



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

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources

### 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:** Louisiana

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 07/11/2016 - 07/15/2016

**Agency Representative:** Steven Giambrone

**PHMSA Representative:** Leonard Steiner

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

**Name/Title:** Richard Ieyoub, Commisiosner

**Agency:** Louisiana Department of Natural Resources-Office of Conservation

**Address:** 617 North Third Street

**City/State/Zip:** Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802

**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
50	47
15	15
10	10
8	8
12	12
0	0
0	0

### TOTALS

**118 115**

**State Rating ..... 97.5**

## 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: Accurate as reported			
2	Review of Inspection Days for accuracy - Progress Report Attachment 2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as 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: Accurate as reported			
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: Accurate as reported			
5	Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as 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, Well organized, assessable and records were retrievable.			
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: Accurate as reported			
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:			
9	List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Info OnlyInfo Only

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



## PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Standard 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:

Yes, have inspections procedures.

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

Yes, have inspections procedures.

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

Yes, have inspections procedures.

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

Yes, have inspections procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Operator training procedures and documented as completed.

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

Yes, have inspections procedures. Louisiana requires notification of construction projects.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

---

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):  
930.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
220 X 10.31 = 2268.20

Ratio: A / B  
930.00 / 2268.20 = 0.41

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

Evaluator Notes:

Ratio = .41

- 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:

Outside training included 4 attending training at LA Gas Association, 4 attending training at LA Municipal Gas Authority

- 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 issues were addressed, some were corrected and others are long term corrections with plans to correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, in July 2015

- 6 Did state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in written procedures? Chapter 5.1 5 2  
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4

Evaluator Notes:

Needs improvement. There were 59 of the 89 operators of transmission pipelines the need to have the initial IMP inspection.

some of these operators may need only to be inspected the assure they have no HCAs. There were 30 of 209 operators needing a standard inspection. Over 100 of 292 operators need an OQ inspection.

- 
- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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?<br>Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, their system provide the list of code sections to be inspected.

---

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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?<br>(NTSB) Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Have question on inspection form.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Have question on inspection form.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

yes, have question on inspection form.

---

- |    |  |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|
| 11 | Did the state review operator records of previous accidents and failures including reported third party damage and leak response to ensure appropriate operator response as required by 192.617? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, has questions about inspecting accidents and failures.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, This is part of their standard 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.<br>Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, But they are have a backlog of inspections to conduct.

---



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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes have question on NPMS submittal and compare PDM report

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

Evaluator Notes:

They conducted drug and alcohol 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<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Louisiana conducts OQ inspections each year.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Louisiana conducts IMP inspections each year.

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

Evaluator Notes:

They conduct DIMP inspections and inspections required actions by the operator.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, PAP inspections are conducted

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

Evaluator Notes:

Louisiana uses its website to communicate with all stake holders.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, SRCR are monitored and recommended for closure when the correction is complete.

- 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, a question is on the inspection form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No waivers or current waivers for followups.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

- 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:

The excavation damages per 1000 locate tickets is lower, but the inspections days per 1000 miles of pipeline is lower. The enforcement received excellent remarks with a strong effort to apply civil or monetary penalties.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 47  
Total possible points for this section: 50

## 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 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:

Louisiana has procedures.

- 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 4 4  
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3
- a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system? Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- b. Document probable violations Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- c. Resolve probable violations Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- d. Routinely review progress of probable violations Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- e. Were applicable civil penalties outlined in correspondence with operator(s) Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

If a sections is marked as "Unsat" in their records system called Mpire, then there must be a compliance action.

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

Evaluator Notes:

- 5** Is the program manager familiar with state process for imposing civil penalties? Were civil penalties considered for repeat violations (with severity consideration) or violations resulting in incidents/accidents? (describe any actions taken) 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Civil penalties have been considered and recommended by the program manager and the commission has issued civility penalties.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Civil penalties have been used when the noncompliance is serious.

