrix. A provisional inspection violation score is the sum of the initial score for each Class I violation that occurred during a compliance inspection, and any adjustment to the initial Class I violation score based on repeat violations.² (See 22 CCR § 66271.53, subd. (a).) The basis for the score for each Class I violation is also provided in the enclosed Inspection Violation Scoring Matrix.

¹ Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 673 (Stats. 2015, chapter 611), the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) adopted new hazardous waste permitting criteria regulations, which became effective on January 1, 2019. The full text of the hazardous waste permitting criteria regulations is available at https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/LawsRegsPolicies/Regs/upload/18-DTSC-SB-673-Reg-TEXT_OAL_20181023-revised.pdf. More information regarding SB 673 is available at https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/HazardousWaste/Permit_Roundtables.cfm.

² For purposes of calculating a facility's inspection violation score, DTSC may also consider Class II violations that meet the definition of a Class I violation as specified in CCR, title 22, section 66260.10. (See 22 CCR § 66271.50, subd. (d)(1).)

Based on the provisional inspection violation scores for the Facility for the ten (10) year period beginning January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2018, DTSC has calculated a Facility VSP Score for the Facility of "38.40". A Facility VSP Score is the sum of all provisional or final inspection violation scores for each compliance inspection conducted during the preceding ten (10) years, divided by the number of compliance inspections. (See 22 CCR § 66271.54, subd. (a).)

A facility may be assigned to one of three compliance tiers based on its Facility VSP Score:

- "Acceptable." A facility that receives a Facility VSP Score of less than 20 shall be designated as having a Facility VSP Score that is "acceptable". (See 22 CCR § 66271.54, subd. (b)(1).)
- "Conditionally Acceptable." A facility that receives a Facility VSP Score equal to or greater than 20 and less than 40 shall be designated as having a Facility VSP Score that is "conditionally acceptable." Facilities that receive a final compliance tier assignment of "conditionally acceptable" are required to comply with additional requirements outlined in the regulations. (See 22 CCR § 66271.54, subd. (b)(2); 22 CCR § 66271.56.)
- "Unacceptable." A facility that receives a Facility VSP Score equal to or greater than 40 shall be designated as having a Facility VSP Score that is "unacceptable." DTSC is required to initiate permit denial, suspension, or revocation proceedings for facilities that receive a final compliance tier assignment of "unacceptable." (See 22 CCR § 66271.54, subd. (b)(3); 22 CCR § 66271.57.)

As a result of the Facility's VSP Score, DTSC has assigned the Facility to a compliance tier of "**Conditionally Acceptable**". Generally, as discussed further below, a facility's compliance tier assignment becomes final after all provisional inspection violation scores upon which the Facility VSP Score is based become final pursuant to CCR, title 22, section 66271.53, subdivision (d).

Provisional Inspection Violation Score Disputes and Compliance Tier Assignment Challenges

An owner or operator of a facility may dispute a provisional inspection score pursuant to CCR, title 22, section 66271.53, subdivision (c) by filing a Provisional Inspection Violation Score Dispute Document (template available at <https://dtsc.ca.gov/violations-scoring-procedure/>) within sixty (60) calendar days of this notice. All of the following information must be enclosed with the Dispute Document cover letter:

- A statement that describes in detail the factual and legal basis of the dispute and the relief sought;
- Any claimed erroneous facts, assumptions, approaches, or conclusions of law made by DTSC;

- A statement describing in detail any efforts already made by the owner or operator to resolve the dispute with DTSC; and
- Any photographs, documents, or any other material that supports the owner's or operator's position regarding the disputed provisional inspection violation score.

The owner or operator of a facility may request a one-time extension of up to sixty (60) calendar days to submit a Provisional Inspection Violation Score Dispute Extension Document (template available at <https://dtsc.ca.gov/violations-scoring-procedure/>).

