

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

2016 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION 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: Virginia

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 06/13/2017 - 06/15/2017

Agency Representative: Massoud Tahamtani

PHMSA Representative: Jim Anderson

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

Name/Title: Judith Williams Jagdmann, Chairman

Agency: Virginia State Corporation Commission

Address: Tyler Building, 1300 E. Main Street

City/State/Zip: Richmond, Virginia 23219

Rating:

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

INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete this evaluation in accordance with the Procedures for Evaluating State Pipeline Safety Program. The evaluation should generally reflect state program performance during CY 2016 (not the status of performance at the time of the evaluation). All items for which criteria have not been established should be answered based on the PHMSA representative's judgment. A deficiency in any one part of a multiple part question should be scored as needs improvement. Determine the answer to the question then select the appropriate point value. If a state receives less than the maximum points, include a brief explanation in the space provided for general comments/regional observations. If a question is not applicable to a state, select NA. Please ensure all responses are COMPLETE and ACCURATE, and OBJECTIVELY reflect state program performance. Increasing emphasis is being placed on performance. This evaluation together with selected factors reported in the state's annual progress report attachments provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

Field Inspection (PART G):

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

Scoring Summary

PARTS

Possible Points Points Scored

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

10	10
13	13
48	47
15	15
11	11
8	8
12	12
0	0
5	5

TOTALS

122 121

State Rating

99.2

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:

No issues. Reviewed data and it appears correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues on days. Discussed with Program Manager that the Damage Prevention activity days listed did not belong. The days listed were from the VA SCC Damage Prevention group and their activities consisted of damage prevention activities of the Virginia damage prevention law and not part of Part 192.614.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Reviewed data and it appears correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Reviewed data and it appears correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Reviewed data. Minimal math error.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Inspection files are kept on the Commission server in the PIPES program. Also, many program files kept in binders.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Reviewed data and it appears correct.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Verification of Part 192,193,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Reviewed data and it appears correct. Virginia program has automatic adoption of federal government safety regulations.

- 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:

No issues. Reviewed data and it appears correct.

- 10 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

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:

For Standard Inspections

Pre-Inspection Activities ? ? Section V, B2, Preparation for Inspection Page 16

Inspection Activities- Section V, C, Types of Inspections, page 18-19, B3 pages 16 and 17

Post Inspection Activities ? Section V, B4, General Post Inspection record Guidelines, All types of inspections, and NOI/
NOPV-Compliance page 49.

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

For IMP Inspections

Pre-Inspection Activities ? Section V, B2, Preparation for Inspection

Inspection Activities ? Section X, page 32 Integrity Management Programs.

Post Inspection Activities - Section V, B4, General Post Inspection record Guidelines, All types of inspections, and NOI/
NOPV-Compliance page 49.

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

For OQ inspections

Pre-Inspection Activities ? Section V, B2, Preparation for Inspection

Inspection Activities ? Section V, G, pages 29-30.

Post Inspection Activities - Section V, B4, General Post Inspection record Guidelines, All types of inspections, and NOI/
NOPV-Compliance page 49.

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

For Damage Prevention Inspections

Pre-Inspection Activities Section V, B2, Preparation for Inspection, and Section VI (Pre-MURBI) page 30

Inspection Activities ? Section IV, pages 30-31

Post Inspection Activities - Section V, B4, General Post Inspection record Guidelines, All types of inspections, and NOI/
NOPV-Compliance page 49.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Section VII, pages 32 - Operator Training of the written inspection procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

For Construction Inspections

Pre-Inspection Activities - Section V, B2, Preparation for Inspection, and Section V, F, page 25

Inspection Activities ? Section V, F , Pages 25-29

Post Inspection Activities - Section V, B4, General Post Inspection record Guidelines, and page 29, Conclusion of Inspection, and NOI/NOPV-Compliance page 49.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 7 | Does inspection plan address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements?
Yes = 6 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-5 | 6 | 6 |
| 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:

Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval) - 10 year Inspection Plan, page 11 and appendix 4.

Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities) ? Section V, pages 10-15.

Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction) ? LCP's, Facility Inspections, Location Sheets.

Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density, etc.) ? Inspection units binder

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) ? Section V, pages 10-15 and the Risk Model

Are inspection units broken down appropriately? ? Inspection Unit Binder, reviewed annually

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

PART C - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

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

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
1867.61

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
 $220 \times 10.27 = 2259.77$

Ratio: A / B
 $1867.61 / 2259.77 = 0.83$

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

Evaluator Notes:

VA SCC reported 860 Damage Prevention days on the 2016 Progress Report that did not have inspection activities to Part 192.614. These days were deducted from the the total inspection days activities.

New Calculation -

$1007/220 \times 10.27 = 1007/2259.4 = .445$ which is greated than the needed .38 ratio.

- 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:

Reviewed VA SCC employees on TQ SABA website. No issues.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Massoud Tahamtani is very knowledgeable of both the state's pipeline safety program and PHMSA program and regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Needs improvement. The response letter was not received by PHMSA within the 60 days. It was late by two weeks.

- 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. The VA SCC conducted TQ seminars in October 2014 and again in October 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues found in reviewing the Inspection Report binders.

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

Yes. VA SCC uses federal form in conducting 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:

This question is asked every year on the 5 questions added to Form 2 in conducting an inspection.

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

This question is asked every year on the 5 questions added to Form 2 in conducting an inspection.

