



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2020 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

NEW JERSEY BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

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



2020 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2020

Gas

State Agency: New Jersey

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 10/18/2021 - 10/20/2021

Agency Representative: Mr. Juan Urena
Acting Program Manager

PHMSA Representative: Clint Stephens
State Liaison

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

Name/Title: Mr. Joseph L. Fiordaliso, President
Agency: New Jersey Board of Public Utilities
Address: 44 So. Clinton Ave.
City/State/Zip: Trenton, NJ 08625-0350

Rating:

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

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 2020 (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
10
0

0
14
10
48
15
10
0

TOTALS

100 97

State Rating **97.0**

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Were the following Progress Report Items accurate? (*items not scored on progress report) 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:

- 1a. The information in Attachment 1 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1b. The information was reviewed in NJ InfoShare database and seems accurate in Attachment 2 of Progress Report.
- 1c. The information in Attachment 3 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1d. The information was reviewed in PDM and Attachment 4 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1e. The information in Attachment 5 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1f. The information in Attachment 6 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1g. The information was reviewed in TQ Blackboard and Attachment 7 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1h. The information in Attachment 8 of Progress Report seems accurate.
- 1i. The information in Attachment 10 of Progress Report seems accurate.

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
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 5 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Standard Inspections, which include Drug/Alcohol, CRM and Public Awareness Effectiveness Inspectionsb. TIMP and DIMP Inspections (reviewing largest operator(s) plans annually)c. OQ Inspectionsd. Damage Prevention Inspectionse. On-Site Operator Trainingf. Construction Inspections (annual efforts)g. LNG Inspections | | |

Evaluator Notes:

The procedures were in Section 7.4 ? Inspection Procedures, pages 17 ? 20.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 4 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Length of time since last inspectionb. Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities)c. Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction)d. Locations of operator's inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic area, Population Centers, etc.)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)f. Are inspection units broken down appropriately? | | |

Evaluator Notes:

The procedures were in Section 7.2 ? Inspection Priorities, page 16.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2 | 3 | 2 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identifiedb. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdownsc. Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Procedures were in Section ? Post-Inspection Evaluation and Enforcement, pages 21-23. The procedures did not contain notifying an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified. Recommend add more detail on the review procedure for progress of compliance actions. Recommend adding procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations.

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

Procedure were in Section 9 ? Incident Investigation Procedures, pages 23-26.

5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The following issue was identified in Part B of the evaluation:

- 1) The NJBPU operations procedures did not contain a process regarding closing outstanding probable violations.

Total points scored for this section: 14
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
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 5 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Completion of Required OQ Training before conducting inspection as leadb. Completion of Required DIMP/IMP Training before conducting inspection as leadc. Completion of Required LNG Training before conducting inspection as leadd. Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/program managere. Note any outside training completedf. Verify inspector has obtained minimum qualifications to lead any applicable standard inspection as the lead inspector (Reference State Guidelines Section 4.3.1) | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Andre Moses, Juan Urena, and Eric Weaver have completed Root Cause Course, and are qualified to lead all inspection types. They have a waiver in place for the ECDA course, to lead IM inspections. No issues.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 5 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The state pipeline safety manager indicated adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations.

- | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 3 | General Comments:
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

There were no issues identified in Part C of the program evaluation.

