



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Pipeline and Hazardous  
Materials Safety  
Administration**

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE  
Washington DC 20590

## 2019 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

### Document Legend

#### PART:

- O -- Representative, Dates and Title Information
- A -- Progress Report and Program Documentation Review
- B -- Program Inspection Procedures
- C -- State Qualifications
- D -- Program Performance
- E -- Field Inspections
- F -- Damage prevention and Annual report analysis
- G -- Interstate Agent/Agreement States



# 2019 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2019

Gas

**State Agency:** Washington

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 07/31/2020 - 07/31/2020

**Agency Representative:** Sean Mayo, Director, Pipeline Safety Division, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

**PHMSA Representative:** David Lykken, Transportation Specialist, PHMSA State Programs Division

**Commission Chairman to whom follow up letter is to be sent:**

**Name/Title:** David W. Danner, Chairman

**Agency:** Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

**Address:** 621 Woodland Square Loop SE

**City/State/Zip:** Lacey, WA 98503

**Rating:**

**60105(a):** Yes **60106(a):** No **Interstate Agent:** Yes

## INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete this evaluation in accordance with the Evaluator Guidance for conducting state pipeline safety program evaluations. The evaluation should generally reflect state program performance during CY 2019 (not the status of performance at the time of the evaluation). A deficiency in any one part of a multiple-part question should be scored as "Needs Improvement." Determine the answer to the question then select the appropriate point value. If a state receives less than the maximum points, include a brief explanation in the appropriate notes/comments section. If a question is not applicable to a state, select NA. Please ensure all responses are COMPLETE and ACCURATE, and they OBJECTIVELY reflect the state's program performance for the question being evaluated. Increasing emphasis is being placed on how the state pipeline safety programs conduct and execute their pipeline safety responsibilities (their performance). This evaluation, together with selected factors reported in the state's annual progress report attachments, provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

## Scoring Summary

### PARTS

### Possible Points Points Scored

- A Progress Report and Program Documentation Review
- B Program Inspection Procedures
- C State Qualifications
- D Program Performance
- E Field Inspections
- F Damage prevention and Annual report analysis
- G Interstate Agent/Agreement States

0  
15  
10  
50  
15  
4  
0

0  
15  
10  
45  
15  
4  
0

### TOTALS

94 89

**State Rating** ..... 94.7

## PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX)    Score

**1**    Were the following Progress Report Items accurate?

Info Only    Info Only

Info Only = No Points

- a.    Stats On Operators Data - Progress Report Attachment 1
- b.    State Inspection Activity Data - Progress Report Attachment 2
- c.    List of Operators Data - Progress Report Attachment 3\*
- d.    Incidents/Accidents Data - Progress Report Attachment 4\*
- e.    Stats of Compliance Actions Data - Progress Report Attachment 5\*
- f.    List of Records Kept Data - Progress Report Attachment 6 \*
- g.    Staff and TQ Training Data - Progress Report Attachment 7
- h.    Compliance with Federal Regulations Data - Progress Report Attachment 8
- i.    Performance and Damage Prevention Question Data - Progress Report Attachment 10\*

Evaluator Notes:

a & c) Operator/Inspection Unit totals on Attachment 1 are consistent with the Operator/Inspection Unit totals on Attachment 3. b) No issues. d & e) No issues. g) Information verified through T&Q Blackboard training site. Training for personnel found to be complete and accurate. h) All rule amendments have been adopted to date.

Total points scored for this section: 0  
Total possible points for this section: 0



## PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Do written procedures address pre-inspection, inspection and post inspection activities for each of the following inspection types: Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4   | 5 | 5 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Standard Inspections, which include Drug/Alcohol, CRM and Public Awareness Effectiveness Inspections</li><li>b. TIMP and DIMP Inspections (reviewing largest operator(s) plans annually)</li><li>c. OQ Inspections</li><li>d. Damage Prevention Inspections</li><li>e. On-Site Operator Training</li><li>f. Construction Inspections (annual efforts)</li><li>g. LNG Inspections</li></ul> |   |   |

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. Sections referenced come from the program's written Policy & Procedures Manual. a. Section 14 General and Specialized Insp Procedures, Section 15. Entire section devoted to Pre, Inspection, and Post inspection activities; b. Sections 22 (IMP) and 36 (DIMP); c. Section 17; d. Damage Prevention activities under Section 31; e. Section 27 - Training and Outreach Policy; f. Section 21 Design, Testing & Construction Inspections; g. LNG inspection frequency (not to exceed 3 yrs) addressed under Section 13 - Inspection Scheduling Policy. Also Section 33 for CRM inspections.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Do written procedures address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements and time frames established in its procedures? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3  | 4 | 4 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Length of time since last inspection</li><li>b. Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities)</li><li>c. Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction)</li><li>d. Locations of operator's inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic area, Population Centers, etc.)</li><li>e. Process to identify high-risk inspection units that includes all threats - (Excavation Damage, Corrosion, Natural Forces, Outside Forces, Material and Welds, Equipment, Operators and any Other Factors)</li><li>f. Are inspection units broken down appropriately?</li></ul> |   |   |

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes; a thru e - Sections 13 and 13.1 Workplan Development and Scheduling; f. Units apportioned satisfactory.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | (Compliance Procedures) Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2  | 3 | 3 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified</li><li>b. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns</li><li>c. Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations</li></ul> |   |   |

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. Sections referenced taken from the program's Policy & Inspection Manual. a thru c addressed under Sections 15 (Standard Intra Inspections & Correspondence), 25 (Compliance Enforcement Tracking Policy), Section 26 (Follow-up Inspection Policy), and Section 34 (Compliance and Enforcement Policy). Section 37 (Civil Penalty Consideration Factor Policy).

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | (Incident/Accident Investigations) Does the state have written procedures to address state actions in the event of an incident/accident?<br>Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2 | 3 | 3 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Mechanism to receive, record, and respond to operator reports of incidents, including after-hours reports</li></ul>                       |   |   |

- b. If onsite investigation was not made, do procedures require on-call staff to obtain sufficient information to determine the facts to support the decision not to go on-site.

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Section 10 (On-Call and Telephonic Notification), Section 20 (Response to Pipeline Incidents), Section 24 (Investigations Policy), Section 24-A (Level of Investigation Matrix).

---

5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No concerns or issues.

---

Total points scored for this section: 15  
Total possible points for this section: 15



## PART C - State Qualifications

Points(MAX) Score

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Has each inspector and program manager fulfilled training requirements? (See Guidelines Appendix C for requirements) Chapter 4.4<br>Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4  | 5 | 5 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Completion of Required OQ Training before conducting inspection as lead</li><li>b. Completion of Required DIMP/IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead</li><li>c. Completion of Required LNG Training before conducting inspection as lead</li><li>d. Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/program manager</li><li>e. Note any outside training completed</li><li>f. Verify inspector has obtained minimum qualifications to lead any applicable standard inspection as the lead inspector (Reference State Guidelines Section 4.3.1)</li></ul> |   |   |

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Yes. All inspectors including the Chief Engineer and PM have attended and successfully completed required OQ training.
- b. Yes. One Joint States DIMP Inspection conducted in 2019. Lead inspector for WA was qualified.
- c. Yes. One LNG (Mobile) inspection conducted in 2019. Lead was qualified.
- d. Yes. Nine inspectors including Chief Engineer and PM have completed Root Cause Training.
- e. Nine inspection staff attended the API1169 (Pipeline Inspector Certification) training in 2019. Six successfully attained Certification. Staff also attend a NACE sponsored 1-day CP Rectifier class.
- f. All inspection staff who led the 14 Standard Inspections conducted in 2019 were qualified.

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | Did state records and discussions with state pipeline safety program manager indicate adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations? Chapter 4.1,8.1<br>Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 5 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Sean Mayo has attended and successfully completed all core classes required for the PM position. Sean has been with the safety program 3 years.

- |   |  |           |           |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 3 | General Comments:<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues or concerns noted.

Total points scored for this section: 10  
Total possible points for this section: 10



## PART D - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Did state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in written procedures? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4  | 5 | 0 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Standard (General Code Compliance)</li><li>b. Public Awareness Effectiveness Reviews</li><li>c. Drug and Alcohol</li><li>d. Control Room Management</li><li>e. Part 193 LNG Inspections</li><li>f. Construction (did state achieve 20% of total inspection person-days?)</li><li>g. OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)</li><li>h. IMP/DIMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements)</li></ul> |   |   |

**Evaluator Notes:**

Five Point deduction for exceeding the 5 year interval for D&A inspections conducted on operators Puget Sound Energy, Cascade Natural Gas, Northwest Natural, Georgia-Pacific, Nippon Dynawave Packaging, J.R. Simplot and Cardinal FG. Minimum intervals exceeded by over 1 year in all cases. The program had identified the deficiency and has since performed the necessary full D&A plan reviews.

- |   |   |    |    |
|---|---|----|----|
| 2 | Did inspection form(s) cover all applicable code requirements addressed on Federal Inspection form(s)? Did State complete all applicable portions of inspection forms? Chapter 5.1. Do inspection records indicate that adequate reviews of procedures, records and field activities, including notes and the appropriate level of inspection person-days for each inspection, were performed?<br>Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9 | 10 | 10 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Standard (General Code Compliance)</li><li>b. Public Awareness Effectiveness Reviews</li><li>c. Drug and Alcohol</li><li>d. Control Room Management</li><li>e. Part 193 LNG Inspections</li><li>f. Construction</li><li>g. OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)</li><li>h. IMP/DIMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements)</li></ul>  |    |    |

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. The program utilizes the IA application for conducting most inspection types except construction. PHMSA Form 3.1.11 used for conducting D&A inspections. Inspections results are thoroughly documented with sufficient notes to support result findings.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Is state verifying operators OQ programs are up to date? This should include verification of any plan updates and that persons performing covered tasks (including contractors) are properly qualified and requalified at intervals established in the operator's plan. 49 CFR 192 Part N<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. The program has reviewed OQ plans within the timeframes established. Protocol 9 inspections are conducted during LDC annual reviews, standard, and construction inspections.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Is state verifying operator's integrity management Programs (IMP and DIMP)? This should include a review of plans, along with monitoring progress. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operator's plan(s). 49 CFR 192 Subpart P<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Are the state's largest operator(s) plans being reviewed annually?</li><li>b. Are states verifying with operators any plastic pipe and components that have shown a record of defects/leaks and mitigating those through DIMP plan?</li></ul>                              |   |   |

- c. Are the states verifying operators are including low pressure distribution systems in their threat analysis?

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The program conducts a review annually with the state's four LDC's consisting in part a review of the operator's DIMP/TIMP plan revisions, plan effectiveness evaluation, remediation work performed the prior year and work anticipated for the coming year. Operators are required to file annual reports detailing all construction defects and material failures which result in leakage. Submissions are reviewed as part of the operator Annual Review process. All low pressure distribution has been eliminated in WA.

