

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

## 2016 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

Alabama Public Service Commission

### Document Legend

#### PART:

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



2016 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2016  
Hazardous Liquid

**State Agency:** Alabama

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 06/26/2017 - 08/11/2017

**Agency Representative:** Wallace Jones, Director, Gas Pipeline Safety Division

**PHMSA Representative:** Patrick Gaume and Clint Stephens

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

**Name/Title:** Twinkle Andress Cavanaugh, President

**Agency:** Alabama Public Service Commission

**Address:** 100 N. Union St., Suite 800

**City/State/Zip:** Montgomery, Alabama 36104

**Rating:**

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

---

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Complete this evaluation in accordance with the Procedures for Evaluating State Pipeline Safety Program. The evaluation should generally reflect state program performance during CY 2016 (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    Accident Investigations  
F    Damage Prevention  
G    Field Inspections  
H    Interstate Agent State (if applicable)  
I    60106 Agreement State (if applicable)

10    9.5  
13    13  
42    42  
15    15  
7    7  
8    8  
12    12  
0    0  
0    0

**TOTALS**

**107    106.5**

**State Rating .....**

**99.5**

---

## PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

- |          |   |   |     |
|----------|---|---|-----|
| <b>1</b> | Accuracy of Jurisdictional Authority and Operator/Inspection Units Data - Progress Report Attachment 1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|---|-----|

Evaluator Notes:

A1. NI. 0.5 of 1pt. The Attachment 1 Operator counts & Unit counts were incorrect. Revision has already been made. The revision will be in agreement with Attachment 3. Attachment 1 is in agreement with Attachment 8.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A2. Yes. Attachment 2 is accurate & matched the APSC's 2016 inspection records.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

A4. Yes. Attachment 4 is accurate. There were no intrastate HL significant accidents.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>5</b> | Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

A5. Yes. Attachment 5 is accurate. We discussed for the 3rd year that 4 PV carried over from prior years may be very old and may have been addressed but may lack some item of paperwork to be closed. We strongly advised that the 4 old PV be addressed and cleared.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A6. Yes. Attachment 6 is accurate. APSC paper records are now 'old' records. The official records for current records are now electronic. There is an effort to scan recent paper records and place them into the electronic database. Currently the 'official' records are in paper form (older) and electronic (newer). The records are found as appropriate on the 9th floor. The electronic files are backed up onto the server. I recommended that the server be backed up to off-site storage.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A7. Yes. Attachment 7 appears to be correct. These time allocations are submitted to accounting and are applied to the following year. There appears to be a small time allocation variation from year to year. 100% time is dedicated to pipeline safety with some employees having time split between HL & NG.

- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>8</b> | Verification of Part 195,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

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

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

---

|           |                       |                    |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>10</b> | General Comments:     | Info OnlyInfo Only |
|           | Info Only = No Points |                    |

Evaluator Notes:

A10. Yes. The error in Attachment 1 resulted in a 0.5-point reduction. It is noted that the Director now has authority to recommend civil penalties for violations of the regulations through an administrative process and not have to go through a Formal Hearing.

---

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



## PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

B6. Yes. APS Operations Plan Sec V subsection H. Also B&C; & S,T,& U. APSC uses its State Form, and The State Form appears adequate, but they will also use the federal construction forms, Form 05 & Form 07, which are the federal construction forms for NG & HL as needed.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 area, 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:

B7. YES, 6 of 6 points. APSC uses a detailed spreadsheet and also APS Operations Plan Appendix D (mostly for Standard insp), Also Sec VI subsection A Background (specifically for construction, incidents & accidents). Yes for parts a,b,c,d,e,& f.

**8** General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

B8. Yes. The APSC procedures are well developed and highly functional. Full points were awarded in this Section. An item of note is the new rule, GPS 13, passed in June, 2017 & effective in June, 2019, which requires the removal of inactive service lines after they have been inactive for 5 years.

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):  
43.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
 $220 \times 0.42 = 92.40$

Ratio: A / B  
 $43.00 / 92.40 = 0.47$

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

### Evaluator Notes:

C1. Yes. HL Total Insp Person Days is 43. Total insp person days charged to the Program is .42 years or 92.4 days. The ratio is  $43/92.4=0.465$ .  $0.465 > 0.38$ .

- 2 Has each inspector and program manager fulfilled the T Q Training Requirements? (See Guidelines Appendix C for requirements) Chapter 4.4 5 5  
Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4

- |    |  |                                      |                          |   |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | Completion of Required OQ Training before conducting inspection as lead?   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Completion of Required IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/prgram manager   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Note any outside training completed  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e. | Verify inspector has obtained minimum qualifications to lead any applicable standard inspection as the lead inspector. | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

### Evaluator Notes:

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

- 3 Did state records and discussions with state pipeline safety program manager indicate adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations? Chapter 4.1,8.1 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

### Evaluator Notes:

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

- 4 Did state respond to Chairman's letter on previous evaluation within 60 days and correct or address any noted deficiencies? (If necessary) Chapter 8.1 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

### Evaluator Notes:

C4. Yes. Letters, dated 12/1/16 & 1/19/17, are within the 60 day response time, especially considering mail time. All eight required items were addressed.

- 5 Did State conduct or participate in pipeline safety training session or seminar in Past 3 Years? Chapter 8.5 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0

### Evaluator Notes:

C5. Yes. The last seminar was held in November of 2016. The APSC conducts its seminar annually. In addition, APSC co-hosts the annual TQ Seminar in New Orleans.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C6. Yes. 5 of 5 points. The frequency of Standard Inspections are in good order. PAPEI are in good order. Construction & incident inspections are fine. All 8 LIMP inspections are within the 5 yr frequency. All 8 HL operators have been OQ inspected.

- 
- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>7</b> | 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<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C7. Yes. Seven files of inspections with probable violations were reviewed which included both NG & HL. All were found to be satisfactory.

- 
- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>8</b> | 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 195.402(c)(5)?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

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

- 
- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>9</b> | 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:

C9. Yes. The APSC reviews the data from annual reports and utilizes a major portion of the data in its risk model.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>10</b> | Did state input all applicable OQ, LIMP inspection results into federal database in a timely manner? This includes replies to Operator notifications into IMDB database. Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C10. Yes. the OQ and IMP databases show regular and recent uploading of inspections.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>11</b> | Has state confirmed intrastate 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:

C11. Yes. The APSC periodically reviews the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) which indicates environmentally sensitive areas. Question 1(a) on its hazardous liquid standard inspection reviews operators' submittals to the NPMS.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>12</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:

C12. Yes. The APSC reviews program changes during each standard inspection. The APSC conducted 108 drug and alcohol inspections as a part of standard inspections during 2016.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>13</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 195 Part G<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|



Evaluator Notes:

C13. Yes. All operators' OQ programs have been inspected. The APSC reviews compliance with Protocol 9 during each Standard Inspection. The APSC performed and uploaded several OQ Program reviews and field portion (Protocol 9) reviews during 2016.

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>14</b> | Is state verifying operator's hazardous liquid integrity management (L IMP) Programs are up to date? This should include a previous review of LIMP 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). (Are the State's largest operators programs being contacted or reviewed annually?). 49 CFR 195.452 Appendix C<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C14. Yes. The APSC has conducted the integrity management programs of all Hazardous Liquid operators. The APSC has recently completed the second round of IMP inspections.

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>15</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. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should have been completed by December 2013. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be conducted every four years by operators. 49 CFR 195.440<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C15. Yes. All PAPEI have been done and have been successfully uploaded into the database.

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>16</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:

C16. Yes. The APSC posts pipeline safety information on the Commission's website. The APSC participates in and makes presentations at Alabama Natural Gas Association meetings; Also the annual Alabama Damage Prevention Summit.

- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>17</b> | Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C17. YES. The SRC reported in 2016 was addressed.

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>18</b> | Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPSRS or PHMSA?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C18. Yes. APSC fully participates with NAPSRS & PHMSA.

- |           |  |   |    |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| <b>19</b> | 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.<br>Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

C19. NA. All waivers past & present have been handled through their NG Program.

- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>20</b> | Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated?<br>Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

C20. Yes. The APSC sent three employees to the National NAPSRS Meeting, including the Program Manager.

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

C21. Yes. The PM pulled up the data. The information appears to be accurate. The PM plans to compare this data with his internal data. This information appears to hold promise to be of value.  
 Damage Prevention Program; leaks per thousand are generally flat.  
 Inspection Activity; AL is meeting its inspection goals and is looking to fill its open position ASAP  
 Inspector Qualification; AL is fully focused on inspector training.  
 Leak Management; AL is monitoring; no significant threats identified at this time.  
 Enforcement; The GPS Director now has authority to recommend civil penalties for violations of the regulations through an administrative process and not have to go through a Formal Hearing. Operator privilege to request a Hearing is preserved.  
 Incident Investigation; two significant incidents in 2016, including an injury due to fire. The recent rule, GPS Rule 13, to remove abandoned service lines, was influenced by this incident.

