



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2009 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation

for

NEW YORK PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Document Legend

PART:

- O -- Representative Date and Title Information
- A -- General Program Qualifications
- B -- Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/Performance
- C -- Interstate Agent States
- D -- Incident Investigations
- E -- Damage Prevention Initiatives
- F -- Field Inspection
- G -- PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan
- H -- Miscellaneous
- I -- Program Initiatives



2009 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2009
Natural Gas

State Agency: New York

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 08/23/2010 - 08/27/2010

Agency Representative: Gavin Nicoletta, P.E.

PHMSA Representative: Dino N. Rathod, P.E.

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

Name/Title: Garry A. Brown, Chariman

Agency: New York Public Service Commission

Address: Three Empire State Plaza

City/State/Zip: Albany, New York 12223

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 2009 (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 certification/agreement attachments provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

Field Inspection (PART F):

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 F, the PHMSA representative should include a written summary which thoroughly documents the inspection.

Scoring Summary

PARTS

Possible Points Points Scored

A	General Program Qualifications	26	22
B	Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/Performance	25	25
C	Interstate Agent States	4	4
D	Incident Investigations	7	7
E	Damage Prevention Initiatives	9	9
F	Field Inspection	12	12
G	PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan	10	10
H	Miscellaneous	3	3
I	Program Initiatives	9	9

TOTALS

105 101

State Rating

96.2

PART A - General Program Qualifications

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Did the state submit complete and accurate information on the attachments to its most current 60105(a) Certification/60106 (a) Agreement? (NOTE: PHMSA Representative to verify certification/agreement attachments by reviewing appropriate state documentation. Score a deficiency in any one area as "needs improvement". Attachment numbers appear in parenthesis) Previous Question A.1, Items a-h worth 1 point each
Yes = 8 No = 0 Needs Minor Improvement = 3-7 Needs Major Improvement = 2 | 8 | 7 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| a. | State Jurisdiction and agent status over gas facilities (1) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| b. | Total state inspection activity (2) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| c. | Gas facilities subject to state safety jurisdiction (3) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| d. | Gas pipeline incidents (4) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| e. | State compliance actions (5) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| f. | State record maintenance and reporting (6) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| g. | State employees directly involved in the gas pipeline safety program (7) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| h. | State compliance with Federal requirements (8) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

SLR Notes:

Attachmnet 7- Upon discussion, NY staff revealed that one inspector has not completed training successfully. He has failed to successfully complete in spite of multiple attempts. However, Attachment 7 does not reflect it. It incorrectly shows course completed by that inspector.

Attachment 8- According to NY PSC staff, state is unable to impose civil penalty unless the violation results in death or injury. Otherwise, penalty is limited to \$1,000 max. PSC has made efforts to revise appropriate language and submitted to state legislators for passage of amenments but has not succeeded yet. This discrepancy in NY CRR is not consistent with appliable federal code requirements.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state have an adequate mechanism to receive operator reporting of incidents to ensure state compliance with 60105(a) Certification/60106(a) Agreement requirements (fatality, injury requiring hospitalization, property damage exceeding \$50,000 - Mechanism should include receiving "after hours" reports)? (Chapter 6) Previous Question A.2
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

State Guideline Manual (SGM)- Seciton IX covered this requirement

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 3 | Has the state held a pipeline safety TQ seminar(s) in the last 3 years? (NOTE: Indicate date of last seminar or if state requested seminar, but T&Q could not provide, indicate date of state request for seminar. Seminars must be held at least once every 3 calendar years.) (Chapter 8.5) Previous Question A.4
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC hosted T&Q seminar Sept 2010 in Saratoga Spring, NY

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Were pipeline safety program files well-organized and accessible?(NOTE: This also includes electronic files) (Chapter 5) Previous Question A.5
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC maintains accessible nspection files- hard copies as well as computerized records database.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 5 | Did state records and discussions with the state pipeline safety program manager indicate adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations? (Chapter 4.1, Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.6
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Gavin Nicoletta has extensive pipeline safety regulatory experience, completed required T&Q training. He works closely with PHMSA staff and NAPSRR. He activley participated in NAPSRR committees. He also provides guidance to PSC pipeline safety staff.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 6 | Did the state respond in writing within 60 days to the requested items in the Chairman's letter following the Region's last program evaluation? (No response is necessary if no items are requested in letter and mark "Yes") (Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.8
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC response dated Feb 14, 2010

