



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE  
Washington DC 20590

# 2015 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

IOWA UTILITIES BOARD

## 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)



# 2015 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2015

Gas

**State Agency:** Iowa

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 05/16/2016 - 05/27/2016

**Agency Representative:** Don Stursma

**PHMSA Representative:** Leonard Steiner

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

**Name/Title:** Geri D. Huser, Chair

**Agency:** Iowa Utilities Board

**Address:** 1375 East Court Avenue, Room 69

**City/State/Zip:** Des Moines, Iowa 50319

**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 2015 (not the status of performance at the time of the evaluation). All items for which criteria have not been established should be answered based on the PHMSA representative's judgment. A deficiency in any one part of a multiple part question should be scored as needs improvement. Determine the answer to the question then select the appropriate point value. If a state receives less than the maximum points, include a brief explanation in the space provided for general comments/regional observations. If a question is not applicable to a state, select NA. Please ensure all responses are COMPLETE and ACCURATE, and OBJECTIVELY reflect state program performance. Increasing emphasis is being placed on performance. This evaluation together with selected factors reported in the state's annual progress report attachments provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

## Field Inspection (PART G):

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

## Scoring Summary

### PARTS

### Possible Points Points Scored

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

10	10
13	13
44	44
15	15
9	9
8	8
12	12
4	3
0	0

### TOTALS

**115 114**

### State Rating

**99.1**

## PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

1	Accuracy of Jurisdictional Authority and Operator/Inspection Units Data - Progress Report Attachment 1 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Jurisdiction over pipeline operators accurately reported.			
2	Review of Inspection Days for accuracy - Progress Report Attachment 2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Then number of inspection person days is accurately reported.			
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: The list of operators and units is accurate and complete.			
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: The information of incidents is accurate. One intrastate operator and 2 interstate operators were listed as reportable incidents.			
5	Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: The correct number of compliance actions and correct number of probable violations were reported.			
6	Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
Evaluator Notes: Yes, Iowa is moving to use more electronic files			
7	Was employee listing and completed training accurate and complete? - Progress Report Attachment 7 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: The list of inspectors was accurate			
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: The adoption of Rules and Amendments is accurate. The adoption of amendments adopts all Federal regulations as of the effective date of the state adoption order.			
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:

Satisfactory detail

---

**10** General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

---

Total points scored for this section: 10  
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:

Provides guidance.

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

Provides guidance.

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

Provides guidance.

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

Provides guidance.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Provides guidance.

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

Provides guidance.

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

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

- |    |   |                                      |                          |   |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval)  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

**8** General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The procedures/guidelines for all pre-inspection, during inspection and post inspection activities are in a format for all inspections. Any specific guidance is contained in the instructions for each type of inspection.

---

Total points scored for this section: 13  
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):  
538.40

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
220 X 5.73 = 1260.23

Ratio: A / B  
538.40 / 1260.23 = 0.43

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

Evaluator Notes:

Ratio is .43

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

Evaluator Notes:

Outside training received is attended Iowa Municipal Association training of joining and cadwelding.

- 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:

- 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:

Yes, all concerns were addressed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Prior to CY2016, The previous Pipeline safety seminar was conducted in CY2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

All operators were inspected.

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	2
---	--	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, all inspection forms are patterned after the PHMSA forms.

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	NA
---	---	---	----

Evaluator Notes:

No known Cast Iron in Iowa

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	NA
---	--	---	----

Evaluator Notes:

No known Cast Iron in Iowa.

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:

There is a question on the O&M procedures inspection form asking this.

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:

Questions on records inspection form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Conducting inspections of all annual reports and recording results on Annual Report Inspection form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Iowa uploads all IMP and OQ 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:

Ask on inspection form and compares the Annual Report mileage to the National Pipeline Mapping System mileage from Pipeline Data Mart.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes Iowa conducted 54 drug inspections in CY2015.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, conducted 23 inspector days of OQ inspections.

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

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 DIMP ? First round of program inspections should have been complete by December 2014 | 2 | NA |
|           | Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1  |   |    |

Evaluator Notes:

No DIMP inspections were conducted in CY2015.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <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) PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be conducted every four years per RP1162 | 2 | 2 |
|           | Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1  |   |   |

Evaluator Notes:

The Public Awareness program followup inspections are part of the Standard Inspection and are completed with each Standard Inspection. The results are recorded with the Standard Inspection form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The pipeline safety section has a web site for general information. All records pertaining to any pipeline operator as filed in the Iowa Electronic Filing System. This system can be accessed by anyone through the internet.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Safety Related Condition Reports were submitted in Iowa during CY2015.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, there is a question on the O&M inspection form, asking what is any plastic pipe and components have a record of defect or leaks.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Waivers were requested and no waivers were given.

- 25** Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated? 1 1  
No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, attended.

- 26** Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site - <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm> 2 2  
No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 Yes = 2

- a. Discussion of Potential Accelerated Actions (AA's) based on any negative trends Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐  
b. NTSB P-11-20 Meaningful Metrics Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 44  
Total possible points for this section: 44

## PART D - Compliance Activities

Points(MAX) Score

- |          |  |                                      |  |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>1</b> | Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1<br>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:

Yes, adequate procedures for notifying operators of compliance actions, and then completion of compliance actions.