DTSC will issue a written decision, granting or denying, in whole or in part, the relief sought by the owner or operator of a facility disputing a provisional inspection violation score. A provisional inspection violation score will become the final inspection violation score consistent with DTSC's written decision. A provisional inspection violation score will also become the final inspection violation score if the owner or operator of a facility does not file a Dispute Document within sixty (60) calendar days of this notice.

A facility's compliance tier assignment becomes final after all inspection violation scores upon which the Facility VSP Score is based become final pursuant to CCR, title 22, section 66271.53, subdivision (d). Final compliance tier assignments of "acceptable" or "conditionally acceptable" are not subject to additional administrative dispute resolution. (See 22 CCR § 66271.54, subds. (e), (f).) However, owners or operators of facilities assigned to a final compliance tier of "unacceptable" may further administratively challenge their final compliance tier assignment under California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 66271.57.

Issuance of this provisional inspection violation score, Facility 2019 VSP Score, and compliance tier assignment do not constitute an enforcement action. If you have any questions regarding this notice, please contact VSP_Info@dtsc.ca.gov. If you have any questions regarding the dispute process, please contact VSP_Dispute_Inbox@dtsc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Keith Kihara, Chief
Enforcement and Emergency Response Division

Enclosure(s)

Violation Scoring Matrix
Proof of Service

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name:		10 Year Date Range:		2009-2018		Permit Effective Date:		7/28/2015		Link to EnviroStor			
Address:		Number of Inspections:		5		Permit Expiration Date:		7/28/2025		(Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)			
EPA ID:		Total Number of Violations Scored:		18		Date VSP Completed:		8/6/2019					
Inspection Date:	4/26/2010 CEI & 5/10/2010 FRR	Class I Justification	Citation	Violation	Potential for Harm	Potential for Harm Justification	Extent of Deviation	Extent of Deviation Justification	Initial Score	Repeat (Yes/No)	Date(s) of Previous Violation	Adjustment Factor (%)	Adjusted Score
Inspection Type:	CEI & FRR												
Class I Violations:	1	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could have resulted in the failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active or post closure period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66264.15(b)(1) and 22 CCR 66264.195(b)(1) and (3)	The facility failed to develop and follow a written schedule for daily inspection of the storage tanks and secondary containment area of Unit #1.	Minimal	Incomplete inspection schedules had the potential to impact public health and safety should there have been an accidental release of HW. Unit #1 held up to 80,000 gallons of used oil, antifreeze or oily water. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	The facility performed inspections of Unit #1, but did not specifically address the status of the four tanks (holding 20,000 gallons each) including secondary containment in Unit #1. The act deviated from the requirement but still functioned to some extent as daily inspections were documented.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00
	2	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	HSC 25202(a)	The facility performed unauthorized treatment when it used four 500 gallon containers to separate oil and solid from oily water waste received at the facility.	Minimal	The facility's unauthorized treatment created an increased potential for release that could have impacted human health and the environment. The wastestream was four 500 gallon containers of used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Major	The facility was required to request a permit modification to treat HW so DTSC could have ensured that the facility HW management activities would not endanger human health or the environment. The facility treated waste that it was not authorized to treat in its HWFP. The function of the requirement was rendered ineffective and deprived the public of any of the protective benefits intended by the HW management requirements.	15	No	n/a	0	15.00
	3	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to perform emergency clean-up operation or other corrective action for releases.	22 CCR 66264.32(c)	The facility failed to equip the tank farm area (Unit #1) with an emergency shower and an eye wash/first aid station as indicated in the HWFP, Part B, Section XII, page 5.	Minimal	The wastestreams in this tank farm were used oil and oily wastewater. Incomplete emergency equipment could have impacted public and/or the employee's health by potentially impacting effective and timely emergency response in the event of a HW release. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	The facility failed to have proper emergency equipment at Unit #1 (e.g. fire extinguisher and eye wash) despite the requirement to have said equipment in its HWFP. The requirement functioned to some extent as emergency equipment in other areas of the facility were not cited in violation.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00
	4	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66264.14(a)	The facility failed to prevent the unknowing entry, and minimize the possibility for the unauthorized entry, of people or livestock onto the active portion of the facility. The facility failed to provide a fence or a gate to the active portion of the facility.	Minimal	Inspectors noted that the facility failed to install a fence or gate to the active portion of the facility. A lack of fence could have led to individuals or animals wandering onto the property and coming into physical contact with HW or machinery. The wastestreams treated at the facility were used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Major	The inspectors noted the active portion of the facility had no fence or a gate to prevent unauthorized entry to the active portion of the facility. The requirement was rendered ineffective as its provisions were not complied with.	15	No	n/a	0	15.00

