

FLORIDA DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT RISK MANAGEMENT PLANNING UNIT (RMP) RMP ON-SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION CHECKLIST FOR PROGRAM LEVEL 1

CHECK TYPE(S) APPLICABLE:

LIST CHEMICALS AND PROGRAM LEVELS REPORTED IN RMP:

CHEMICAL: _____ PROGRAM LEVEL 1
 CHEMICAL: _____ PROGRAM LEVEL _____
 CHEMICAL: _____ PROGRAM LEVEL _____
 CHEMICAL: _____ PROGRAM LEVEL _____

X ON-SITE INSPECTION
X ON-SITE DOCUMENTATION REVIEW
X INTERVIEWS WITH FACILITY REPRESENTATIVES
X INTERVIEWS WITH FACILITY EMPLOYEES

Owner/Operator Name: _____
 Facility Name: _____
 Street Address: _____
 City, State, Zip: _____
 Mailing Address: _____
 City, State, Zip: _____
 RMP Contact Name: _____
 Facility Phone #: _____
 Email Address: _____

EPA Identifier #: _____
 Notice of Inspection: _____
 On-Site Inspection Date: _____
 Inspection Team Leader: _____
 Team Member: _____
 Team Member: _____
 Facility Representative: _____
 Facility Representative: _____
 Facility Representative: _____

CHECKLIST KEY:

- Y = YES** indicates that the facility had documentation for the corresponding item at the time of inspection.
- N = NO** indicates that the facility did not have documentation for the corresponding item at the time of inspection.
- P = PARTIAL** indicates that the documentation was incomplete at the time of inspection.
- NA = NOT APPLICABLE** indicates the documentation was not required or the item was not applicable to facility at time of inspection.
- NR = NOT REVIEWED** at the time of inspection.
- UN = UNAVAILABLE** indicates that the documentation was not available for review at the time of the inspection.
- ND = NOT DETERMINED** indicates that the auditor is unable to determine or evaluate compliance of item at the time of the inspection.

Management System 68.15	
1	• Management system to oversee the implementation of risk management program elements is developed and implemented. 68.15(a)
2	• A qualified person or position is assigned the overall responsibility of RMP development, implementation, and integration. 68.15(b)
3	• Other persons responsible for implementing individual requirements of the risk management program are documented and lines of authority are defined through an organizational chart. 68.15(c)
Hazard Assessment Documentation Review	
For worst-case release scenarios, has the owner/operator (o/o) maintained records of the following:	
4	• A description of the vessel or pipeline and substance selected. 68.39(a)
5	• The assumptions and parameters used. 68.39(a)
6	• The rationale for selection of specific scenarios. 68.39(a)
7	• The anticipated effects of administrative controls and passive mitigation on the release quantity and rate. 68.39(a)
For alternative release scenarios, has the o/o maintained records of the following:	
8	• A description of the scenarios identified. 68.39(b)
9	• The assumptions and parameters used. 68.39(b)
10	• The rationale for selection of specific scenarios. 68.39(b)

Hazard Assessment Documentation Review	
11	• The anticipated effects of the administrative controls and passive mitigation on the release quantity and rate. 68.39(b)
For all release scenarios, has the o/o maintained records of the following:	
12	• Documentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? 68.39(c)
13	• Methodology used to determine distance to endpoints. 68.39(d)
14	• Data used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected. 68.39(e)
For defining off-site impacts, has the o/o:	
15	• Used most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population. 68.30(c)
16	• Relied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify environmental receptors. 68.33(b)
Has the o/o:	
17	• Completed a revised RMP within six months of a change in processes, quantities stored or handled, or any other aspect that might reasonably be expected to increase or decrease the distance to the endpoint by a factor of two or more. 68.36(b)
18	COMMENTS:

Incident Investigation 68.81		
19	• Each incident which resulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in, a catastrophic release of a regulated substance has been investigated. 68.81(a)	
20	• Each incident investigation is initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident. 68.81(b)	
21	• An incident investigation team has been established and consists of at least one person knowledgeable in the process involved, contractor employee (if applicable), and other persons with knowledge and experience in incident investigation. 68.81(c)	
22	• At conclusion of investigation, report is prepared. 68.81(d)	
Each incident investigation report includes documentation of the following information:		68.81(d)
23	• Date of incident. 68.81(d)(1)	
24	• Date investigation began. 68.81(d)(2)	
25	• A Description of the incident. 68.81(d)(3)	
26	• Factors that contributed to incident. 68.81(d)(4)	
27	• Any recommendations resulting from the investigation. 68.81(d)(5)	
28	• A system to address and resolve the report findings and recommendations has been established and implemented. 68.81(e)	
29	• Resolutions and corrective actions are documented. 68.81(e)	
30	• Investigation report was reviewed with all affected personnel, whose job tasks are relevant to the incident findings. 68.81(f)	
31	• Investigation reports are retained for five years. 68.81(g)	
32	COMMENTS:	
Emergency Response		
33	• Is facility a responding facility? If N , proceed to Items 224-226 under Non-Responding Facilities. If Y , proceed Items 227-235 under Responding Facilities.	
Non-Responding Facilities 68.90		
34	• For toxic substances held above the TQ, the facility is included in the LEPC's community emergency response plan. 68.90(b)(1)	
35	• For flammable substances held above the TQ, facility has coordinated response actions with the local fire department. 68.90(b)(2)	
36	• Appropriate mechanisms are in place to notify emergency responders. 68.90(b)(3)	
37	COMMENTS:	

RMP Violations:**Suggested Improvement Areas:**