



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

NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

### Document Legend

#### PART:

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



# 2018 Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2018

Gas

**State Agency:** New Hampshire

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 06/18/2019 - 06/20/2019

**Agency Representative:** Randy Knepper, Director Safety Division

**PHMSA Representative:** Rex Evans

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

**Name/Title:** Mr. Martin Honigberg, Chairman

**Agency:** New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission

**Address:** 21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10

**City/State/Zip:** Concord, NH 03301-2429

**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	10
13	13
48	48
15	15
7	7
8	8
12	12
0	0
0	0

### TOTALS

**113 113**

**State Rating** .....

**100.0**

## 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<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

All jurisdictional authority appears to be correct. No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

The inspection report files had inspection day summaries, by person, by month. 153 days confirmed

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

Evaluator Notes:

The information appeared to account for all operators. No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

There were no incidents in 2019. No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

[https://www.puc.nh.gov/Safety/Pipeline\\_Safety\\_Enforcement\\_Program.html](https://www.puc.nh.gov/Safety/Pipeline_Safety_Enforcement_Program.html)

All enforcement activity was confirmed, all letters and documentation were reviewed and no issues are found

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, all the inspection reports are printed and in files, in addition to electronic available if needed. , all enforcement correspondence on-line. No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues

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. Very thorough

---

10 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

Very thorough, excellent 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:

Covered in Section V: Types of Inspections. No issues.

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

Covered in Section V: Types of Inspections. No issues.

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

Covered in Section V: Types of Inspections. No issues.

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

Covered in Section V: Types of Inspections. No issues.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Covered in Section V: Types of Inspections. No issues.

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

Covered in Section V: Types of Inspections. Found many construction activities were actually documented as an O & M inspection. Recommend designating at Construction to make sure days counted are appropriate.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

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

Intervals are covered in Section IV. The pre,inspection, post activities are covered in Section IX. Risk process is covered in Section VI. All generally acceptable.

**8** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

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



## PART C - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

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

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):  
153.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
220 X 1.74 = 383.29

Ratio: A / B  
153.00 / 383.29 = 0.40

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

Evaluator Notes:

The ratio ended up .4. Program loss inspector at end of CY2018 and has not hired anyone as of evaluation date.

- 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:

All training appears complete after review of TQ transcript information. 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:

No issues. Long-time program manager and all matters are covered very well.

- 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:

Chair response was not required. No issues

- 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:

The last New England combined seminar was in October 2018. 160 attendees. No issues.

- 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:

Between the summary sheet provided and the records reviewed, it appears all operators have been inspected in time frames. No issues.

- 
- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

It appears all code requirements being covered during inspection and during time frames required.

---

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

In addition to inspection forms verifying procedures. Unitil and Liberty both have cast iron. Companies required to file report and Commission requires reporting.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Utilities report leaks for surveillance, PUC has rules for monitoring and operators have clear procedures in this area. No issues.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

State has verified through inspection forms for Emergency response process. No issues at this time.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Leak responses are reported monthly by operators and include the information on operator responses. No issues.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Annual reports are reviewed no issues. Spreadsheets and graphs made to evaluate trends, projections of bare steel replacement, etc.

---

- |    |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|
| 13 | Has state confirmed intrastate transmission operators have submitted information into NPMS database along with changes made after original submission?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|
- 

Evaluator Notes:

Liberty only, 3 miles. No issues.

---



- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>14</b> | Is the state verifying operators are conducting drug and alcohol tests as required by regulations? This should include verifying positive tests are responded to in accordance with program. 49 CFR 199<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

D & A were all done in 2016 on LDC's. There are no issues found on records reviewed.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>15</b> | Is state verifying operators OQ programs are up to date? This should include verification of any plan updates and that persons performing covered tasks (including contractors) are properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operators plan. 49 CFR 192 Part N<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

OQ plan inspections are being done, OQ protocol 9 crew inspection could use some more attention and more documentation. This is regularly being done during field inspection other than the Protocol 9 document.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>16</b> | Is state verifying operator's gas transmission integrity management programs (IMP) are up to date? This should include a previous review of IMP plan, along with monitoring progress on operator tests and remedial actions. In addition, the review should take in to account program review and updates of operators plan(s). (Are the State's largest operators programs being contacted or reviewed annually? Are replies to Operator IM notifications addressed? (formerly part of Question C-13)). 49 CFR 192 Subpart O<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