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name:		BAKERSFIELD TRANSFER INC DBA COLES ENVIRONMENTAL		10 Year Date Range:		2009-2018		Permit Effective Date:		7/28/2015		Link to EnviroStor (Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)	
Address:		1620 E BRUNDAGE LANE, BAKERSFIELD, CA 93307		Number of Inspections:		5		Permit Expiration Date:		7/28/2025			
EPA ID:		CAL000282598		Total Number of Violations Scored:		18		Date VSP Completed:		8/6/2019			
	5	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to perform emergency clean-up operation or other corrective action for releases.	22 CCR 66264.16	The facility failed to provide training for the emergency coordinators identified in the facility's Contingency Plan and Emergency Procedures.	Minimal	The facility was permitted to handle used oil and oily wastewater. Because the emergency coordinators were not trained, it could have resulted in unnecessary delays to emergency response and/or clean up. The wastestreams handled by the facility presented a minimal potential for harm.	Moderate	The facility failed to train personnel that were integral in managing the facility during an emergency, clean up operations, and other releases. The requirement functioned to some extent in that there was documentation demonstrating that other staff had completed emergency response training.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00
	6	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to assure that HW are destined for and delivered to an authorized HW facility.	22 CCR 66264.73(b)(1)	The facility failed to keep records of the description and quantity of HW received and the method(s) and the date(s) of its transfer and storage at the facility. Specifically, the oily water HW stored/transferred within the facility was not tracked in the facility's operating log.	Minimal	The facility failed to keep operating logs that ensured HW is tracked from "cradle to grave." The wastestreams the facility failed to track were oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	The oil and oily wastewater HW stored/transferred within the facility were not tracked in the facility operating log. The act deviated from the requirement, but the requirement functioned to some extent as other wastestreams handled by the facility were not cited in violation.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00
Provisional Inspection Violation Score:												54.00	
Inspection Date:	1/30/2014	Class I Justification	Citation	Violation	Potential for Harm	Potential for Harm Justification	Extent of Deviation	Extent of Deviation Justification	Initial Score	Repeat (Yes/No)	Date(s) of Previous Violation	Adjustment Factor (%)	Adjusted Score
Inspection Type:	CEI												
Class I Violations:	0	n/a	n/a	No Class I Violations	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00
Class II Violations:	1	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66264.15(a)	The facility failed to frequently inspect the facility for malfunctions and deterioration, operation errors, and discharges that could have lead to a threat to human health or the environment.	Minimal	The facility failed to perform its daily inspections. DTSC inspectors observed approximately five compromised 55-gallon metal drums containing HW within Unit #2 that should have been identified and addressed had the facility been completing its daily inspections. The drums contained used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	During a review of the facility's inspection logs, DTSC inspectors found that the facility's records were consolidated on one "facility inspection report and checklist to cover for the missing days," which demonstrated that daily inspections did not occur. A daily and substantive inspection of Unit #2 would have led to the identification of compromised containers that eventually required repacking. The requirement functioned to some extent in that some of daily inspection logs were provided and not cited in violation, but not as well as if the facility has completed daily inspections as required.	6	Yes	4/26/2010	25	7.50
Provisional Inspection Violation Score:												7.50	

