



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2018 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

Tennessee Public Utility 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)



2018 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2018

Gas

State Agency: Tennessee

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 08/06/2019 - 08/08/2019

Agency Representative: Bryce Keener, Director, Gas Pipeline Safety Division
Travis Aslinger, Deputy Director, Gas Pipeline Safety Division

PHMSA Representative: David Lykken, State Liaison

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

Name/Title: Robin L. Morrison, Chairman
Agency: Tennessee Public Utilities Commission
Address: 502 Deaderick Street, 4th Floor
City/State/Zip: Nashville, TN 37243

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 2018 (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.

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 9
13 13
48 46.5
15 15
11 8
8 6
11 11
0 0
0 0

TOTALS

116 108.5

State Rating

93.5

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:

No issues noted. Operator counts and Inspection Unit totals by operator type on Attachment 3 are consistent with totals on Attachment 1.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Minimum number of inspection days required was 587. Actual was 594. The number of inspection days entered for each operator type and inspection type essentially match the records kept by the program. The program typically inspects 100% of operators and Units each year. A total of 89 D&A inspections were reported for CY2018 using DOT Form 3.1.11 for inspections. Discussed with the program the necessity to pay special attention to conducting DT&C inspections going forward. The program has historically not allocated field days to this inspection type.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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 PDM data including operator annual reports. No issues noted.

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

Evaluator Notes:

One-Point deduction for omission of Savannah Gas Utility incident on 11/16/2018. (NRC Rpt # 20180079). Corrected PR submitted.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues noted. Reviewed and verified the carry over violations and compliance action numbers were correct.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues. All inspections kept in binders and electronically. Information readily available.

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

Yes. Information verified through T&Q Blackboard training site. Training for personnel found to be complete and accurate.

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

Information listed in Attachment 8 is correct. As noted in previous years. Civil penalties amount of \$10,000 per day up to

\$500,00 for a related series of violations is below the minimum requested amount of \$100,000 per day up to \$1M for a related series of violations. This item discussed with new Program Manager. The TNPUC is currently working on legislation to correct this deficiency. Will be presented for consideration during the 2020 session.

-
- 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:

Reviewed Attachment 10 and confirm planned performance goals and accomplishments were completed. No concerns.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Question A-4. One-Point deduction for omission of Savannah Gas Utility incident on 11/16/2018. (NRC Rpt # 20180079). Corrected PR submitted.

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:

TN-PUC's Inspection, Enforcement & Incident Investigation Procedures (IEII), Section V (Conducting Inspection) contains pre-inspection, inspection and post inspection procedures. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example.

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

Sections V.N (TIMP) and V.P (DIMP). Meets minimal content requirements. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example. Provided other examples of robust procedure manuals for their consideration.

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

Section V.I (Training and Operator Qualification (OQ) Inspections. Meets minimal content requirements. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example.

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

Section V.M. Meets minimal content requirements. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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 V.L. Meets minimal content requirements. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example.

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

Section V.H. Meets minimal content requirements. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example.

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

a) Section IV.C. Time Intervals for Inspections; b) Section IV.B Inspection Priorities; c) Section V.C General Inspection Guidelines - Inspection Activities; e) Section IV.B Inspection Priorities; f) Inspection Unit breakdown sufficient.

All meets minimal content requirements. Mirrors State Program Guidelines - Appendix S Program Example.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

All procedures essentially mirrors the State Program Guideline - procedure manual examples found under Appendix S. The programs goal is to create a set of enhanced procedures that goes over and above the basic requirements. Provided other examples of robust procedure manuals as guidance material.

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):
594.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 6.62 = 1457.50

Ratio: A / B
594.00 / 1457.50 = 0.41

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Total inspection days/ratio met. No issues.

A.Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2)= 594 B.Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the program(220*Number of Inspection person years(Attachment 7)=1457.49978 Formula:- Ratio = A/B = 594/1457.49978 = 0.41

- 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:

Yes. a) OQ training necessary for conducting OQ inspections completed. b) Inspection staff who have conducted IM inspections as lead have completed all necessary T&Q training. c) Six inspectors have completed the T&Q Root Cause training. d) No outside training in CY2018 e) Inspectors who conducted standard inspections as the lead have attend all necessary T&Q courses.

