



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2014 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

Alabama Public Service 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)



2014 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2014

Gas

State Agency: Alabama

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 05/11/2015 - 05/22/2015

Agency Representative: Wallace Jones, Sr. - Administrator, Gas Pipeline Safety

PHMSA Representative: Patrick Gaume

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

Name/Title: Twinkle Andress Cavanaugh, President

Agency: Alabama Public Service Commission

Address: 100 N. Union St., Suite 800

City/State/Zip: Montgomery, Alabama 36104

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 2014 (not the status of performance at the time of the evaluation). All items for which criteria have not been established should be answered based on the PHMSA representative's judgment. A deficiency in any one part of a multiple part question should be scored as needs improvement. Determine the answer to the question then select the appropriate point value. If a state receives less than the maximum points, include a brief explanation in the space provided for general comments/regional observations. If a question is not applicable to a state, select NA. Please ensure all responses are COMPLETE and ACCURATE, and OBJECTIVELY reflect state program performance. Increasing emphasis is being placed on performance. This evaluation together with selected factors reported in the state's annual progress report attachments provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

Field Inspection (PART G):

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

Scoring Summary

PARTS

Possible Points Points Scored

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

10	9.5
13	12
45	42
15	15
6	6
8	8
12	12
0	0
0	0

TOTALS

109 104.5

State Rating

95.9

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
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

A1. YES. Attachment 1 is accurate. A small typo was corrected during the evaluation.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A2. Yes. The inspection person days on Attachment 2 matched the APSC's 2014 inspection records.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A3. Yes. The APSC's listing of operators and units matched the spreadsheet listing kept by the APSC. The number of units on Attachment 3 matched the Attachment 1 tally.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A4. Yes. There were no significant incidents or accidents in 2014. The NG incident 20140140-16580 for LEGACY RESOURCES CO LP, opid 31836, concerned a flow line platform that was struck in State waters. It is jurisdictional to the AL Oil & Gas Board, not to APSC or PHMSA. It is APSC practice to onsite investigate all significant incidents or accidents.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

A5. Yes. There were no errors found on Attachment 5.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

A6. Yes. APSC is in transition from paper to electronic. Currently the 'official' records are in paper form. The records are found as appropriate on the 9th floor. I advised that the electronic files need to be backed up into the main frame database.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|
| 7 | Was employee listing and completed training accurate and complete? - Progress Report Attachment 7
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 0.5 |
|---|--|---|-----|

Evaluator Notes:

A7. NI. 0.5 of 1 point. Some math errors for inspector time dedicated for NG were discovered and a corrected report will be submitted. The training records were correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A8. Yes. Attachment 8 appears to be correct. No discrepancies were found with the APSC's Attachment 8 information. The

APSC does not have civil penalty levels substantially the same as PHMSA. Legislation has been introduced to raise the APSC's civil penalty level to be substantially the same as PHMSA.

- 9** List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

A9. Yes. No issues identified with Attachment 10. It is s a good description of the APSC's program.

- 10** General Comments: Info OnlyInfo Only
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

A10. Yes. The Progress Report was reasonably done. We discussed the impact of typos and math errors.

Total points scored for this section: 9.5
Total possible points for this section: 10



PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Standard Inspection procedures should give guidance to state inspectors that insure consistency in all inspections conducted by the state? The following elements should be addressed at a minimum - pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities. | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

B1. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection B&C; &G; & S,T,& U.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | IMP and DIMP Inspection procedures should give guidance to state inspectors that insure consistency in all inspections conducted by the state? The following elements should be addressed at a minimum - pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities. | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

B2. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection B&C; & N & P; & S,T,& U.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | OQ Inspection procedures should give guidance to state inspectors that insure consistency in all inspections conducted by the state? The following elements should be addressed at a minimum - pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities. | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

B3. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection B&C; &I; & S,T,& U.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Damage Prevention Inspection procedures should give guidance to state inspectors that insure consistency in all inspections conducted by the state? The following elements should be addressed at a minimum - pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities. | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

B4. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection B&C; &M; & S,T,& U.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 5 | Any operator training conducted should be outlined and appropriately documented as needed. | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

B5. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection L.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | Construction Inspection procedures should give guidance to state inspectors that insure consistency in all inspections conducted by the state? The following elements should be addressed at a minimum - pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities. | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

