



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

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



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

State Agency: Texas

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 08/22/2024 - 08/26/2024

Agency Representative: Stephanie Weidman, PHMSA Program Manager, RRCTX

PHMSA Representative: David Lykken, State Liaison

Clint Stevens, State Liaison

Michael Thompson, State Liaison

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

Name/Title: Christi Craddick, Chairman

Agency: Railroad Commission of Texas

Address: 1701 N. Congress

City/State/Zip: Austin, TX 78711-2967

Rating:

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

Interstate Agent: Yes

INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete this evaluation in accordance with the Evaluator Guidance for conducting state pipeline safety program evaluations. The evaluation should generally reflect state program performance during CY 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
- B Program Inspection Procedures
- C State Qualifications
- D Program Performance
- E Field Inspections
- F Damage prevention and Annual report analysis

0
15
10
50
15
6

0
15
10
45
15
6

TOTALS

96 91

State Rating

94.8

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:

No issues or concerns. PR review score: 50 points

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:

No issues or concerns noted.

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

No issues or concerns identified.

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

No issues or concerns.

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

No issues or concerns identified.

5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No point deductions under Part B. No areas of concern identified.

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:

No issues identified.

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

No deficiencies identified.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No point deductions under Part C.

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 | 0 |
| | <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:

Five points were deducted for not completing all inspections within the maximum five-year time interval allowed in its written procedures and PHMSA State Program Guidelines.

1. No inspection records: Coastal Caverns Inc. (PAPEI, D&A, O&M); Ocelot Energy Management LLC (D&A); Cowtown Pipeline Partners LP (D&A); Markwest Javelina Co. LLC (LIMP); Tandem Energy Corp. (O&M); Valero Texas City Refinery (O&M); DCP Midstream (PAPEI, O&M, LIMP); Motiva Enterprise LLC (D&A, OQ); Nustar Permian Transportation and Storage, LLC (D&A); Santa Fe Midstream Permian LLC (D&A, O&M, OQ) and Vaquero Permian Processing, LLC (Standard Comp, PAPEI).

2. Exceeded 5-yr inspection interval: Citgo Refining and Chemical Co. LP (1/26/24 & 2/9/18 ? CRM); EVX Midstream Partners LLC (10/4/18 no current inspections ? Standard Comp) and (10/4/2018 no current inspection ? OQ); HFOTCO, LLC (5/4/23 & 8/4/17 ? PAPEI), (1/27/23 no previous inspection ? O&M), and (3/3/23 no previous inspection ? CRM); Hill Lake Gas Storage, LLC (3/31/17 no current inspections ? Standard Comp) and (2/16/24 & 11/9/18 ? LIMP); Magellan Pipeline Co., LP (4/28/23 & 10/21/16 ? LIMP); Vaquero Permian Processing, LLC (5/12/23 no previous inspection ? OQ); Valero Refining-Texas LP (9/17/15 no current inspection ? D&A), (10/27/23 & 3/4/11 ? O&M), (8/25/17 no current inspection ? LIMP), and (11/30/17 no current inspection ? CRM); Kinder Morgan CO2 CO, LP (7/15/2015 no current inspection ? Standard Comp), and (8/24/23 no previous inspection ? O&M); Markwest Javelina Co., LLC (12/3/18 no previous inspection - OQ) and (3/22/18 no previous inspection ? CRM); Valero Texas City Refinery (4/14/23 & 8/25/17 exceeded intervals ? LIMP); DCP Midstream (4/20/2018 did not meet interval ? Standard Comp); Eagleclaw Midstream Ventures (4/6/23 no previous inspection ? O&M); Equistar Chemicals, LP (4/6/23 & 2/9/18 ? CRM); Motiva Enterprise, LLC (2/3/23 & 2/10/17 ? LIMP); Valero Terminaling and Distribution Co. (5/12/23 & 8/25/17 ? LIMP); Magellan Operating Co., LLC (4/28/23 & 10/21/16 ? LIMP); Frio LaSalle Pipeline, LP (1/20/2017 no previous inspection ? OQ); and Santa Fe Midstream, LLC (12/1/23 no previous inspection ? LIMP).

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

No deficiencies identified. No areas of concern.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

No concerns noted.

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

No deficiencies identified.

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

No issues or concerns noted.

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

None issued in CY2023. No concerns noted.

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

No deficiencies identified, No concerns.

8	(Accident 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:

No issues or concerns identified.

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. No issues.

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:

No issues or concerns. Held annually.

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:

No issues.

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:

No issues or concerns.

13	Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.7 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No concerns noted.

14	Was the State responsive to:	1	1
-----------	------------------------------	---	---

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

- a. Surveys or information requests from NAPSR or PHMSA; and
- b. PHMSA Work Management system tasks?

Evaluator Notes:

No issues identified.

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

Yes. Currently one still open. No issues or concerns noted.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No concerns.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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. No concerns or issues noted.

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

No concerns identified.

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

Yes. No issues or concerns identified.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D-1: Five points were deducted for not completing all inspections within the maximum five-year time interval allowed in its written procedures and PHMSA State Program Guidelines.

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

PART E - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

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

Info Only = No Points

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

Evaluator Notes:

Kinder Morgan
Kyle Metcalf, RRC Inspector
Pasadena, TX
February 20-23, 2024
Agustin Lopez, PHMSA Evaluator

- Standard inspection
- Last inspection was on 9/27/2021
- Yes pipeline representative was present during inspection.
- Have not observed Kyle Metcalf in the past.

- 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, inspector utilized RRC PIPES forms during 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 the inspector reviewed the following:
a. Procedures were reviewed.
b. Records were reviewed.
c. Field inspection was conducted of pipeline facilities.
d. No other type of inspection.
e. Yes the inspection was adequate in length.

- 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, the inspector had adequate knowlegde of the pipeline safety program.

- 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 and exit interview was conducted at the conclusion of the inspection with no probable violations.

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 in a safe, positive, and constructive manner.

- a. No unsafe acts were performed.
 - b. Inspector observed condition of the pipeline facilities.
 - c. No best practices to share.
 - d. No other notes.
-

7 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Kyle Metcalf performed an a very good inspection of Kinder Morgan Pasadena Unit.

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:

Yes. No issues identified.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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. No concerns noted.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Reviewed with PM, AR data pertaining to Part D - Damage Prevention.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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. No concerns noted.

5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No point deductions under Part F.

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