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name:		BAKERSFIELD TRANSFER INC DBA COLES ENVIRONMENTAL		10 Year Date Range:		2009-2018		Permit Effective Date:		7/28/2015		Link to EnviroStor (Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)	
Address:		1620 E BRUNDAGE LANE, BAKERSFIELD, CA 93307		Number of Inspections:		5		Permit Expiration Date:		7/28/2025			
EPA ID:		CAL000282598		Total Number of Violations Scored:		18		Date VSP Completed:		8/6/2019			
Inspection Date:	9/22/2016 CEI & 10/26/2016 FRR	Class I Justification	Citation	Violation	Potential for Harm	Potential for Harm Justification	Extent of Deviation	Extent of Deviation Justification	Initial Score	Repeat (Yes/No)	Date(s) of Previous Violation	Adjustment Factor (%)	Adjusted Score
Inspection Type:	CEI & FRR												
Class I Violations:	0	n/a	n/a	No Class I Violations	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.00
Class II Violations:	1	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66264.14(a)	The facility failed to prevent the unknowing entry, and minimize the possibility for the unauthorized entry, of person or livestock onto the active portion of the facility.	Minimal	DTSC inspectors noted that the facility failed to install a fence or gate to the active portion of the facility. A lack of fence could lead to individuals or animals wandering onto the property and coming into physical contact with waste or machinery. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation (used oil and oily wastewater).	Major	All permitted facilities are required to have a natural or artificial barrier that surrounds the active portion of the facility. The inspectors noted the northeastern portion of the facility had no gate/fence to prevent unauthorized entry. In addition, the gate at the south side of the facility was open during the inspection. The requirement was rendered ineffective as its provisions were not complied with.	15	Yes	4/26/2010	25	18.75
	2	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could have resulted in a failure to assure that HW are destined for and delivered to an authorized HW facility and/or failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	HSC 25202(a) and 22 CCR 66270.30(a)	The facility stored HW in excess of one year.	Minimal	Twelve drums contained the following HW were stored at the facility in excess of one year: Non-RCRA oily debris, solids, solid absorbents, soil/diesel, oily sludge, used oil, and lube grease. These wastes represented a minimal threat to human health and the environment.	Moderate	12 HW drums were stored on site in Unit #2, Drum Storage Area, for approximately 14 months, two months more than the facility was allowed by its HWFP. These were the only drums stored in excess of one year, demonstrating that the requirement functioned to some extent, although not all of its important provisions were complied with.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00
	3	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could have resulted in a failure to assure that HW are destined for and delivered to an authorized HW facility.	HSC 25202(a) and 22 CCR 66270.30	The facility failed to test all outgoing used oil for PCBs to ensure that the used oil did not contain PCBs at a concentration of 2 ppm or greater.	Moderate	The wastestream was used oil and oily wastewater, but the facility failed to ensure that the used oil/oily wastewater didn't contain PCBs. PCBs are bioaccumulative and have been demonstrated to cause a variety of adverse health effects. PCBs have been shown to cause cancer in animals as well as a number of serious non-cancer health effects in animals, including: effects on the immune system, reproductive system, nervous system, endocrine system and other health effects. A moderate potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Major	The facility failed to test all of its outgoing used oil for PCBs as required by its HWFP, Part V., Condition 2. The failure to conduct testing deviated from the HW management requirement to such an extent that the requirement was completed ignored and none of its provisions were complied with.	20	No	n/a	0	20.00
Provisional Inspection Violation Score:												44.75	

