



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

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

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: Texas

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 10/04/2021 - 10/29/2021

Agency Representative: Stephanie Weidman, Carrie Ebbinghaus, Kendall Smith

PHMSA Representative: Michael Thompson, David Lykken, Clint Stephens

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

Name/Title: Wayne Christian, Chairman

Agency: Railroad Commission of Texas

Address: 1701 N. Congress

City/State/Zip: Austin, Texas 78701

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	0
15	15
10	10
50	43
15	15
10	10
0	0

TOTALS

100 93

State Rating **93.0**

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:

- a. Number of operators does not correspond to Annual Reports submitted to PHMSA. Need to verify operators submit annual reports and assure PHMSA operators with annual reports are in the RRC operator list.
 - b. Reviewed TX RRC person days data provided and data seems to be accurate.
 - c. Number of operators does not correspond to Annual Reports submitted to PHMSA. Need to verify operators submit annual reports and assure PHMSA operators with annual reports are in the RRC operator list.
 - d. Verified reportable incidents in PDM with Attachment 4. There were no issues identified.
 - e. Verified compliance actions submitted on Attachment 5.
 - f. TX RRC keeps all records electronically in their PES database.
 - g. Reviewed qualifications and verified with Blackboard. No issues identified.
- The RRC is on a 3 year waiver due to growth on the Category Qualification levels. Currently they are below the PHMSA required category level. Will need to qualify inspectors in the near future to avoid future point deductions.
- h. TX RRC has adopted all the regulations within the 2 year requirement.
 - I. TX RRC listed their planned and past performance activities and damage prevention initiatives.

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



- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 Inspections b. TIMP and DIMP Inspections (reviewing largest operator(s) plans annually) c. OQ Inspections d. Damage Prevention Inspections e. On-Site Operator Training f. Construction Inspections (annual efforts) g. LNG Inspections | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Section 3 addresses pre and post inspection activities for each type of inspection.

a. Yes, Section 3 has comprehensive inspection procedures which give guidance to inspectors on conducting comprehensive procedures.

b. Yes Section 6.1 and 6.2 has IMP and DIMP inspection procedures which give guidance to inspectors on how to conduct inspections. The procedures include pre and post inspection activities.

c. Yes Section 6.3 has OQ inspection procedures which give guidance to inspectors on how to conduct inspections. The procedures include pre and post inspection activities.

d. Yes Section 6.7 has Damage Prevention inspection procedures which give guidance to inspectors on how to conduct inspections. The procedures include pre and post inspection activities.

e. Section 5 has On-Site Training procedures which includes documentation of training on PES.

f. Section 6.6 which gives guidance to inspectors on how to conduct construction inspections.

g. Section 3.3.12 mentions LNG facility 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
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 4 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Length of time since last inspection b. 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:

Yes, Section 3 has a risk based inspection priority. PES generates an inspection schedule each calendar year based on risk factors for each system. The risk factors include; previous violations, customer count, leaks, type of pipe, inspection frequency, incidents, HCAs, class location and non evaluated systems. Inspection units are broken down into systems which vary in size.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 3 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified b. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns c. Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Section 3.6, 4 and 11 has procedure to notify operator of alleged violations. In 3.2.2 it states that contact must be an officer of the company. In 3.4 it states the RRC sends a executive closing summary to the operator when they close out an inspection.

-
- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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 |
|----------|--|---|---|
- a. Mechanism to receive, record, and respond to operator reports of incidents, including after-hours reports
 - 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:

- A. Section 7 has On-Call procedures that include after hours response. RRC inspectors rotate on call duties. During operating hours, the RRC Accident Coordinator receives calls and routes them to the on-call inspector.
 - B. Section 7.2.3 shows the requirements for an on-site investigation. The procedure states that all incidents that meet their requirements must have an on-site investigation on both regulated intrastate and non-regulated intrastate pipelines.
-

- | | | | |
|----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 5 | General Comments: | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
- Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

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
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:

- A. Yes lead inspectors are qualified to conduct inspections. The Program Manager has procedure to allow inspectors be qualified to conduct comprehensive inspections without completing the required T&Q courses.
- B. Yes, verified all lead inspectors are qualified to lead IMP inspections.
- C. Yes, there are RRC inspectors who have completed the Root Cause training course.
- D. RRC inspectors attend outside training.
- E. Verified during records review that all inspectors are qualified before leading any type of inspection.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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 Program Manager has been with the RRC for awhile and has completed T&Q courses. She demonstrates knowledge of the PHMSA program and regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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 <ol style="list-style-type: none">Standard (General Code Compliance)Public Awareness Effectiveness ReviewsDrug and AlcoholControl Room ManagementPart 193 LNG InspectionsConstruction (did state achieve 20% of total inspection person-days?)OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)IMP/DIMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements) | 5 | 0 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

A review of the inspections conducted on operators listed in the "Random Operators List" for CY2020 showed that not all types of inspections had been conducted at the intervals listed in the TXRRC procedures. Although many operators had Comprehensive inspections conducted in the prescribed intervals, many specialized inspections had only recent inspection dates with few prior dates found.

