

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

2016 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

NEBRASKA PIPELINE SAFETY DIVISION

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: Nebraska

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 09/18/2017 - 09/22/2017

Agency Representative: David Levering, Chief Deputy Fire Marshal, Program Manager for the Pipeline Safety Section

PHMSA Representative: Patrick Gaume

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

Name/Title: Jim Heine, Nebraska State Fire Marshal

Agency: Nebraska State Fire Marshal Office

Address: 246 South 14th Street

City/State/Zip: Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-1804

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
48	35
15	14.5
11	11
8	8
12	12
0	0
0	0

TOTALS

117 103.5

State Rating

88.5

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

A1. Yes. Attachment 1 is in agreement with Attachments 3 & 8 and is consistent with internal records.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A2. Yes. Attachment 2 is in agreement with internal records.

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

A3. Yes. Attachment 3 is in agreement with internal records.

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

A4. Yes. One incident was reported; it met criteria for Significant, It was a fire caused by a line bore strike. The resulting fire destroyed a large historical building and the area surrounding it. Current estimate of costs and collateral damage now exceed \$14,000,000. Several lawsuits are associated with the incident.

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 5 | Accuracy verification of Compliance Activities - Progress Report Attachment 5
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

A5. Yes. Attachment 5 is in agreement with internal records.

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

Evaluator Notes:

A6. Yes. Attachment 6 is correct. Most files are electronic.

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

A7. Yes. Attachment 7 is in agreement with internal records.

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

A8. Yes. Attachment 8 is in agreement with Attachment 1. Two administrative revisions have not been adopted since 2013, but neither are relevant to the Pipeline Safety Program.

- 9 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. Attachment 10 was properly filled out.

10 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

A10. This Section was awarded full points. The Risk analysis plan has been improved and they are in the 3rd year using it. They will continue to tweak and improve.

The NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan has been continually revised to better reflect what the Pipeline Safety Office actually does.

The NSFM Web site has been improved. Pipeline violation information has been uploaded. Additional information will be added to the web site later. Audit was completed by a 3rd party in 2017. Improvements and links will be added in the near future.

The NSFM is making plans for a new data base; it will expand the information that can be captured and make the information available to all staff anywhere.

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:

B1. Yes. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec E & F, with specific guidance in F.5-1, 2, & 3.

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

B2. Yes. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec E & F, with specific guidance in F.5-4, & 5.

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 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. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec E & F, with specific guidance in F.5-7.

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 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. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec E & F, with specific guidance in F.5-9, & Sec G.

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 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. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec E & F, with specific guidance in F.5-10.

- | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 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. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec E & F, with specific guidance in F.5-8.

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

B7. Yes. Sec E names the various risk factors for scheduling inspections.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

B8. This Section received full points. The NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan is a living document with input from the entire staff. This iterative process is creating an ever improving document.

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 0
Yes = 5 No = 0

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
205.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
 $220 \times 2.87 = 630.67$

Ratio: A / B
 $205.00 / 630.67 = 0.33$

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

Evaluator Notes:

C1. NO. 0 of 5 points. 205 insp person days, 2.87×220 total Inspector days, ratio = .325, $< .38$, Fail. This is due in part to retirements, new hires, and time spent at TQ in OKC.

- 2 Has each inspector and program manager fulfilled the T Q Training Requirements? (See Guidelines Appendix C for requirements) Chapter 4.4 5 0
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 type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

C2. NO. 0 of 5 points. Repeat violation. Clark Conklin, program manager, has only attended one of the required courses for a program manager. He has not attended any of the required courses within the past five years. All attended NACE Corrosion control short course. A review of training records found that all inspectors with 3+ yrs of service have taken the TQ courses. Yes, yes, yes, yes, NI for the needed PM training. As a FYI, Clark retired on May 31st, 2017.

- 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. Clark served many years as Program Manager.

- 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. The letters were dated 12/19/16 (Fire Marshal letter) & 1/20/17 (Fire Marshal response). All 6 issues were responded to.

- 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. NSFME hosted a Seminar in February of 2016 at Columbus, NE.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C6. Yes. 5 of 5 points. TIMP inspections are current. DIMP inspections are current. PAPEI: inspections are current. the initial PAPEI for BRD will be due in 2017, and ADM Fremont is handled by Black Hills. OQ: OQ inspections are current, but the initial OQ for BRD will be due in 2017, and ADM Fremont is handled by Black Hills.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C7. Yes. The NSFPM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan specifies the use of the Federal forms except for construction and some special inspections.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C8. Yes. Federal inspection form-# 2 Part 192.489 (b); pp. 19.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C9. Yes. Federal inspection form- #2; pg 4 Part 192.613(a).

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

Evaluator Notes:

C10. Yes. Federal inspection form- #2; pg 5 Part 192.615 (a) (7).

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

Evaluator Notes:

C11. Yes. Federal inspection form- #2; pg 4 & 5 Part 192.614 (c).

