



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

MAINE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Document Legend

PART:

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



2014 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2014

Gas

State Agency: Maine

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 08/28/2015 - 08/30/2015

Agency Representative: Gary Kenny

PHMSA Representative: Jim Anderson

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

Name/Title: Mark Vannoy, Chairman

Agency: Maine Public Utilities Commission

Address: 18 State House Station

City/State/Zip: Augusta, Maine 04347

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

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

Possible Points Points Scored

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

TOTALS

109 109

State Rating **100.0**

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

1	Accuracy of Jurisdictional Authority and Operator/Inspection Units Data - Progress Report Attachment 1 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: No issues.			
2	Review of Inspection Days for accuracy - Progress Report Attachment 2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: No issues.			
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: No issues.			
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: No issues.			
5	Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: No issues.			
6	Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
Evaluator Notes: No issues. Electronic files are kept on a Commission shared drive for all to use.			
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: Yes. No issues.			
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: No issues. Maine PUC safety rules automatically adopt PHMSA safety regulations.			
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. No issues.

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. Written procedures, Appendix C, contains spreadsheet listing the types of inspections, including Standard Inspections, and time table for conducting the inspection. Also, Part C of Appendix C addresses pre-inspection, inspection and post-inspection activities.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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. Written procedures, Appendix C, contains spreadsheet listing the types of inspections, including IMP and DIMP Inspections, and time table for conducting the inspection.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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. Written procedures, Appendix C, contains spreadsheet listing the types of inspections, including OQ Inspections, and time table for conducting the inspection.

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

Damage Prevention inspections are conducted by the 2 Damage Prevention employees at MSPUC.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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. Written procedures, Appendix C, contains spreadsheet listing the types of inspections, including Training Inspections/Activities, and time table for conducting the inspection. MPUC Gas Safety Staff participated in the New England Pipeline Safety Seminar, held in Portsmouth, NH, on October 21-22, 2014. These seminars are conducted annually and are reference in Section 9 of the MPUC Gas Safety Program Procedures, as well as included on the annual inspection plan (see Attachment 1 to Appendix C of the Procedures).

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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. Written procedures, Appendix C, contains spreadsheet listing the types of inspections, including Constuction Inspections, and time table for conducting the inspection.

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:

Yes. No issues. All plus others are listed in Appendix C, Part B (1) Planning Inspections-Scheduled Inspections. Section A of Appendix C provides the background and foundation of the inspection program. Section B of the Appendix discusses both planned and risk-based inspections, including the elements considered when planning inspections annually. Appendix A of the Procedures includes a breakdown of inspection units.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

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):
248.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 2.21 = 485.83

Ratio: A / B
248.00 / 485.83 = 0.51

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Ratio of .51 is greater than ratio needed of .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:

No issues.

- 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:

Yes. Gary Kenny is a former NAPSIR National Officer.

- 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. The Chairman of the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Tom Welch, responded to the letter on August 27, 2014. In response to Item 1, inspection planning has made use of a defined inspection frequency table, and a detailed inspection plan was developed. In addition, the program has drafted a pilot tracking sheet to detail the last inspection date for major inspection types and track dates by which subsequent inspections must be completed. In response to Item 2, the gas safety program is making use of federal inspection forms for standard O&M plan inspections during CY 2015. The supplemental LP facility inspection form was forwarded to PHMSA personnel for commentary prior to revision. No response has been received to date. In response to Item 3 and 4, the program staff developed a compliance tracking spreadsheet that follows findings of probable violation from identification through to resolution, and is actively using this tool to track compliance actions.

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

Evaluator Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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 | 5 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues.

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

State uses federal forms for all inspection types for which forms are available (Examples: LP DIMP reports, Standard Inspection form for Gas Distribution Operators). All portions of the forms applicable to the type of inspection being conducted are completed.

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

Only one operator in Maine ? Unitil (Northern Utilities) ? has cast iron pipe in their system. Section 6.3.3 of their O&M Procedure states the following:

- (a) General Graphitization: Each segment of cast iron pipe or ductile iron pipe on which general graphitization (i.e., graphitic corrosion) is found to a degree where a fracture or leakage might result, or where these events have occurred, shall be replaced or repaired.
 - (b) Localized Graphitization: Each segment of cast iron pipe or ductile iron pipe on which localized graphitization (i.e., graphitic corrosion) is found to a degree where leakage might result, shall be replaced, or repaired, or sealed by internal sealing to prevent or arrest leakage
-

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

Unitil (Northern Utilities) has a cast iron and bare steel model used for the ranking of pipe and the priority of its replacement. The ranking is completed annually and filed with the MPUC.

