



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2024 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION, Office of Pipeline Safety

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



2024 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2024
Hazardous Liquid

State Agency: Arizona
Agency Status:
Date of Visit: 06/06/2025 - 08/22/2025
Agency Representative: Eric Villa, Program Manager
PHMSA Representative: Sean Mayo
Commission Chairman to whom follow up letter is to be sent:
Name/Title: Mr. Kevin Thompson, Chair
Agency: Arizona Corporation Commission
Address: 1200 W. Washington St.
City/State/Zip: Phoenix, AZ 85007

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 2024 (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	49
E Field Inspections	15	15
F Damage prevention and Annual report analysis	6	6
TOTALS	96	95
State Rating		99.0



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:
Items a-i appeared accurate.

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



PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Do written procedures address pre-inspection, inspection and post inspection activities for each of the following inspection types: Chapter 5.1
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 5 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Standard Inspections, which include Drug/Alcohol, CRM and Public Awareness Effectiveness Inspectionsb. IMP Inspectionsc. OQ Inspectionsd. Damage Prevention Inspectionse. On-Site Operator Trainingf. Construction Inspections (annual efforts) | | |

Evaluator Notes:
Satisfactory. All items a-g present.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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:
Satisfactory. All items a-e are addressed. Units appear to be broken down appropriately.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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:
Satisfactory. All items a-c addressed.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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:
Satisfactory. Both a and b are addressed.

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

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

All items satisfactory. No point deductions for Part B.

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:

Satisfactory. All items a-d meet the requirements. e:No outside training conducted in 2024. f: all reviewed inspections met this requirement.

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

Satisfactory. Mr. Villa demonstrates compliance with this requirement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Both items satisfactory. No point deductions for 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 | 4 |
| | <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:

Review of inspection documentation indicates that AZCC failed to fully complete select programmatic inspections on some operators (Plains Marketing, West Phoenix Power Plant, Swissport Fueling Inc.) between 2016 and 2024. Given that AZCC conducts annual inspections on these operators and many--but not all--program elements are addressed during those inspections, partial scoring is appropriate. A ONE POINT deduction is recommended.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|----|
| 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 to all items a through g. State uses PHMSA IA equivalent forms and state forms to meet this requirement.

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

Satisfactory. State uses IA equivalent forms. Checked during annual standard inspections and construction inspections.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Is state verifying operator's integrity management Programs (IMP and DIMP)? This should include a review of plans, along with monitoring progress. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operator's plan(s). 49 CFR 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:

Satisfactory. Verified during annual inspections.



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

Satisfactory. Addressed in annual inspection checklists.

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

Satisfactory. Addressed on annual inspection checklist.

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

No HL-related non-compliances identified in 2024, but gas program compliance procedures/documentation demonstrate satisfactory process performance meeting the requirements of this part.

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

All items a-i satisfactory. no HL accidents in 2024. Lessons learned shared routinely via state-of-the-state briefings.

- 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:

Not required for last year's evaluation.

- 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:

Satisfactory. Conducted 10/11/24 in conjunction with gas seminar.

- 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:

Satisfactory. Checked during annual inspections.

- 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:

Satisfactory. Website.

- 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:

Satisfactory. No HL SRC in 2024.

- 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:

Satisfactory.

- 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:

Satisfactory. None on file.



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

Evaluator Notes:
Satisfactory.

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:
Satisfactory. Numbers appear accurate.

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:
Satisfactory.

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:
Satisfactory. Addressed in annual inspection forms.

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

Evaluator Notes:
D.1 Recommended ONE POINT deduction for failure to complete select programmatic inspections within the 5 year interval.

Total points scored for this section: 49
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 Info Only Info Only comments box below)
Info Only = No Points
- a. What type of inspection(s) did the state inspector conduct during the field portion of the state evaluation? (i.e. Standard, Construction, IMP, etc)
 - b. When was the unit inspected last?
 - c. Was pipeline operator or representative present during inspection?
 - d. Effort should be made to observe newest state inspector with least experience

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Standard Comprehensive of APS West Phoenix Power Plant (HL, Diesel)
- b. 2024
- c. Yes, operations and compliance reps present.
- d. Inspector: Luis Hurtado

-
- 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:

Satisfactory. State checklist used, in conjunction with field observation notes.

-
- 3 Did the inspector adequately review the following during the inspection 10 10
Yes = 10 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-9
- a. Procedures (were the inspector's questions of the operator adequate to determine compliance?)
 - b. Records (did the inspector adequately review trends and ask in-depth questions?)
 - c. Field Activities/Facilities (did inspector ensure that procedures were being followed, including ensuring that properly calibrated equipment was used and OQ's were acceptable?)
 - d. Other (please comment)
 - e. Was the inspection of adequate length to properly perform the inspection?

Evaluator Notes:

All items satisfactory. Protocol 9 conducted in conjunction with standard field observations. Mr. Hurtado reviewed applicable procedures and OQ records as part of his field observations.

-
- 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:

Mr. Hurtado demonstrated good knowledge of pipeline safety regulations and administrative procedures associated with inspection activities.

-
- 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:

Satisfactory. Mr. Hurtado conducted a thorough exit interview upon completion of the day's observations. This interview included requests for follow-up documentation as appropriate.

-
- 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:

Satisfactory. Mr. Hurtado observed valve maintenance/operation, CP testing, Rectifier testing, electrical isolation checks, and other ROW checks as part of this inspection. He asked thorough initial and follow-up questions.

7 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

All items satisfactory. No issues or concerns in Part E.

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



PART F - Damage prevention and Annual report analysis

Points(MAX) Score

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

Satisfactory. State is conducting analysis on data derived from both report types.

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

Satisfactory. Program is verifying these actions.

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

Satisfactory. State program is reviewing annual reports in accordance with this requirement.

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

Satisfactory. State is verifying appropriately.



5 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

All items satisfactory. No point deductions in Part F.

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

