



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2023 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

Louisiana Department of Energy and Natural Resources

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



2023 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2023
Hazardous Liquid

State Agency: Louisiana

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 04/01/2024 - 04/19/2024

Agency Representative: Steve Giambrone, Director, Pipeline Safety Division
Michael Peikert, Assistant Director, Pipeline Safety Division
Larry Piglia, Conservation Enforcement Specialist

PHMSA Representative: Glynn Blanton, US DOT/PHMSA State Evaluator

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

Name/Title: Benjamin C. Bienvenu, Commissioner
Agency: Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
Address: PO Box 94275
City/State/Zip: Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9275

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 2023 (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	0	0
B	Program Inspection Procedures	15	15
C	State Qualifications	10	10
D	Program Performance	50	50
E	Field Inspections	15	15
F	Damage prevention and Annual report analysis	6	6
TOTALS		96	96
State Rating			100.0

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
- Stats On Operators Data - Progress Report Attachment 1
 - State Inspection Activity Data - Progress Report Attachment 2
 - List of Operators Data - Progress Report Attachment 3*
 - Incidents/Accidents Data - Progress Report Attachment 4*
 - Stats of Compliance Actions Data - Progress Report Attachment 5*
 - List of Records Kept Data - Progress Report Attachment 6 *
 - Staff and TQ Training Data - Progress Report Attachment 7
 - Compliance with Federal Regulations Data - Progress Report Attachment 8
 - Performance and Damage Prevention Question Data - Progress Report Attachment 10*

Evaluator Notes:

- Using PHMSA Portal a review found jurisdictional authority, number of operators 80 and units 98 were less from previous year by one. The number of units inspected was 81 compared to 98 in previous year. No issues.
- Total number of inspection activities were 469 compared to previous year of 502.
- Compared attachment 1 and 3 with information in PHMSA Portal. No issues with data and information.
- Four incidents occurred in CY2023. PHMSA Portal found all four incidents were listed and cause codes were correct.
- Number of carryovers were 27, found 30 violations and corrected 12. The number to be corrected 45. No issues. Number of civil penalties assessed in CY2023 was 15, with dollar amounts of \$11,500. They collected \$6,500 in civil penalties.
- Records appear to reasonable and listed correctly. No issues.
- Total number of staff is 25. However, only a portion of the staff members perform HL inspections. Number of person-years is 3.94. Two inspectors are category I, nineteen category II and four category III. Information on HL qualification was checked and verified in TQ Black Board program. No issues.
- Adopted all federal regulation amendments. Civil penalty amount is \$2000,000/\$2 million. No issues.
- Description is weak, and improvement needed in meeting the nine elements of an effective damage prevention program.

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. IMP Inspectionsc. OQ Inspectionsd. Damage Prevention Inspectionse. On-Site Operator Trainingf. Construction Inspections (annual efforts) | | |

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR) Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 5, Types of Inspections, Sub-Sect 3.1 addresses this item.
- b. LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 5, Types of Inspections, Sub-Sect 4.3 addresses this item.
- c. LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 5, Types of Inspections, Sub-Sect 4.4 addresses this item.
- d. LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 5, Types of Inspections, Sub-Sect 4.6 addresses this item.
- e. LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 5, Types of Inspections, Sub-Sect 4.2 addresses this item.
- f. LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 5, Types of Inspections, Sub-Sect 4.1 addresses this item.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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:

Yes, LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 2, Procedures for determining inspection priorities, address items a thru e. A review of progress report and PHMSA Portal confirm inspection units are broken down correctly.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 identifiedb. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdownsc. Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations | | |

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Yes, LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 10a provides the agency's enforcement procedures for identify steps to be taken when a non-compliance is found to resolution of the non-compliance item(s). Additionally, Title 43 Natural Resources, Subpart 3 Pipeline Safety, Chapter 5 in ?507 provides procedures on Letter of Noncompliance and notification requirements.
- b. Yes, LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, section 5, subpart 4.7, Re-Inspections (Compliance Follow-up), describes this item.
- c. Yes, LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, Section 8, Procedures for Reviewing Inspections