B6. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection H. Also B&C; & S,T,& U. The State Form appears adequate but I advised that APSC staff should critically compare their state form against Form 05 & Form 07, which are the federal construction forms for NG & HL.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Does inspection plan address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements? | 6 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|

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

- a. Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval)

Yes ☒

No ☐

Needs Improvement ☐

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| b. Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic areas, Population Density, etc) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e. Process to identify high-risk inspection units that includes all threats - (Excavation Damage, Corrosion, Natural Forces, Outside Forces, Material and Welds, Equipment, Operators and any Other Factors) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. Are inspection units broken down appropriately? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

B7. NI, 5 of 6 points. APSC uses a detailed spreadsheet and also APS Operations Plan Appendix D (mostly for Standard insp), Also Sec VI subsection A Background (specifically for construction, incidents & accidents). Yes for parts a,b,c,d,& e; NI for part f, Transmission Units have not been developed for 9 NG operators that show to operate transmission lines on their annual reports.

8 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

B8. Yes. The APSC procedures generally complied with the requirements of Part B of this evaluation. One point was lost in this Section.

Total points scored for this section: 12
Total possible points for this section: 13



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 5 5
Yes = 5 No = 0

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
965.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 7.48 = 1646.33

Ratio: A / B
965.00 / 1646.33 = 0.59

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

Evaluator Notes:

C1. Yes. Attachment 7 is being amended. NG Total Insp Person Days is 965. Total insp person days charged to the Program has been revised to 7.48 years or 1645.6 days. The ratio is 965/1645.6=0.586. 0.586 $>$ 0.38.

- 2 Has each inspector and program manager fulfilled the T Q Training Requirements? (See Guidelines Appendix C for requirements) Chapter 4.4 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"/> |
| e. | Verify inspector has obtained minimum qualifications to lead any applicable standard inspection as the lead inspector. | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

C2. Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes. All lead inspectors are qualified to Standard, imp, OQ, & 3 inspectors have taken Root Cause. Outside training includes several inspectors with extensive industry experience, H2S training, Offshore Training, & current HAZWOPER Certification.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C3. Yes. Wallace Jones demonstrates a professional knowledge of the Pipeline Safety Program. He has also completed the required TQ classes and most electives too.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C4. Yes. Letters were dated 5/9 & 7/7, is within the 60 day response time, especially considering mail time. All three required items were addressed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C5. Yes. The last seminar was held in December of 2014. The APSC conducts its seminar annually. In addition APSC co-hosts the annual TQ Seminar in New Orleans.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | Did state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in written procedures? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4 | 5 | 3 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C6. NI. 3 of 5 points. The frequency of Standard Inspections are in good order. PAPEI are in good order. Construction & incident inspections are fine. 3 of 8 LIMP inspections are beyond the 5 yr frequency. 33 of 35 TIMP inspections are beyond the 5 yr frequency. 137 of 141 OQ Program inspections are beyond the 5 yr frequency.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C7. NI. 1 of 2 points. For the 5/8/14 Std Insp of Wilton Gas System, pages 20-26 (the Field & Records portion) of the federal form were not filled out. The Federal Form was not used in 2012 or 2013 for Wilton Gas System. A PV concerning Atmospheric Corrosion in the letter of 6/5/14 was not documented in the file. A sampling of other inspection files, both NG & HL, were satisfactory.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C8. Yes. it is covered on the Standard Inspection forms

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C9. Yes, it is covered on the Standard Inspection forms.

- | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C10. Yes, it is covered on the Standard Inspection forms.

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 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
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C11. Yes, it is covered on the Standard Inspection forms.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C12. The APSC reviews the data from annual reports and utilizes a major portion of the data in its risk model. The APSC has been utilizing trend charts for cast iron replacement since 2008.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C13. Yes. the OQ and IMP databases show regular and recent uploading of inspections.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C14. Yes, The APSC uses Form 1, the federal form for the inspection of gas transmission pipelines. The requirement for NPMS is on Page 3 of the federal form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C15. Yes. The APSC reviews program changes during each standard inspection. The APSC conducted 83 drug and alcohol inspections as a part of standard inspections during 2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C16. Yes. All operators' OQ programs have been inspected. The APSC reviews compliance with Protocol 9 during each Standard Inspection. The OQ database also shows that the APSC has continually uploaded the results of Protocol 9 inspections. The APSC continued reviewing the field portion (Protocol 9) of Part 192, Subpart N during 2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C17. Yes. The APSC has conducted the integrity management programs of all gas transmission operators. The APSC is starting the second round of IMP inspections. The APSC is planning to complete the second round as soon as practical.

