TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION – DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES NPDES INDUSTRIAL STORMWATER (TMSP) INSPECTION WORKSHEET

| | ١ | NPC | ES | TNRFacility | Name | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|------|--|--|------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | | | spector | | | | |
| | - 1 | nsp | ect | tor's email | Field Office | | | |
| | Inspection start date/time | | | | Inspection end date/time | | | |
| | Inspection Purpose: Routine | | | | | | | |
| | Weather conditions | | | | Last R | ain Event | | |
| | Site Address | | | dress | | City | County | |
| | Facility SIC code(s) | | | SIC code(s) | TMSP Sector(s) | | | |
| | 1 | 100 | C Ef | fective datePe | ermit Expiration d | ate | | |
| | | | | Representative | | | | |
| | F | Res | oon | nsible Official | Title | | phone | |
| | A | Add | itio | onal on-site facility personnel | | | | |
| | F | Rec | eivi | ing waters (or MS4) | | Nu | ımber of Outfalls | |
| | | | | · / | | | | |
| | | | | | Monitoring Rep | orts | | |
| | | | | ☐ AMR reporting yearre | | | eedances? | |
| | | | | ☐ AMR reporting yearre | eceived date | Exce | eedances? | |
| | | | | □ AMR reporting yearre | eceived date | Exce | eedances? | |
| | | | | ☐ AMR reporting yearre | eceived date | Exce | eedances? | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Stormwater Poll | ution Preventior | າ Plan (SWP | PPP) Review | |
| | | Ν | | | | | | |
| | | | | Is a copy of the NOC available on-si | | | | |
| | | | | Has a site-specific SWPPP been dev | eloped? | Date? | | |
| | | | | Is SWPPP maintained on-site? | | | | |
| | | | | Does the SWPPP include a certification with appropriate signature? | | | | |
| | | | | Has a pollution prevention team been identified? | | | | |
| | | | | Description of potential pollutant sources included? | | | | |
| | | | | Is a narrative of the potential pollutant sources included addressing risk identification? Has an inventory of all exposed materials been developed (including up to 3 years prior to | | | | |
| ο. | П | Ш | Ш | submitting the NOI for coverage up | | ppea (mciaam | g up to 3 years prior to | |
| q | | П | | Has a detailed site map been devel | | ainage outfa | lls notential pollutant | |
| ٥. | | | | sources, BMPs, direction of flow? | opea lacitii yiiig ai | amage, outra | ns, potential ponatant | |
| 10. | | | | List of significant spills and leaks of | f toxic and hazardo | us pollutants? | | |
| | | | | Description of good housekeeping s | | - | | |
| | | | | Preventative maintenance program developed?Implemented? | | | | |
| | | | | Spill prevention and Response procedures developed? | | | | |
| 14. | | | | Employee Training conducted, which | h includes spill resp | onse, good ho | ousekeeping, and | |
| | | | | materials management? Frequence | cy? | Documen | tation available? | |
| 15. | | □ □ □ Has a certification of the testing for non-stormwater discharges been included? | | | | | | |
| | | | | Signed? Date? | | | | |
| | | | | | List of erosion prevention and sediment control practices? | | | |
| 17. | | | | Description of runoff management? | ? | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | erly Visual Exam | | | |
| 18. | | | | Has the permittee performed quart | erly visual examinat | tions at all out | falls? | |

| | | | N/A | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 19. | | | | Were examinations conducted during a qualifying rain event? | | | | | |
| 20. | | | | Have any representative discharges or sampling waivers been identified? | | | | | |
| 21. | | | | Are reports of examinations retained on-site (for past 3 years minimum)? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Analytical Monitoring | | | | | |
| | | | | Has the permittee performed stormwater monitoring at all outfalls? | | | | | |
| 23. | | | | Have all parameters been monitored? | | | | | |
| 24. | | | | Does sampling data include? | | | | | |
| | | | | Date and duration (in hours) of storm event sampled? | | | | | |
| | | | | Rainfall measurement or estimate (in inches)? | | | | | |
| | | | | Time since previous measurable storm event (in hours)? | | | | | |
| 25. | | | | Did the facility notify the division within 30 days if/when analytical benchmark exceedances occurred? | | | | | |
| 26. | | $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | results, including a timetable for implementation? | | | | | |
| 27. | | | | Low concentration/adverse conditions waiver? | | | | | |
| 28. | | Were Annual analytical monitoring reports submitted to the division in the timeframe specified in the | | | | | | | |
| | | | | permit? | | | | | |
| 29. | | | | Are monitoring reports and associated documents retained on-site or available upon request? | | | | | |
| | | | | Numeric Effluent Limitations requirements? | | | | | |
| 31. | | | | Have DMRs been submitted for effluent limitation monitoring as specified in the permit? | | | | | |
| | | | | Numeric Effluent Limitations exceedances? | | | | | |
| 33. | | | | Any additional monitoring required by the Division, TMDLs or ETWs? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluations and Inspections | | | | | |
| 34. | П | П | П | Have the comprehensive site compliance evaluations been conducted annually? | | | | | |
| | | | | Have site inspections been conducted? | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequency? Checklist used? | | | | | |
| 36. | П | П | П | Does the facility utilize tracking or follow-up procedures in response to issues found? | | | | | |
| | | | | Are evaluation and inspection records retained on-site (for the past 3 years minimum)? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Facility BMPs, Outfalls, Receiving Waters | | | | | |
| 38. | | | | Are the site BMPs in accordance with the SWPPP? | | | | | |
| 39. | | | | Have the BMPs been installed correctly? | | | | | |
| | | | | Have the BMPs been maintained? | | | | | |
| 41. | | | | Have good housekeeping measures been maintained? | | | | | |
| | | □ □ Evidence of pollutant impact to receiving water(s) or at outfall(s)? | | | | | | | |
| | | | | If yes, describe: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 43. | _ | | | Photos taken? | | | | | |
| | A | ddi | tion | al Notes: | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | | | | | |
| | | _ | | | | | | | |
| | (| Com | nplia | nce Rating: Satisfactory all items marked Y | | | | | |
| | | | | ☐ Marginal any item not bolded marked N consider Notice of Violation | | | | | |
| | | | | □ Unsatisfactory any bolded item marked N recommend Notice of Violation | | | | | |
| Inspection Results: □ In Compliance □ Out of Compliance | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |