



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2010 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation

for

Delaware PSC

Document Legend

PART:

- O -- Representative Date and Title Information
- A -- General Program Qualifications
- B -- Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/Performance
- C -- Interstate Agent States
- D -- Incident Investigations
- E -- Damage Prevention Initiatives
- F -- Field Inspection
- G -- PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan
- H -- Miscellaneous
- I -- Program Initiatives



2010 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation -- CY 2010
Natural Gas

State Agency: Delaware

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 10/03/2011 - 10/07/2011

Agency Representative: Jerry Platt

PHMSA Representative: Dino N.Rathod

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

Name/Title: Ms. Joann Conaway, Acting Chair

Agency: Delaware Public Service Commission

Address: 861 Silver Lake Blvd

City/State/Zip: Dover, Delaware 19904

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 2010 (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 certification/agreement attachments provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

Field Inspection (PART F):

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 F, the PHMSA representative should include a written summary which thoroughly documents the inspection.

Scoring Summary

PARTS

Possible Points Points Scored

A	General Program Qualifications	26	26
B	Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/Performance	24.5	24
C	Interstate Agent States	0	0
D	Incident Investigations	6	5.5
E	Damage Prevention Initiatives	9	9
F	Field Inspection	12	12
G	PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan	9.5	9
H	Miscellaneous	3	3
I	Program Initiatives	9	9

99 97.5

TOTALS

State Rating 98.5

PART A - General Program Qualifications

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Did the state submit complete and accurate information on the attachments to its most current 60105(a) Certification/60106 (a) Agreement? (NOTE: PHMSA Representative to verify certification/agreement attachments by reviewing appropriate state documentation. Score a deficiency in any one area as "needs improvement". Attachment numbers appear in parenthesis) Previous Question A.1, Items a-h worth 1 point each
Yes = 8 No = 0 Needs Minor Improvement = 3-7 Needs Major Improvement = 2 | 8 | 8 |
| | a. State Jurisdiction and agent status over gas facilities (1) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | b. Total state inspection activity (2) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | c. Gas facilities subject to state safety jurisdiction (3) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | d. Gas pipeline incidents (4) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | e. State compliance actions (5) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | f. State record maintenance and reporting (6) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | g. State employees directly involved in the gas pipeline safety program (7) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| | h. State compliance with Federal requirements (8) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

SLR Notes:

- 1 PSC to review Attachment 1 and add clarifying notes.
2.Attachment 5. PSC to make minor changes and include Number of Compliance Actions.
Corrected hard copies (scanned) should be sent to Zach (and State Liaison) requesting his concurrence for making minor correction in FedStar

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state have an adequate mechanism to receive operator reporting of incidents to ensure state compliance with 60105(a) Certification/60106(a) Agreement requirements (fatality, injury requiring hospitalization, property damage exceeding \$50,000 - Mechanism should include receiving "after hours" reports)? (Chapter 6) Previous Question A.2
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 3 | Has the state held a pipeline safety TQ seminar(s) in the last 3 years? (NOTE: Indicate date of last seminar or if state requested seminar, but T&Q could not provide, indicate date of state request for seminar. Seminars must be held at least once every 3 calendar years.) (Chapter 8.5) Previous Question A.4
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

DE PSC hosted T&Q seminar May 21-22, 2009. DE PSC has contacted T&Q for another seminar for CY 2012. PSC will keep me advised of progress.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Were pipeline safety program files well-organized and accessible?(NOTE: This also includes electronic files) (Chapter 5) Previous Question A.5
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC maintains hard copies of various inspection docuemnts (check lists, OQ and IMP protocols etc) and limited electrone database capabilites. I encouraged PSC for improvement to data management capabilities for user-friendly and efficient use of limited resources. PSC to reievw it for possible implementation.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 5 | Did state records and discussions with the state pipeline safety program manager indicate adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations? (Chapter 4.1, Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.6
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Program Manager Jerry Platt continues to take necessary T&Q training courses. He has gained familiarity with PHMSA pipeline safety requirements and initiatives. He continues to work closely with PHMSA and NAPS R

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 6 | Did the state respond in writing within 60 days to the requested items in the Chairman's letter following the Region's last program evaluation? (No response is necessary if no items are requested in letter and mark "Yes") (Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.8
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

PSC Chair Responded Jan 11, 2011

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 7 | What actions, if necessary, did the State initiate as a result of issues raised in the Chairperson's letter from the previous year? Did actions correct or address deficiencies from previous year's evaluation? (No response is necessary if no items are requested in letter and mark "Yes") (Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.8/A.9 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Personnel and Qualifications

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 8 | Has each inspector fulfilled the 3 year TQ training requirement? If No, has the state been granted a waiver regarding TQ courses by the Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety? (NOTE: If the State has new inspectors who have not attended all TQ courses, but are in a program which will achieve the completion of all applicable courses within 3 years of taking first course (5 years to successfully complete), or if a waiver has been granted by the applicable Region Director for the state, please answer yes.) (Chapter 4.4) Previous Question A.10 | 3 | 3 |
|----------|--|---|---|
- Yes = 3 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Prog Manager Jerry Platt has completed 5 courses in CY 2011 and 2 courses in CY 2010. He expects to sign for a few additional T&Q training courses.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 9 | Brief Description of Non-TQ training Activities:

Info Only = No Points

For State Personnel:

For Operators:

For Non-Operator Entities/Parties, Information Dissemination, Public Meetings: | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 10 | Did the lead inspectors complete all required T&Q OQ courses and Computer Based Training (CBT) before conducting OQ Inspections? (Chapter 4.4.1) Previous Question A.12 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
- Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

R Schaeffgen completed PL 3OQ (WBT) and PL 3311 in 03/2007

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 11 | Did the lead inspectors complete all required TQ Integrity Management (IMP) Courses/Seminars and CBT before conducting IMP Inspections? (Chapter 4.4.1) Previous Question A.13 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|
- Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

R Schaeffgen completed IMP WBT and Gas IMP PL1297 in 06/2005

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 12 | Was the ratio acceptable of Total inspection Person-days to Total Person-days charged to the program by state inspectors? (Region Director may modify points for just cause) (Chapter 4.3) Previous Question B.12 | 5 | 5 |
|-----------|---|---|---|
- Yes = 5 No = 0
- A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
89.99
- B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
 $220 \times 0.70 = 154.00$
- Ratio: A / B
 $89.99 / 154.00 = 0.58$
- If Ratio ≥ 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0
Points = 5

SLR Notes:

ok 5 points

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 13 | Have there been modifications or proposed changes to inspector-staffing levels? (If yes, describe) Previous Question B.13 | Info Only | Info Only |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
- Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

14 Part-A General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 26
Total possible points for this section: 26



PART B - Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/ Performance

Points(MAX) Score

Inspection Procedures

- 1** Does the State have a written inspection plan to complete the following? (all types of operators including LNG) (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question B.1 + Chapter 5 Changes + Incorporate LNG 6.5 6.5
Yes = 6.5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 50% Deduction
- | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a | Standard Inspections (Including LNG) (Max points = 2) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b | IMP Inspections (Including DIMP) (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c | OQ Inspections (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d | Damage Prevention (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e | On-Site Operator Training (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f | Construction Inspections (Max points = .5) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| g | Incident/Accident Investigations (Max points = 1) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| h | Compliance Follow-up (Max points = 1) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

SLR Notes:

- 2** Did the written Procedures for selecting operators adequately address key concerns? (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question B.2, items a-d are worth .5 point each 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 50% Deduction
- | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a | Length of time since last inspection | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b | History of Operator/unit and/or location (including leakage , incident and compliance history) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c | Type of activity being undertaken by operator (construction etc) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d | For large operators, rotation of locations inspected | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

SLR Notes:

Inspection Performance

- 3** Did the state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in its written procedures? (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question B.3 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0

SLR Notes:

- 4** Did the state inspection form cover all applicable code requirements addressed on the Federal Inspection forms? (Chapter 5.1 (3)) Previous Question B.4 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

- 5** Did state complete all applicable portions of inspection forms? (Chapter 5.1 (3)) Previous Question B.5 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

- 6** Did the state initiate appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition Reports? (Chapter 6.3) Previous Question B.6 .5 NA
Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

No SRC in CY 2010

7	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) Previous Question B.7 Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	.5
----------	--	----	----