---

- 22** Discussion with State on accuracy of inspection day information submitted into State Info Only Info Only  
 Inspection Day Calculation Tool. (No points)  
 Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

C22. Yes. It is a learning process to learn how much time each type of inspection takes for each type of operator. Bigger operators require more time as they are more complicated. Applying those times back to your actual personnel is also a learning curve. This is an ongoing, living, iterative process.

---

- 23** Did the State verify Operators took appropriate action regarding Pipeline Flow Reversals, Info Only Info Only  
 Product Changes and Conversions to Service? See ADP-2014-04 (No Points)  
 Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

C23. No information: APSC is not aware of any PL flow reversals, product changes, or conversion to service in the state. Recommended that this question be added to the Standard Inspection as an addendum item.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

C24. Yes. APSC is actively engaged in inspecting operators and pipelines for safety. Specialty inspections are current for HL. All points were awarded in this Section.

---

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

## PART D - Compliance Activities

Points(MAX) Score

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>1</b> | Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4   | 4                                       |
| a.       | Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b.       | Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c.       | Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

### Evaluator Notes:

D1. Yes, Yes, & Yes. The APSC's procedures include a matrix of response timeframes depending on the nature of the probable violation. It is described on Page 22 & 23 of the APSC's inspection and enforcement procedures. Response date required and the actual response date are kept by each lead inspector for follow-up. Written compliance action correspondence must be sent to an officer of a private company.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>2</b> | Did the state follow compliance procedures (from discovery to resolution) and adequately document all probable violations, including what resolution or further course of action is needed to gain compliance? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4   | 4                                       |
| a.       | Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board director if municipal/government system?  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b.       | Document probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c.       | Resolve probable violations  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d.       | Routinely review progress of probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e.       | Were applicable civil penalties outlined in correspondence with operator(s)  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

### Evaluator Notes:

D2. Yes, yes, yes, yes & Yes, 4 of 4 points. Upon a review of randomly selected inspection files, the files generally contained responses from operators within the deadlines given by the APSC. APSC has a written policy in their procedures to perform follow-up every quarter until compliance is achieved. Compliance notifications were sent to company officer when a private company was involved. APSC is outlining potential civil penalties in correspondence with operators.

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

### Evaluator Notes:

D3. Yes. Upon a review of randomly selected inspection files completed during 2015, all inspections with discovered probable violations had letters of non-compliance in the files.

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

### Evaluator Notes:

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

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

### Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

D6. Yes. APSC assessed a Civil Penalty in 2014. It is noted that, effective June 26, 2017, the GPS Director now has authority to recommend civil penalties for violations of the regulations through an administrative process and not have to go through a Formal Hearing. Operator privilege to request a Hearing is preserved.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D7. Yes. APSC has established Compliance processes.

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



## PART E - Accident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

- 2 Does state have adequate mechanism to receive and respond to operator reports of accidents, including after-hours reports? And did state keep adequate records of Incident/Accident notifications received? Chapter 6 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

- a. Acknowledgement of MOU between NTSB and PHMSA (Appendix D) Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐  
b. Acknowledgement of Federal/State Cooperation in case of incident/accident (Appendix E) Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

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

- 3 If onsite investigation was not made, did state obtain sufficient information from the operator and/or by other means to determine the facts to support the decision to not go on-site? Chapter 6 1 NA  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

E3. NA. There were no significant accidents in 2016.

- 4 Were all accidents 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 where appropriate Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

E4. NA. There were no accidents in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

E5. NA. There were no probable violations for incidents or accidents in 2016.