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 7 | What actions, if necessary, did the State initiate as a result of issues raised in the Chairperson's letter from the previous year? Did actions correct or address deficiencies from previous year's evaluation? (No response is necessary if no items are requested in letter and mark "Yes") (Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.8/A.9 | 1 | 1 |
| | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

Discussed that NY was unable to pass revisions being proposed to NY CRR. This issue has been under discussion with NY PSC for many years now with no results. Currently NYCRR Regs pose limitation on PSC for violations by operators unless it results in death or injury. This is not consistent with federal regulations for enforcement of pipeline safety regulations for probable violations.

Personnel and Qualifications

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 8 | Has each inspector fulfilled the 3 year TQ training requirement? If No, has the state been granted a waiver regarding TQ courses by the Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety? (NOTE: If the State has new inspectors who have not attended all TQ courses, but are in a program which will achieve the completion of all applicable courses within 3 years of taking first course (5 years to successfully complete), or if a waiver has been granted by the applicable Region Director for the state, please answer yes.) (Chapter 4.4) Previous Question A.10 | 3 | 0 |
| | Yes = 3 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

Review of PSC inspector training completion revealed that one inspector in NYC regional office has failed one course in spite of multiple attempts. PSC confirmed T&Q data to PHMSA by e-mail. Attachment 7 does not reflect this information correctly for this PSC inspector. PSC has failed to meet T&Q requirements listed in this question resulting in 3 point loss.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 9 | Brief Description of Non-TQ training Activities: | Info Only | Info Only |
| | Info Only = No Points | | |
| | For State Personnel: | | |
| | For Operators: | | |
| | For Non-Operator Entities/Parties, Information Dissemination, Public Meetings: | | |

SLR Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 10 | Did the lead inspectors complete all required T&Q OQ courses and Computer Based Training (CBT) before conducting OQ Inspections? (Chapter 4.4.1) Previous Question A.12 | 1 | 1 |
| | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 11 | Did the lead inspectors complete all required TQ Integrity Management (IMP) Courses/Seminars and CBT before conducting IMP Inspections? (Chapter 4.4.1) Previous Question A.13 | 1 | 1 |
| | Yes = 1 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 12 | Was the ratio acceptable of Total inspection Person-days to Total Person-days charged to the program by state inspectors? (Region Director may modify points for just cause) (Chapter 4.3) Previous Question B.12 | 5 | 5 |
| | Yes = 5 No = 0 | | |
| | A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
4368.00 | | |
| | B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 22.45 = 4939.00 | | |
| | Ratio: A / B
4368.00 / 4939.00 = 0.88 | | |
| | If Ratio >= 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0 | | |
| | Points = 5 | | |

SLR Notes:

13	Have there been modifications or proposed changes to inspector-staffing levels? (If yes, describe)	Previous	Info Only	Info Only
	Question B.13			
	Info Only = No Points			

SLR Notes:

14	Part-A General Comments/Regional Observations		Info Only	Info Only
	Info Only = No Points			

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section:	22
Total possible points for this section:	26



PART B - Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/ Performance

Points(MAX) Score

Inspection Procedures

- 1** Does the State have a written inspection plan to complete the following? (all types of operators including LNG) 6.5 6.5
(Chapter 5.1) Previous Question B.1 + Chapter 5 Changes + Incorporate LNG
Yes = 6.5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 50% Deduction
- | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a | Standard Inspections (Including LNG) (Max points = 2) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b | IMP Inspections (Including DIMP) (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c | OQ Inspections (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d | Damage Prevention (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e | On-Site Operator Training (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f | Construction Inspections (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| g | Incident/Accident Investigations (Max points = 1) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| h | Compliance Follow-up (Max points = 1) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

SLR Notes:

PSC is in process of revising State Guideline Manual. Based on discussions with PSC, it was agreed that SGM review and revisions to be completed by Dec 17, 2010. Gavin will incorporate comments I sent to him upon completion of office records review.