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
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 3 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Standard (General Code Compliance)b. Public Awareness Effectiveness Reviewsc. Drug and Alcohold. Control Room Managemente. Part 193 LNG Inspectionsf. Construction (did state achieve 20% of total inspection person-days?)g. OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)h. IMP/DIMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements) | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed inspection reports intervals for Elizabethtown Gas Co. ? Standard (GS-3 2/11/20, 4/9/19, & 4/2/19), PA (No inspection date), D&A (10/9/14 past due), Construction (12/22/20 & 7/28/20), OQ (12/11/19 & 5/16/14), DIMP (12/19/19 & 9/16/14); Public Service Electric & Gas ? Standard (GS-2 corrosion 2/26/20 & NJBPU looking for), PA (No inspection date), D&A (5/28/15 past due), CRM (12/11/13 past due), Construction (12/2/20 & 11/23/20), OQ (12/28/18 & 3/4/15), IM (12/20/17); New Jersey Natural Gas Co. ? LNG Standard (9/15/21 & 11/28/18), PA (No inspection date), CRM (2013 date not in system - past due), Construction (10/28/20 & 10/13/20), OQ (11/28/18); Arbor Hills ? Standard, PA, OQ, DIMP (12/19/17 past due), Billmar Reality Co. ? Standard, PA, OQ, DIMP (12/12/17 past due), Boonton H/A ? Standard, PA, OQ, DIMP (11/8/18), Garfield H/A ? Standard, PA, OQ, DIMP (12/20/18), Harrogate Inc. ? Standard, PA, OQ, DIMP (12/17/18), and Troy Hills Village Apts. - Standard, PA, OQ, DIMP (12/16/19). The NJBPU had inspection types due in CY 2020, but due to restrictions by the State of New Jersey and the pipeline operators, these inspections did not meet the inspection intervals.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|----|
| 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?
Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9 | 10 | 10 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Standard (General Code Compliance)b. Public Awareness Effectiveness Reviewsc. Drug and Alcohold. Control Room Managemente. Part 193 LNG Inspectionsf. Constructiong. OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)h. IMP/DIMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements) | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed inspection reports for Elizabethtown Gas Co. ? Standard (GS-3 2/11/20), Public Service Electric & Gas ? Standard (GS-2 corrosion 2/26/20) and Construction (11/23/20); and New Jersey Natural Gas Co. ? Construction (10/28/20). All forms covered code requirements and all applicable portions of inspection forms were complete. There were no issues.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 3 | Is state verifying monitoring (Protocol 9/Form15) of operators OQ programs? 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
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU did not perform any OQ inspections in CY 2020 because they were not due based on inspection intervals.

- 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 into account program review and updates of operator's plan(s). 49 CFR 192 Subpart P 2 2
- Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1
- a. Are the state's largest operator(s) plans being reviewed annually to ensure they are completing the full cycle of the DIMP/IMP process?
 - 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?
 - c. Are the states verifying operators are including low pressure distribution systems in their threat analysis?

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU did not perform any IMP/DIMP inspections in CY 2020 because they were not due based on inspection intervals. The quarterly meetings that the LDC operators host concerning regulatory items was not held in CY 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions.

- 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 2 2
- Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1
- a. Operator procedures for determining if exposed cast iron pipe was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary remedial action was taken;
 - 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);
 - 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;
 - 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;
 - 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;
 - f. Operator procedures for considering low pressure distribution systems in threat analysis?
 - g. Operator compliance with state and federal regulations for regulators located inside buildings?

Evaluator Notes:

- 5a. This item is listed in NJBPU Form GS-2 on page 2. NJBPU also added this question to the construction inspection forms, GS-9-ST & GS-9-PL.
- 5b. This item is listed in NJBPU Form GS-3 page 1, under B 4.
- 5c. This item is listed in NJ BPU Form GS-3 on page 2, B 8 (7).
- 5d. This item is listed in NJBPU Form GS-3 on page 3, B10.
- 5e. This is accomplished by New Jersey Administrative Code Section 14:7-1.25 and is included in each operator's construction procedures manual.
- 5f. The NJBPU has been discussing low pressure distribution systems in their DIMP inspections as being included in the threat analysis. This is included in form GS-35 inspection form, question 4.
- 5g. The NJBPU has been discussing with operators about having regulators located outside of buildings. There are numerous meter sets inside buildings in New Jersey, so an email was sent to each operator on 8/28/20 pertaining to this issue.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU has included discussion with operators about ADBs in the DIMP inspections. Also, ADBs are sent to the operators through email.

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 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
Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9 | 10 | 10 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system?b. Were probable violations documented properly?c. Resolve probable violationsd. Routinely review progress of probable violationse. 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 concernsj. 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:

The NJBPU had no probable violations issued in CY 2020.

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 8 | (Incident Investigations) Were all federally reportable incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, with conclusions and recommendations?
Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9 | 10 | 10 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">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:

The NJBPU investigated all federally reportable incidents, thoroughly documented any issues found. There were two reportable incidents in CY 2020 that are still open and waiting for the operator to submit its final report with root cause. The onsite observation were documented, as well as contributing factors. There were no compliance actions initiated based on the incident investigation. The NJBPU assisted AID by have the operator correct its incident report. There were no issues.

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 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
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Chair letter sent on November 9, 2020; response received on January 4, 2021. No issues.

- 10** Did State conduct or participate in pipeline safety training session or seminar in Past 3 Years? Chapter 8.5 Info Only Info Only
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU conducted the last pipeline safety seminar in 2019.

- 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:

This information is included in the GS-3 inspection form, section E, #4, page 9.

- 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:

The NJBPU is communicating with its stakeholder through the quarterly LDC operator and public hearings pertaining to new construction and penalty cases. Contact information for pipeline safety staff is on the state website.