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name:		BAKERSFIELD TRANSFER INC DBA COLES ENVIRONMENTAL		10 Year Date Range:		2009-2018		Permit Effective Date:		7/28/2015		Link to EnviroStor (Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)	
Address:		1620 E BRUNDAGE LANE, BAKERSFIELD, CA 93307		Number of Inspections:		5		Permit Expiration Date:		7/28/2025			
EPA ID:		CAL000282598		Total Number of Violations Scored:		18		Date VSP Completed:		8/6/2019			
Inspection Date:	1/30/2018 CEI & 2/14/2018 FRR	Class I Justification	Citation	Violation	Potential for Harm	Potential for Harm Justification	Extent of Deviation	Extent of Deviation Justification	Initial Score	Repeat (Yes/No)	Date(s) of Previous Violation	Adjustment Factor (%)	Adjusted Score
Inspection Type:	CEI & FRR												
Class I Violations:	1	The deviation from the requirement was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation and/or assure early detection of releases.	HSC 25189.2(a)	The facility made a false representation in its handwritten inspection logs, and drum logs.	Minimal	Due to the false representation on the inspection logs, there was an increased potential for undocumented release that could have impacted human health and the environment. The wastestream was used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Major	The facility made a false representation in that it made no mention of damage/repairs to the secondary containment systems, identifying the systems as acceptable. In addition, inspectors observed seven open drums (55-gallon, Used Oil Filters) on 3/1/2018, in Unit 2, getting ready to be consolidated into a roll-off according to the facility. However, the drum logs demonstrated the date of consolidation was 2/15/2018. The requirement was rendered ineffective as its provisions were not complied with.	15	No	n/a	0	15.00
	2	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66264.175 (b)(1) and 66264.193	The facility failed to ensure that secondary containment systems were free of cracks or gaps and was sufficiently impervious to leaks, spills and accumulated precipitation in Unit 2 and Sub-Unit 5-3. In addition, the epoxy coating was lifting/peeling in Unit 2.	Minimal	Due to the failure to maintain the secondary containment systems, there was an increased potential for release and downward contaminant migration that could have impacted human health and the environment. The wastestreams were used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	The facility failed to ensure that secondary containment systems were free of cracks or gaps and was sufficiently impervious to leaks, spills and accumulated precipitation in Unit 2 and Sub-Unit 5-3. In addition, the epoxy coating was lifting/peeling in Unit 2. The requirement functioned to some extent in that other secondary containment systems were not cited in violation.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00
Class II Violations:	3	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66264.14(a) and (b)	The facility failed to prevent the unknowing entry, and minimize the possibility for the unauthorized entry, of persons or livestock onto the active portion of the facility. The eastern portion of the facility had no gate/fence to prevent unauthorized entry between two existing metal buildings.	Minimal	Inspectors noted that the facility failed to install a fence or gate to the active portion of the facility. A lack of fence could lead to individuals or animals wandering onto the property and coming into physical contact with waste or machinery. The wastestream was used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Major	The eastern portion of the facility had no gate/fence to prevent unauthorized entry between two existing metal buildings. In addition, DTSC inspectors were able to drive into the facility through the open gate at the south side of the facility and easily accessed the HW portion of the facility. The function of the requirement was rendered ineffective because its provisions were not complied with.	15	Yes	9/22/2016	25	18.75

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name:		BAKERSFIELD TRANSFER INC DBA COLES ENVIRONMENTAL		10 Year Date Range:		2009-2018		Permit Effective Date:		7/28/2015		Link to EnviroStor (Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)	
Address:		1620 E BRUNDAGE LANE, BAKERSFIELD, CA 93307		Number of Inspections:		5		Permit Expiration Date:		7/28/2025			
EPA ID:		CAL000282598		Total Number of Violations Scored:		18		Date VSP Completed:		8/6/2019			
4	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation and/or assure early detection of releases.	22 CCR 66264.15 (d)	The facility failed to make a notation of observations made in an inspection log, and/or date and nature of any repairs or other remedial actions.	Minimal	Failure to adequately identify and address issues observed during inspections could have increased the potential for release that could have impacted human health and the environment. The wastestreams were used oil and oily wastewater and the volume in violation was not specified. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	Between 1/2/2018 and 3/1/2018, the facility failed to make notations in its inspection logs to repair the cracks/gaps in Unit 2 and Sub-Unit 5-3, that there was peeling epoxy coating in Unit 2, and that there was an open 55-gallon drum in Unit 3. In addition, some inspection logs were missing the date and time of the inspections. The requirement functioned to some extent in that some portions of the inspection requirements were met.	6	Yes	1/30/2014	25	7.50	
5	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could have resulted in a failure to assure that HW are destined for and delivered to an authorized HW facility.	22 CCR 66264.73(b)(1)	The facility failed to record a description and the quantity of each HW received, and the method(s) and date(s) of its transfer, treatment, storage, or disposal at the facility.	Minimal	The facility failed to keep operating logs that ensured HW was tracked from cradle to grave. The wastestream was used oil filters. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestream at issue and volume in violation.	Minimal	On 3/1/2018, inspectors observed seven open drums (55-gallon, Used Oil Filters) in Unit 2, which the facility stated was to be consolidated into a roll-off. However, the drum logs demonstrated the date of consolidation was 2/15/2018. Unit 2 was permitted to store up to 1,200 55-gallon drums of waste. The requirement functioned nearly as intended.	2	No	n/a	25	2.50	
6	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to perform emergency clean-up operation or other corrective action for releases.	22 CCR 66264.54(d)	The facility failed to immediately amend the contingency plan when the list of emergency coordinators changed.	Minimal	The facility failed to update its contingency plan. The wastestreams handled by the facility were used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Moderate	The facility failed to immediately amend the contingency plan when the list of emergency coordinators changed. An employee began work as the emergency coordinator for the facility in late 2016, and the list of emergency coordinators identifying this employee wasn't updated until 3/8/2018. The requirement functioned to some extent as other elements of the contingency plan were not in violation.	6	No	n/a	0	6.00	
Provisional Inspection Violation Score:											55.75		

