

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

## 2016 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

COLORADO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

### Document Legend

#### PART:

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



# 2016 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2016

Gas

**State Agency:** Colorado

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 06/12/2017 - 06/23/2017

**Agency Representative:** Joe Molloy

**PHMSA Representative:** Leonard Steiner, lead and David Appelbaum

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

**Name/Title:** Jeffery P. Ackermann, Chairman

**Agency:** Colorado Public Utilities Commission

**Address:** 1560 Broadway Suite 250

**City/State/Zip:** Denver, Colorado 80202

**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

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

### Possible Points Points Scored

10	10
13	13
42	41
15	15
11	10
8	8
12	12
0	0
0	0

### TOTALS

**111 109**

**State Rating** .....

**98.2**

## PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

1	Accuracy of Jurisdictional Authority and Operator/Inspection Units Data - Progress Report Attachment 1 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as reported.			
2	Review of Inspection Days for accuracy - Progress Report Attachment 2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Needs improvement,			
3	Accuracy verification of Operators and Operators Inspection Units in State - Progress Report Attachment 3 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as reported.			
4	Were all federally reportable incident reports listed and information correct? - Progress Report Attachment 4 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Yes, Accurate as reported.			
5	Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as reported.			
6	Were pipeline program files well-organized and accessible? - Progress Report Attachment 6 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
Evaluator Notes: yes.			
7	Was employee listing and completed training accurate and complete? - Progress Report Attachment 7 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as reported.			
8	Verification of Part 192,193,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
Evaluator Notes: Accurate as reported.			
9	List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1

Evaluator Notes:

yes.

---

**10** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

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:

Needs improvement. The procedures need to be more specific. The procedures should include times intervals, the forms to be used, will all of the standard inspection be conducted at one visit or only portions of the standard inspection and the entire standard inspection be conducted over several visits, who will initiate the letter for probable violations, what evidence will be required for probable violations. Examples are: when will the notice of a standard inspection and how far before the inspection and who will give the notice, who will recommend civil penalties, who recommends the amount, who will determine if the response from the operator is adequate for probable violations.

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

Adequate 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:

Adequate procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Adequate procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

**8** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

---

Total points scored for this section: 13  
Total possible points for this section: 13



## PART C - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Was ratio of Total Inspection person-days to total person days acceptable? (Director of State Programs may modify with just cause) Chapter 4.3 5 5  
Yes = 5 No = 0

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):  
484.90

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
220 X 4.53 = 995.50

Ratio: A / B  
484.90 / 995.50 = 0.49

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

Evaluator Notes:

Ration: .49

- 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:

Two attended NACE conference.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

- 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:

Yes, March 2017 with TQ assisting.

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

Evaluator Notes:

It could not be shown when some previous inspections were conducted or what was actually inspected. Many records prior

to CY2014 were purged and not available. Since some inspection intervals are 5 years, some previous inspections were not available for evaluation.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Colorado uses the IA questions sets.

---

- |   |  |   |    |
|---|--|---|----|
| 8 | Did the state review operator procedures for determining if exposed cast iron pipe was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary remedial action was taken?<br>(NTSB) Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|--|---|----|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

No known cast iron pipe in Colorado.

---

- |   |  |   |    |
|---|--|---|----|
| 9 | Did the state review operator procedures for surveillance of cast iron pipelines, including appropriate action resulting from tracking circumferential cracking failures, study of leakage history, or other unusual operating maintenance condition? (Note: See GPTC Appendix G-18 for guidance) (NTSB) Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|---|--|---|----|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

No known cast iron pipe in Colorado.

---

- |    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 10 | Did the state review operator emergency response procedures for leaks caused by excavation damage near buildings and determine whether the procedures adequately address the possibility of multiple leaks and underground migration of gas into nearby buildings Refer to 4/12/01 letter from PHMSA in response to NTSB recommendation P-00-20 and P-00-21? (NTSB) Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

A question on the question set for this.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Inspects Annual reports, the incident report is part of the incident investigation.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes,

---



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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Question on form, and compares AR vs NPMS report.

- 
- |           |   |   |    |
|-----------|---|---|----|
| <b>15</b> | Is the state verifying operators are conducting drug and alcohol tests as required by regulations? This should include verifying positive tests are responded to in accordance with program. 49 CFR 199<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | NA |
|-----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

No D & A inspections conducted in CY2016

- 
- |           |   |   |    |
|-----------|---|---|----|
| <b>16</b> | Is state verifying operators OQ programs are up to date? This should include verification of any plan updates and that persons performing covered tasks (including contractors) are properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operators plan. 49 CFR 192 Part N<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | NA |
|-----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

No OQ procedures were conducted in CY2016.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>17</b> | Is state verifying operator's gas transmission integrity management programs (IMP) are up to date? This should include a previous review of IMP plan, along with monitoring progress on operator tests and remedial actions. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). (Are the State's largest operators programs being contacted or reviewed annually?). 49 CFR 192 Subpart O<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes,

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>18</b> | Is state verifying operator's gas distribution integrity management Programs (DIMP)? This should include a review of DIMP plans, along with monitoring progress. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). (Are the State's largest operators programs being contacted or reviewed annually?). 49 CFR 192 Subpart P DIMP ? First round of program inspections should have been complete by December 2014<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>19</b> | Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should have been completed by December 2013. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be conducted every four years by operators. 49 CFR 192.616<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Conducted effective inspections.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>20</b> | Does the state have a mechanism for communicating with stakeholders - other than state pipeline safety seminar? (This should include making enforcement cases available to public).<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Colorado has a website.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>21</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:

No open SRCR and none were submitted in CY2016.