There is only 3 miles of transmission in NH, Liberty. Plans are required to be submitted. No issues with IMP Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The 2 Major LDC's had DIMP inspections done in CY2018. Liberty actually had compliance actions. It appears to be sufficiently covered.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>18</b> | Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be conducted every four years by operators. 49 CFR 192.616<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Public awareness programs were last done in 2016, programs appear to be on track. No issues.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>19</b> | Does the state have a mechanism for communicating with stakeholders - other than state pipeline safety seminar? (This should include making enforcement cases available to public).<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Excellent website information

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>20</b> | Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

One SRC in 2018. No issues

- 
- 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:

New Hampshire has state rule an annual reporting requirement on Aldyl A. And PPDC participation.

---

- 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:

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:

No waivers. Anything previous has been cleared and removed.

---

- 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

---

- 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:

Performance Metrics were reviewed. All trends appear positive. No issues

---

- 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:

Discussed data entered and process. No issues.

---

- 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

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

---

Total points scored for this section: 48

Total possible points for this section: 48



## PART D - Compliance Activities

Points(MAX) Score

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>1</b> | Does the state have written procedures to identify steps to be taken from the discovery to resolution of a probable violation? Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4   | 4                                       |
| a.       | Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b.       | Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c.       | Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

All compliance procedures noted on 16-17 of procedures. All were sent to appropriate personnel. No issues

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>2</b> | Did the state follow compliance procedures (from discovery to resolution) and adequately document all probable violations, including what resolution or further course of action is needed to gain compliance? (Incident Investigations do not need to meet 30/90 day requirement) Chapter 5.1<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4   | 4                                       |
| a.       | Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system?  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b.       | Document probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c.       | Resolve probable violations  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d.       | Routinely review progress of probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e.       | 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:

[https://www.puc.nh.gov/Safety/Pipeline\\_Safety\\_Enforcement\\_Program.html](https://www.puc.nh.gov/Safety/Pipeline_Safety_Enforcement_Program.html)

Review of compliance actions found no issues, all documented inspections that show compliance issues were all ok. No issues.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, no issues

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

Evaluator Notes:

There are no issues with due process

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, there are no issues.

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Definite demonstration of fining authority.

---

7 General Comments:  
Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo 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:

Procedures are in place and no issues

- 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:

Staff on call weekly. No issues on records.

- 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:

Although there were none Federally reportable, state investigates all. No issues

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

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:

No reportable incidents in 2018. N/A

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

N/A - none in 2018

- 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:

Although no incidents in 2018. There are no issues with cooperation.

- 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:

Always has sharing session at NAPSIR meetings. No issues.

---

**8** General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

---

Total points scored for this section: 7  
Total possible points for this section: 7



## PART F - Damage Prevention

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

State has trenchless tech rules. There are no issues.

- 
- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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?<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

NH requires reporting. Reports are reviewed by damage prevention specialist. There are no issues in this area.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There is various encouragement and promotion through the Damage Prevention program that is established within the NHPUC. There are no issues in this area.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes there is data collected and monthly data reporting and trend analysis. There are no issues in this area.

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

Liberty Utilities

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Joseph Vercellotti

Location of Inspection:

Manchester and Concord, NH

Date of Inspection:

06/19/2019

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Rex Evans

Evaluator Notes:

Various crews were working in Manchester and Concord, primarily on very slow cast iron replacement projects. Stopped at 4 sites in Manchester and only found crews doing excavation cleanup in Concord. Overall, good interaction with operator at every location. Did not find any issues of concern.

- 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:

The operator or operator representative were at locations visited. No issues.

- 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:

The inspector documents inspection typically via photo's of inspection site and transcribing to inspection documents. No issues with this process.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, it appeared information obtained was thorough based on the activity seen.

- 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:

No issues

- 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:

Inspector reviewed SOP at sites, reviewed field activities in an acceptable manner covering the activities that were happening.

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:

No issues with his knowledge or operator interaction. Asked very appropriate questions.

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:

Based on the on going nature of these replacement projects, there was not an exit interview needed. However, the operator was communicated with on areas reviewed.

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:

One possible violation regarding meter set at nearby building was identifying, requiring further information to be obtained from the operator on when the service was installed.

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 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 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 checked="" 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**

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

This section not applicable.

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

This section is not applicable.

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