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

Yes, as part of O&M inspections.

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

MPUC Rule Chapter 420 ? E.3 requires that operators provide monthly reports to the MPUC of the response times to

emergency calls. Any responses exceeding 60 minutes, without an adequate explanation, are investigated. The MPUC Damage Prevention Investigators (DPIs) investigate all damage prevention incidents whether or not there are any facility damages. The DPIs discuss natural gas and LPG related incidents with the Program Manager and/or Inspector. When warranted, incidents are also investigated to see if pipeline safety violations were involved. There were no incidents or accidents in 2014 which required reporting under Part 191.

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

The annual reports are reviewed for trends regarding cast iron and unprotected steel pipe (only one operator has them), mains and services, leaks, damages, and unaccounted for gas.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes for OQ. Only one operator has transmission line with HCA. This is Summit Natural Gas and their system was installed and completed in 2014. When IMP inspections are conducted, they will be uploaded.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The NPMS Public Viewer has been verified for Woodland, MNG, and Summit.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Gary Kenny performed inspection to verify that Summit, MNG, and Unitil Contractors were included in the Drug and Alcohol plan in 2014, and inspected the Drug and Alcohol program for Woodland Natural Gas, LLC. All natural gas operators were last inspected for Drug & Alcohol compliance in 2013 utilizing PHMSA Form 13.

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

Evaluator Notes:

MPUC Rule Chapter 42 ? 7.C.1.d requires that natural gas operators submit their OQ plans to the MPUC annually. The qualification of the operator's and contractor's personnel is verified each time tasks are observed during inspections. If the records are not available at the time of the inspection, they are either requested from the operator or obtained from the appropriate database. Regulator station maintenance qualifications were checked in 2014, as well as OQ programs for Unitil and Bangor Gas.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The MPUC inspected Bangor Gas' IMP plan in 2014 and verified the implementation of SNGME's plan. SNGME's plan is scheduled for inspection in August 2015.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The MPUC verified adoption and implementation of SNGME DIMP plan in 2014, as well as DIMP plans for jurisdictional propane operators.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The MPUC conducted a partial inspection of the public awareness program for SNGME transmission and distribution facilities in 2014. SNGME is a new company started in 2014.

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

Yes; the following methods of communication are utilized:

- Dissemination of Federal Register notices and other pertinent information to operators via e-mail. The program maintains an operator distribution list for dissemination of these notices.
 - Information concerning gas safety regulations and contact information is available on the Commission website. Enforcement cases are available to the public through the Commission's Case Management System.
-

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

There were no safety related condition reports during CY 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:

MPUC Rule Chapter 420 ? 7.A. states "Each natural gas utility shall participate in the Plastic Pipe Data Collection and Sharing Initiative and report each discovered incident of plastic pipe failure as prescribed in the Initiative to the Maine Public Utilities Commission Gas Safety Manager, and The American Gas Association Plastic Pipe Ad Hoc Committee." In addition, defective workmanship has been shown to be an issue with the installation of SNGME plastic distribution system. The MPUC has engaged in ongoing compliance activity to order the investigation and remediation of these workmanship issues.

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

Yes, numerous from both.

- 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) 0 0
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

A waiver to the MPUC Chapter 420 Rule regarding regulator vents (?5(B)(4)(b)(2) was issued to Unitil via Docket 2014-00135. The waiver exempts the operator from compliance with the Rule section in cases where a building opening is situated at least 8' vertically from an installed regulator vent.

Regular field inspections verify compliance with the waiver requirement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Gary Kenny attended the NAPSIR National Meeting in Springfield, Illinois on September 15-19, 2015.

-
- 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> 0 0
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

MPUC is aware of the PHMSA Stakeholder's webpage.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 45
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
- 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:

Appendix D of the MPUC Gas Safety Program Procedures addresses compliance action procedures, including notification of company officers and compliance tracking and follow-up.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Compliance actions are tracked by MPUC Gas Safety Program Staff. Multiple examples of compliance actions from 2014 were made available.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Compliance actions include both informal and formal action when conducted in accordance with MPUC Gas Safety Program Procedures, Appendix D.