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

This question is asked every year on the 5 questions added to Form 2 in conducting an inspection.

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

Three NRC Incidents; (CGV, WGL, COR) in 2016, see 2016 Accident Report Binder. All Natural Gas damages are investigated and leak records are reviewed.

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

Annual Reports are entered into the PIPES database and semi-annually all leak data is reviewed for trends. Use information for risk ranking.

-
- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 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 | 2 |
|----|--|---|---|

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

TIMP and DIMP inspections are inspected per the Divisions 10 year inspection plan, (see VNG IMP implementation and Aria IMP protocol Inspection in OQ binder.)

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

Staff has reviewed NPMS and found that the addition of the Clinch River 5-mile transmission project for ANG D was entered. (See Company email) All other operators have had no significant changes from their original submissions but are checked during Standard Inspections and review of Annual Reports for any mileage changes.

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

MIS data sheets are in the Standard Inspection binders. Comprehensive Drug and Alcohol inspections have been scheduled for 2017 per the 10 year inspection plan.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 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 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

OQ is verified during each inspection for contractors and operator personnel see Certifications and Qualifications Records binder and PHMSA form 15's. Also the Enhanced VGOA OQ Task Force, See Commonwealth of Virginia Operators OQ Program Binder.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 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 0 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

All Operator plans were reviewed and compliance action was taken in 2013. In addition, inspection protocol forms were uploaded to GT IMP Database December 2013. (See 2016 TIMP inspections for VNG and Aria Energy.)

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

First round was completed for all Muni and LDC in 2014. Master Meter and LPG operator DIMP plans were reviewed in 2016. Implementation Audits are to be performed per our 10 year inspection plan.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 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 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Done in 2013 and reevaluation due in 2017 per 10 year inspection plan.

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

State Website, Executive meetings, emails to operators, Pipeline Safety Conference Agenda, and VGOA.

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

No SRC's in 2016.

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

Information is contained in the Operator's DIMP plan. This information is also in the 2016 Risk Model.

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

Yes.

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

None issued in 2016. Discussed the 1999 waiver in regard to valve spacing.

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

Yes.

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

Yes, reviewed our State Program Metrics found on the PRIMUS PHMSA website.

Had discussion with Program Manager on metrics.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed SIDC with program manager.

- 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:

None of the operators in the State have the means to execute flow reversals, only tariff gas transported exception of a few Gathering lines, and none of the Operators have been a converted service.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 47
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:

In Appendix 6, page 49 of the written procedures.

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

VA SCC keeps a closed case binder of activities throughout the year. Reviewed binder and all compliance actions taken in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

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:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, issued \$945,000 in fines in 2016.

7 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

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 2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

State O&M Incident Investigation Procedures, Appendix 7.

- 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:

Acknowledgement of MOU between NTSB and PHMSA (Appendix D)

Acknowledgement of Federal/State Cooperation in case of incident/accident (Appendix E)

(Yes= 2 points, No= 0 Points, NI=1 point)

Comments: Inspector on call rotation binder, PIPES incident report binder, and Section IV for MOU.

- 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:

In Attachment 2 and 3, pages 64 and 65 of the written procedures.

- 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. Reports are in the 2016 reportable Accident report binder. Reviewed binder.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, reviewed URS-2016-00280 (WGL Accident)

- 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.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Executive Meetings, Pipeline Safety Conference, Safety Stand down.

- 8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

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:

This question is asked every year on the 5 questions added to Form 2 in conducting an inspection.

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

See PHMSA Form 2's and all damages are investigated. Every pipeline safety inspection Miss Utility Tickets are checked.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. VA SCC is a leader throughout the country in Damage Prevention .

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

VA SCC does this. The damage rate was down to 1.26 damages per 1000 locate request.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

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

Name of Operator Inspected:

(1) Columbia of Virginia

(2) Virginia Natural Gas

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

(1) Mike Smith

(2) Chris de Lisle

Location of Inspection:

(1) Chester, VA

(2) Newport News

Date of Inspection:

(1) May 3, 2017

(2) May 4, 2017

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Jim Anderson

Evaluator Notes:

- 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:

(1) Yes, operator personnel was in attendance

(2) Yes, operator personnel was in attendance

- 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:

(1) Yes

(2) Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:

(1) Yes

(2) Yes

- 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:

(1) Yes

(2) Yes

- 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:

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:

- (1) Yes
- (2) Yes

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:

- (1) Yes
- (2) Yes

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:

- (1) Yes - discussed regulator pressure concerns
- (2) Yes - discussed damage prevention concerns

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

Info Only = No Points

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | Abandonment | <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 type="checkbox"/> | |
| h. | Cast-iron Replacement | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| i. | Damage Prevention | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| j. | Deactivation | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| k. | Emergency Procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| l. | Inspection of Right-of-Way | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| m. | Line Markers | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| p. | MOP | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| q. | MAOP | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| r. | Moving Pipe | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| s. | New Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| u. | Odorization | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| w. | Plastic Pipe Installation | <input checked="" 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:

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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

Uses Federal Inspection Forms 2, 13.

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

Evaluator Notes:

In Eastern Region Inspection Plan and tracking spreadsheet binder.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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.) | 1 | 1 |
| | Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | | |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. VA SCC sent PHMSA Eastern Region probable violations for the City of Richmond and the City of Danville.

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

Evaluator Notes:

None in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 5
Total possible points for this section: 5