



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2012 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation

for

Public Service Commission, State of Wyoming

Document Legend

PART:

- O -- Representative Date and Title Information
- A -- Progress Report and Program Documentation Review
- B -- Program Inspection Procedures
- C -- Program Performance
- D -- Compliance Activities
- E -- Incident Investigations
- F -- Damage Prevention
- G -- Field Inspections
- H -- Interstate Agent State (If Applicable)
- I -- 60106 Agreement State (If Applicable)



2012 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2012
Natural Gas

State Agency: Wyoming

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 06/04/2013 - 06/06/2013

Agency Representative: David Piroutek, Program Manager

PHMSA Representative: Rex Evans, State Liaison

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

Name/Title: Alan B. Minier, Chairman

Agency: Wyoming Public Service Commission

Address: 2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 300

City/State/Zip: Cheyenne, WY 82002

Rating:

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

INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete this evaluation in accordance with the Procedures for Evaluating State Pipeline Safety Program. The evaluation should generally reflect state program performance during CY 2012 (not the status of performance at the time of the evaluation). All items for which criteria have not been established should be answered based on the PHMSA representative's judgment. 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 space provided for general comments/regional observations. If a question is not applicable to a state, select NA. Please ensure all responses are COMPLETE and ACCURATE, and OBJECTIVELY reflect state program performance. Increasing emphasis is being placed on 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.

Field Inspection (PART G):

The field inspection form used will allow different areas of emphasis to be considered for each question. Question 13 is provided for scoring field observation areas. In completing PART G, the PHMSA representative should include a written summary which thoroughly documents the inspection.

Scoring Summary

PARTS

Possible Points Points Scored

A Progress Report and Program Documentation Review
B Program Inspection Procedures
C Program Performance
D Compliance Activities
E Incident Investigations
F Damage Prevention
G Field Inspections
H Interstate Agent State (If Applicable)
I 60106 Agreement State (If Applicable)

10 10
15 15
43 43
15 14
8 8
8 8
11 11
0 0
0 0

TOTALS

110 109

State Rating 99.1

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

1	Accuracy of Jurisdictional Authority and Operator/Inspection Units Data - Progress Report Attachment 1 (A1a) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Jurisdictional data appear ok			
2	Review of Inspection Days for accuracy - Progress Report Attachment 2 (A1b) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: No issues			
3	Accuracy verification of Operators and Operators Inspection Units in State - Progress Report Attachment 3 (A1c) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Operators all appear ok and match information in PDM. No issues			
4	Were all federally reportable incident reports listed and information correct? - Progress Report Attachment 4 (A1d) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Only one for Questar Gas, less than \$50k property damage. Drunk driver. All ok			
5	Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 (A1e) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Reviewed compliance activities and counts, carryover correct. No issues			
6	Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6 (A1f, A4) Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
Evaluator Notes: Electronic files in file folders, has moved to converting to pdf since last evaluation. No issues			
7	Was employee listing and completed training accurate and complete? - Progress Report Attachment 7 (A1g) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: No issues. There were questions about qualification categories that was resolved after review.			
8	Verification of Part 192,193,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8 (A1h) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: no issues. they are reviewing ability of automatic adoption by legal staff which may change in future			
9	List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 (H1-3) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1

Evaluator Notes:
no issues

10 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points
Evaluator Notes:

Info OnlyInfo Only

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



PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Standard Inspections (B1a)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Procedures describe standard - completed every two years.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 2 | IMP Inspections (including DIMP) (B1b)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

In procedures. Again recommend annual review and communication with operators to make sure IMP issues are up to date.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 3 | OQ Inspections (B1c)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Field inspections during random field visits, HQ review every four years which was completed in CY2012

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Damage Prevention Inspections (B1d)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

One-Call ticket review part of standard inspection

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 5 | On-Site Operator Training (B1e)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

As needed

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 6 | Construction Inspections (B1f)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 7 | Incident/Accident Investigations (B1g)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

This is generally outlined in procedures.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 8 | Does inspection plan address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements? (B2a-d, G1,2,4)
Yes = 6 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-5 | 6 | 6 |
|----------|---|---|---|

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. Length of time since last inspection | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic areas, Population Density, etc) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| 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) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. Are inspection units broken down appropriately? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:
No issues as limited number of operators and regularly visited and any compliance activities are followed up appropriately.

