



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

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Document Legend

PART:

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



2014 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2014

Gas

State Agency: Missouri

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 07/20/2015 - 07/24/2015

Agency Representative: Bob Leonberger

PHMSA Representative: Rex Evans and Agustin Lopez

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

Name/Title: Robert S. Kenney, Chairman

Agency: Missouri Public Service Commission

Address: 200 Madison Street, Suite 900 (P.O Box 360)

City/State/Zip: Jefferson City, MO 65101

Rating:

60105(a): Yes **60106(a):** No **Interstate Agent:** No

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

Field Inspection (PART G):

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

Scoring Summary

PARTS

Possible Points Points Scored

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

10	10
13	13
45	36
15	12
11	11
8	8
11	11
0	0
0	0

TOTALS

113 101

State Rating

89.4

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: Information reviewed appears correct			
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: All appear correct			
5	Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: all appear correct			
6	Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
Evaluator Notes: All inspection files kept in paper files in cabinet.			
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: 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 - PA-11 amendment not adopted - rules more stringent ok			
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:
No issues

10 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

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:

Procedures found in Section 5 of Pipeline Safety Procedures. Discussed Pre-Inspection, Inspection and Post-inspection process needs to be incorporated into 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:

Section 5.1.3.2 and 5.1.3.3 has IMP and DIMP inspection 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:

Section 5.1.3.4 has OQ inspection procedures. 7 year interval needs to be five years

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

Section 5.1.3.6 has Public Awareness and Damage Prevention inspection 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:

Section 5.1.3.5 has Operator Training 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:

Section 5.1.3.8 includes Construction Inspection procedures.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

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

Evaluator Notes:

Section 5.1 thru 5.1.2 has inspection intervals and inspection priorities process. Inspect units every year not to exceed 2 years. Operator history and operator activities is taken into consideration as an inspection priority.

8 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed the need for pre-inspection, inspection and post inspection procedures to be incorporated into their Pipeline Safety Procedures. This is a new item added to the Evaluation Form so no point deduction will be taken. All inspection intervals should be five year maximum as outlined in state guidelines.

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 4
Yes = 5 No = 0
- A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
516.00
- B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 7.60 = 1672.00
- Ratio: A / B
516.00 / 1672.00 = 0.31
- If Ratio \geq 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio $<$ 0.38 Then Points = 0
Points = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Discussion with program manager on this issue, did not meet per-inspector inspection days needed in order to have minimum inspection days for staff. It was estimated that two inspectors spent approximately 30 days on high profile incident from previous year, and approximately 58 days were spent at TQ training for new inspectors. Recommending a deduction of only one point as they did meet program minimum required days of 516 out of 407 needed.

Days Participating in T&Q Training

NEUNER: Had 23 days in PHMSA training.

POSTON: Had 30 days in PHMSA training.

FOSTER: Had 5 days at PHMSA training, and spent 3 days on the web training for the introduction course.

Time Required to be in the Office Due to JJ's Restaurant Incident Investigation and Preparation for Complaint Hearing

FENNEL and STRUCKHOFF: Had to spent all of January 2014 and half of February 2014 in the office completing the Incident Report and preparing the Complaint for filing. They couldn't go out in the field and conduct inspections. In addition, they were unable to take new employees, that had not completed their training, on inspections. During 2014, three inspectors were not yet fully trained to conduct independent inspections.

FENNEL and STRUCKHOFF: Each spent 15 ? 20 days each in the office reviewing video-taped depositions of witnesses (March-May 2014). Our PSC Chief Counsel said Staff had to know what was in the depositions so he would not be surprised by additional evidence that might be presented during the Complaint hearing. They couldn't go out in the field and conduct inspections. In addition, they were unable to take new employees, that had not completed their training, on inspections.

During 2014, three inspectors were not yet fully trained to conduct independent inspections.

FENNEL and STRUCKHOFF: Had to be in the office all of December 2014 writing testimony for the Complaint hearing and preparing for the Complaint hearing. They couldn't go out in the field and conduct inspections. In addition, they were unable to take new employees, that had not completed their training, on inspections. During 2014, three inspectors were not yet fully trained to conduct independent inspections.

- 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:

Recommend review of TQ curriculum and getting more inspectors fully trained on IMP courses.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

Letter was responded to, extension was given due to arrival of letter around 2014 end of year holidays. Issues such as OQ, IMP and Public Awareness inspections have not been fully addressed. One point deduction as improvement still needed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

They hold annual conference at Lake of Ozarks with Missouri operators. No issues.

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

Master meter inspections have not been completed since 2010 since have not yet exceeded five year maximum no points deducted, but will be deducted if not completed in CY2015.

-
- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 7 | Did inspection form(s) cover all applicable code requirements addressed on Federal Inspection form(s)? Did State complete all applicable portions of inspection forms? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Improvement needed. It appears O & M reviews have not been completed as required. It appears all items other than O & M are covered, but should take some time to do a thorough review.