SLR Notes:

8	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) Previous Question B.8 Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	.5
----------	---	----	----

SLR Notes:

9	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) Previous Question B.9 Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	.5
----------	--	----	----

SLR Notes:

10	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? (NTSB) Previous Question B.10 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

Compliance - 60105(a) States

11	Did the state adequately document sufficient information on probable violations? (Chapter 5.2) Previous Question B.14 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

DE PSC reported in 2011 Certification Attachment 5- Seven (7) Probable Violations were found. DE also informed operators by sending letter(s). This action should be counted towards Number of Compliance Actions. PSC agreed to make minor changes in Attachment 5 and include Number of Compliance Actions instead of zero.

12	Does the state have written procedures to identify the steps to be taken from the discovery to the resolution of a probable violation as specified in the "Guidelines for State Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1) Previous Question D(1).1 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

DE PSC need to enhance Compliance and Enforcement procedures. PSC agreed to review and revise the written procedures and provide additional details.

13	Does the state have written procedures to notify an operator when a noncompliance is identified as specified in the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1(4)) Previous Question D(1).2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

Title 26 Public Utilities Administrative Law-8001 Gas Regulations Rules establish Intrastate pipeline safety compliance program.

14	Does the state have a written procedure for routinely reviewing the progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns of the enforcement process, as required by the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1(5)) Previous Question D(1).3 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 15 | Has the State issued compliance actions for all probable violations discovered? (Note : PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation) Previous Question D(1).4
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

For Cy 2010 PSC found seven probable violations and sent letter(s) to operators. However PSC did not count tehse actions as Compliance Action. PSC was ro advised to revise Attachment 5 and indicate Number of Compliance Actions

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 16 | Did the state follow its written procedures for reviewing compliance actions and follow-up to determine that prompt corrective actions were taken by operators, within the time frames established by the procedures and compliance correspondence, as required by the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? Previous Question D(1).5
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 17 | If compliance could not be established by other means, did state pipeline safety program staff request formal action, such as a "Show Cause Hearing" to correct pipeline safety violations? (check each states enforcement procedures) Previous Question D(1).6
No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| 18 | Did the state adequately document the resolution of probable violations? (Chapter 5.1 (6)) Previous Question D(1).7
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | .5 |
|-----------|--|---|----|

SLR Notes:

I discussed with PSC need to fomalize process to convey probable violations and deficiencies found as a ressalt Inspections and requires a Formal response in writing from operator and keep adequate docuemtnation to support final resolution(s). PSC will review and revise Written Procedures accordingly.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|----|
| 19 | Were compliance actions sent to a company officer? (manager or board member if municipal/government system) (Chapter 5.1(4)) Previous Question D(1).8
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | .5 |
|-----------|--|----|----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 20 | Did the compliance proceedings give reasonable due process to all parties? (check each states enforcement procedures) Previous Question D(1).9
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Compliance - 60106(a) States

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|----|
| 21 | Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)? Previous Question D(2).1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|---|---|----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| 22 | Are results adequately documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with state inspection plan? Previous Question D(2).2
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|--|---|----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| 23 | 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.) Previous Question D(2).3
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|--|---|----|

SLR Notes:

24	Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment? Previous Question D(2).4 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
----	--	---	----

SLR Notes:

25	Did the state give written notice to PHMSA within 60 days of all probable violations found? Previous Question D(2).5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
----	---	---	----

SLR Notes:

26	Did the state initially submit adequate documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations? Previous Question D(2).6 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
----	---	---	----

SLR Notes:

27	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) Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
----	--	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

28	Part B: General Comments/Regional Observations Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
----	---	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 24
Total possible points for this section: 24.5



PART C - Interstate Agent States

Points(MAX) Score

1	Did the state use the current federal inspection form(s)? Previous Question D(3).1 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
---	---	---	----

SLR Notes:

2	Are results documented demonstrating inspection units were reviewed in accordance with "PHMSA directed inspection plan"? Previous Question D(3).2 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
---	--	---	----

SLR Notes:

3	Did the state submit documentation of the inspections within 60 days as stated in its latest Interstate Agent Agreement form? Previous Question D(3).3 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	NA
---	--	---	----