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

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



## PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Does 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 Louisiana has procedures for responding to reports of incidents.

- 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:

- 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 1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

- 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:

Louisiana uses the PHMSA Incident Investigation form for data collection.

- 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 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:

Louisiana maintains communication with the PHMSA Southwest Region.

- 7 Does state share lessons learned from incidents/accidents? (sharing information, such as: at NAPS 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: 10  
Total possible points for this section: 10



## 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 of the inspection form.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state inspector check to assure the pipeline operator is following its written procedures pertaining to notification of excavation, marking, positive response and the availability and use of the one call system?<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Louisiana inspects the notification and marking procedures and the results.

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

Louisiana One-Call Center has damage prevention meetings, and the Governor signs a proclamation in April for Safe Digging month.

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

They collect the data from the Annual Reports and analyze the data.

- |   |  |           |           |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 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<br>Info Only = No Points | Info OnlyInfo Only |
|---|---|--------------------|

Name of Operator Inspected:  
Enlink Midstream

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:  
Wayne Leger- Lead; Thien D. Le - inspector

Location of Inspection:  
Grand Cheniere, LA

Date of Inspection:  
September 26-29, 2016

Name of PHMSA Representative:  
Agustin Lopez

Evaluator Notes:

Evaluated Mr. Wayne Leger perform an inspection of Enlink Midstream transmission pipeline in the Lake Charles, LA area. Mr. Thien D. Le was also an inspector during the inspection but mostly as a trainee. Mr. Leger reviewed maintenance records and a field inspection of the pipeline facilities. The procedures were reviewed the previous week during a separate unit. Mr. Leger conducted himself professionally and did an exceptional job.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the operator was notified with enough time to allow any representative to be present for the 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)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the inspector utilized the MPire system, which is the LDNR electronic database, to document his inspection and used it as a guide. During the field he utilized a copy of the field portion of the inspection form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, he documented all findings and results of the inspection in the MPire program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the inspector had the operator take pipe-to-soil readings and operate valves with the required equipment.

- |   |  |   |                                     |
|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 6 | Did the inspector adequately review the following during the field portion of the state evaluation? (check all that apply on list)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2                                   |
|   | a. Procedures  |   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
|   | b. Records   |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|   | c. Field Activities  |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|   | d. Other (please comment)  |   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Evaluator Notes:

a. Procedures were reviewed the previous week while inspecting another of Enlink's units.



- b. Records were reviewed by the inspectors during the inspection.
- c. The inspectors conducted a field inspection of the pipeline facilities. They checked cathodic protection levels, operated valves, checked ROW and for line markers and checked for any hazardous conditions.

<b>7</b>	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:

Yes, Mr. Leger has many years of experience and was very knowledgeable of the pipeline 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:

Yes, the inspector concluded the inspection with an exit interview with the operator. He summarized his findings and results with their compliance personnel.

<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:

There were no probable violations identified during the inspection. The inspector did ask for further documentation be provided to close out the inspection.

<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	Info Only
-----------	--	-----------	-----------

Info Only = No Points

- |                                  |                                     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Abandonment                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Abnormal Operations           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. Break-Out Tanks               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. Compressor or Pump Stations   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e. Change in Class Location      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f. Casings                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g. Cathodic Protection           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Cast-iron Replacement         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| i. Damage Prevention             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| j. Deactivation                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| k. Emergency Procedures          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| l. Inspection of Right-of-Way    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| m. Line Markers                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| n. Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| o. Leak Surveys                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| p. MOP                           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| q. MAOP                          | <input 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 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:

The inspector checked cathodic protection levels, operated valves, checked ROW and for line markers, and checked OQ records for the technicians performing the tasks. The inspector asked questions during the tasks to assure the technician was knowledgeable of the task. Mr. Leger performed a very detailed inspection and was very thorough.

---

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 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <b>4</b> | Were probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance? (NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <b>1</b> | Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)?<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