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | Did the state review the following (these items are NTSB recommendations to PHMSA that have been deemed acceptable response based on PHMSA reviewing these items during the evaluation process): Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1   | 2 | 2 |
|   | <p>a. Operator procedures for determining if exposed cast iron pipe was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary remedial action was taken;</p> <p>b. Operator procedures for surveillance of cast iron pipelines, including appropriate action resulting from tracking circumferential cracking failures, study of leakage history, or other unusual operating maintenance condition? (Note: See GPTC Appendix G-18 for guidance);</p> <p>c. Operator emergency response procedures for leaks caused by excavation damage near buildings and determine whether the procedures adequately address the possibility of multiple leaks and underground migration of gas into nearby buildings Refer to 4/12/01 letter from PHMSA in response to NTSB recommendation P-00-20 and P-00-21;</p> <p>d. Operator records of previous accidents and failures including reported third-party damage and leak response to ensure appropriate operator response as required by 192.617;</p> <p>e. Directional drilling/boring procedures of each pipeline operator or its contractor to determine if they include actions to protect their facilities from the dangers posed by drilling and other trench less technologies;</p> <p>f. Operator procedures for considering low pressure distribution systems in threat analysis?</p> <p>g. Operator compliance with state and federal regulations for regulators located inside buildings?</p> |   |   |

Evaluator Notes:

- a & b - No CI remaining in WA  
c & d - Reviewed under UTC supplemental Form C - Records Review and Field Inspection.  
e & f - Reviewed under IA Procedural Questions PD.OC.PDPROGRAM.P and GDIM.RA.INFOCONSIDERED.P  
g. Content updates to IA inspections forms to bring focus to inside regulators/meter installations occurring June 24, 2020

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | Did the State verify Operators took appropriate action regarding advisory bulletins issued since the last evaluation? (Advisory Bulletins Current Year)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Question is incorporated into the Operator Annual Review Checklist along with a link to the PHMSA web site. Also addressed during gas operator meetings.

- |   |   |    |    |
|---|---|----|----|
| 7 | (Compliance Activities) Did the state follow compliance procedures (from discovery to resolution) and adequately document all probable violations, including what resolution or further course of action is needed to gain compliance? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9 | 10 | 10 |
|   | <p>a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system?</p> <p>b. Were probable violations documented properly?</p> <p>c. Resolve probable violations</p> <p>d. Routinely review progress of probable violations</p>                    |    |    |



- e. Did state issue compliance actions for all probable violations discovered?
- f. Can state demonstrate fining authority for pipeline safety violations?
- g. Does Program Manager review, approve and monitor all compliance actions?  
(note: Program Manager or Senior Official should sign any NOPV or related enforcement action)
- h. Did state compliance actions give reasonable due process to all parties?  
Including "show cause" hearing, if necessary.
- i. Within 30 days, conduct a post-inspection briefing with the owner or operator outlining any concerns
- j. Within 90 days, to the extent practicable, provide the owner or operator with written preliminary findings of the inspection. (Incident investigations do not need to meet 30/90-day requirement)

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. All non-compliance letters reviewed. Certain inspections conducted over several months so NC letters covered the entire inspection period. According to PM the operator is notified immediately and issues discussed with management at the time a PV identified. Suggested staff document those communications in inspection reports and final NC letters. No compliance letters exceeded the 90 day requirement. The program has demonstrated it's fining authority having most recently collected civil penalties in CY2017.

- |          |  |    |    |
|----------|--|----|----|
| <b>8</b> | (Incident Investigations) Were all incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, with conclusions and recommendations?<br>Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9 | 10 | 10 |
|----------|--|----|----|
- a. Does state have adequate mechanism to receive and respond to operator reports of incidents, including after-hours reports?
  - b. Did state keep adequate records of Incident/Accident notifications received?
  - c. If onsite investigation was not made, did the state obtain sufficient information from the operator and/or by means to determine the facts to support the decision not to go on site?
  - d. Were onsite observations documented?
  - e. Were contributing factors documented?
  - f. Were recommendations to prevent recurrences, where appropriate, documented?
  - g. Did state initiate compliance action for any violations found during any incident/accident investigation?
  - h. Did state assist Region Office or Accident Investigation Division (AID) by taking appropriate follow-up actions related to the operator incident reports to ensure accuracy and final report has been received by PHMSA?
  - i. Does state share any lessons learned from incidents/accidents?