The TXRRC continues to make progress in this area with their inspection planning.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|----|
| 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none">Standard (General Code Compliance)Public Awareness Effectiveness ReviewsDrug and AlcoholControl Room ManagementPart 193 LNG InspectionsConstructionOQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)IMP/DIMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements) | 10 | 10 |
|----------|--|----|----|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the TXRRC utilizes a PHMSA equivalent form for all of their inspections that cover all the applicable code sections. Reviewed inspection reports to verify that inspectors are completing all applicable portions of the inspection. There were no issues identified.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The RRC is has not been verifying operators OQ Program plans up to date and that persons performing covered tasks are properly qualified and re-qualified at intervals established in the operators plan. A loss of one point

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 <ol style="list-style-type: none">Are the state's largest operator(s) plans being reviewed annually to ensure they are completing the full cycle of the DIMP/IMP process? | 2 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

- 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 RRC is not reviewing all operator DIMP and IMP to verify programs are meeting the regulations. It was also discussed that the TXRRC needs to conduct field verification inspections while operators are conducting assessments. A loss of 1 point

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 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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:

Yes, the TX RRC PES form has incorporated the NTSB recommendations and ADB questions.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the TX RRC PES form has incorporated the NTSB recommendations and ADB questions.

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 violations d. Routinely review progress of probable violations 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:

The TXRRC has made improvements in this area by setting in place procedures and assigning responsibilities to inspectors. However, in reviewing records it was noted that there are some cases that have taken extended time to resolve due to the Covid 19 effect on business, especially on small operators.

The state appears to be issuing compliance actions, they are demonstrating fining authority and due process is no issue.

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:

- a. Yes, The program utilizes a 24-hour notification system which notifies the on-call engineer.
- b. Yes, the program maintains records of operator incident notifications and copies of NRC reports.
- c. On site investigations were conducted on all 23 federally reportable gas incidents.
- d, e, & f. Yes. The program utilizes PHMSA Form 11 and TXRRC Incident Investigation Reports to document on-site observations, contributing factors and recommendations to prevent reoccurrences.
- g. Yes, the program initiated compliance actions where probable violations were identified and routinely reviews progress of PV's. However there are instances where investigations have remained open a year or more before closure.
- h. Yes, the program maintains good communications with AID when necessary.
- I. Yes, during the regional and national NAPSIR conferences.

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:

Yes, Letter mailed out 10/29/2020 and response received on 12/2/2020

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the Texas RRC has conducted safety seminars on an annual basis.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the inspection form addresses the NPMS database changes question.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, website has pipeline safety section which provides information to stakeholders.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed SRCR in WMS and the TX RRC is responding to notifications. All SRCR were reviewed by the RX RRC and most are closed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the RRC responded to surveys by NAPSR and PHMSA

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

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed the 4 existing waivers found on the PHMSA web site. Advised they should contact Jenny Donohue about those that are no longer relevant.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the program files are well organized, however, it is still difficult to track the changes of ownership on some pipelines. This is an area that they will continue to try to improve.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed SICT data with the PM and it seems to be accurate.

TX Gas =
SICT ? 5149
2020 Progress Report ? 9161

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed with PM

- ? Excavation Damages per 1000 Locate Tickets has remained very steady for the past 4-6 years at 3.2 to 3.4 and has risen just a little to the 3.4 level in 2020.
- ? Inspection days per 1000 miles of pipe have increased from 38.54 in 2019 to 42.18 in 2020 good trend.
- ? Inspection days per MMO/LPG have gone up from .66 in 2016 to .89 in 2019. However, the number dropped to .70 in 2020. ?
- ? Inspection days per 1000 miles of liquid pipelines have steadily increased from 40.64 in 2017 to 83.01 in 2020.
- ? Gas & Liquid Inspector core training has improved in 2020, with additional training and 5-year retention staying basically the same as 2019.
- ? Total Gas Distribution System Leaks eliminated per 1000 miles of pipe has dropped a little in 2020, with the number of hazardous leaks repaired going down from 161 in 2019 to 159 in 2020. Scheduled repairs have increased in 2020.
- ? Enforcement Program Evaluation is steady for both 2018 and 2019 for gas and liquid pipelines.

