

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

2016 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WEST VIRGINIA

Document Legend

PART:

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



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

State Agency: West Virginia

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 10/03/2017 - 10/05/2017

Agency Representative: Mary Friend, Director, Gas Pipeline Safety

PHMSA Representative: Jim Anderson

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

Name/Title: Michael A. Albert, Chairman

Agency: Public Service Commission of West Virginia

Address: 201 Brooks Street

City/State/Zip: Charleston, West Virginia 25301

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	Accident Investigations
F	Damage Prevention
G	Field Inspections
H	Interstate Agent State (if applicable)
I	60106 Agreement State (if applicable)

Possible Points Points Scored

10	9
13	8
41	37
13	13
6	6
8	8
11	11
0	0
0	0

TOTALS

102 92

State Rating

90.2

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

- | | 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:

Reviewed Attachment 1 and appears to be correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed Attachment 2 and appears to be correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed Attachment 3 and no issues found.

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

Reviewed Attachment 4 and no issues found.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed Attachment 5 and noncompliances found in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Most files are kept electronically. No issues in retrieving requested reports.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Inaccurate information on Attachment 7. Two employees were listed incorrectly in reference to their qualifications.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. Language in state statute (150-4-11.3) has automatic adoption of federal rule language.

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

Evaluator Notes:
No issues with Attachment 10.

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

Info OnlyInfo Only

Total points scored for this section: 9
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:

All pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities are listed in Section 6, page 6 of the Inspectors Duties and Responsibilities written procedures. Standard inspections are listed on page 8 of the procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

All pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities are listed in Section 6, page 6 of the Inspectors Duties and Responsibilities written procedures. IMP and DIMP inspections are listed on page 15 of the procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

All pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities are listed in Section 6, page 6 of the Inspectors Duties and Responsibilities written procedures. OQ inspections are listed on page 14 of the procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

All pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities are listed in Section 6, page 6 of the Inspectors Duties and Responsibilities written procedures. Damage Prevention inspections are listed on page 11 of the procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

All pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities are listed in Section 6, page 6 of the Inspectors Duties and Responsibilities written procedures. Operator training activities are listed on page 16 of the 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:

All pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities are listed in Section 6, page 6 of the Inspectors Duties and Responsibilities written procedures. Construction inspections are listed on page 12 of the procedures.

7 Does inspection plan address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements? 6 1

Yes = 6 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-5

- | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| a. | Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval) | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" 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 type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density, etc) | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" 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 type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. | Are inspection units broken down appropriately? | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Needs Improvement. Only operator history listed in determining inspection priorities.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 8
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):
25.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 0.26 = 56.47

Ratio: A / B
25.00 / 56.47 = 0.44

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

Evaluator Notes:

Ratio of .44 exceeds the needed ratio of .38.

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

Needs improvement. No one inspector was qualified to conduct an IMP inspection. Would send two inspectors with the combined TQ training.
Conducted 10 IMP inspection days.

- 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:

No issues. Mary Friend has been program manager for 3 years.

- 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:

Chairman's letter was within the 60 requirement, however not all items addressed in the letter were corrected. ex - IMP inspection qualification

- 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. February 25, 2015.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. All times frames met. currently changed to 5 year intervals.

-
- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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, uses the federal IA form for inspections and has a state form for construction inspections.

-
- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 8 | Did the state review operator records of previous accidents and failures including reported third party damage and leak response to ensure appropriate operator response as required by 195.402(c)(5)?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

This question was added to the IA form for inspectors to ask during the inspection.

-
- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 9 | 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:

Yes. Reviewed spreadsheet.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Uses IA. Reviewed IMP/DIMP and OQ IA inspection records.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 11 | Has state confirmed intrastate operators have submitted information into NPMS database along with changes made after original submission?
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Reviewed NPMS website to verify pipelines are in system.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 12 | Is the state verifying operators are conducting drug and alcohol tests as required by regulations? This should include verifying positive tests are responded to in accordance with program. 49 CFR 199
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 0 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

There have not been any Drug and Alcohol inspections as far back as 2010.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 13 | Is state verifying operators OQ programs are up to date? This should include verification of any plan updates and that persons performing covered tasks (including contractors) are properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operators plan. 49 CFR 195 Part G
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Completed no OQ inspection in 2016. Plan to adhere to written procedures going forward.