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. a. Pipeline operators contact the 24-Hr Emergency Response line which is then directed to the on-call engineer. b. Yes. Reviewed the four incident reports generated. Reports were detailed and made good use of photographs. c. All reportables were responded to. d & e. Yes. g. Yes, when applicable. h. The program maintains communications with PHMSA AID and Western Region offices during reportable events. I. Yes, during seminars and annual NAPSRS meetings.

- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>9</b> | Did state respond to Chairman's letter on previous evaluation within 60 days and correct or address any noted deficiencies? (If necessary) Chapter 8.1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

**Evaluator Notes:**

The program did not have any point deductions. No response required.

- |           |   |           |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| <b>10</b> | Did State conduct or participate in pipeline safety training session or seminar in Past 3 Years? Chapter 8.5<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|

**Evaluator Notes:**

Operator seminars conducted annually.

- 11** Has state confirmed transmission operators have submitted information into NPMS database along with changes made after original submission? Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Question #2 on the program's "Operator Annual Review Checklist". Reviewed all completed GT operator reviews conducted in CY2019.

- 12** Does the state have a mechanism for communicating with stakeholders - other than state pipeline safety seminar? (This should include making enforcement cases available to public). 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The UTC web site provides information and links to other external resources including Call Before You Dig, State and Federal Pipeline Safety Rules, Pipeline News, Completed inspection reports, forms and compliance letters, Failure Investigation reports, enforcement action information, and the Citizens Committee on Pipeline Safety.

- 13** Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

No intrastate SRCR's reported in CY2019.

- 14** Was the State responsive to: 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5  
a. Surveys or information requests from NAPSRS or PHMSA;  
b. Operator IM notifications; and  
c. PHMSA Work Management system tasks?

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Reviewed PM emails to NAPSRS in response to certain requests for data. NAPSRS surveys typically conducted via Survey Monkey.

- 15** If the State has issued any waivers/special permits for any operator, has the state verified conditions of those waivers/special permits are being met? This should include having the operator amend procedures where appropriate. 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Last waiver issued in 2016 (2016-0061) regarding construction of a covered impounding system at a LNG facility currently being built in Tacoma.

- 16** Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Documentation and other supporting records readily available.

- 17** Discussion with State on accuracy of inspection day information submitted into State Inspection Day Calculation Tool (SICT). Has the state updated SICT data? 3 3  
Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2

Evaluator Notes:

The program far exceeded it's minimum field day requirement in 2019. Just in construction days the program was at 87% of the minimum number of SICT estimated field days. The PM may want to consider re-evaluating the total estimated number of minimum number of field days as a result.

- 18** Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site.\ <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm?nocache=4805> Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Discussed performance metrics. The WA-UTC metrics appeared to be at reasonable performance levels. Excavation damages per 1000 tickets (requested) continues to trend down since 2015 averaging approximately 3.0 damages in CY2019. Inspection days per 1000 miles up from CY2018 (14 days) averaging approximately 15 days in CY2019. Inspector Qualification core training and five year retention at 90%. Number of total leaks eliminated/repaired averaging 90 for CY2019. CI and Bare Steel has been eliminated. Large operators now working to identify and replace existing Aldyl-A PE pipe.

---

- 19** Did the state encourage and promote operator implementation of Pipeline Safety Management Systems (PSMS), or API RP 1173? This holistic approach to improving pipeline safety includes the identification, prevention and remediation of safety hazards. Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points
- a. <https://pipelinesms.org/>
  - b. Reference AGA recommendation to members May 20, 2019

Evaluator Notes:

The program does promote implementation of PSMS via operator meetings and as part of the Operator Annual Reviews (Refer to OAR Checklist).

---

- 20** General Comments: Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

D.1 Five Point deduction for exceeding the 5 year interval for D&A inspections conducted on operators Puget Sound Energy, Cascade Natural Gas, Northwest Natural, Georgia-Pacific, Nippon Dynawave Packaging, J.R. Simplot and Cardinal FG. Minimum intervals exceeded by over 1 year in all cases. The program had identified the deficiency and has since performed the necessary full D&A plan reviews.