- 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:

There are no open SRC Reports.

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

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Yes, the NJBPU was responsive to surveys or information requests from NAPSRS and/or PHMSA.
b. There were no WMS tasks for CY 2020.

- 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:

The NJBPU has not issued any waivers/special permits for any operators.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Pipeline files were well-organized and accessible in the Info-Share database.

- 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:

Yes. The NJBPU has updated SICT data.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed performance metrics with NJBPU:

- ? Damage Prevention Program ? Slight increase in gas distribution excavation damages per 1,000 tickets from 2019 to 2020.
- ? Inspection Activity - Big decrease inspection days per 1,000-mile gas pipelines from 2019 to 2020. Big decrease in inspection days for MMP/LPG units from 2018 to 2020.
- ? Inspector Qualification ? Decrease in % staff with core training from 2018 to 2020.
- ? Leak Management ? Total leaks eliminated/repaired per 1,000 miles; hazardous leaks eliminated/repaired per 1,000 miles; and leaks scheduled for repair at end of year per 1,000 miles for gas distribution systems have decreased from 2018 to 2020.

-
- 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:

New Jersey Natural Gas is currently utilizing PSMS and have the framework in place. Currently, looking to improve the system. The other larger operators have staff that are being trained to use and implement PSMS for their companies. Suggest the NJBPU continue to discuss with the larger operators on their plan to implement to PSMS.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The following issue was identified in Part of the program evaluation:

- 1) The NJBPU did not inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with the time intervals established in their written procedures. The NJBPU stated this was due to by the State of New Jersey and the pipeline operators.

Total points scored for this section: 48
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:

Operator: Elizabethtown Gas Co.

Inspector(s): Andre Moses(L) and Mehnaz Moon

Location: Perth Amboy, NJ

Date: October 20, 2021

PHMSA Rep.: Clint Stephens

The inspectors conducted a construction inspection. Replacing 4" CI pipe and installing 6" plastic main.

- 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:

The inspector used the GS-9 PL construction form as a guide for the inspection.

- 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:

The inspectors observed the operator perform butt fusion of the 6" PE pipe. The inspectors reviewed OQ records for the person performing plastic fusion. The inspectors reviewed plastic pipe fusion procedures.

- 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:

From my observation, the lead inspector had adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations.

- 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:

The inspector did not conduct an exit interview. The construction project and the task being performed during the evaluation were not complete at that time.

- 6 Was inspection performed in a safe, positive, and constructive manner ? Info Only Info Only
Info Only = No Points
- a. 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:

The inspection was performed in a safe, positive, and constructive manner. The inspectors observed plastic pipe butt fusion, installing tracer wire, and digging of the trench.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There were no issues identified in Part E of the program evaluation.

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**

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

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU has reviewed operator annual report, along with incident/accident reports, for accuracy and analyzed data for trends and operator issues.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | 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)
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)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU has verified that the operators analyze excavation damages for the purpose of determining root causes and minimizing the possibility of recurrence. The operators must report to the Bureau of One-Call those excavators who repeatedly damage their facilities. The NJBPU has discussed with the operators during the DIMP inspections the ways the steps the operator has taken to mitigate those risks.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU is reviewing the operator's annual reports and evaluating causes for the damages listed under "one-Call Notification Not Sufficient", "Locating Practices Not Sufficient", and "Excavation Practices Not Sufficient". The New Jersey One Call Center sponsors a Damage Prevention Seminar for the public and excavators monthly. The information for reasons of excavation damages is discussed and recorded in the GS-35 DIMP inspection form.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 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?
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. What stakeholder group is causing the highest number of damages to the pipelines? Operator, contractor, locating company or public.b. Has the state verified the operator is appropriately focusing damage prevention education and training to stakeholders causing the most damages? | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

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

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU has collected data and evaluated trends on the number of pipeline damages per 1,000 locate requests. The New Jersey One Call Center host a Damage Prevention Seminar for the public and excavators monthly. The information for reasons of excavation damages is discussed and recorded in the GS-35 DIMP inspection form.

5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

There were no issues identified in Part F of the program evaluation.

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



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:

The NJBPU is not an interstate agent on behalf of PHMSA.

- 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:

The NJBPU is not an interstate agent on behalf of PHMSA.

- 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:

The NJBPU is not an interstate agent on behalf of PHMSA.

- 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:

The NJBPU is not an interstate agent on behalf of PHMSA.

- 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:

The NJBPU is not an interstate agent on behalf of PHMSA.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The NJBPU is not an interstate agent on behalf of PHMSA.

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