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

Evaluator Notes:

C12. Yes. The NSFPM has created and standardized its form for reviewing annual reports. The form is used for all operators; Distribution, Transmission, and LNG. In addition a spreadsheet is used to compare current information against the prior two years of information. Significant variances are investigated.

- 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. Chapter 5.1 2 1
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C13. NI 1 of 2 points. Repeat violation DIMP uploads are current. TIMP: Only 9 of 13 current Transmission Operators are found in the TIMP database. The missing operators are; BRD (new, not due until 2017), Foundation, Nebraska City, and North Platte.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C14. Yes, The NSFMS uses Form 1, the federal form for the inspection of gas transmission pipelines. The requirement for NPMS is on Page 3 of the federal form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C15. Yes. D&A inspections are current. Generally the D&A Long form is used during the HQ O&M inspections.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C16. NI 1 of 2 points. Repeat violation Three OQ inspections for Abengoa, Foundation, Northwestern, were either not done or were not uploaded in the last 5 years. BRD is new and is due in 2017. ADM needs to be listed with Black Hills.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C17. Yes. The TIMP inspections are current.

- 18 Is state verifying operator's gas distribution integrity management Programs (DIMP)? This should include a review of DIMP plans, along with monitoring progress. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). (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 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C18. Yes. The DIMP inspections are current.

- 19 Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. 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 2 1

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C19. NI, 1 of 2 points. Repeat violation At the time of the Program Evaluation, 19 of 33 operators were absent from the PAPEI Database. NSFM will actively investigate this.

20	Does the state have a mechanism for communicating with stakeholders - other than state pipeline safety seminar? (This should include making enforcement cases available to public).	1	1
-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

C20. Yes. The Fire Marshal's office has developed a portion of their website to provide information for all stakeholders.

21	Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3	1	NA
-----------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	----

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

C21. NA, No SRC for the last several years.

22	Did the State ask Operators to identify any plastic pipe and components that has shown a record of defects/leaks and what those operators are doing to mitigate the safety concerns?	1	1
-----------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

C22. Yes. NSFM & operators are aware of their PE inventory, and respond to PE reports.

23	Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPSRS or PHMSA?	1	1
-----------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

C23. Yes. NSFM responds to NAPSRS & PHMSA requests.

24	If the State has issued any waivers/special permits for any operator, has the state verified conditions of those waivers/special permits are being met? This should include having the operator amend procedures where appropriate.	1	1
-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C24. Yes. It was a 2012 waiver for a mitered fitting to create a 90 deg 16" PE elbow connection. It had detailed requirements that were closely monitored and documented.

25	Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated?	1	1
-----------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

C25. Yes. Mr. Conklin attended the 2016 National NAPSRS Meeting.

26	Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site - http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm	2	2
-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 Yes = 2

- | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| a. | Discussion of Potential Accelerated Actions (AA's) based on any negative trends | Yes <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:

C26. Yes. The PM has reviewed the data and likes it. He sees it will have increasing value as more years of data get added. The significant negative trend is due to the retirement of senior staff. The remedy was the accelerated hiring of replacement personnel and scheduling them for their TQ courses, which is being done. The NSFM is committed to using and improving

this resource. Specifically the line hits are trending down, the inspection days are doing badly due to retirements, Inspection days per Master Meter is not applicable for Nebraska; Inspector Training is negative because of the new hires. Leaks are trending down.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C27. The SICT was discussed with David & his senior inspector. David will be investing time to familiarize himself with the SCIT.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C28. Yes. NSFM does not have any jurisdictional pipe that is scheduled for flow reversal. NSFM does not see flow reversal as a threat in NE. Flow reversals have been discussed with NSFM pipeline safety staff.

- 29** General Comments: Info OnlyInfo Only
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

C29. 13 points have been lost in this Section. The workload due to the specialized inspections has increased and has been exacerbated by the retirement of two inspectors and the inability to fully utilize new hires until they are trained. Some of this increased workload is that inspections require increased detail and reporting into federal databases. Increased staffing is very likely needed if NSFM is to perform fully in all areas of Pipeline Safety. Succession planning and technical training also need to be addressed.

Total points scored for this section: 35
Total possible points for this section: 48



PART D - Compliance Activities

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1 | Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 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. See section H for mailing letters to the executive officer, & Sections F & H for Compliance.

- | | | | |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 2 | Did the state follow compliance procedures (from discovery to resolution) and adequately document all probable violations, including what resolution or further course of action is needed to gain compliance? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 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:

D2. Yes, Yes, Yes, Yes. It is an established office procedure and it is followed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D3. Yes. Some inspection files were reviewed and they confirmed that NOPV letters are generated when violations are found.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D4. Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D5. Yes. Fines and other penalties were considered. A January 9, 2016 incident has resulted in NOPV for the operator and maximum civil penalties of up to \$2,000,000 have been recommended to the State Attorney General. The AG has delayed action to allow civil suits to progress.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D6. NI 0.5 of 1 point. NSFM communicates with the Nebraska Attorney General on fines. None have been used. A January 9, 2016 incident has resulted in NOPV for the operator and maximum civil penalties have been recommended to the State Attorney General. There is no record of civil penalties being assessed in the last 10 years other than Damage Prevention fines.

