A1 - Yes, because it was given on the "Site Information" sheet that FWW Permit conditions apply

A2 - No, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that the DEM was not aware that construction on your site had begun

A3 - Yes, because both the FWW Permit and the approved site plans are shown in the photos and therefore considered to be on site
A4 - Yes, because there is a picture of a DEM permit sign, therefore it is posted on site
A5 - Yes, because there is a picture of a quarry, where off-site fill materials would originate from, therefore they are being used on site.

A10 - No, because this question is based off of other non-compliant questions such as (B2-iv) staying within the approved LOD, (A2) notifying RIDEM when construction begins, and (B1) erosion controls must be in place before soil disturbance occurs.

A5-i - Yes, because in the picture a pH test is being done on the off-site fill material, therefore it was inspected.

B1 - No, because in the picture there are no erosion controls in place and construction has clearly started, therefore erosion controls were not put in place before initiating soil disturbance activities.

B2-i - Yes, because in the picture there is a silt fence being used as an LOD, which is in place to protect nearby environmental resources.
B2-ii - No, because in the picture there is an existing infiltration area on a construction site that has not been protected by an LOD.

B2-iii - No, because in the picture there are no LOD marked on site, therefore they are not in compliance with having the LOD be consistent with the approved site plans.

B2-iv - No, because in the picture there is a pile of mulch dumped in the wooded area, which is beyond the approved LOD.

B3 - No, because in the picture there are no controls in place to limit the runoff of exposed soils, the stormwater flow is full of sediment and not being properly contained on site.
B4 - Yes, because in the picture there is a nicely designed temporary water conveyance, which was designed correctly and is currently functioning properly

B4-i - No, because in the picture the once properly functioning temporary water conveyance has become riddled with sediment/unstabilized and needs to be properly maintained

B5 - Yes, because in the picture they are seeding currently unstabilized areas on October 15th

B6 - No, because in the picture there is a large area of the site which has been inactive for over two months and has not been properly stabilized after exceeding 14 days of inactivity as required
B7 - Yes, because in the picture a suitable growth of vegetation has not yet been reached by November 15th, so erosion controls have been implemented here to effectively stabilize the site

B9 - Yes, because in the picture the catch basins have protective measures installed

B8 - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that the site was inactive from October 15th to April 15th

B10 - No, because in the picture there are no longer any inlet protection measure installed, so they must not have been properly maintained

B11 - No, because in the picture there is a layer of sediment surrounding the catch basin, so cleaning of this area has not been performed within 24 hours
B12 - Yes, because in the picture there is an adequate layer of rip rap installed at this discharge point.

B13 - No, because in the picture there is now only a little bit of rip rap left and therefore the water is pooling in front of the outlet and no longer effectively dissipating the flow or slowing the velocity of the stormwater.

B14 (i, ii) - Yes, because in the picture the inspector is checking the outlet to make sure it was properly designed and is being well maintained.

B15 - Yes, because in the picture there is a row of haybales (reinforced by a silt fence) implemented on site as a perimeter control.
B16 - No, because in the picture the mulch sock being used as a perimeter control has been overpowered by erosion and sedimentation, which is now going directly into the lake; therefore this control was not properly maintained.

B17 - Yes, because in the picture there is a large permanent sediment basin on site that is fully surrounded by erosion controls.

B18 - Yes, because in the picture the equipment routing is on an existing roadway, therefore construction equipment will not be able to compact any infiltration areas.

B19 - Yes, because in the picture there is a siphon installed in this temporary sediment basin.
B20 - No, because in the picture the hay bails used as a temporary sediment trap have not been maintained.

C1-i - No, because in the picture the contaminated groundwater has not been properly managed and dewatered.

B21 and B22 - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there are no chemicals used on this site.

C1-ii - No, because in the picture wastewater from the washout of concrete has flown down hill to a nearby catch basin and therefore was not properly contained or disposed of.

C1-iii - Yes, because in the picture there are containers on site that are specifically for the washout of paint and other construction products.
C1-iv - Yes, because in the picture there is a large spill mat being used on site to properly contain any leaks from this construction vehicle.

C1-v - Yes, because in the picture there are no soaps or solvents being used on the site for equipment and vehicle washing, just a high powered hose.

C1-vi - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there are no chemicals used on this site.

C2 - No, because in the picture it can be seen that this is not a properly designed exit point from the site, seeing as there is no crushed stone padding or other BMPs in place to remove sediment from tires before exiting.

C3 - No, because in the picture there is not a crushed stone padding here, therefore the sediment is being tracked out in the active roadway from construction vehicles exiting.
C4 - No, because in the picture there was once an adequate layer of crushed stone padding, but it has now become ineffective and there are no other controls in place to prevent sediment track out from the site.

C5 - No, because in the picture there is a large amount of sediment track out that has not been removed by the end of each work day.

C6 - No, because in the picture there is a pile of construction debris that is not being properly contained, as well as an overflowing trash can for personal trash which also needs to be properly contained.

C7 - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there are no chemicals used on this site.