- 4 (Incident/Accident Investigations) Does the state have written procedures to address state actions in the event of an incident/accident? 3 3
Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2
- 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. Yes, LDNR Pipeline Safety Program Guidelines, section 5, subpart 4.5, Investigating Incidents/Accidents describes this item.
- b. Section 9, GUIDELINES FOR FORMING AN ACCIDENT RESPONSE TEAM address this item.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

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 4.3
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 IMP Training before conducting inspection as leadc. Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/program managerd. Note any outside training completede. 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:

Yes, a review of TQ training records show twenty-two inspectors to be qualified liquid inspectors, six have completed Liquid IM training to be the lead on inspections and two have completed the Root Cause course.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Michael Peikert is qualified to perform all types of inspections. He has been with LDNR for 12 years and program manager for seven years. He has demonstrated an excellent knowledge in performing the function of a state program manager.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

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 | 5 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Standard (General Code Compliance)b. Public Awareness Effectiveness Reviewsc. Drug and Alcohold. Control Room Managemente. Construction (did state achieve 20% of total inspection person-days?)f. OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)g. IMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements) | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, randomly generated operators to be checked for this evaluation period consisted of 14 hazardous liquid operators. Using LDNR SONRIS System confirmed each operator was inspected in accordance with LDNR written procedures. Reviewed inspection reports, date of inspections, letters sent to operators, response to violations cited, corrected action taken and found inspections were conducted in accordance with established time intervals not to exceed 5 years.

Listed below are the name of the operators checked for this evaluation period: Chalmette Refining LLC, EnLink Processing Services, Central Louisiana Energy Pipeline Company, Valero Refining ? Meraux LLC, Energy XXI Pipeline LLC, XTO Energy Inc, Pipeline Technology, Exxon Mobile Fuels and Lubricants Company, Buckeye Development & Logistics LLC, Chevron Pipeline Company, Targa Resources Operating LLC and Shell Pipeline Company.

- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 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. Constructionf. OQ (see Question 3 for additional requirements)g. IMP (see Question 4 for additional requirements) | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, using LDNR SONRIS System reviewed 14 hazardous liquid operators' inspection reports and forms. All forms were complete with required information in each section.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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 Part 195 Subpart G
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, using LDNR SONRIS System reviewed the random selected operators and found OQ inspections were conducted and meet the established time frame. LDNR also conducts OQ Protocol 9 during field 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 Part 195 Subpart F & G
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Are the implementation plans of the state's large/largest operators(s) being reviewed annually to ensure they are completing full cycle of the IMP process? | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The largest operators are Enterprise Products Operating LLC, ExxonMobil Pipeline Company, Phillips 66 Pipeline LLC, Targa Resources Operating LLC, EnLink Processing Services LLC, Harvest Midstream Company, Energy Transfer Company and Boardwalk Louisiana Midstream LLC. They are reviewed annually.

-
- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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 |
| | a. Operator records of previous accidents and failures including reported third-party damage and leak response to ensure appropriate operator response as required by 195.402; and | | |
| | b. 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; | | |

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Yes. This item and question are listed in LDNR inspection form on page 9.
- b. Yes. This item and question are listed on page 11 of LDNR Inspection form.

-
- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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, a review of LDNR standard inspection form found a question on this item 192.613(a) on page 10 pertaining to advisory bulletins. Additionally, this information is listed on LDNR website.

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|----|----|
| 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 |
| | 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:

- a. Yes, operators are required annually to file with the agency electronically the name of the company officers. This includes the company emergency & DOT representative, compliance officer, board member and other official (Mayor). The list is used to mail out letters of non-compliance to the company.
- b. Yes, probable violations are documented in their SONRIS System.
- c. Yes, action is taken during inspections to clear violations.
- d. Yes, probable violations are reviewed quarterly.
- e. Yes, seventeen compliance actions were issued in CY2023. Number of civil penalties issued was fifteen and dollars assessed was \$11,500. Dollars collected was \$6,500.
- f. Yes.
- g. Yes, Program Manager reviews with Director the compliance action letter before it is signed by the Director provided the fine amount is \$500 or less. If the penalty is more than \$500, the LDNR Commissioner will sign the letter.

