Checklist – CAC005M
Erosion and Sediment Control (MRTS52)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Contractor |  | Date |  | Review No. |  |
| Contract No. |  | Project No. |  | Project Name |  |

Part A – Legislative Compliance

| Reference | Requirements | Y/N | Comments / Observations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S440ZG EP ActDEHP 2 | Is there any sediment build up in the receiving environment (from the project)? |  |  |
| S440ZG EP ActDEHP 2 | Has sediment or other prescribed contaminant (oil and so on) been released to waters or stormwater drainage? |  | It is recommended that you discuss with the regulatory authority officer at beginning of project what their definition of ‘Sediment release’ is – when do they want to be notified? Above 75 NTU? Only if material or serious harm?If no agreement made – notify when above discharge limits for project. |

If the answer to these questions is yes, the Transport and Main Roads incident management procedure shall be followed, including notification to DEHP where environmental harm is considered to have occurred.

Part B of this checklist should be completed by Principal or Contract Administrator, to review whether the Contractor has complied with the MRTS52 requirements and the General Environmental Duty (s 319) of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 (Qld) (EP Act)*.*

Part B – General

Legend:  C Conformance  NC Non‑conformance  O Observation  N/A Not Applicable  NFV  Not Fully Verifiable

| Reference | Requirements | Addressed | Comments / Observations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Erosion and Sediment Control Plan |
| MRST52Clause 6.1 – 6.3 DEHP 3 | Is there a current Erosion and Sediment Control plan for all sites in construction, that have been assessed as suitable by the Contract Administrator? |  | For large projects list the actual area or site(s) audited. |
| MRST52Clause 5.1, 7.1 | Were erosion and sediment controls installed as soon as possible and prior to significant earthworks? |  |  |
| Performance Criteria |
| MRTS52Clause 8.1.2DEHP 2 | Is stormwater exiting the Site meeting the required performance criteria?Performance criteria is: 50 mg/L (75NTU) and pH 6.5 – 8.5 unless otherwise specified in MRTS52 annexure. |  | Evidence: monitoring results collated in monthly report (refer to MRTS52 9.3) and undertaken as per MRTS52 8.2.2. |
| MRTS52Clause 8.1.3 | Is the water quality of adjacent water bodies below investigation criteria?(If water quality has been above investigation criteria: has the exceedance been investigated and deemed to be not due to construction activities)? |  | Evidence: monitoring results undertaken and collated in accordance with MRTS52 8.2.3. |
| MRTS52Clause 8.1.4 | Are adjacent roadways free of sediment tracked from Site? |  |  |
| Drainage Controls (Catch Drains, Drainage Channels, Batter chutes, Check Dams) |
| DEHP 6MRTS52Clause 6.3, 10.2MRS Work item descriptions | Have drainage controls been designed and constructed in accordance with ESCP and MRTS? |  | Design requirements are:* 40% AEP for area open 0‑12 months
* 20% AEP for area open 1‑2 years
* 10% AEP for area open > 2 years.
 |
| DEHP 7MRTS52Clause 1.3 | Is clean stormwater diverted around the Site in manner that stormwater is kept clean? |  | Note: Clean water may also be diverted through the Site in some instances, as long as it is a defined channel and dirty water cannot ingress. Alternatively, sediment controls must be designed to manage clean water flow volumes. |
| DEHP 6MRTS52Clause 1.3 | Is erosion from concentrated flow minimised? |  |  |
| DEHP 15 | Are drainage controls installed to protect steep batters? That is, are flows diverted so do not run down steep batter face and directed to drainage channel / chute area? |  |  |
| MRTS52Clause 1.3 | Are drainage controls being maintained? |  |  |
| Erosion Controls (Geobinders, Erosion Control Blankets, Mulch, Temporary Cover Crops) |
| MRTS52Clause 6.3MRS Work item descriptions | Are erosion controls installed in accordance with ESCP? |  |  |
| DEHP 5 MRTS52Clause 1.3 | Has the risk of soil exposure been appropriately minimised?Methods to reduce risk may include minimising earthworks in the wet season, using erosion controls to stabilise bare areas not actively being Works, commencing permanent stabilisation ASAP. |  | DEHP guidance on clearing states: Clearing large areas of land at one time may deliver some cost benefits due to economies of scale. Clear areas where soil is left exposed pose a high risk of causing water contamination. It is the responsibility of those who create the risk to manage the risk. |
| MRTS52Clause 6.2 | For general high risk projects: does the runoff from all areas greater than 1 hectare not effectively stabilised (as still being worked) drain to a sediment basin? |  | Where not possible, state alternative controls in place. |
| MRTS52Clause 6.2 | For low risk projects: does the runoff from all areas not effectively stabilised drain to an appropriate Type 2 or 3 sediment control device? For example, check dams, rock filter dams, sediment weir. |  | Further information / guidance on appropriate devices can be found within IECA Design Fact Sheet: Sediment Control Classification system – Sediment Control Techniques. |
| Sediment Controls (Sediment basins, Sediment fence, Check dams, Inlet protection) |
| MRTS52Clause 6.3 | Have sediment basins and other sediment controls been located in accordance with ESCP? |  |  |
| DEHP 10 MRTS52Clause 6.3, 10.2MRS Work item descriptions | Have sediment basins been designed and constructed in accordance with ESCP and MRTS? |  | Key design requirements are:* sized for 80% or 85% 5 day rain event
* banks compacted as per MRTS04
* basin inlet and outlets sized and strength.
 |
| MRTS52 Clause 7.2DEHP 11 | Have sediment basins been operated and maintained in accordance with ESCP and technical requirements? |  | Key operational requirements are:* design capacity made available within 120 hours of rainfall event
* jar test or SCV used to determine flocculant requirements thus avoiding overdosing.
 |
| MRTS52 Clause 6.4 | Have other sediment controls been designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with ESCP? |  | All designs must be in accordance with IECA Book 6 unless variation specifically noted in ESCP (MRTS52, Clause 6.2). |
| In Stream (In-Stream silt curtain, coffer dams) |
| MRTS52 Clause 6.4 | Erosion and Sediment devices installed in accordance with plan and requirements? |  |  |
| MRTS52 Clause 8.1.3 | Installed devices are effectively minimising sediment to waterway? |  | Evidence: monitoring results undertaken and collated in accordance with MRTS52, Clause 8.2.3. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Audited by: |  |  |  |
| Name |  | Signature |  | Date |  |

**Definitions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conformance (C) | Fulfilment of a requirement, either contractual or legislative. |
| Non-conformance (NC) | A failure to comply with a requirement of contract. |
| Not Fully Verifiable (NFV) | There was insufficient evidence to determine conformance or non‑conformance. |
| Observation (O) | A positive or negative comment of the auditor based on evidence and/or an observation made during the audit. Observations may or may not suggest corrective actions. |

References

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EP Act | Environmental Protection Act 1994 (Qld). |
| DEHP | The references related to Assessment of compliance with the general environmental duty questions as outlined within Procedural Guide: Standard work method for the assessment of lawfulness of releases to waters from construction sites in South East Queensland (Version 1) and Stormwater Guideline – Environmentally Relevant Activities (Version 1). While the questions are similar in both publications the question number is different. For the purposes of this checklist, the reference relates to the question number with the DEHP Stormwater Guideline. |