



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2011 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WEST VIRGINIA

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 -- Accident Investigations
- F -- Damage Prevention
- G -- Field Inspections
- H -- Interstate Agent State (if applicable)
- I -- 60106 Agreement State (if applicable)



2011 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2011
Hazardous Liquid

State Agency: West Virginia

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 04/01/2012 - 04/06/2012

Agency Representative: Dave Hippchen

PHMSA Representative: Dinubhai (Dino) N. Rathod

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

Name/Title: Michael A. Albert, Chairman

Agency: Public Service Commission of West Virginia

Address: 201 Brooks St

City/State/Zip: Charleston, West Virginia 25323

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 2011 (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 Accident Investigations
F Damage Prevention
G Field Inspections
H Interstate Agent State (if applicable)
I 60106 Agreement State (if applicable)

8
15
42
6
2
8
12
0
0

7
15
39.5
6
2
8
12
0
0

TOTALS

93 89.5

State Rating

96.2

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:

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable Haz Liquid Accidents in CY 2011

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Haz Liquid Compliance Actions during CY 2011

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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC maintains hard copies as well as electronic data. However, No progress in database for all inspection records. PSC promised to resolve this issue ASAP.

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:

8	Verification of Part 195,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8 (A1h) Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
---	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

9	List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 (H1-3)	1	1
---	--	---	---

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

10 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 7
Total possible points for this section: 8



PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Item 11.6.2

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

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Item 11.6.11

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

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Item 11.6.8

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

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Item 11.6.12

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Item 11.6.7

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

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Item 11.6.6.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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 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 type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction) | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density, etc) | Yes <input 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 type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. | Are inspection units broken down appropriately? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:
WV PSC Written Inspection Procedures- Items 11.5 & 11.6

9 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

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? 5 5
Yes = 5 No = 0

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
9.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person
Years) (Attachment 7):
 $220 \times 0.04 = 8.80$

Ratio: A / B
 $9.00 / 8.80 = 1.02$

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

Evaluator Notes:

Ratio A/B is >0.38 ; Ok 5 points

- 2 Has each inspector and program 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 IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/prgram 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:

WV PSC Training Records including "Wait-Listed" courses reviewed- ok

- 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:

Dave Hippchen has extensive pipeline safety regulatory experience and completed T&Q training courses. He works closely with PHMSA and NAPSRS staff.

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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC efforts to increase Civil Penalty limits (current \$1,000) for pipeline safety were not successful. Bill was considered but no further action resulted. PSC informed me of possible action in CY 2013.

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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC hosted pipeline operator seminar. Both liquid and Gas operators participated. Discussed with PSC to cover appropriate T&Q seminar material specific to liquid pipeline facilities.

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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC uses PHMSA inspection forms

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Did the state review operator procedures for determining areas of active corrosion on liquid lines in sufficient detail? (NOTE: PHMSA representative to describe state criteria for determining areas of active corrosion) (B7)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | Did the state adequately review for compliance operator procedures for abandoning pipeline facilities and analyzing pipeline accidents to determine their causes? (NOTE: PHMSA representative to describe state criteria for determining compliance with abandoning pipeline facilities and analyzing pipeline accidents to determine their causes) (B8)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 10 | Is the state aware of environmentally sensitive areas traversed by or adjacent to hazardous liquid pipelines? (reference Part 195, review of NPMS) (B9)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 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 195.402(c)(5)? (B10,E5)
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 (G5-8,G15)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

I discussed with PSC need for performing review of Annual Reports for accuracy, completeness and consistent data. PSC agreed to address this issue and maintain adequate documentation of review(s)

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 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 (G9-12)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 14 | Has state confirmed intrastate operators have submitted information into NPMS database along with changes made after original submission? (G13)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

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

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 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 195 Part G (I4-7)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 17 | Is state verifying operator's hazardous liquid integrity management (L IMP) Programs are up to date? This should include a previous review of LIMP 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 195.452 Appendix C (C8-12)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 18 | 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 195.440 (I13-16)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|-----|
| 19 | 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). (G19-20)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 0.5 |
|-----------|---|---|-----|
-

Evaluator Notes:

pSC has a weblink:

<http://www.psc.wv.us> PSC website does not post any enforcement related data. I encouraged PSC to consider making this type of enforcement data available to public via web access.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| 20 | 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:

NO SRC reported in CY 2011

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 21 | Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPSRS or PHMSA? (H4)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

PSC participated in GAOREports, NAPSRS Surveys about furlough days etc

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|--|
| 22 | General Comments: | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|--|

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 39.5
Total possible points for this section: 42



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:

WV PSC Procedures Items 11.7 thru 11.11

- 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 NA
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3
- a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board director if municipal/government system? Yes ☐ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

WV PSC Procedures Items 11.7 thru 11.11. However, in CY 2011 no Compliance Actions taken by PSC.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Probable violations discovered in CY 2011

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

Evaluator Notes:

No probable violations/ enforcement actions in CY 2011

- 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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC Prog Manager is familiar with state process of imposing civil penalties. No probable violations discovered in CY 2011

- 6 Can the State demonstrate it is using their enforcement fining authority for pipeline safety violations? (new question) Info Only Info Only
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

PART E - Accident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- 1** Does state have adequate mechanism to receive and respond to operator reports of accidents, 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 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable accidents in CY 2011. PSC has procedure to follow-up, as needed.

- 3** Were all accidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations? (D5) 3 NA
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 where appropriate Yes ☐ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable Accidents in CY 2011

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

Evaluator Notes:

- 5** Did the state assist region office by taking appropriate follow-up actions related to the operator accident 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 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable accidents in CY 2011. PSC works closely with PHMSA staff.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable accidents in CY 2011. However, PSC shares gas incident information at NAPS meetings

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 2
Total possible points for this section: 2



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? (E1)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator 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? (E2)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

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

Union Carbide

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Dave Hippchen

Location of Inspection:

South Charleston, WV

Date of Inspection:

04/04/2012

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Dinubhai (Dino) N.Rathod

Evaluator Notes:

Observe Cathodic Protection (CP) related activities.

- 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:

PSC had notified Union Carbide

- 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:

PSC used inspection form/ check list to document inspection observations

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

Evaluator Notes:

- 5 Did the inspector check to see if the operator had necessary equipment during inspection to conduct tasks viewed? (Maps, valve keys, half cells, etc) (F5) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

- 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:

Observe CP activities.

- 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:

Dave Hippen has extensive pipeline safety experience and completed necessary T&Q training courses.

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC discussed and requested additional information from Union Carbide.

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

PSC requested additonal information for OQ traaining records and list of CP related Covered Tasks performed by Company and Contractor persons.

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



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:

WV PSC is only intrastate liquid program.

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:

WV PSC is not 60106 Agreement Program

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