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name:		BAKERSFIELD TRANSFER INC DBA COLES ENVIRONMENTAL		10 Year Date Range:		2009-2018		Permit Effective Date:		7/28/2015		Link to EnviroStor (Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)	
Address:		1620 E BRUNDAGE LANE, BAKERSFIELD, CA 93307		Number of Inspections:		5		Permit Expiration Date:		7/28/2025			
EPA ID:		CAL000282598		Total Number of Violations Scored:		18		Date VSP Completed:		8/6/2019			
Inspection Date:	12/3/2018 CEI & 2/1/2019 FRR	Class I Justification	Citation	Violation	Potential for Harm	Potential for Harm Justification	Extent of Deviation	Extent of Deviation Justification	Initial Score	Repeat (Yes/No)	Date(s) of Previous Violation	Adjustment Factor (%)	Adjusted Score
Inspection Type:	CEI & FRR												
Class I Violations:	1	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation.	22 CCR 66270.30(a) and HSC 25202(a)	The facility accumulated a volume of waste that was greater than allowed by its HWFP. The HWFP stated that the facility's Storage Capacity was twelve 20-cubic yard roll-off bins (240 cubic yards) or 48,470 gallon equivalents. The facility accumulated approximately 135,552 gallons, approximately 80,000 gallons over its allowed capacity.	Minimal	The facility accumulated approximately 80,000 gallons more than allowed in its HWFP. The wastestreams at issue were used oil and oily wastewater. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the volume and characteristics of the substances at issue in this violation.	Major	The facility stored more than 2.8 times the amount of waste allowed in the permit. The excess accumulation of HW deviated from the HW management requirement to such an extent that the requirement was completed ignored and none of its provisions were complied with.	15	No	n/a	0	15.00
	2	The deviation from the requirements was significant enough that it could result in a failure to prevent releases of HW or constituents to the environment during the active period of facility operation and/or assure early detection of releases.	22 CCR 66264.192(b), 22 CCR 66264.192(l), and 22 CCR 66264.192(k)	The facility failed to satisfy all of the tank system assessment requirements required by regulation.	Minimal	Four tanks in Unit #1, with 20,000 gallon capacity each, that held up to a combined volume of 80,000 gallons of used oil, oily water, or antifreeze did not meet all the tank assessment requirements. Proper tank certification was necessary to ensure that the tanks and associated tank systems did not collapse, rupture, or fail in any way. A minimal potential for harm was assigned due to the wastestreams at issue in this violation.	Major	All tank assessments for Unit #1 were insufficient and/or missing the following: Engineer Certification (22 CCR 66270.11(d)); Tank Configuration (22 CCR 66264.192(l)(1)); Material of construction (22 CCR 66264.192(l)(2)(A)); Description of tank system piping (22 CCR 66264.192(l)(2)(C)); Internal and external pumps, if any (22 CCR 66264.192(l)(2)(D)); Sketch or drawing of tank system, including dimensions (22 CCR 66264.192(l)(2)(E)); Description and evaluation of leak detection system (22 CCR 66264.192(l)(4)); and Description and evaluation of secondary containment meeting standards (22 CCR 66264.192(k)(1)-(3)). The function of the requirement was rendered ineffective because some its important provisions were not complied with.	15	No	n/a	0	15.00
Provisional Inspection Violation Score:												30.00	