- 2** Did the written Procedures for selecting operators adequately address key concerns? (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question B.2, items a-d are worth .5 point each 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 50% Deduction
- | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a | Length of time since last inspection | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b | History of Operator/unit and/or location (including leakage , incident and compliance history) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c | Type of activity being undertaken by operator (construction etc) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d | For large operators, rotation of locations inspected | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

SLR Notes:

Inspection Performance

- 3** Did the state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in its written procedures? (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question B.3 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0

SLR Notes:

- 4** Did the state inspection form cover all applicable code requirements addressed on the Federal Inspection forms? (Chapter 5.1 (3)) Previous Question B.4 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

- 5** Did state complete all applicable portions of inspection forms? (Chapter 5.1 (3)) Previous Question B.5 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

- 6** Did the state initiate appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition Reports? (Chapter 6.3) Previous Question B.6 .5 .5
Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

7	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) Previous Question B.7 Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	.5
----------	--	----	----

SLR Notes:

8	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) Previous Question B.8 Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	.5
----------	---	----	----

SLR Notes:

9	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) Previous Question B.9 Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	.5
----------	--	----	----

SLR Notes:

10	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? (NTSB) Previous Question B.10 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

Compliance - 60105(a) States

11	Did the state adequately document sufficient information on probable violations? (Chapter 5.2) Previous Question B.14 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

12	Does the state have written procedures to identify the steps to be taken from the discovery to the resolution of a probable violation as specified in the "Guidelines for State Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question D(1).1 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

13	Does the state have written procedures to notify an operator when a noncompliance is identified as specified in the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1(4)) Previous Question D(1).2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

14	Does the state have a written procedure for routinely reviewing the progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns of the enforcement process, as required by the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1(5)) Previous Question D(1).3 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

15	Has the State issued compliance actions for all probable violations discovered? (Note : PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation) Previous Question D(1).4	1	1
	Yes = 1 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

16	Did the state follow its written procedures for reviewing compliance actions and follow-up to determine that prompt corrective actions were taken by operators, within the time frames established by the procedures and compliance correspondence, as required by the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? Previous Question D(1).5	1	1
	Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5		

SLR Notes:

17	If compliance could not be established by other means, did state pipeline safety program staff request formal action, such as a "Show Cause Hearing" to correct pipeline safety violations? (check each states enforcement procedures) Previous Question D(1).6	1	1
	No = 0 Yes = 1		

SLR Notes:

18	Did the state adequately document the resolution of probable violations? (Chapter 5.1 (6)) Previous Question D(1).7	1	1
	Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5		

SLR Notes:

19	Were compliance actions sent to a company officer? (manager or board member if municipal/government system) (Chapter 5.1(4)) Previous Question D(1).8	.5	.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

20	Did the compliance proceedings give reasonable due process to all parties? (check each states enforcement procedures) Previous Question D(1).9	1	1
	Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5		

SLR Notes:

Compliance - 60106(a) States

21	Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)? Previous Question D(2).1	1	NA
	Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5		

SLR Notes:

22	Are results adequately documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with state inspection plan? Previous Question D(2).2	1	NA
	Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5		

SLR Notes:

23	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.) Previous Question D(2).3	1	NA
	Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5		

SLR Notes:

24	Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment? Previous Question D(2).4	1	NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5			

SLR Notes:

25	Did the state give written notice to PHMSA within 60 days of all probable violations found? Previous Question D(2).5	1	NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5			

SLR Notes:

26	Did the state initially submit adequate documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations? Previous Question D(2).6	1	NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5			

SLR Notes:

27	Part B: General Comments/Regional Observations	Info Only	NA
Info Only = No Points			

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 25
Total possible points for this section: 25



PART C - Interstate Agent States

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)? Previous Question D(3).1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 2 | Are results documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with "PHMSA directed inspection plan"? Previous Question D(3).2
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC worked closely ER staff with PHMSA directed interstate inspection plan

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state submit documentation of the inspections within 60 days as stated in its latest Interstate Agent Agreement form? Previous Question D(3).3
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

For 2009 interstate inspections, PSC has submitted results of inspections to ER within time frame as stated in current Interstate Inspection Agent Agreement.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 4 | 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.) Previous Question D(3).4
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 5 | Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment? Previous Question D(3).5
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

SLR Notes:

No imminent conditions needed any immediate reporting to PHMSA/ER

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 6 | Did the state give written notice to PHMSA within 60 days of all probable violations found? Previous Question D(3).6
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

SLR Notes:

No Interstate Probable violations found in CY 2009

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 7 | Did the state initially submit documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations? Previous Question D(3).7
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