- |          |  |                                      |   |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>2</b> | 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<br>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.       | Document probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/>            |
| c.       | Resolve probable violations  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/>            |
| d.       | Routinely review progress of probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/>            |
| e.       | Were applicable civil penalties outlined in correspondence with operator(s)  | Yes <input type="radio"/>            | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Requirement starting CY2016, is that letters for Probable Violations should include applicable civil penalties in which the operator may be subject to for failure to comply with regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

All probable violations were contained in a compliance action.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Adequate due process in all compliance actions.

- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>5</b> | 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the program manager is familiar with the process to forward compliance actions that may require civil penalties.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, in previous years Iowa has issued civil penalties. It is suggested that guidelines be developed to show when a civil penalty should be imposed, such as repeat violations, or if the results of a noncompliance would result in an immediate safety hazard, or if the operator does not correct the probable violation within a specific time.

**7** General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo 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 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:

Yes. Adequate procedures for conducting incident investigations.

- 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:

The Iowa Utilities Board (IUB) has established by regulations the rotating additional duty of Duty Officer. The Duty Officer will receive notices of incidents and relay the information to the appropriate section, ie pipeline safety. The telephone number is in the regulation 199-10.17(479).

- 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:

In CY2016, there was only one incident and an on-site investigation was conducted.

- 4 Were all incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations? 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:

A complete report was written.

- 5 Did the state initiate compliance action for violations found during any incident/accident investigation? 1 NA

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

No probable violations of pipeline safety regulations were discovered.

- 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:

- 7 Does state share lessons learned from incidents/accidents? (sharing information, such as: at NAPSR Region meetings, state seminars, etc) 1 1

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

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

Info OnlyInfo Only

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

Evaluator Notes:

There is a question on the O&M procedure inspection form that inspects the procedures about drilling/boring near an operator's pipeline.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There are several questions on the O&M procedures inspection form about how the operator responds to the receipt of a locate request.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The Iowa Pipeline Safety Program is active with the Iowa One-Call System, and works with the Damage Prevention Councils.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the data is collected and presented, the documentation should be retained for a period of time.

- |   |  |           |           |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 5 | General Comments:<br>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:

Southwest Iowa Renewable Energy LLC, Bloomfield Municipal Gas

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Dan O'Connor, Nick Vandegriff

Location of Inspection:

Council Bluffs, IA, Bloomfield, IA

Date of Inspection:

5/24/2016, 5/25-27/2016

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? 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

- 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:

- 4 Did the inspector thoroughly document results of the inspection? 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, pyrometer, soap spray, CGI, etc.) 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, at both locations, the inspectors had notified the operator of needed equipment.

- 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:

Standard Inspection at both locations.

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



Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Both inspectors were very knowledgeable of the safety program and regulations.

<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) Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
----------	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Probable violations were discovered, however, areas that could be improved were suggested.

<b>10</b>	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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. | Deactivation                      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| k. | Emergency Procedures              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| l. | Inspection of Right-of-Way        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| m. | Line Markers                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| o. | Leak Surveys                      | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices       | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. | Signs                             | <input 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:

On May 24, 2016, I observed Nick Vandegriff and Dan O'Connor conduct a standard inspection of Southwest Iowa Renewable Energy, LLC. in Council Bluff, Iowa. This operator has a short transmission pipeline. The inspectors arrived at the office as scheduled and started the inspection. They inspected any changes to the O&M manual, the records for operation and maintenance, then moved to the field and inspected the pipeline facilities. The inspection was thorough and comprehensive. Both inspectors were knowledgeable and competent. They conducted the inspection in a courteous and professional manner. On May 25 - 25, 2016, I observed Nick Vandegriff conduct a standard inspection of Bloomfield Municipal Gas, Bloomfield, IA. The operator has a municipal owned distribution system. Mr. Vandegriff had coordinated the inspection and arrived at the scheduled time. The inspection was of the O&M manual and operations records. Mr. Vandegriff was knowledgeable and competent and he 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)?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|---|-----|

**Evaluator Notes:**

Iowa is required to enter all interstate inspections into Inspector Assistant (IA). The one inspection scheduled for CY2015 was not entered in to IA

- |          |   |   |     |
|----------|---|---|-----|
| <b>2</b> | Are results documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with "PHMSA directed inspection plan"?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|---|-----|

**Evaluator Notes:**

Needs improvement. Iowa was scheduled to complete one inspection of an interstate pipeline facility, an LNG plant. Iowa conducted the inspection in CY2016.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

The inspection was recorded on in a paper inspection form, and was submitted within the required time.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

No Probable Violations were discovered. Nothing to report.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

**Evaluator Notes:**

No conditions were discovered that would have posed an imminent safety hazard. Nothing to report.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

No probable violations were discovered, and the inspection results were submitted to PHMSA within 60 days.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

No probable violations were discovered, thus no supporting documentation was required.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

Total points scored for this section: 3  
Total possible points for this section: 4

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

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <b>1</b> | Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)?<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?<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?<br>(NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.)<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?<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?<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?<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