-
- 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:

Discussed at seminar with operators.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D1. A review of the inspections conducted on operators listed in the "Random Operators List" for CY2020 showed that not all types of inspections had been conducted at the intervals listed in the TXRRC procedures. Although many operators had Comprehensive inspections conducted in the prescribed intervals, many specialized inspections had only recent inspection dates with few prior dates found.

The TXRRC continues to make progress in this area with their inspection planning.

A loss of 5 points

D3. The RRC is not reviewing all operator OQ Programs to verify plans are meeting the regulations. nA loss of 1 point

D4. The RRC is not reviewing all operator DIMP and IMP to verify programs are meeting the regulations. It was also discussed that the TXRRC needs to conduct field verification inspections while operators are conducting assessments. A loss of 1 point

Total points scored for this section: 43
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:

Inspection 1 - Evaluator: Don Martin - September 7 - 10

- The inspector, Carlos Jaime, conducted a review of Enmark Operations, Inc.'s O&M and Emergency Procedures (portion of a Standard Gas Transmission Inspection).
- The operator's O&M and Emergency Procedures were last inspected on 4/1/2016.
- Enmark Representative - Jeff Tharpe
- Carlos has been with the Railroad Commission for 3 years and 10 months.

- 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:

Inspection 1 observed by Don Martin

The inspector used the RRC's form 8.1 - Gas Transmission OM&E Evaluation. The form was appropriate. The inspector followed the sequence of questions on the form. The form contains questions to verify the operator has reviewed the latest PHMSA Advisory Bulletins.

- 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:

Inspection 1 observed by Don Martin

- Procedures were the focus of this inspection. The inspector covered all questions on the appropriate form.
- The inspector was effective in asking probing questions to verify compliance with regulations.
- NA - Field activities will be covered in a separate inspection.
- None
- The length of inspection was appropriate for the regulations that were covered.

- 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:

Inspection 1 observed by Don Martin

There were no issues with the inspector's knowledge of the 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:

Inspection 1 observed by Don Martin

The inspector provided an exit briefing with the operator's representative at the end of the inspection on September 9, 2021. The inspector noted that there were two non-compliance issues. One probable violation found that the operator did not have written procedures for all items required by 192.605. The other violation was for a RRC regulation requirement that is more stringent than Part 192.

The inspector provided the next steps in the enforcement process which included a written exit briefing that would be provided immediately to the operator.

-
- 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:

Inspection 1 observed by Don Martin

(a. Due to the Covid pandemic, the inspection was conducted using virtual means.

(b. NA- Field activities will be covered in a separate inspection.

(c. A thorough review with the operator verifying that recent Advisory Bulletins have been considered and acted upon by the operator if applicable.

(d. None

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

Evaluator Notes:

Inspection 1 observed by Don Martin

The inspector conducted a very thorough inspection of the operator's Operation and Maintenance Procedures Manual and Emergency Procedures Manual. The inspector was very professional in the manner he conducted the inspection. No issues were found that resulted in the loss of points.

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 RRC reviews annual and incident reports to complete the yearly risk assessment for their work plan. The RRC needs to assure all operators submit annual reports in order to thoroughly and completed analyze the entire data for trends and 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:

Discussed with the RRC to assure that Part D of the annual reports are reviewed and analyzed for any issues. The RRC provided feedback to PHMSA on current issues related to excavation damages reported on certain operators.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 RRC has a dedicated damage prevention department who analyzes data and provides support to pipeline safety related to excavation damages. Discussed with the RRC the need to review and analyze Part D data provided in Annual Reports. (for gas operators)

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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?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? | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes their damage prevention personnel and 811 collect damage data which includes damages per 1,000 locates. The damage prevention personnel analyze data and encourage the utilization of best practices.

5 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

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 RRC of Texas is NOT an interstate agent

- 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 RRC of Texas is NOT an interstate agent

- 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 RRC of Texas is NOT an interstate agent

- 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 RRC of Texas is NOT an interstate agent

- 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 RRC of Texas is NOT an interstate agent

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

Evaluator Notes:

The RRC of Texas is NOT an interstate agent

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