C8 - Yes, because in the picture there are procedures in place for the prevention and control of spills.
C9 - Yes, because in the picture there is a highly visible area on site for the storage of spill prevention and control equipment.

C10 - Yes, because in the picture the construction crew is being trained on how to use spill prevention and control equipment.

C11 - No, because this question is based off other compliance questions, mainly prohibited discharges such as (C1-ii) concrete washout not being kept separate from stormwater flow.

C12 - No, because this question is based off of other compliance questions, mainly prohibited discharges such as (C1-ii) concrete washout that was not managed properly with adequate controls.

C13 - Not Covered

C14-i - No, because in the picture there is a discharge of foam coming from the construction site.

C14-ii - No, this would not be a slope to use as an infiltration area for dewatering practices.

C14-iv - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there are no filters used on site.
C15 - No, because in the picture there are no erosion controls surrounding the staging area

C16-i - Yes, because in the picture the stockpile is within the LOD

C16-ii - No, because in the picture the stockpile is neither surrounded by erosion controls nor covered with polysheeting

C16-iii - Yes, because in the picture the stockpile is covered with polysheeting
C17 - No, because in the picture there is a lot of dust being kicked up from the construction equipment, therefore it is not being properly managed through the use of water or vegetative measures

C18 - Yes, because in the picture there is a designated concrete washout area on site with a sign indicating this

C19 - Yes, because in the picture the fuel truck is fueling all of the construction equipment in the staging area, which is surrounded by erosion controls
D1 - Yes, because in the picture there is a sign specifying the location of the SESC Plan, who to contact to view the SESC Plan and how to contact that person; therefore it is considered to be posted on the site.

D2 - No, because this question is based off of other compliance questions, mainly (D3) if the SESC Plan is on the site, (D19) if all SESC weekly inspection reports are on site, (D18) if all project permits and RIPDES NOI are on site, and (D6) if the full Site Plans or SESC Site Plans detailing BMPs in the field are on site.
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
For:
Repairs to the Cliff Walk
Ruggles Avenue to Bellevue Avenue
Newport, Rhode Island

RI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FRANK CORRAO, III, P.E.
2 CAPITOL HILL
PROVIDENCE, RI 02903
401-222-2468

Owner:

Company Name
Name
Address
City, State, Zip Code
Telephone Number

Operator:

TO BE DETERMINED UPON CONTRACT AWARD

Estimated Project Dates:
Start Date: October 24, 2013
Completion Date: June 14, 2014

Commonwealth Engineers & Consultants, Inc.
Karen A. Beck, RLA

SWPPP Prepared By:
400 Smith Street
Providence, RI 02908
(401) 273-6600

SWPPP Preparation Date:
July 23, 2013

D3 - Yes, because in the picture there is a copy of the SESC Plan, therefore it is considered to be on site
D19 - Yes, because in the picture there is a copy of the SESC weekly inspection report, therefore they are all considered to be on site
General Permit
Rhode Island Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
Storm Water Discharge Associated with Construction Activity

September 26, 2008

Valid ONLY in accordance with Part I.C.

Expiration Date: September 25, 2013

Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management
Office of Water Resources
Permitting Section

D18 - No, because in the picture there is a copy of the RIDEM RIPDES permit on site and in a previous picture there is a copy of the FWW Permit on site, however there is no RIPDES NOI on site
D6 - Yes, because in the picture there is a copy of the construction Site Plans detailing the BMPs on site
OPERATOR CERTIFICATION

Upon contract award, a principal officer of the firm which will act as the OPERATOR must sign this certification statement before construction may begin.

RIPDES Construction General Permit – Section V.G

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under the direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete.

I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations. I am aware that it is the responsibility of the owner/operator to implement and amend the SWPPP as appropriate in accordance with the requirements of the RIPDES Construction General Permit.

Operator Signature: [Signature]
Date:

Contractor Representative: [Name]
Contractor Title: [Title]
Contractor Company Name: [Company]
OWNER CERTIFICATION

RIPDES Construction General Permit – Section V.G

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under the direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete.

I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations. I am aware that it is the responsibility of the owner/operator to implement and amend the SWPPP as appropriate in accordance with the requirements of the RIPDES Construction General Permit.

Owner Signature: [Signature]

Date

Owner Name: Frank Corrao III, P.E.
Owner Title: Deputy Chief Engineer
Company Name: Rhode Island Department of Transportation

D5 - Yes, because in the picture the owner has signed and certified the SESC Plan
RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

AMENDMENT LOG

ALL AMENDMENTS MUST BE APPROVED BY RIDOT RESIDENT ENGINEER

Describe amendment to be made to SWPPP, the date, and the person/title making the amendment. ALL amendments must be approved by the RIDOT Resident Engineer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Amendment</th>
<th>Amended by: Person/Title</th>
<th>R.E. Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D7 - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there were no amendments made on this site
D8 - Yes, because in the picture there is an inspector performing their weekly inspection of the site

D9 - No, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there were only a few inspections that occurred over the winter shutdown, but these were never documented
### SWPPP Inspection Report