7 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

D7. 0.5 points was lost in this Section. The Nebraska procedures and statutes for processing violations are well established processes. The Attorney General's office has made a commitment, effective August, 2015, to commit manpower to enforce civil penalties against operators for violations as necessary. The willingness of the current Attorney General to pursue civil penalties, when necessary, is appreciated. David the new Program Manager is receptive to using civil penalties.

Total points scored for this section: 14.5
Total possible points for this section: 15



PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- 1 Does the state have written procedures to address state actions in the event of an incident/accident? 2 2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

E1. Yes. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec I

- 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:

E2. Yes. See NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec I.1. The NSFM publishes and disseminates contact information to operators. A contact listing is also maintained on the web site. After hour contact instructions are sent to operators frequently. 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 1

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

E3. Yes. NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec I. Virtually all significant incidents are investigated on site.

- 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:

E4. Yes. The incident had complete files. Observations, & factors were included.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

E5. Yes. Violations were found and are in process with the Atty General's office.

- 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:

E6. Yes. NSFM works with and responds to PHMSA requests on violations.

- 7 Does state share lessons learned from incidents/accidents? (sharing information, such as: at NAPS Region meetings, state seminars, etc) 1 1

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

E7. Yes. NSFM makes a report of incidents at the regional NAPSIR Meeting each year.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

E8. Yes. Full points were awarded in this Section. The NSFM PL Inspection & Compliance Plan Sec I and actual practices are in compliance with PHMSA state programs for incident/accident investigation procedures. All findings and reports are available to NAPSIR and PHMSA. The NSFM continues to maintain staff on-call for emergency purposes as required per State Guidelines.

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



PART F - Damage Prevention

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Has the state reviewed directional drilling/boring procedures of each pipeline operator or its contractor to determine if they include actions to protect their facilities from the dangers posed by drilling and other trench less technologies? NTSB
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

F1. Yes. This question is addressed during Standard and DIMP inspections, and also line hits and incidents.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F2. Yes. 192.614 is addressed during every Standard Inspection, and during Damage Prevention 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.)
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

F3. Yes. NSFM is committed to Damage Prevention; they conducted 4 Excavator One-Call Classes where One-Call violators were required to attend by order of the Attorney General and learn about the One-Call Law. An annual Damage Prevention Safety Summit was started in 2012 (using Damage Prevention Grant money). The first class had 75 attendees and the 2016 class had 605 attendees.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F4. Yes. The line hit information is gathered, compiled, reviewed, and compared year to year.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F5. Full points were awarded in this Section. NSFM has intense focus on damage prevention through education and enforcement of regulations. Data is collected to determine trends and to utilize the information to drive damages downward.

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

PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

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

Name of Operator Inspected:

Nebraska City, opid 13180

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Arnie Bates, inspector NSFM

Location of Inspection:

Nebraska City office, 100 Central AV, Nebraska City, NE 68410

Date of Inspection:

9/20/2017

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Patrick Gaume

Evaluator Notes:

G1. Nebraska City, opid 13180; Arnie Bates, inspector NSFM; Nebraska City office, 100 Central AV, Nebraska City, NE 68410, 9/20/2017; Patrick Gaume

a Special Inspection to double check correction of low CP reads and check for Line Marker re-installations.

- 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. It was scheduled and held in the field & at the operator's office and three Company personnel attended.

- 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. Mr. Bates used the State Compliance Follow-up Form. They are as detailed as the Federal Form for the portion being inspected. This was a Special Inspection to double check correction of low CP reads and check for Line Marker re-installations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G4. Yes. Mr. Bates entered the results directly into the forms through the computer.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G5. Yes. Records, readings, and Field. This was a field inspection to confirm correction of low CP reads and confirm that replacement Signs had been installed. The inspected finished with an office visit to confirm that the work was input into the records.

- 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. Compliance Follow-up for CP records, and field work to confirm the work.

7	Did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Evaluator will document reasons if unacceptable) Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

G7. Yes. Mr Bates conducted a professional level inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G8. Yes. An end of day exit interview was conducted. No violations were found. Nebraska City was complemented on their response to the two items needing correction.

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

Evaluator Notes:

G9. Yes. An end of day exit interview was conducted. No violations were found. Nebraska City was complemented on their response to the two items needing correction.

10	General Comments: 1) What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) 2) Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) 3) Other. Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------

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

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. | Repairs | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. | Signs | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

G10. Full points were awarded in this Section. The Field Evaluation was to observe Mr. Arnie Bates conduct a Compliance Follow-up for records, and for some applicable Field work of Nebraska City in their Nebraska City, NE office. The evaluation was thorough and complete. Mr. Bates was professional in conducting the inspection. (g, l, m & B)

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



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

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

H1-8. NA. Not an Interstate Agent Program.

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

I1-7. NA. Not a 60106 Program.

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