- 18 Is state verifying operator's gas distribution integrity management Programs (DIMP)? This should include a review of DIMP plans, along with monitoring progress. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). 49 CFR 192 Subpart P DIMP ? First round of program inspections should be complete by December 2014 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C18. Yes. All DIMP have been done and have successfully uploaded 88 into the database. The remaining 15 have been uploaded but are not showing in the database. APSC will try to upload them again.

- 19 Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. 49 CFR 192.616 (I13-16) PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should have been completed by December 2013 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C19. Yes. All PAPEI have been done and 95 have been successfully uploaded into the database. APSC is contacting its inspection staff to find and upload (or re-upload) the missing 10 inspections.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 20 | Does the state have a mechanism for communicating with stakeholders - other than state pipeline safety seminar? (This should include making enforcement cases available to public).
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C20. Yes. The APSC posts pipeline safety information on the Commission's website. The APSC participates in and makes presentations at Alabama Natural Gas Association meetings.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C21. NA. There were no safety related condition reports filed by operators during 2013 or 2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C22. Yes. The APSC has included Question 39 on their inspection forms which cover the issue of plastic pipe and component failures.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C23. Yes. APSC fully participates with NAPSRS & PHMSA.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 24 | If the State has issued any waivers/special permits for any operator, has the state verified conditions of those waivers/special permits are being met? This should include having the operator amend procedures where appropriate.(New Question for CY2013, no points until CY2015 evaluation conducted in CY2016)
Info Only = No Points | 0 | 0 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C24. Yes. APSC has been involved with four waivers but only one is still active. The inactive waivers were for short term and special case and they expired. The active waiver was issued in 2009 to Alabama Gas Corp for un-odorized gas to be delivered to Hunt Oil Corp. That contract is still active and the waiver is still active.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 25 | Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated? (New Question for CY2014, no points first year)
Info Only = No Points | 0 | 0 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C25. Yes. The APSC sent four employees to the National NAPSRS Meeting, including the Program Manager.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 26 | Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site. (question will be rolled up and included as part of Question C12 on future evaluations) http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm
Info Only = No Points | 0 | 0 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C26. Yes. The PM pulled up the data. The information appears to be accurate. The PM plans to compare this data with his internal data. This information appears to hold promise to be of value.

27 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

C27. Yes. APSC is actively engaged in inspecting operators and pipelines for safety. They are aware of the need to perform OQ and IM inspections and to successfully upload certain inspections into the databases. Three points were lost in this Section.

Total points scored for this section: 42
Total possible points for this section: 45



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
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 4 |
| a. | Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

D1. Yes & Yes. The APSC's procedures include a matrix of response timeframes depending on the nature of the probable violation. It is described on Page 24 of the APSC's inspection and enforcement procedures. Response date required and the actual response date are kept by each lead inspector for follow-up. Written compliance action correspondence must be sent to an officer of a private company.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D2. Yes, yes, yes, & yes. Upon a review of randomly selected inspection files, the files contained responses from operators within the deadlines given by the APSC. No instances were found where the APSC failed to follow-up on probable violation corrections. Compliance notifications were sent to company officer when a private company was involved.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D3. Yes. Upon a review of randomly selected inspection files completed during 2014, all inspections with discovered probable violations had letters of non-compliance in the files.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D4. Yes. The APSC's rules and procedures provide operators with an opportunity to argue their position as to whether a probable violation occurred. The operator is provided with an opportunity to present its case in a "show cause" hearing before a presiding officer or the commission. Upon a review of randomly selected inspection files the APSC followed its procedures.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D5. Yes. Page 21 & 22 of the APSC's inspection and enforcement procedures identify the criteria to be considered to determine a level of civil penalty fine. It addresses the severity of the probable violation, if the probable violation was repeated, the operator's ability to pay, and whether or not an accident resulted in an injury or fatality.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D6. Yes. APSC assessed a Civil Penalty in 2014. APSC was encouraged to develop an administrative civil penalty process.