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

This question is covered on inspection form page 7. Recommend making sure procedure review covers this issue.

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

While this is generally addressed on cast iron question relating to C8, needs to specifically address on inspections. Suggest adding specific NTSB questions.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|-----|
| 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 | 0.5 |
|-----------|---|---|-----|

Evaluator Notes:

This question needs to be specifically addressed and documented on inspection. 1/2 point deduction for improvement needed.

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

This is covered under 192.617

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

Reviewed how they look and address this issue. Recommend utilization of Pipeline Data Mart to analyze any operator trends including Loss and Unaccounted for gas particularly for small operators.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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 | 0 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

Previous evaluation issue, still not being done and addressed in previous evaluation.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|-----|
| 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 | 0.5 |
|-----------|---|---|-----|
-

Evaluator Notes:

Needs specific documentation on this issue.

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

These are being covered during standard inspections.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

OQ programs are being generally reviewed during standard inspections. Full program reviews need to be completed with protocol questions and time frame established. Improvement needed.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 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 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|
-

Evaluator Notes:

Improvement needed in this area also. Large operators should have reviews done and inspections uploaded to database. Needs to complete overall analysis of where operators IMP programs stand and make sure inspections are uploaded into IMP database.

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

There doesn't appear to be any current issues. Recommend thorough review and documentation of previous inspection dates to ensure future program reviews are done in a timely manner.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

State verifies Public Awareness programs are up to date during current operator inspection. Effectiveness inspections have not all been completed and continues to be an issue and previously identified. Needs to get these up to date.

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

Website

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

None

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

Has had previous individual communications on this issue. City of Springfield is undergoing plastic replacement program. Should encourage PPDC participation and should include this on future checklist.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed - no issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

Attended in CY2014

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:

Discussed

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed need to make sure all questions involving "did state verify" should be appropriately documented on all operator inspections.

Total points scored for this section: 36
Total possible points for this section: 45



PART D - Compliance Activities**Points(MAX) Score**

- | | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 3 |
| a. | Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input checked="" 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:

Section 5.1.5 are the procedures for compliance notifications and follow up on non-compliance. Need procedure to state compliance actions are sent to company officer.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 2 | Did the state follow compliance procedures (from discovery to resolution) and adequately document all probable violations, including what resolution or further course of action is needed to gain compliance? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 3 |
| a. | Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| b. | Were probable violations documented? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Were probable violations resolved? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Was the progress of probable violations routinely reviewed? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

All compliance actions appear to be addressed and appropriately followed-up on. Compliance actions have not been sent to appropriate personnel as outlined in State Guidelines.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues - letters have been sent, followed-up and closed. Good file documentation in files.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes program is familiar with process. Civil penalty as a result of incident involving Missouri Gas Energy on 2/19/13. Incident occurred at 700 Market Street in Kansas City penalties were considered but case settled for other company actions.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No fines issued

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 12
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:

Section 6 of Pipeline Safety Procedures addresses the actions taken during an incident/accident investigation.

- 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:

No issues

- 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:

No issues

- 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:

All incidents appear appropriately investigated, documented and conclusions presented. Very good job on incident reports, very thorough and complete. No issues.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Compliance actions issued, specifically on Incident occurred in February 2013. Process went through MoPSC process although no civil penalties and case was settled with other terms than penalty.

- 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:

State works as best they can to assist

- 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:
No issues

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

Info OnlyInfo Only

Total points scored for this section: 11
Total possible points for this section: 11



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:

Has previously addressed. Should make this question specific on operator inspection checklist in future. Full points during this evaluation.

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

No issues.

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

No issues

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

Part of annual report now and reviewed.

- | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 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:
City of Madison Missouri - Randy Hendren
Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:
Daniel Fitzpatrick
Location of Inspection:
Madison Missouri
Date of Inspection:
July 23, 2015
Name of PHMSA Representative:
Rex Evans, Agustin Lopez

Evaluator Notes:

Standard Inspection of this municipal operator completed.

- 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:

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:

checklist completed as required

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

Evaluator Notes:

Results were documented thoroughly

- 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:

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:

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:

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:

Inspection was summarized with operator

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

Evaluator Notes:

No violations found

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

Evaluator Notes:

This was a very small operator. Regulator station maintenance is contracted

Total points scored for this section: 11
Total possible points for this section: 11



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. State not an interstate agent

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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. State not an interstate agent

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 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. State not an interstate agent

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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. State not an interstate agent

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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. State not an interstate agent

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 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. State not an interstate agent

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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. State not an interstate agent

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

Evaluator Notes:

State not an interstate agent

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. State has 60105 Certification

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 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. State has 60105 Certification

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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. State has 60105 Certification

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 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. State has 60105 Certification

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 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. State has 60105 Certification

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|----|
| 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. State has 60105 Certification

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. State has 60105 Certification

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