- 14** Is state verifying operator's hazardous liquid integrity management (L IMP) Programs are up to date? This should include a previous review of LIMP plan, along with monitoring progress on operator tests and remedial actions. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). (Are the State's largest operators programs being contacted or reviewed annually?). 49 CFR 195.452 Appendix C
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. IMP programs have been reviewed by the PSC

- 15** Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should have been completed by December 2013. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be conducted every four years by operators. 49 CFR 195.440
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Have completed first PAP evaluation by 2013. None scheduled in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

PSC of WV webpage, operator meetings.

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

Evaluator Notes:

None in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

- 19** 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.
Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

None for hazardous liquid.

- 20** Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated?
Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

a. Discussion of Potential Accelerated Actions (AA's) based on any negative trends Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

b. NTSB P-11-20 Meaningful Metrics

Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed with program manager and reviewed performance metric webpage in PHMSA website.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed with program manager.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No intrastate pipelines have reverse flow capability.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 37
Total possible points for this section: 41



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
- a. Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- b. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- c. Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Information starts on page 14 of the Inspector Duties and Responsibilities 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
- a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board director if municipal/government system? Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐
- b. Document probable violations Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐
- c. Resolve probable violations Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐
- d. Routinely review progress of probable violations Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐
- e. Were applicable civil penalties outlined in correspondence with operator(s) Yes ☐ No ☒ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

No non compliances found in 2016. Sent compliances for non compliance found in 2015.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There were 14 probable violation carry overs from CY 2015 to CY 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There were 14 probable violation carry overs from CY 2015 to CY 2016. There were no compliance actions taken on the 14 carry overs in CY 2016 so due process was not made available to the operator to respond to any compliance actions.

- 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) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Program manager is familiar with fines. Issued one in 2016 on gas program operator.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Only on the natural gas pipeline safety program side.

7 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

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



PART E - Accident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, on page 19 of the Inspector Duties and Responsibilities written procedures.

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

- | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | Acknowledgement of MOU between NTSB and PHMSA (Appendix D) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Acknowledgement of Federal/State Cooperation in case of incident/accident (Appendix E) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Inspectors rotate monthly for on call responsibilities.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Criteria for decision making is on page 19 of the written procedures.

- | | | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 4 | Were all accidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations?
Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2 | 3 | NA | |
| a. | Observations and document review | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Contributing Factors | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Recommendations to prevent recurrences where appropriate | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

None in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

None in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

None in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. At operator meeting, NAPSIR meetings, seminars, etc.

8 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 6
Total possible points for this section: 6



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

Evaluator Notes:

This question was added to the IA inspection form to ask during inspections. No issues.

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

Look at One-Call tickets during construction, O&M and incident 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:

Yes. Participates and speaks at One-Call meetings, 811 meetings and operator meetings.

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

Yes. PSC does this. Reviewed spreadsheet during evaluation.

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

Union Carbide (Dow Chemical)

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Bill Youst

Location of Inspection:

South Charleston, WV

Date of Inspection:

October 25, 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:

Yes.

- 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:

Used DOT IA form.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

NA - Standard Procedures inspection.

- 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:

Procedures inspection.

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

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:

Yes. No issues.

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

Yes.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------------------|-----------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | |
| h. | Cast-iron Replacement | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| i. | Damage Prevention | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| j. | Deactivation | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| k. | Emergency Procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| l. | Inspection of Right-of-Way | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| m. | Line Markers | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| p. | MOP | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| q. | MAOP | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| r. | Moving Pipe | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| s. | New Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| u. | Odorization | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| w. | Plastic Pipe Installation | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| x. | Public Education | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| y. | Purging | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| z. | Prevention of Accidental Ignition | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| A. | Repairs | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| B. | Signs | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| C. | Tapping | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| D. | Valve Maintenance | <input 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:

Procedures inspection.

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



PART H - Interstate Agent State (if applicable)**Points(MAX) Score**

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 7 | 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