---

Total points scored for this section: 45  
Total possible points for this section: 50



## PART E - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative (enter specifics into the comments box below) Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

- What type of inspection(s) did the state inspector conduct during the field portion of the state evaluation? (i.e. Standard, Construction, IMP, etc)
- When was the unit inspected last?
- Was pipeline operator or representative present during inspection?
- Effort should be made to observe newest state inspector with least experience

### Evaluator Notes:

Observed a standard field inspection of Puget Sound Energy's gas distribution pressure regulating facilities in Thurston & Lewis counties. Last inspected in 4/2017. Yes, the operator was notified of this inspection and was represented. Inspector D. Ritter has been with the UTC since 2011.

- 2 Did the inspector use an appropriate inspection form/checklist and was the form/checklist used as a guide for the inspection? (New regulations shall be incorporated) 2 2
- Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

### Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The inspector utilized the IA application selecting the WA-UTC protocol question set to document inspection results.

- 3 Did the inspector adequately review the following during the inspection 10 10
- Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9

- Procedures (were the inspector's questions of the operator adequate to determine compliance?)
- Records (did the inspector adequately review trends and ask in-depth questions?)
- Field Activities/Facilities (did inspector ensure that procedures were being followed, including ensuring that properly calibrated equipment was used and OQ's were acceptable?)
- Other (please comment)
- Was the inspection of adequate length to properly perform the inspection?

### Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Inspector conducted a procedure and records review during remote web sessions and email prior to conducting facility field visits. The inspector had copies of operator procedures during site visits. Site visits selected based on the records review and a random selection of facilities. Field inspections were of appropriate length to determine compliance.

- 4 From your observation did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Evaluator will document reasons if unacceptable) 2 2
- Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

### Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Inspector demonstrated good knowledge of regulations and program specifics.

- 5 Did the inspector conduct an exit interview, including identifying probable violations? (If inspection is not totally completed the interview should be based on areas covered during time of field evaluation) 1 1
- Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

### Evaluator Notes:

Inspection has not been completed so a formal exit has not been performed. Mr. Ritter did conduct a end of day status update with the operator. No issues were identified during this evaluation.

- 6 Was inspection performed in a safe, positive, and constructive manner ? Info Only Info Only
- Info Only = No Points
- No unsafe acts should be performed during inspection by the state inspector

- b. What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed)
- c. Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices)
- d. Other

Evaluator Notes:

No unsafe acts were observed. The field inspection covered the annual maintenance for regulator stations and the general condition of regulator station facilities including security, signage, and pipe to soil interfaces. The inspector conducted himself in a courteous and professional manner.

7 General Comments:  
Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

No issues identified. No point deductions under Part E.

Total points scored for this section: 15  
Total possible points for this section: 15



**PART F - Damage prevention and Annual report analysis****Points(MAX) Score**

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>1</b> | Has the state reviewed Operator Annual reports, along with Incident/Accident reports, for accuracy and analyzed data for trends and operator issues.<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes. The UTC performs a Operator Annual Review utilizing a customized checklist to perform this task. Information taken from these reviews are incorporated into the programs risk-based inspection scheduling model. The program began a project this Spring to automate their Annual Review Checklist. The program also discuss detailed inspection/incident trends during their annual operator seminar.

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <b>2</b> | Has the state verified that the operators analyze excavation damages for the purpose of determining root causes and minimizing the possibility of a recurrence? (? 192.617)<br>Has the state verified that the operators have appropriately identified excavators who have repeatedly violated one-call laws and damaged their facilities. Have the operators taken steps to mitigate that risks? (? 192.1007)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