SLR Notes:

No Interstate Probable violations found in CY 2009

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 8 | Part C: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 4
Total possible points for this section: 4

PART D - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Are state personnel following the procedures for Federal/State cooperation in case of an incident? (See Appendix in "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program") (Chapter 6.1) Previous Question E.1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|----|
| 2 | Are state personnel familiar with the jurisdictional authority and Memorandum of Understanding between NTSB and PHMSA? (See Appendix in "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program") (Chapter 6 ? Appendix D) Previous Question E.2
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | .5 |
|----------|---|----|----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state keep adequate records of incident notifications received? Previous Question E.3
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC maintains records of incident notifications.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | If an onsite investigation of an incident was not made, did the state obtain sufficient information by other means to determine the facts and support the decision not to go on-site? Previous Question E.4
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC typically makes attempts to get additional information in order to determine necessary course of action.

- | | | | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 5 | Were investigations thorough and conclusions and recommendations documented in an acceptable manner? Previous Question E.5, comprehensive question worth 2 points total
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| a. | Observations and Document Review | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Contributing Factors | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Recommendations to prevent recurrences where appropriate | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 6 | Did the state initiate enforcement action for violations found during any incident investigation(s)? Previous Question E.6 Variation
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 7 | 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 annual report data from operators concerning incidents/accidents and investigate discrepancies) (Chapter 6) Previous Question E.7/E.8
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff works closely with ER/PHMSA.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 8 | Part D: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

I discussed PHMSA requirements of "Complete, Accurate and Consistent" pipeline safety information/ data submittal. PSC agreed to review and revise 30 day incident + Supplemental Reports.

Total points scored for this section: 7
Total possible points for this section: 7



PART E - Damage Prevention Initiatives

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? Previous Question B.11
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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? New 2008
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state encourage and promote the adoption of the Common Ground Alliance Best Practices document to its regulated companies as a means of reducing damages to all underground facilities? Previous Question A.7
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

NY strongly encourages and promotes adoption of CGA/ Best Practices

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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? New 2008
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC collects damage data and performs analysis and evaluation of trends.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 5 | Did the state review operators' records of accidents and failures due to excavation damage to ensure causes of failure are addressed to minimize the possibility of recurrence as required by 192.617?
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 6 | Part E: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 9
Total possible points for this section: 9

PART F - Field Inspection

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative
<small>Info Only = No Points</small> | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Name of Operator Inspected:
National Fuel Gas Distribution Company and New York State Electric and Gas

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:
Terry Wasielewski and Patrick Raichel

Location of Inspection:
Jamestown and Lockport, New York

Date of Inspection:
10/27 & 28/2010

Name of PHMSA Representative:
Dale Bennett

SLR Notes:

Field Inspection of regulator stations for NYSGE in Lockport and field inspection of distribution valves and a construction inspection in Jamestown.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 2 | Was the operator or operator's representative notified and/or given the opportunity to be present during inspection? New 2008
<small>Yes = 1 No = 0</small> | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes NYSEG and NFGDC Personnel were on-site and were notified on 10/23/2010.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 3 | Did the inspector use an acceptable inspection form/checklist and was the form/checklist used as a guide for the inspection? (New regulations shall be incorporated) Previous Question F.2
<small>Yes = 2 No = 0</small> | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

The inspector used the federal inspection form for gas distribution. The revision date of the form was March, 2010.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Did the inspector thoroughly document results of the inspection? Previous Question F.3
<small>Yes = 2 No = 0</small> | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes. The inspector marked the "check-off" columns for the results found on each item covered on the federal form. Any unsatisfactory results were described in the comments section of the form.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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.) New 2008
<small>Yes = 1 No = 0</small> | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes All necessary equipment was used during the inspection.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 6 | What type of inspection(s) did the state inspector conduct during the field portion of the state evaluation? (i.e. Standard, Construction, IMP, etc) New 2008
<small>Info Only = No Points</small> | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

A standard field and construction inspection

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 7 | Did the inspector adequately review the following during the field portion of the state evaluation? (check all that apply on list) New 2008, comprehensive question worth 2 points total
<small>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1</small> | 2 | 2 |
| a. | Procedures | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| b. | Records | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| c. | Field Activities/Facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| d. | Other (Please Comment) | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

SLR Notes:

In the field the inspector review the records and observed the procedures performed by the operator.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 8 | Did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Liaison will document reasons if unacceptable) Previous Question F.8 | 2 | 2 |
| <small>Yes = 2 No = 0</small> | | | |

SLR Notes:

Terry Wasielewski - Started working for the Gas and Water Section in December 1999. Conduct Federal Audits for both gas and liquid pipelines, compressor stations and storage fields. Conduct State Audits on local distribution companies for both record and field audits. Conduct investigations on both natural gas and liquid incidents and spills. Patrick Raichel - 15 years with Gas Safety Section. Conducted Federal and State audits for Gas Transmission, Gas Distribution, Gas Storage, LNG and Hazardous Liquids; record, field and construction. Conducted investigation of incidents involving Gas Transmission, Gas Distribution, Gas Storage, LNG and Hazardous Liquids. Conducted investigation of complaints involving Gas Transmission, Gas Distribution, Gas Storage, LNG and Hazardous Liquids. Enforcement of NY State damage prevention laws. Handle complaints as assigned. Handled emergency incidents as assigned and as obtained through emergency call-outs. Ran the day-to-day operations (6/09 to 6/10) of the Buffalo Office.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 9 | 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) Previous Question F.10 | 1 | 1 |
| <small>Yes = 1 No = 0</small> | | | |

SLR Notes:

Yes. The inspectors provided a briefing of the inspection results to the operator and provided additional items that were needed from the operator to complete the inspection.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 10 | During the exit interview, did the inspector identify probable violations found during the inspections? Previous Question F.11 | 1 | 1 |
| <small>Yes = 1 No = 0</small> | | | |

SLR Notes:

Yes Both inspectors during the exit review went over in detail the operators probable violations.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 11 | What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) | Info Only | Info Only |
| <small>Info Only = No Points</small> | | | |

SLR Notes:

The inspectors observed valve operating tests, cathodic protection potential and rectifier readings, atmospheric corrosion condition of above ground piping, line markers and signs, overpressure protection devices and PE plastic pipe being installed.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 12 | Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) | Info Only | Info Only |
| <small>Info Only = No Points</small> | | | |

SLR Notes:

There were no best practices that were observed to share with other states or PHMSA regions.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| 13 | Field Observation Areas Observed (check all that apply) | Info Only | Info Only |
| <small>Info Only = No Points</small> | | | |
| 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| m. | Line Markers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

p.	MOP	<input type="checkbox"/>
q.	MAOP	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v.	Overpressure Safety Devices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
w.	Plastic Pipe Installation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
x.	Public Education	<input type="checkbox"/>
y.	Purging	<input type="checkbox"/>
z.	Prevention of Accidental Ignition	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.	Repairs	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.	Signs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C.	Tapping	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.	Valve Maintenance	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
J.	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

SLR Notes:

Most of these areas were covered during inspection the day of the observation.

14 Part F: General Comments/Regional Observations

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

The inspectors were very thorough in their inspection observations. They conducted the inspection in a professional manner and treated the operator's representatives with respect. They provided a clear and concise briefing of her inspection findings. Numerous concerns were identified with the inspections that were performed.

Total points scored for this section: 12
Total possible points for this section: 12



PART G - PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan

Points(MAX) Score

Risk base Inspections - Targeting High Risk Areas

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----|-----|
| 1 | Does state have process to identify high risk inspection units?
Yes = 1.5 No = 0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
|----------|---|-----|-----|

Risk Factors (criteria) to consider may include:

Miles of HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density

Length of time since last inspection

History of Individual Operator units (leakage, incident and compliance history, etc.)

Threats - (Excavation Damage, Corrosion, Natural Forces, Other Outside Forces, Material or Welds, Equipment, Operations, Other)

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 2 | Are inspection units broken down appropriately? (see definitions in Guidelines)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC has performed breakdown of inspection units appropriately

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 3 | Consideration of operators DIMP Plan? (if available and pending rulemaking)
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 4 | Does state inspection process target high risk areas?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

Use of Data to Help Drive Program Priority and Inspections

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 5 | Does state use data to analyze effectiveness of damage prevention efforts in the state? (DIRT or other data, etc)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC performs detailed data analysis and publishes "State Performance Measures" and shares with Gas Utilities and many stakeholders

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 6 | Has state reviewed data on Operator Annual reports for accuracy?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff worked closely with PHMSA/ER for verification of Annual Reports data.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 7 | Has state analyzed annual report data for trends and operator issues?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

NY PSC prepared State Performance Report. This report provides details- trend data, pipeline safety issues for LDCs in the state.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 8 | Has state reviewed data on Incident/Accident reports for accuracy?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

NY PSC performs a review of reportable incidents/accidents for accuracy. PSC worked with PHMSA and ER staff.