- h. Yes, the operator can request an informal meeting or show cause hearing.
- i. Yes.
- j. Yes, this item is listed in the pipeline procedures.

8 (Accident Investigations) Were all federally reportable incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, with conclusions and recommendations? 10 10

Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9

- 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:

In CY2023 four incidents occurred. Harvest Midstream Company on 01-30-2023, two incidents on Whitney Oil & Gas LLC on 07-31-2023 and 11-29-2023 and ExxonMobil Pipeline Company LLC on 11-13-2023. A review of PHMSA Portal confirmed the incidents and cause codes.

- a. Yes, all incidents are investigated by the agency staff members. The operators are required to notify LDNR within one hour of an incident and the agency has a hot line notification system to inform the staff of the incident.
- b. Yes, a review of LDNR records found notifications are recorded in the Leak Report/Incidents data base.
- c. All incidents are investigated by LDNR.
- d. - f. Yes, a review of LDNR records found a report was performed and completed on each incident.
- g. No violations were found, or compliance action was taken.
- h. Yes, LDNR assisted AID in monitoring their information and investigation until the area was safe. i. LDNR continue to share information on incidents at the NAPS SW meetings.

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 1 1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

No response was required.

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:

They conduct annual seminar with the operator. The most recent was conducted on August 14-17, 2023, in New Orleans, LA

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, this item is located on LDNR standard inspection form page 4.

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, this is accomplished via the state pipeline safety seminar and website. Also, they conduct a small operator meeting to train operators. This meeting was held on November 5-6, 2023, at Vidalia, LA.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 13 | Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.7 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

A review in the portal found four safety related condition reports. LDNR is currently investigating the reports and will be closing the documents when the inspection report has been submitted to the Program Manager.

- | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 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:

Yes, they participated in each survey received from NAPSRS. A check and review of emails confirm their responses. No issues

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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:

A review of PHMSA website found two active waivers. They were PHMSA-2016-0081 Louisiana State Waiver PL Order No. 8379 Maurepas Pipeline, LLC- Waiver Renewal to December 31, 2026, and PHMSA-2022-0013 Louisiana State Waiver PL Order No. 8405 (Amended) Harvest Midstream Company- Waiver to March 3, 2032.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 16 | Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? | Info Only | Info Only |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, a review of office files and database confirm records are maintained correctly.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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:

A review of SICT information and discussion with Program Manager was conducted. Program Manager has a good understanding of the data required each year.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 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:

A review of state program performance metrics found damages per 1,000 was 2.8 and increase from the previous year. Total leaks repaired is down from 255 to 213. The trend shows a downward direction in all leaks.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 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:

During the recent Pipeline Safety Seminar in New Orleans, LA information on this topic was presented by Brian Dresel Energy Worldnet.

20 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

Total points scored for this section: 50
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:

- OQ Plan Review and Drug and Alcohol Inspections were performed.
- This unit was last inspected on 10/2/2019.
- The following individuals listed below were present during the inspection.
Michael Courville ? Shell Company, Timothy Mendoza ? Shell Company, Sheila Guzman ? Tang & Company & Ron Pitre ? Shell Company Louisiana Onshore Operations Coordinator.
- Yes, Larry Piglia, LDENR -Conservation Enforcement Specialist. Mr. Piglia has been with the LDENR for five years and completed all required TQ courses to be a liquid and gas inspector. Previously, he was with Texco Company in gas transmission and metering. He has over 30 years of experience in natural gas and hazardous liquid maintenance.

- 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, Mr. Piglia was using Louisiana Department of Energy Natural Resources ? OQ Plan Review & Drug & Alcohol Forms for this 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:

Yes. On April 15, 2024, Mr. Piglia reviewed the OQ Plan of Shell Company at the Norco Station. A complete review of the procedures was conducted. Mr. Piglia checked the qualifications of individuals and instructors. Mr. Piglia was using the LDENR OQ Form during the review. He asked questions on the form to the operator representatives and recorded their answers into the form. At the end of the review, he conducted an exit interview with Michael Courville, Timothy Mendoza and Ron Pitre. No areas of concern were found or noted.