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

Evaluator Notes:

One-point deduction for PM having less than one year in position and no prior experience in pipeline safety. PM has not attended any T&Q training to date but is waitlisted for three classes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the State Program's letter to the Chairman went out 3/18/2019. The Chairman's response letter was received on 4/15/2019.

- 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. Seminar held on 9/18-20/2017. Reviewed meeting agenda and attendees list. Also TGA safety Seminars held annually.

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

100% of Operators and Units inspected in CY2018. Typically done every year. Discussed with the program the necessity to pay special attention to conducting DT&C inspections going forward. The program has historically not allocated field days to this inspection type.

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

No issues noted. Deputy Director conducts a review every year to ensure form contents are up to date.

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

Yes, this question is listed on the gas distribution standard inspection form.

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

Yes, this question is listed on the gas distribution standard inspection form.

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

Yes, this is reviewed with the operator as part of the standard inspection process. (Form 2)

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

Yes, this is reviewed with the operator as part of the standard inspection process. Discussed with program the need to consider paying special attention to ATMOS and the possible need to conduct additional inspections.

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

Yes, The program reviews all operator annual reports and records the information into their risk model. The model is used to

establish inspection priorities for the operators to be inspected. Inspectors will review data and incident/accident reports prior to performing an inspection.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 13 | Has state confirmed intrastate transmission 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 as part of the gas transmission standard inspection process. This question is listed in their transmission inspection form.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 14 | 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 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Drug and Alcohol inspections are performed and included in the standard inspection. As noted on question A-2 a total of 89 D&A inspections were reported for CY2018. PHMSA Form 3.1.11 used (excluding protocols O & P) to conduct a comprehensive inspection not to exceed five years between inspections.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 15 | 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
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The program adopted the PHMSA implantation dates for completing these in sections. The 1st round of OQ written plan reviews were conducted in CY2018. The program is attempting to complete the remainder by the 1/01/2020 deadline.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 16 | 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? Are replies to Operator IM notifications addressed? (formerly part of Question C-13)). 49 CFR 192 Subpart 0
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. 194.5 field days devoted to TIMP and DIMP activities in CY2018. Suggested focusing on Field Validation activities and conduct annual reviews with the programs largest operators.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 17 | 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
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. 194.5 field days devoted to TIMP and DIMP activities in CY2018. Suggested focusing on Field Validation activities and conduct annual reviews with the programs largest operators.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 18 | 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 be conducted every four years by operators. 49 CFR 192.616
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Effectiveness inspections conducted in CY2018. Last round completed in CY2016.

- 19** 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:

Yes. Via the agency's web site and annual newsletter issued to all operators. Reviewed copies of past newsletters. The program intends to issue a newsletter twice annually beginning in CY2019. Will also be posted on the public web site. Public records request necessary to view past inspection reports and enforcement cases.

- 20** Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3 1 0.5
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

One half-point deduction. Two reported in CY2018. Both remain open according to PDM. The program was unable to provide documentation demonstrating follow-up action was taken for Middle Tennessee NG. Provided suggested language for the programs written procedures for processing SRC reports.

- 21** 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:

Yes. The inspector will fill out a "Plastic Pipe & Component Failure Verification" form as part of the standard inspection process. Completed forms reviewed.

- 22** 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. No issues.

- 23** 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 CY2018. Two older remain posted on the PHMSA web site. The program to follow-up with PHMSA to get these removed from the public website.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Pete Hut attended the meeting held in Santa Fe, NM.

- 25** 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 ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
b. NTSB P-11-20 Meaningful Metrics Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

No issues noted. Program will continue to monitor.

- 26** Discussion with State on accuracy of inspection day information submitted into State Inspection Day Calculation Tool (SICT) Has the State updated SICT data? 1 1

No = 0 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Acting PM updated tool in CY2018. No updates in CY2019 to date.

- 27** Did the State verify Operators took appropriate action regarding Pipeline Flow Reversals, Product Changes and Conversions to Service? See ADP-2014-04 1 NA
Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. None in TN.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C-3: One-point deduction for PM having less than one year in position and no prior experience in pipeline safety.

C-20: One half-point deduction. Two SRC's reported and remain open according to PDM. The program was unable to provide documentation demonstrating follow-up action has been taken for Middle Tennessee NG.