**Evaluator Notes:**

This is covered in their Annual Review Checklist Damage Prevention Data section, with additional elements from Q1 and Q2.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <b>3</b> | Has the state reviewed the operator's annual report pertaining to Part D ? Excavation Damage?<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Is the information complete and accurate with root cause numbers?</li><li>b. Has the state evaluated the causes for the damages listed under "One-Call Notification Practices Not Sufficient" (Part D.1.a.)?</li><li>c. Has the state evaluated the causes for the damages listed under "Locating Practices Not Sufficient" (Part D.1.b)? For each operator, does the state review the following?</li><li>d. Is the operator or its locating contractor(s) qualified and following written procedures for locating and marking facilities?</li><li>e. Is the operator appropriately requalifying locators to address performance deficiencies?</li><li>f. What is the number of damages resulting from mismarks?</li><li>g. What is the number of damages resulting from not locating within time requirements (no-shows)?</li><li>h. Is the operator appropriately addressing discovered mapping errors resulting in excavation damages?</li><li>i. Are mapping corrections timely and according to written procedures?</li><li>j. Has the state evaluated the causes for the damages listed under "Excavation Practices Not Sufficient" (Part D.1.c.)?</li></ol> | 4 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

**Evaluator Notes:**

Items a thru j covered in the program's Annual Review Checklist Damage Prevention Data section, with additional elements from Q1 and Q2. Also addressed during annual operator seminar.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>4</b> | Has the agency or another organization within the state collected data and evaluated trends on the number of pipeline damages per 1,000 locate requests?<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. What stakeholder group is causing the highest number of damages to the pipelines? Operator, contractor, locating company or public.</li><li>b. Has the state verified the operator is appropriately focusing damage prevention education and training to stakeholders causing the most damages?</li><li>c. Has the state evaluated which of the following best describes the reason for the excavation damages; i.e., operator or contractor not following written procedures, failure to maintain marks, failure to support exposed facilities, failure to use hand tools were required, failure to test-hole (pot hole), improper backfilling practices, failure to maintain clearance or insufficient excavation practices.</li></ol> | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

- d. Has the state verified the operator is appropriately focusing damage prevention education and training to address the causes of excavation damages?

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Mandatory reporting via the UTC's Virtual DIRT. Aggregated data is used to identify needs and trends. Results are posted on the UTC web site. This data and trending is also reflected on the Annual Review Checklist, and presented during their annual operator seminar. Outside of the annual review process, the program routinely works with operators when Annual Reports and DIRT reports are vague or do not demonstrate the level of detail they want from operators. Also present detailed trending at the annual operators meeting/seminar

---

5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No issues identified. No point deductions.

---

Total points scored for this section: 4  
Total possible points for this section: 4



## PART G - Interstate Agent/Agreement States

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Were all inspections of interstate pipelines conducted using the Inspection Assistant program for documenting inspections. Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Yes WA-UTC uses IA to conduct all interstate inspections.

- 2 If inspections were conducted independent of a PHMSA team inspection was notice of all identified probable violations provided to PHMSA within 60 days. Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the probable violations were reported to PHMSA. PHMSA wrote the enforcement letters and sent them out, worked in conjunction with the WA-UTC inspector. All operators complied and no enforcement cases were contested. All cases opened in 2019 have been closed: warning letter (1), NOPV-CO (1), NOA (1).

- 3 If inspections were conducted independent of a PHMSA team inspection was PHMSA immediately notified of conditions which may pose an immediate safety hazard to the public or environment? Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No immediate threat conditions were discovered, that would have needed to be reported.

- 4 If inspections were conducted independent of a PHMSA team inspection did the state coordinate with PHMSA if inspections not were not included in the PHMSA Inspection Work Plan? Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, WA-UTC provided PHMSA their inspection plan for the year and notified of additional inspections conducted. PHMSA inspector was added to all inspections in IA as a supervisor.

- 5 Did the state take direction from and cooperate with PHMSA for all incident investigations conducted on interstate pipelines? Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No issues identified. The UTC has historically worked closely with PHMSA - Western Region and the Accident Investigation Division during incidents.

- 6 General Comments: Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Answers to questions G-1 thru 5 provided by PHMSA Western Region and AID.

Total points scored for this section: 0  
Total possible points for this section: 0