



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

S. D. PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

## 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:** South Dakota

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 07/08/2012 - 07/12/2012

**Agency Representative:** Nathan Solem

**PHMSA Representative:** Leonard Steiner

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

**Name/Title:** Chris Nelson, Chairman

**Agency:** South Dakota Publis Utilities Commission

**Address:** 500 East Capitol Avenue

**City/State/Zip:** Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070

**Rating:**

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

---

**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 then 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**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 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)            |

**Possible Points    Points Scored**

|    |    |
|----|----|
| 10 | 10 |
| 15 | 15 |
| 43 | 43 |
| 15 | 15 |
| 9  | 9  |
| 8  | 8  |
| 12 | 12 |
| 0  | 0  |
| 0  | 0  |

**TOTALS**

**112                      112**

**State Rating ..... 100.0**

---

## 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | Review of Inspection Days for accuracy - Progress Report Attachment 2 (A1b)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | Accuracy verification of Operators and Operators Inspection Units in State - Progress Report Attachment 3 (A1c)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | Were all federally reportable incident reports listed and information correct? - Progress Report Attachment 4 (A1d)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 (A1e)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6 (A1f, A4)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 7 | Was employee listing and completed training accurate and complete? - Progress Report Attachment 7 (A1g)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Verification of Part 192,193,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8 (A1h)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Recommendation is to put the amount of penalties for one-call violations in the comments.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 (H1-3)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

---

**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)

2                      2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

**2**    IMP Inspections (including DIMP) (B1b)

1                      1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

**3**    OQ Inspections (B1c)

1                      1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

**4**    Damage Prevention Inspections (B1d)

1                      1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

**5**    On-Site Operator Training (B1e)

1                      1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

**6**    Construction Inspections (B1f)

1                      1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

**7**    Incident/Accident Investigations (B1g)

2                      2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

**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)

6                      6

Yes = 6 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-5

a.    Length of time since last inspection

Yes ☒    No ☐    Needs Improvement ☐

b.    Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities)

Yes ☒    No ☐    Needs Improvement ☐

c.    Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction)

Yes ☒    No ☐    Needs Improvement ☐

d.    Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic areas, Population Density, etc)

Yes ☒    No ☐    Needs Improvement ☐

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 ☒    No ☐    Needs Improvement ☐

f.    Are inspection units broken down appropriately?

Yes ☒    No ☐    Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

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

Info OnlyInfo Only

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):  
173.50

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
 $220 \times 1.26 = 277.20$

Ratio: A / B  
 $173.50 / 277.20 = 0.63$

If Ratio  $\geq 0.38$  Then Points = 5, If Ratio  $< 0.38$  Then Points = 0  
Points = 5

Evaluator Notes:

- 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:

one attend the NACE CP1 course

- 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:

- 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:

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

Evaluator Notes:

South Dakota alternates with North Dakota and conducts seminars. In CY2012 with North Dakota and in CY 2013 conducted the seminar for North Dakota

- 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:

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

|   |  |   |    |
|---|--|---|----|
| 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

No know cast iron pipe is in South Dakota.

|   |   |   |    |
|---|---|---|----|
| 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

No know cast iron pipe is in South Dakota

|    |  |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

They have a question on the 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

|    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

|    |  |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

They conducted 2 IMP inspections in CY2012.

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



Evaluator Notes:

They have a question on their inspection form.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>15</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

South Dakota has extensive procedures for drug and alcohol program inspections and conduct the inspections.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>16</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>17</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>18</b> | 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<br>DIMP ? First round of program inspections should be complete by December 2014<br><br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

South Dakota has conducted their initial inspections of DIMP.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>19</b> | 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)<br>PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be complete by December 2013<br><br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>20</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

South Dakota uses the Public Utilities commission website, send operators e-mails with information, and have quarterly operator training webinars.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reports were filed in 2012.

---

- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>22</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

They have a question on their inspection form.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

- |           |  |           |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>24</b> | General Comments:<br>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) 4 4  
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3
- a. Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- b. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

The program manager reviews all uncorrected compliance actions quarterly.

- 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) 4 4  
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3
- a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system? Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- b. Were probable violations documented? Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- c. Were probable violations resolved? Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- d. Was the progress of probable violations routinely reviewed? Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

South Dakota has imposed several fines.

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

Total points scored for this section: 15  
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:

- 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:

All incidents have had an on-site investigation.

- 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:

Adequate reports were written.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No probable violations were discovered during the investigation.

- 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:

During any incidents, South Dakota was in continuous contact with the Central Region.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The specifically shared at the NAPSRS meetings and with other program directors.

- 7 General Comments:  
Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

---

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



## 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

They have a question on the inspection form.

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Locate tickets and times are inspected.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

South Dakota uses the best practices as the reference to the operator's procedures. They emphasize the best practices at operator training and excavator meetings.

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The data is collected form the Operator's Annual reports and analyzed.

- |   |  |  |                    |
|---|--|--|--------------------|
| 5 | General Comments:<br>Info Only = No Points |  | Info OnlyInfo 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:

MidAmerican Energy

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Mary Zanter

Location of Inspection:

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Date of Inspection:

7/11/2013

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Leonard Steiner

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:

Adequate preparation and notification was provided.

- 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:

Yes, a state developed inspection form was used ofr documentation.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the form was completed.

- 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:

Yes

- 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:

Yes, Inspector Zanter was fully knowledgeable of the procedures she observed.

- 
- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>8</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes,

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

Evaluator Notes:

No probable violations were discovered. One area of concern was discussed for improvement of the operator's procedures.

- 
- |           |  |           |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>10</b> | 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.<br>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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>            |
| z. | Prevention of Accidental Ignition | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| A. | Repairs                           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. | Signs                             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| C. | Tapping                           | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> |
| H. | Compliance Follow-up        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. | Atmospheric Corrosion       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

I observed Mary Zanter, a pipeline inspector for the South Dakota Utilities Commission, as she inspected a pipeline replacement project. This portion of the project consisted of inspecting welding, coating of the welded area, jeeeping for holidays, and installtion of pipe by pulling through a borehole. She also inspected the welding procedure and several covered tasks to determine if the employee was Operator Qualified. Ms. Zanter demonstrated she was knowledgable and thorough in her observation. She conducted the inspection in a courteous and professional manner.

---

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



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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <b>4</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |  |           |           |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>8</b> | General Comments:<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <b>3</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |  |           |           |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>7</b> | General Comments:<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

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