- 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:

Yes. Operators are afforded multiple opportunities to respond to compliance actions through mechanisms listed in the MPUC Gas Safety Program Procedures as well as the MPUC Rule Chapter 420.

- 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:

Civil Penalties were issued for multiple cases in 2014 including those finalized with consent decrees including 2014-00110 regarding qualification of pipeline personnel and 2014-00328 regarding horizontal direct drilling practices. Civil penalties were also issued in 2014-00221 and 2014-00328. Both latter cases remain open.

- 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. Issued \$300,000 in fines in 2014.

7 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Info OnlyInfo Only

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



PART 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:

In Appendix E of written procedures.

- 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:

Operators are required to notify Commission Staff in some cases, including incident reporting, per MPUC Chapter 130 requirements. No incidents were reported to MPUC in 2014 that warranted investigation.

- 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:

MEPUC investigates all reportable incidents. There were no reportable incidents in 2014.

- 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:

No reportable incidents 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:

No reportable incidents 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 NA

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable incidents in 2014.

- 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:

Although no incidents took place during CY 2014, lessons learned from compliance actions are disseminated through email to operator representatives. At regional operator seminars. States who have experience incidents review findings and other lessons learned during state.

8 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

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:

Yes, this is a requirement of MPUC Rule Chapter 420 and its incorporation in Operators' O&M Procedures is verified during inspections. Likewise, Ch. 420 includes the requirement to have procedures to prevent cross bores. In 2014, the latter requirement resulted in an NOPV to Summit Natural Gas with a recommended penalty of \$150,000. It was settled at \$100,000.

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

Yes, the Dig Safe ticket number (indicating notification) is verified during construction inspections for work by the operator and their contractors. Random, unannounced construction site visits, by the Damage Prevention Investigators, verify marking and positive response.

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

Yes, the CGA Best Practices are promoted through training by the MPUC's Damage Prevention Investigators and the annual training by Maine's Managing Underground Safety Training (MUST) Committee, in which the MPUC actively participates. The CGA Best Practices are also referenced in ?3.B.a. of MPUC Rule Chapter 420, SAFETY STANDARDS FOR NATURAL GAS AND LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS FACILITY OPERATORS, regarding the qualification of pipeline locating personnel.

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

Yes, the CGA Best Practices are promoted through training by the MPUC's Damage Prevention Investigators and the annual training by Maine's Managing Underground Safety Training (MUST) Committee, in which the MPUC actively participates. The CGA Best Practices are also referenced in ?3.B.a. of MPUC Rule Chapter 420, SAFETY STANDARDS FOR NATURAL GAS AND LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS FACILITY OPERATORS, regarding the qualification of pipeline locating personnel. Damages per 1000 locate request went down from 1.672 in 2013 to 1.543 in 2014.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative Info Only Info Only
Info Only = No Points

Name of Operator Inspected:

Maine Natural Gas and Summit Natural Gas of Maine

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Nathan Dore

Location of Inspection:

Augusta and Randolph

Date of Inspection:

August 28 and August 29, 2015

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Jim Anderson

Evaluator Notes:

Inspector well prepared and conducted a thorough inspection.

- 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:

Yes. No issues.

- 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:

Yes. No issues.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues.

- 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. No issues.

- 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:

Yes. No issues.

- 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:

Yes. No issues.

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

Yes. No issues.

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

Yes. No issues.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Abnormal Operations | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Break-Out Tanks | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Compressor or Pump Stations | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | Change in Class Location | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. | Casings | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. | Cathodic Protection | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. | Cast-iron Replacement | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. | Damage Prevention | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. | Deactivation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k. | Emergency Procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l. | Inspection of Right-of-Way | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m. | Line Markers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| p. | MOP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| q. | MAOP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| r. | Moving Pipe | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| s. | New Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| u. | Odorization | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| w. | Plastic Pipe Installation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| x. | Public Education | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| y. | Purging | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| z. | Prevention of Accidental Ignition | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| A. | Repairs | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. | Signs | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> |
| H. | Compliance Follow-up | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. | Atmospheric Corrosion | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

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:

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 8 | General Comments:
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**

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

Evaluator Notes:

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