---

- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>22</b> | 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?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

---

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>23</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:

Yes

---

- |           |  |   |    |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| <b>24</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>No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 Yes = 1 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|--|---|----|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

No Waivers submitted and not waivers required followup

---

- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>25</b> | Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated?<br>No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 Yes = 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

---

- |           |   |                                      |                          |   |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <b>26</b> | Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site - <a href="http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm">http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm</a><br>No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 Yes = 2 | 2                                    | 2                        |   |
| a.        | Discussion of Potential Accelerated Actions (AA's) based on any negative trends   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b.        | NTSB P-11-20 Meaningful Metrics   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
- 

Evaluator Notes:

The trends in Colorado are steady. Reviewed the metrics with the Program Manager.

---

- |           |  |           |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>27</b> | Discussion with State on accuracy of inspection day information submitted into State Inspection Day Calculation Tool. (No points)<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Need to review the data from as each year. Need to update the needed inspections days for each type of inspections.

---

- |           |  |           |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>28</b> | Did the State verify Operators took appropriate action regarding Pipeline Flow Reversals, Product Changes and Conversions to Service? See ADP-2014-04 (No Points)<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

None of these conditions exist.

---

**29** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Info OnlyInfo Only

---

Total points scored for this section: 41  
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:

Adequate procedures

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Adequate procedures

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

Yes, All probable violations had a compliance action issued.

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

Civil penalties are assessed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

In CY2016 \$325,000 in penalties were assessed and collected.

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

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



## PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

Needs Improvement, The procedures do not state when or if an onsite investigation will be conducted. The procedures need to properly define an incident and have a procedure to notify operators how the operator will report an incident to the PUC.

- 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:

Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Adequate information was provided from other sources, Police, Fire Department.

- 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:

Yes, Adequate incident investigation reports were provided.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes a compliance action was initiated.

- 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:

Yes, Colorado maintained good communications with the Western 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:

Yes, At region meetings.

---

**8** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

---

Total points scored for this section: 10  
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<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, inspectors continue check this item during the standard evaluation of the operator.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this item is reviewed with the operators during standard inspections.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The Colorado PUC work closely with the Colorado One-Call Center. At meetings they promote CGA best practices and other damage prevention efforts.

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 4 | Has the agency or another organization within the state collected data and evaluated trends on the number of pipeline damages per 1,000 locate requests? (This can include DIRT and other data shared and reviewed by the pipeline safety program)<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Colorado CPUC maintains sufficient data needed to determine damage trends and areas needing special attention.

- |   |  |           |           |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 5 | General Comments:<br>Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

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



## PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

- |          |  |                    |
|----------|--|--------------------|
| <b>1</b> | Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative | Info OnlyInfo Only |
|          | Info Only = No Points  |                    |

Name of Operator Inspected:  
Public Service Company of Colorado dba as Xcel

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:  
Janie Castle, Kevin Stilson

Location of Inspection:  
Grand Junction, CO area

Date of Inspection:  
June 19 - 22, 2017

Name of PHMSA Representative:  
Leonard Steiner, Lead and David Appelbaum

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>2</b> | 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:

Adequate notice was provided to the Operator.

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

Evaluator Notes:

yes, Used the IA checklist.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes,

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>5</b> | Did the inspector check to see if the operator had necessary equipment during inspection to conduct tasks viewed? (Maps,pyrometer,soap spray,CGI,etc.) | 1 | 1 |
|          | Yes = 1 No = 0   |   |   |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, minimum of equipment was required.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>6</b> | 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             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. | Records                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Field Activities       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Other (please comment) | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Evaluator Notes:

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, both inspectors were very knowledgeable.

<b>8</b>	Did the inspector conduct an exit interview? (If inspection is not totally complete the interview should be based on areas covered during time of field evaluation)	1	1
	Yes = 1 No = 0		

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, no probable violations were noted but areas of concern were discussed.

<b>10</b>	General Comments: 1) What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) 2) Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) 3) Other.	Info Only	Info Only
-----------	--	-----------	-----------

Info Only = No Points

- |    |                                   |                                     |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Abandonment                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. | Abnormal Operations               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. | Break-Out Tanks                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. | Compressor or Pump Stations       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | Change in Class Location          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f. | Casings                           | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| p. | MOP                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| q. | MAOP                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| r. | Moving Pipe                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| s. | New Construction                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| u. | Odorization                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices       | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- |    |                             |                                     |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| F. | Welding                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| G. | OQ - Operator Qualification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| H. | Compliance Follow-up        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| I. | Atmospheric Corrosion       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Evaluator Notes:

On June 20 - June 22, I and David Appelbaum observed Kevin Stilson and Janie Castle conducted three days of a Standard Inspection of Public Service Company of Colorado. This inspection was of the records and physical facilities of the transmission pipeline in the Grand Junction, CO area. The first day was the inspection of operation and maintenance records. The second day was records in the morning and in the afternoon they inspected some ROW and a compressor station, regulator stations and some crossing of creeks and intermittent streams. The third day they inspected more crossing. Both inspectors were knowledgeable and competent. The conducted the inspection in a professional and courteous manner.

---

Total points scored for this section: 12  
Total possible points for this section: 12



**PART H - Interstate Agent State (If Applicable)****Points(MAX)    Score**

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <b>3</b> | Were any probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance?<br>(NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <b>4</b> | Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <b>6</b> | Did the state initially submit adequate documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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