On April 16, 2024, a team's virtual meeting was conducted with Ms. Guzman about the scope of service on the drug and alcohol testing program. The following individuals participated in the review. They were Michael Courville, Ron Pitre and Glynn Blanton. Ms. Guzman provided information on the MROC certification of Helen Tang, MD. Ms. Guzman provided information on the certification of the Laboratories and certificates of training for individuals in the refresher breath alcohol requirement.

Answer to questions pertaining to Part 199 on the D&A form were provided by Michael Courville from Shell (DOT) Anti-Drug and Alcohol Misuse Prevention Policy, Rev 6 2023 written plan. Answers pertaining to Part 40 on the D&A form were provided by Ms. Guzman from the American Substance Abuse Professional Drug Solutions document. Exit interview was conducted at the end of the day. No issues of concern were found or noted.

- 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, Mr. Larry Piglia, worked for Texaco Pipeline Company dealing with transmission line installation and metering. He has completed the TQ courses and qualified to perform gas & liquid inspection. He demonstrated a professional inspection on the operator's OQ and Drug & Alcohol program. He asked detailed questions pertaining to the programs and documented the results into each of the two forms.

- 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:

Yes, at the end of the day Mr. Larry Piglia conducted the interview with Mr. Michael Courville ? Shell Company. No violations or areas of concern were found.

- 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:

Yes, the inspection was conducted at the Norco Office of Shell Oil Company. No field work was performed due to the length of the inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred on this section of the review.

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



- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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:

Yes, a review of annual reports is conducted by the Director and Program Manager each year. Annual report data is entered into an Excel spreadsheet and compared to previous year information. An analysis on trends pertaining to leakage, bare steel and subpart F damages is conducted. If an error is found or a trend is showing an upward swing, they contact the operator to review or correct their data. The review of the annual report is described in their Standard Operating Procedures manual. A review of current data for 2023 found state damages per 1,000 locate requests was 2.78. The number of damages were 1,927. This number was lower from previous year of 2,029. After their reviews they continue to follow up with operators who have a significant number of twenty or more damages from previous year to determine what action they are taking to lower damages to their facilities.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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:

Yes, they review the annual report data and share the information with the operators at separate meetings when damages are higher from previous year. As a general rule, when an operator has twenty or more damages they are contacted and asked to attend a separate meeting.

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|
| 3 | Has the state reviewed the operator's annual report pertaining to Part D - Excavation Damage?
Info Only = No Points
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.)? | Info Only | Info Only |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Yes, this is checked during the Director's review of the annual report. Information on reviewing the annual reports will be added to their SOP document to assist their staff in checking all items listed in the annual report.
- b. Yes, this is investigated and checked on a complaint or damage report submitted to their agency.
- c. Yes
- d. Yes
- e. Yes.
- f. The number of damages from mismark in 2023 was 444. This number is down for previous year of 483.
- g. The number of damages from not locating within time requirements in 2023 was 505. This number is down for previous year of 572.
- h. Yes, when a damage occurs due to a mapping error, the agency is requiring the operator to update their mapping system.

- i. Yes, the agency is requiring the operator via a compliance to correct the mapping system.
j. The number of Excavation Practices Not Sufficient in 2023 was 953. This number is the same for previous year of 953.

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?	2	2
---	--	---	---

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

- 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?

Evaluator Notes:

- a. The highest number of damages is coming from the stakeholder group - contractors.
- b. Yes, operators are having individual meetings with stakeholders who are causing damages and educating them about their facilities. Additionally, other meetings that address this issue with the operators are Digger's Night Out, UCC, and Pipeline Association of Louisiana.
- c. Yes, they have found most excavation damage has resulted in "failure to maintain clearance". A review of the damages indicated the contractor has failed to maintain clearance.
- d. Yes, the state has monitored the operators and verified they are addressing causes of excavation damages in their training and awareness campaigns.

5	General Comments:	Info Only	Info Only
---	-------------------	-----------	-----------

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

Total points scored for this section: 6
Total possible points for this section: 6