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

Evaluator Notes:
Would be good idea to have general review during next period and enhance with more detail

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



PART C - Program Performance**Points(MAX) Score**

- 1** Was ratio of Total Inspection person-days to total person days acceptable? (Director of State Programs may modify with just cause) Chapter 4.3 (A12) 5 5
Yes = 5 No = 0

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
198.25

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 1.47 = 323.40

Ratio: A / B
198.25 / 323.40 = 0.61

If Ratio >= 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0
Points = 5

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. ration .61 based on 1.47 inspectors

- 2** Has each inspector and program manager fulfilled the T Q Training Requirements? (See Guidelines for requirements) Chapter 4.4 (A8-A11, G19) 5 5
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4

- | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | Completion of Required OQ Training before conducting inspection as lead? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Completion of Required DIMP*/IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead? *Effective Evaluation CY2013 | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/program manager | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Note any outside training completed | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Laura had NACE training in CY2012. No issues

- 3** Did state records and discussions with state pipeline safety program manager indicate adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations? Chapter 4.1,8.1 (A5) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

No issues, Dave has excellent knowledge of program and regulations.

- 4** 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 (A6-7) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, letter received 12-16-12 from 10-31-12 letter. Issued were addressed as needed.

- 5** Did State hold PHMSA TQ Seminar in Past 3 Years? Chapter 8.5 (A3) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Had TQ seminar week of April 1, 2013. Had joint with ND,SD in Rapid City, SD

- 6** Did state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in written procedures? Chapter 5.1 (B3) 5 5
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed electronic inspection files, all appear to have been done within two year time interval. No issues

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 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 (B4-5)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

PHMSA Forms were used, working on breaking down forms to be more usable. No issues

-
- | | | | |
|---|--|---|----|
| 8 | Did the state review operator procedures for determining if exposed cast iron pipe was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary remedial action was taken? (NTSB) Chapter 5.1 (B7)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

No cast

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 9 | Did the state review 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) (NTSB) Chapter 5.1 (B8)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

No cast

-
- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 10 | Did the state review 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? (NTSB) Chapter 5.1 (B9)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

no issues on inspection form

-
- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 11 | Did the state review 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? Chapter 5.1 (B10,E5)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, and part of new inspection form.

-
- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 12 | Has the state reviewed Operator Annual reports, along with Incident/Accident reports, for accuracy and analyzed data for trends and operator issues? Data Initiative (G6-9,G16)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Continues to put information in spreadsheet and reviews.

-
- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 13 | Did state input all applicable OQ, IMP inspection results into federal database in a timely manner? This includes replies to Operator notifications into IMDB database. Chapter 5.1 (G10-12)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

no issues. Databases reviewed and information is being uploaded

-
- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 14 | Has state confirmed intrastate transmission operators have submitted information into NPMS database along with changes made after original submission? (G14)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 15 | Is the state verifying operators are conducting drug and alcohol tests as required by regulations? This should include verifying positive tests are responded to in accordance with program. 49 CFR 199 (I1-3)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Files reviewed indicate D & A tests are being reviewed. No issues

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 16 | Is state verifying operators OQ programs are up to date? This should include verification of any plan updates and that persons performing covered tasks (including contractors) are properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operators plan. 49 CFR 192 Part N (I4-7)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, several program reviews conducted in CY2012. No issues

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 17 | Is state verifying operator's gas transmission integrity management programs (IMP) are up to date? This should include a previous review of IMP plan, along with monitoring progress on operator tests and remedial actions. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). 49 CFR 192 Subpart O (I8-12)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, IMP records appear up to date. Recommend annual reviews to ensure progress is being complete.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 18 | Is state verifying operator's gas distribution integrity management Programs (DIMP)? This should include a review of DIMP plans, along with monitoring progress. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). 49 CFR 192 Subpart P
DIMP ? First round of program inspections should be complete by December 2014

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

Evaluator Notes:

Inspection of plans complete, plan on field next year

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 19 | Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. 49 CFR 192.616 (I13-16)
PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be complete by December 2013

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

Evaluator Notes:

PAPEEs on target for completion by end of year

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 20 | 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). (G20-21)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Advisory bulletins and other information all forwarded to operators, working on website enhancement.