- 6 Did the state assist region office by taking appropriate follow-up actions related to the operator accident reports to ensure accuracy and final report has been received by PHMSA? (validate report data from operators concerning incidents/accidents and investigate discrepancies) Chapter 6 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

---

**8** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

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

---

Total points scored for this section: 7  
Total possible points for this section: 7



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

Evaluator Notes:

F1. Yes. The APSC conducts reviews of operators' OM procedures on a three-year rotational basis. Directional drilling/boring procedures are a part of the review. The APSC uses the federal standard inspection form which covers this requirement. It is also on the State Form and is addressed during construction too.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state encourage and promote practices for reducing damages to all underground facilities to its regulated companies? (i.e. such as promoting/adopting the CGA Best Practices encouraging adoption of the 9 Elements, etc.) | 2 | 2 |
|   | Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1   |   |   |

Evaluator Notes:

F3. Yes. The Program Manger participates in the Alabama Damage Prevention Alliance where he has encouraged stakeholder representatives to use CGA Best Practices. The APSC includes damage prevention topics during its annual pipeline safety seminar. It is also addressed during the Damage Prevention Summit. In addition, the Director is a member of the One Call System Study Commission which is tasked to improve the existing One Call Law in AL.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

## PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

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

Name of Operator Inspected:  
Hunt Refining Company, opid 26048  
Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:  
Daniel Trapp, Pipeline Safety Investigator Supervisor, APSC.  
Location of Inspection:  
1855 Fairlawn Rd, Tuscaloosa, AL 35401  
Date of Inspection:  
8/8/2017  
Name of PHMSA Representative:  
Patrick Gaume

Evaluator Notes:

G1. Hunt Refining Company, opid 26048  
Daniel Trapp, Pipeline Safety Investigator Supervisor, APSC.  
1855 Fairlawn Rd, Tuscaloosa, AL 35401  
8/8/2017,  
Patrick Gaume  
The APSC conducted a PAPEI inspection of this refined products pipeline operator. The operator has 47 miles of jurisdictional pipeline. Also applies to opid 7660, Hunt Crude Oil Supply Company.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G2. Yes. Five operator/consultant staff participated in the inspection. This was a scheduled inspection.

- 3** Did the inspector use an appropriate inspection form/checklist and was the form/checklist used as a guide for the inspection? (New regulations shall be incorporated) 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

G3. Yes. The APSC used the federal PAPEI inspection form during the evaluation. The APSC inspector used the form as a guide to progress through all portions of the inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G4. Yes, all findings were documented on the inspection form.

- 5** Did the inspector check to see if the operator had necessary equipment during inspection to conduct tasks viewed? (Maps, valve keys, half cells, etc) 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

G5. Yes, they had records and procedures.

- 6** Did the inspector adequately review the following during the field portion of the state evaluation? (check all that apply on list) 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1
- a. Procedures ☒
  - b. Records ☒
  - c. Field Activities ☐



d. Other (please comment)

☐

Evaluator Notes:

G6. Yes, yes, NA, NA. Performed a full PAPEI inspection.

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:

G7. Yes. Daniel demonstrated a professional level of pipeline safety knowledge.

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)

1

1

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

G8. Yes. No violations found. Daniel recommended attention to section 6.5 to make it clear that Public Officials associated with Emergency Response are included.

9 During the exit interview, did the inspector identify probable violations found during the inspections? (if applicable)

1

1

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

G9. Yes. No violations found. Daniel recommended attention to section 6.5 to make it clear that Public Officials associated with Emergency Response are included.

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 Info Only

Info Only = No Points

- a. Abandonment
- b. Abnormal Operations
- c. Break-Out Tanks
- d. Compressor or Pump Stations
- e. Change in Class Location
- f. Casings
- g. Cathodic Protection
- h. Cast-iron Replacement
- i. Damage Prevention
- j. Deactivation
- k. Emergency Procedures
- l. Inspection of Right-of-Way
- m. Line Markers
- n. Liaison with Public Officials
- o. Leak Surveys
- p. MOP
- q. MAOP
- r. Moving Pipe
- s. New Construction
- t. Navigable Waterway Crossings
- u. Odorization
- v. Overpressure Safety Devices
- w. Plastic Pipe Installation
- x. Public Education

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☒☐☐☒☐☒☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☒

- |    |                                   |                                     |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

G10. Yes. Best practice found is Hunt does an informal Effectiveness Evaluation every year, and a formal Effectiveness Evaluation every 4th year. Items i, l, n, x, J. The APSC conducted a PAPEI inspection of this refined products pipeline operator. The operator has 47 miles of jurisdictional pipeline. Also applies to opid 7660, Hunt Crude Oil Supply Company.

---

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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8 NA Not an Interstate Agent State

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:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <b>3</b> | 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.)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

- |          |  |           |           |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>7</b> | General Comments:<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

I1-6 NA Not a 60106 Agreement State

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