7 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

D7. Yes. APSC has an established Compliance processes. An improved process for issuing civil penalties is recommended.

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



PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Does the state have written procedures to address state actions in the event of an incident/accident? 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

E1. (old B7) Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec VI subsections A-G. The APSC investigates incidents as they occur.

- 2 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 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:

E2. Yes. The APSC publishes and disseminates contact information to operators. A contact listing is also maintained on the Commission's web site. After hour contact instructions are also included. The Program Manager is knowledgeable of the MOU and understands the cooperation between the state and PHMSA as outlined in the Appendices of the Guidelines.

- 3 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 1 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

E3. NA. There were no significant incidents or accidents in 2014. The NG incident 20140140-16580 concerned a flow line platform that was struck in State waters. It is jurisdictional to the AL Oil & Gas Board. It is APSC practice to onsite investigate all significant incidents or accidents.

- 4 Were all incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations? 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 when appropriate Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

E4. NA. There were no incidents or accidents in 2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

E5. NA. There were no probable violations for incidents or accidents in 2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

E6. Yes. APSC is cooperative with PHMSA Southern Region.

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

Evaluator Notes:

E7. Yes. Wallace Jones communicates this information during Southern Region Meetings & in the State hosted Pipeline Safety Seminars both in AL & in New Orleans.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

E8. Yes. APSC responds to notices of incidents and accidents.

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



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

Evaluator Notes:

F1. Yes. The APSC conducts reviews of operators' OM procedures on a three year rotational basis. Directional drilling/boring procedures are a part of the review. The APSC uses the federal standard inspection form which covers this requirement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F2. Yes. The APSC's standard inspection form Question 25 has the inspector review the operator's damage prevention program and records.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F3. Yes. The Program Manager participates in the Alabama Damage Prevention Alliance where he has encouraged stakeholder representatives to use CGA Best Practices. The APSC includes damage prevention topics during its annual pipeline safety seminar.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F4. Yes. The APSC collects this information each year and uses the information in its relative risk ranking model. The data is insufficient to establish any trends at this time.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F5. Yes. The APSC generally complied with the requirements of Part F of this evaluation and supports Damage Prevention efforts.

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:

North Baldwin Utilities, opid 1192

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Daniel Trapp, Pipeline Safety Supervisor, APSC

Location of Inspection:

25 Hand Avenue, Bay Minette, AL 36507

Date of Inspection:

5/13/15

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Patrick Gaume

Evaluator Notes:

G1. North Baldwin Utilities, opid 1192, Daniel Trapp, Pipeline Safety Supervisor, APSC

25 Hand Avenue, Bay Minette, AL 36507, 5/13/15, Patrick Gaume

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

Evaluator Notes:

G2. Yes. 4 operator personnel & 1 contractor participated in this inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G3. Yes. AL State Form for NG Std Insp.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G4. Yes, The entire form was filled out.

- 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.) 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

G5. Yes. CP equipment, odor meter, hand tools, keys, valve handles.

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

a. Procedures ☒

b. Records ☒

c. Field Activities ☒

d. Other (please comment) ☒

Evaluator Notes:

G6. Yes, yes, yes, yes, Performed a Full Std insp including OQ protocol 9s for CP, odor testing, & valve operation.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Evaluator will document reasons if unacceptable)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

G7. Yes. Daniel performed his duties in a professional manner.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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)
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

G8. Yes. No violations found; noted minor atmospheric corrosion on a meter set; noted some missing PL markers near Co Rd 40 Gate Station 2; recommended installing permanent odor testing sites.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G9. Yes. No violations found; noted minor atmospheric corrosion on a meter set; noted some missing PL markers near Co Rd 40 Gate Station 2; recommended installing permanent odor testing sites.

- | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|-----------|
| 10 | General Comments: 1) What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) 2) Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) 3) Other.
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----|---|-----------|-----------|

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Abandonment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Abnormal Operations | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. | Deactivation | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| u. | Odorization | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. | Tapping | <input type="checkbox"/> |



- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| D. | Valve Maintenance | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

G10. This was a standard inspection of a cooperative LDC.

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)?
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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.)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent 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)?
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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.)
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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