9	Does state do evaluation of effectiveness of program based on data? (i.e. performance measures, trends, etc.)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

NY PSC prepared "State Performance Report" and provided details on pipeline safety issues/ data and trends.

10	Did the State input all operator qualification inspection results into web based database provided by PHMSA in a timely manner upon completion of OQ inspections? Previous Question B.15	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

CY 2009 PSC has uploaded OQ inspections in PHMSA OQDB.

11	Did the State submit their replies into the Integrity Management Database (IMDB) in response to the Operators notifications for their integrity management program? Previous Question B.16	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

NY has submitted replies in IMDB.

12	Have the IMP Federal Protocol forms been uploaded to the IMDB? Previous Question B.17	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

CY 2009 NY PSC has uploaded IMP inspections in IMDB.

13	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? Previous Question B.18	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

14	Has state confirmed transmission operators have submitted information into National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) database along with any changes made after original submission?	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

Accident/Incident Investigation Learning and Sharing Lessons Learned

15	Has state shared lessons learned from incidents/accidents? (i.e. NAPSIR meetings and communications)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

PSC presented incident/ accident details at ER NPASIR Mtg.

16	Does the State support data gathering efforts concerning accidents? (Frequency/Consequence/etc)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

17	Does state have incident/accident criteria for conducting root cause analysis?	Info Only	Info Only
	Info Only = No Points		

SLR Notes:

18	Does state conduct root cause analysis on incidents/accidents in state?	Info Only	Info Only
	Info Only = No Points		

SLR Notes:

19	Has state participated on root cause analysis training? (can also be on wait list)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

NY PSC inspectors have attended and participated in "Root Cause Analysis Training."

Transparency - Communication with Stakeholders

20	Other than pipeline safety seminar does State communicate with stakeholders? (Communicate program data, pub awareness, etc.)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

PSC communicates to various stakeholders in multiple ways. State Performance Report" has detailed information. NY State website also provides weblink to Dig Safe etc.

21	Does state share enforcement data with public? (Website, newsletters, docket access, etc.)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

NY PSC shares enforcement data with public via website link.

22	Part G: General Comments/Regional Observations	Info Only	Info Only
	Info Only = No Points		

SLR Notes:

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



PART H - Miscellaneous

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 1 | What were the major accomplishments for the year being evaluated? (Describe the accomplishments, NAPSR Activities and Participation, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

- 1) 2010 State Performance Report. This report analyzes and reports 2009 data gathered from gas operators with respect to damage prevention, leak management, and infrastructure enhancement (replacement of cast iron and bare/ineffectively coated steel). This report also offers area for improvement. This year's report illustrates that, overall, operator performance has improved year over year.
- 2) PSC Investigation and Report of Con Edison - Floral Park incident. ("CENY-Floral Park.pdf")
- 3) PSC NAPSR activities/participation
- 4) PSC Staff participation in CGA and GPTC
- 5) PSC Staff from each office participated in local Dig-Safely NY damage prevention councils and damage prevention public education events

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 2 | What legislative or program initiatives are taking place/planned in the state, past, present, and future? (Describe initiatives (i.e. damage prevention, jurisdiction/authority, compliance/administrative, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

- 1) The PSC continues its ongoing efforts to enact damage prevention initiatives and increase penalties and efforts to enhance capabilities for civil penalties for repeat code violations

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 3 | Any Risk Reduction Accomplishments/Projects? (i.e. Cast iron replacement projects, bare steel, third-party damage reductions, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

- 1) The issuance and publishing of the Performance Reports helps reduce risk in several key areas, including damage prevention, emergency response, and leak management. Year over year improvements in key indicators within the report illustrate this fact.