**Project Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Replacement of Central Bridge #182, Massasoit Avenue, Barrington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIDOT Project Manager</td>
<td>G. Chahine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Cardi Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;S Sub-Contractor</td>
<td>MON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inspection Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>L. Hastings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Date</td>
<td>7/11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start/End Time</td>
<td>10:30 – 11:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inspection Type**

- **Weekly**
- **Pre-storm event**
- **During storm event**
- **Post-storm event**
- **Violation**

**Weather Information**

- **Rain Gauge:** Nyatt SE, Barrington (KRIBARRI3)
  - [Link](http://www.wunderground.com/weatherstation/WXDailyHistory.asp?ID=KRIBARRI3)
- **Last Rain Event**
  - Date: 7/4/14-7/5/14
  - Duration (hrs): ~12 hours
  - Approximate Rainfall (in): 2.75
- **Current Weather at time of this inspection:**
  - ~75 degrees, clear skies
- **Weather Forecast at time of this inspection:** (when is next precipitation or wind event anticipated?)
  - 30% chance of rain on 7/14; 60% chance of rain on 7/15

### Certification Statements

**Inspector:** (check one)

- X, as the designated Inspector, certify that this site has been inspected and is in compliance with the site-specific SWPPP. **However, corrective actions are required to maintain site compliance.** The required corrective actions are noted within this inspection report.

- [ ] 1. as the designated Inspector, certify that this site has been inspected and 1 have made the determination that the site requires corrective actions before it will be compliant with the site-specific SWPPP. The required corrective actions are noted within this inspection report.

**Print Name:** L. Hastings  
**Signature:** [Signature]  
**Date:** 7/11/14

**Resident Engineer:**

1. the RIDOT Resident Engineer, acknowledge the receipt of this SWPPP inspection report, and understand the requirements set forth in the RIDOT Standard Specifications and the Contract Documents regarding the implementation and maintenance of erosion and sedimentation controls.

**Print Name:**  
**Signature:**  
**Date:**

**Contractor:**

1. the designated Contractor representative, acknowledge the receipt of this SWPPP inspection report, and understand the requirements set forth in the RIDOT Standard Specifications and the Contract Documents regarding the implementation and maintenance of erosion and sedimentation controls.

**Print Name:**  
**Signature:**  
**Date:**

---

**D10**

- (i) Yes, (ii) Yes, (iii) Yes, (iv) Yes, (v) No, (vi) No, (vii) No; because the inspectors contact information, along with signatures from both the owner and operator are missing.

---

**D11**

- No, because this question is based off of other compliance questions pertaining to the maintenance of BMPs, which was rarely done on this site.
D12 - Yes, because in the picture the operator is working with his crew to fix a non-compliance issue immediately

D14, D15, and D16 - N/A, because it was given in the "Site Information" sheet that there were no significant issues encountered on this site, nor were there any amendments made to the SESC Plan
### Overall Site Issues

Below are some general site issues that should be assessed during inspections. Please consider conditions at the site. If item is not applicable, please note why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION BMP INSPECTION</th>
<th>Installed &amp; Operating correctly?</th>
<th>Assoc. Photo/ Figure #</th>
<th>CORRECTIVE ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are Limits of Disturbance clearly marked?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Sediment migration has been noted along the river-facing slope at the lower end of the northwest causeway near the opening in the sheeting. Sediment deposits and turbidity were not observed within the river, however future rain events could wash this sediment downslope. The slopes should be stabilized with crushed stone as necessary to prevent migration of sediment into the river, and/or consider installing a sedimentation barrier across the gap in the sheeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are natural resource areas (e.g., streams, wetlands, trees, etc.) protected with barriers or similar BMPs?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Is construction sequencing being followed?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Are structural BMPs properly installed to control stormwater flow on the construction site?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Is clearing/grubbing only occurring in areas that will have active work within 21-days?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Is clearing/grubbing taking place inside the Apr 15 - Oct 15 window?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Do unstabilized areas have appropriate controls in place?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>See Item 2.1 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Are all slopes protected from concentrated stormwater flow?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>See Item 2.1 above. While no concentrated stormwater flow was observed, sheet flow from the previous rain event appears to have carried sediment downslope toward the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Are storm drain inlets properly protected?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Are storm drain outfalls properly protected?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Are perimeter controls and sediment barriers adequately installed and maintained?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perimeter hay bales and silt fences are generally in good condition and no displacement was noted. However, some of the hay bales at the southeast and southwest quadrants are decomposing and slightly slumping, and may need to be replaced in the near future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Are discharge points and receiving waters free of sediment deposits?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>Sand bags have been placed in the gap between the sheeting and concrete wall at northeast work area to prevent sedimentation. See Item 2.1 addressing the potential for sedimentation into river at northwest causeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D16 - Yes, because in the picture the corrective actions that need to be made have been properly documented in the weekly report**

**D17 - No, because in the picture the operator has not signed or dated next to the corrective action in the report once that action has been made in the field**