21	Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3 (B6) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
----	--	---	----

Evaluator Notes:
none in CY2012

22	Did the State ask Operators to identify any plastic pipe and components that has shown a record of defects/leaks and what those operators are doing to mitigate the safety concerns? (G13) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
----	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:
SourceGas, MDU, Questar participate in PPDC, identifying through DIMP programs. No issues.

23	Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPS or PHMSA? (H4) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
----	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:
No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 43
Total possible points for this section: 43



PART D - Compliance Activities

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1 (B12-14, B16, B1h)
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 4 |
| a. | Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Procedures are in place and still limited. Indicates working on enhancements for future procedure edits.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 2 | 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 (B11,B18,B19)
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 4 |
| a. | Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Were probable violations documented? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Were probable violations resolved? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Was the progress of probable violations routinely reviewed? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Probable violations were reviewed and all appear to have appropriate follow up and documentation until resolution. No issues

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state issue compliance actions for all probable violations discovered? (B15)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The inspection records reviewed indicated compliance actions were taken on issues discovered.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Did compliance actions give reasonable due process to all parties? Including "show cause" hearing if necessary. (B17, B20)
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 5 | Is the program manager familiar with state process for imposing civil penalties? Were civil penalties considered for repeat violations (with severity consideration) or violations resulting in incidents/accidents? (describe any actions taken) (B27)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues with process. Have to bring in for show cause, Commission has to agree to proceed then any action to pursue civil penalties has to eventually go through AG office to seek civil penalty.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 6 | Can the State demonstrate it is using their enforcement fining authority for pipeline safety violations?
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 0 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No fines, this was discussed during previous evaluation and there is loss of point in this area. Lack of fining could be in part due to process of having to pursue civil penalties though State Attorney General.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 14
Total possible points for this section: 15



PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Does state have adequate mechanism to receive and respond to operator reports of incidents, including after-hours reports? And did state keep adequate records of Incident/Accident notifications received? Chapter 6 (A2,D1-3) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

- a. Acknowledgement of MOU between NTSB and PHMSA (Appendix D) Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
b. Acknowledgement of Federal/State Cooperation in case of incident/accident (Appendix E) Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

Commission rules 420A require reporting. No issues.

- 2 If onsite investigation was not made, did state obtain sufficient information from the operator and/or by other means to determine the facts to support the decision to not go on-site? Chapter 6 (D4) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Records indicate sufficient information is gathered. No issues.

- 3 Were all incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations? (D5) 3 3
Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2

- a. Observations and document review Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
b. Contributing Factors Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
c. Recommendations to prevent recurrences when appropriate Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

One incident with Questar Gas, information documented appears appropriate action was taken. No conclusions or recommendations necessary.

- 4 Did the state initiate compliance action for violations found during any incident/accident investigation? (D6) 1 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Incident did not require compliance actions

- 5 Did the state assist region office by taking appropriate follow-up actions related to the operator incident reports to ensure accuracy and final report has been received by PHMSA? (validate report data from operators concerning incidents/accidents and investigate discrepancies) Chapter 6 (D7) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

no issues

- 6 Does state share lessons learned from incidents/accidents? (sharing information, such as: at NAPS Region meetings, state seminars, etc) (G15) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

State participates at NAPS Region meeting with state report. No issues.

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

Evaluator Notes:

only recommendation is to make any incident file as detailed as possible and be ready when necessary.