Total points scored for this section: 46.5
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:

- a. Section V.R and V.R.S
- b. Section V.T - Notices of Probable Violation Tracker
- c. Section V.U - Removal or Correction of NOPV's

- | | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 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? (Incident Investigations do not need to meet 30/90 day requirement) 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. | Within 30 days, conduct a post-inspection briefing with the owner or operator of the gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility inspected outlining any concerns; and | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. | Within 90 days, to the extent practicable, provide the owner or operator with written preliminary findings of the inspection. | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. 2018 Inspection reports sent to appropriate company officer. Probable Violations well documented. Tracks and reviews progress and resolution of PV's via spreadsheet. 30 day and 90 day requirements to communicate findings met via exit interview which is performed at the end of each inspection and written notice to operator via "Written Notice of Formal Violation Response Form". Compliance letter to company officer or manager typically sent out within 30 days of inspection completion.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. A written notice and letter of non-compliance was issued in all cases.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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. Due process options are outlined in the "Written Notice of Formal Violation Response Form" issued to operators.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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. No issues noted. Penalty formula included in notices to operators. The TN-PUC is currently working on proposed legislation to increase civil penalty amounts to essentially match PHMSA amounts. Legislation to be presented for consideration in early 2020.

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. \$15,000 in penalties assessed and \$61,863 collected in CY2018.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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



PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Section VI of procedures.

- 2 Does state have adequate mechanism to receive and respond to operator reports of incidents, including after-hours reports? And did state keep adequate records of Incident/Accident notifications received? Chapter 6 2 2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Section V.I.B of procedures.

- 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:

Program typically responds to all reports. Covered under Section V.I.B of procedures.

- 4 Were all incidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations? 3 0

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:

3-point deduction. Three reportable incidents in CY2018. Two investigations thoroughly documented. No documentation found for Citizens Gas incident (NRC Report# 20180079) dated 7/25/2018. This incident was not listed on Attachment 4 of the Progress Report.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Compliance action taken resulting from investigation of Savannah Gas incident investigation. NRC report 20180114.

- 6 Did the state assist Region Office or Accident Investigation Division (AID) 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. Program maintains good communications with both AID and WR.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Program shares their "state-of-the-state" during regional NAPSIR meeting and at TGA safety seminars. No issues.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

E-4: 3-point deduction. No documentation found for Citizens Gas incident (NRC Report# 20180079) dated 7/25/2018. This incident was not listed on Attachment 4 of the Progress Report.

Total points scored for this section: 8
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 | 0 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

2-point deduction for not having this question listed on their inspection forms or documented discussions with its operators.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state inspector verify pipeline operators are following their 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:

Yes. GD Standard inspection form used includes this item.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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, via the commission's web site, safety seminars, UUDP meetings and TN811.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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. Part of the inspectors review of annual reports. Data is entered in the programs risk model.

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

Evaluator Notes:

F-1: 2-point deduction for not having this question listed on their inspection forms or documented discussions with its operators.

Total points scored for this section: 6
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:

Piedmont Natural Gas

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Shinisha Freeman

Location of Inspection:

West Nashville - Maxon Road

Date of Inspection:

08/07/2019

Name of PHMSA Representative:

David Lykken

Evaluator Notes:

An inspection of a gas distribution main and service replacement project. Work performed by contractor Team Construction.

- 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. The company was notified and was represented during the inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. TN-PUC "Plastic Construction" Inspection Checklist used.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The inspection was thoroughly documented.

- 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 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

No tasks reviewed at time of inspection. Contractor was excavating trench at time of visit.

- 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:

Yes. Operator procedures, OQ records, area maps, and job package reviewed.

- 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, the lead inspector appeared to have a good working knowledge of the pipeline safety program and relevant regulations.
Program in the past has not typically done construction inspections and will be ramping up this effort going forward.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues identified.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No. No issues identified.

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| p. | MOP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| q. | MAOP | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| r. | Moving Pipe | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| s. | New Construction | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| x. | Public Education | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| y. | Purging | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| z. | Prevention of Accidental Ignition | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| H. | Compliance Follow-up | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I. | Atmospheric Corrosion | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

The quality of questions asked was proportionate to the inspector's respective training and experience with these types of inspections. Increasing the amount of construction inspections will benefit all of the program's staff inspectors knowledge base and experience.

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:

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have an Interstate Agent agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 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