In addition, PSC continues to reduce risk through rate case initiatives ? which are continued and enhanced based on the above report and operator leak and pipe inventory reported in PHMSA annual reports. These initiatives include incentives for meeting key indicators, such as:

? Meeting leak and odor response time criteria (responding to 75% of calls within 30 minutes, 90% within 45 minutes, 95% within 60 minutes.)

? Reduction and elimination of cast iron facilities. (Examples: NYSEG rate case (merger with Iberdrola requires reduction of 20 miles of leak prone pipe and 2000 services per year. RGE requires reduction of 20 miles of leak prone pipe and 2000 services/year. Leak prone pipe defined as cast iron and/or bare/ineffectively coated steel)

? Reduction in bare and ineffectively coated steel facilities (services and mains). (Examples: NYSEG rate case (merger with Iberdrola requires reduction of 20

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPSR or PHMSA?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC actively participated and supported information requests from NAPSR/ PHMSA.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 5 | Sharing Best Practices with Other States - (General Program)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 6 | Part H: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 3

Total possible points for this section: 3



PART I - Program Initiatives

Points(MAX) Score

Drug and Alcohol Testing (49 CFR Part 199)

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Has the state verified that operators have drug and alcohol testing programs?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

NY has verified that LDCs have D&A Testing Plans. NY PSC performed D&A inspection and used PHMSA form #13

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 2 | Is the state verifying that operators are conducting the drug and alcohol tests required by the operators program (random, post-incident, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

NY PSC performed D&A inspection and used PHMSA form #13.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 3 | Is the state verifying that any positive tests are responded to in accordance with the operator's program?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

NY PSC performed D&A inspection and used PHMSA form #13

Qualification of Pipeline Personnel (49 CFR Part 192 Subpart N)

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Has the state verified that operators have a written qualification program?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff has performed OQ inspections and uploaded completed federal protocols in OQDB.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 5 | Has the state reviewed operator qualification programs for compliance with PHMSA rules and protocols?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff performed OQ inspections and uploaded completed federal protocols in OQDB.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 6 | Is the state verifying that persons who perform covered tasks for the operator are qualified in accordance with the operator's program?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff performed 177 OQ #9 inspections and uploaded completed federal protocols in OQDB.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 7 | Is the state verifying that persons who perform covered task for the operator are requalified at the intervals specified in the operator's program?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff performed OQ inspections and uploaded completed federal protocols in OQDB.

Gas Transmission Pipeline Integrity Management (49 CFR Part 192 Subpart O)

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 8 | Has the state verified that all operators with transmission pipelines have either adopted an integrity management program (IMP), or have properly determined that one is not required?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

During 2007-2008, PSC performed IMP staff inspections of interstate and intrastate operators and used federal IMP protocols.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 9 | Has the state verified that in determining whether a plan is required, the operator correctly calculated the potential impact radii and properly applied the definition of a high consequence area?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

During 2007-2008, PSC performed IMP staff inspections of interstate and intrastate operators and used federal IMP protocols

10	Has the state reviewed operator IMPs for compliance with Subpart O? (In accordance with State Inspection plan) Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	---	----	-----

SLR Notes:

During 2007-2008, PSC performed IMP staff inspections of interstate and intrastate operators and used federal IMP protocols

11	Is the state monitoring operator progress on the inspections, tests and remedial actions required by the operator's IMP, including that they are being done in the manner and schedule called for in its IMP? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

During 2007-2008, PSC performed IMP staff inspections of interstate and intrastate operators and used federal IMP protocols.

12	Is the state verifying that operators are periodically examining their transmission line routes for the appearance of new HCAs? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

Public Awareness (49 CFR Section 192.616)

13	Has the state verified that each operator has developed a continuing public awareness program? (due date was 6/20/06 for most operators, 6/20/07 for certain very small operators, 6/13/08 for master meters) Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

PSC has verified that operators has developed a continuing public awareness program.

14	Has the state reviewed the content of these programs for compliance with 192.616 (by participating in the Clearinghouse or by other means)? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

PSC participates in variety of Damage Prevention activities (seminars sponsored by LDCs) and Paradigm mtgs.

15	Is the state verifying that operators are conducting the public awareness activities called for in its program? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

In CY2009 PSC staff verified that operators are conducting the public awareness activities called for in its program.

16	Is the state verifying that operators have evaluated their Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162? Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
-----------	---	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

17	Part I: General Comments/Regional Observations Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
-----------	---	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 9
Total possible points for this section: 9