Violation Scoring Matrix

Facility Name: BAKERSFIELD TRANSFER INC DBA COLES ENVIRONMENTAL	10 Year Date Range: 2009-2018	Permit Effective Date: 7/28/2015	Link to EnviroStor (Inspection Reports, SOVs, etc.)
Address: 1620 E BRUNDAGE LANE, BAKERSFIELD, CA 93307	Number of Inspections: 5	Permit Expiration Date: 7/28/2025	
EPA ID: CAL000282598	Total Number of Violations Scored: 18	Date VSP Completed: 8/6/2019	

FACILITY VIOLATION SCORING PROCEDURE SCORE				
Inspection Number	Number of Violations Scored	Inspection Type(s)	Inspection Date(s)	Provisional Inspection Violation Score
1	6	CEI & FRR	4/26/2010 CEI & 5/10/2010 FRR	54.00
2	1	CEI	1/30/2014	7.50
3	3	CEI & FRR	9/22/2016 CEI & 10/26/2016 FRR	44.75
4	6	CEI & FRR	1/30/2018 CEI & 2/14/2018 FRR	55.75
5	2	CEI & FRR	12/3/2018 CEI & 2/1/2019 FRR	30.00
Sum of Provisional Inspection Violation Scores				192.00
FACILITY VSP SCORE				38.40

*FACILITY VSP SCORE = Sum of Provisional Inspection Violation Scores/Total Number of Inspections conducted in 10 year (calendar) timeframe

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>CCR = California Code of Regulations
 CDI = Case Development Inspection
 CEI = Compliance Evaluation Inspection
 CI = Complaint Investigation
 DTSC = Department of Toxic Substances Control
 EPA ID = Environmental Protection Agency Identification
 FCI = Focused Compliance Inspection
 FRR = Financial Records Review
 FSD = Facility Self Disclosure
 FUI = Follow-Up Inspection</p> | <p>GAR = Groundwater Audit Report
 GME = Groundwater Monitoring Evaluation
 HSC = Health and Safety Code
 HW = Hazardous Waste
 HWFP = Hazardous Waste Facility Permit
 n/a = Not Applicable
 NFRR = Non-Financial Record Review
 PPM = Parts per Million
 RCRA = Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
 SOV = Summary of Violations
 VSP = Violations Scoring Procedure</p> |
|---|---|

PROOF OF SERVICE

1. I served the NOTICE OF PROVISIONAL INSPECTION VIOLATION SCORES, 2019 FACILITY VIOLATION SCORING PROCEDURE SCORE, AND 2019 COMPLIANCE TIER ASSIGNMENT on Bryan Hill, Bakersfield Transfer Inc., EPA ID Number CAL000282598.
2. I served Bryan Hill, Bakersfield Transfer Inc., by mailing a copy of the aforementioned document via Certified Mail, Receipt No. 7018-0680-0000-9827-9553, return receipt requested, in a sealed envelope addressed to:

Mr. Bryan Hill
Bakersfield Transfer Inc.
1620 E Brundage Lane
Bakersfield, California 93307

3. My name, business address, and telephone number are:

Alan Korematsu
Department of Toxic Substances Control
HWMP, 11th Floor
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812-0806
(916) 323-3706

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration of Proof of Service is executed on October 4, 2019 at Sacramento, California.



(Signature)