Total points scored for this section: 8
Total possible points for this section: 8



PART F - Damage Prevention

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Has the state reviewed 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? NTSB (E1)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes on new inspection form, procedures reviewed with operators

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state inspector check to assure the pipeline operator is following its written procedures pertaining to notification of excavation, marking, positive response and the availability and use of the one call system? (E2)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, during standard inspections. No issues.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state encourage and promote practices for reducing damages to all underground facilities to its regulated companies? (i.e. such as promoting/adopting the CGA Best Practices encouraging adoption of the 9 Elements, etc.) (E3)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

works closely with Wyoming 811, link to Wyoming One-Call on web.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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? (This can include DIRT and other data shared and reviewed by the pipeline safety program) (E4,G5)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Information collected in operator spreadsheet. No issues.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 8
Total possible points for this section: 8

PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative Info Only Info Only
Info Only = No Points

Name of Operator Inspected:

Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

David Piroutek, Perry McCollum and George (new inspectors)

Location of Inspection:

Cheyenne, WY

Date of Inspection:

June 5, 2013

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Rex Evans

Evaluator Notes:

- 2 Was the operator or operator's representative notified and/or given the opportunity to be present during inspection? (F2) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Operator was on site, no issues.

- 3 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) (F3) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Appropriate forms used, pictures used to document.

- 4 Did the inspector thoroughly document results of the inspection? (F4) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

No issues.

- 5 Did the inspector check to see if the operator had necessary equipment during inspection to conduct tasks viewed? (Maps,pyrometer,soap spray,CGI,etc.) (F5) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

- 6 Did the inspector adequately review the following during the field portion of the state evaluation? (check all that apply on list) (F7) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

a. Procedures ☐

b. Records ☐

c. Field Activities ☒

d. Other (please comment) ☐

Evaluator Notes:

- 7 Did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Evaluator will document reasons if unacceptable) (F8) 2 2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

David has adequate knowledge. Time was also spent coaching new employees

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 8 | Did the inspector conduct an exit interview? (If inspection is not totally complete the interview should be based on areas covered during time of field evaluation) (F9)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

This is an ongoing project, issues were discussed with on site supervisor. No issues.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 9 | During the exit interview, did the inspector identify probable violations found during the inspections? (if applicable) (F10)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

none found

- | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|-----------|
| 10 | General Comments: What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) Other.
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----|--|-----------|-----------|

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | Abandonment | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| b. | Abnormal Operations | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| c. | Break-Out Tanks | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| d. | Compressor or Pump Stations | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| e. | Change in Class Location | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| f. | Casings | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| g. | Cathodic Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| h. | Cast-iron Replacement | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| i. | Damage Prevention | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| j. | Deactivation | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| k. | Emergency Procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| l. | Inspection of Right-of-Way | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| m. | Line Markers | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| p. | MOP | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| q. | MAOP | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| r. | Moving Pipe | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| s. | New Construction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| u. | Odorization | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| w. | Plastic Pipe Installation | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| x. | Public Education | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| y. | Purging | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| z. | Prevention of Accidental Ignition | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| A. | Repairs | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| B. | Signs | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| C. | Tapping | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| D. | Valve Maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| E. | Vault Maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| F. | Welding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| G. | OQ - Operator Qualification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| H. | Compliance Follow-up | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. | Atmospheric Corrosion | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Viewed tapping and stopping of 6 inch steel main and cut over to new line serving Dyno Nobel

Total points scored for this section: 11
Total possible points for this section: 11



PART H - Interstate Agent State (If Applicable)**Points(MAX) Score**

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 1 | Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)? (C1)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 2 | Are results documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with "PHMSA directed inspection plan"? (C2)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 3 | Did the state submit documentation of the inspections within 60 days as stated in its latest Interstate Agent Agreement form? (C3)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 4 | Were probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance? (NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.) (C4)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 5 | Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment? (C5)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 6 | Did the state give written notice to PHMSA within 60 days of all probable violations found? (C6)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 7 | Did the state initially submit documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations? (C7)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 8 | General Comments:
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

Not applicable - Not an Interstate Agent

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

PART I - 60106 Agreement State (If Applicable)**Points(MAX) Score**

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 1 | Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)? (B21)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 2 | Are results documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with state inspection plan? (B22)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 3 | Were any probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance? (NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.) (B23)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 4 | Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment? (B24)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 5 | Did the state give written notice to PHMSA within 60 days of all probable violations found? (B25)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 6 | Did the state initially submit adequate documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations? (B26)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

Not applicable

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