SLR Notes:

4	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.) Previous Question D(3).4 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	NA
---	---	---	----

SLR Notes:

5	Did the state immediately report to PHMSA conditions which may pose an imminent safety hazard to the public or to the environment? Previous Question D(3).5 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
---	--	---	----

SLR Notes:

6	Did the state give written notice to PHMSA within 60 days of all probable violations found? Previous Question D(3).6 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	NA
---	--	---	----

SLR Notes:

7	Did the state initially submit documentation to support compliance action by PHMSA on probable violations? Previous Question D(3).7 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	NA
---	--	---	----

SLR Notes:

8	Part C: General Comments/Regional Observations Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
---	---	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

DE is not an Interstate Agent State but only Intrastate natural gas pipeline safety program.

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

PART D - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Are state personnel following the procedures for Federal/State cooperation in case of an incident? (See Appendix in "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program") (Chapter 6.1) Previous Question E.1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|----|
| 2 | Are state personnel familiar with the jurisdictional authority and Memorandum of Understanding between NTSB and PHMSA? (See Appendix in "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program") (Chapter 6 ? Appendix D) Previous Question E.2
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | .5 |
|----------|---|----|----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state keep adequate records of incident notifications received? Previous Question E.3
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | If an onsite investigation of an incident was not made, did the state obtain sufficient information by other means to determine the facts and support the decision not to go on-site? Previous Question E.4
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------|---|
| 5 | Were investigations thorough and conclusions and recommendations documented in an acceptable manner? Previous Question E.5, comprehensive question worth 2 points total
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 1.5 |
| a. | Observations and Document Review | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| b. | Contributing Factors | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| c. | Recommendations to prevent recurrences where appropriate | Yes <input type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input checked="" type="radio"/> |

SLR Notes:

Discussed with PSC Pipeline Inspection staff need for completion of Incident Investigation Form and prepapre Final Report(s) in a timely manner and supporting documentation organized in the acceptable manner. PSC will review and assure that above listed items a), b) and c) are described with pertinent details.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 6 | Did the state initiate enforcement action for violations found during any incident investigation(s)? Previous Question E.6 Variation
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

SLR Notes:

No enforcement actions were needed.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 7 | Did the state assist region office by taking appropriate follow-up actions related to the operator incident reports to ensure accuracy and final report has been received by PHMSA? (validate annual report data from operators concerning incidents/accidents and investigate discrepancies) (Chapter 6) Previous Question E.7/E.8
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

PSC staff received and reviewed operator incident reports. I also discussed need for verification of 30 day Original, Supplemental and Final Reports, as necessary.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 8 | Part D: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 5.5
Total possible points for this section: 6



PART E - Damage Prevention Initiatives

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? Previous Question B.11
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

The DE PSC reviews all procedures, including directional drilling/boring, from both major operators on an annual basis. The procedures are reviewed to ensure that

- i.) damage prevention actions are taken to protect the operator's facilities as well as that of other utilities,
- ii.) ensure that minimum clearances are maintained using latest cutting edge locating equipment,
- iii.) ensures damage prevention of the pipe when the boring tool is pulled back.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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? New 2008
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

As a normal course of all construction, PSC inspector ensures that a One Call ticket has been established for that particular excavation. The details of this are denoted in the Inspection Report, which has an established field for this information. As part of the inspection, the inspector is verifying that all utilities have been located and marked. Both major LDC's participate in the One Call notification system. Also, the inspector ensures that proper excavating techniques are being used in the immediate vicinity of all marked utilities.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 3 | Did the state encourage and promote the adoption of the Common Ground Alliance Best Practices document to its regulated companies as a means of reducing damages to all underground facilities? Previous Question A.7
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

DE State encourages and promotes the adoption of the Common Ground Best Practices document to its regulated companies, especially Delmarva Power and Chesapeake Utilities. DE PSC Pipeline Safety Program Manager participated in the USPCD Monthly meetings, when available. At these meetings, the CGA Best Practices document is provided to all interested members of the USPCD. The Commission has Damage Prevention advertisements on the radio and has a message regarding 811 on its homepage (www.depsec.delaware.gov) with a link to the 811 website.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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? New 2008
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

The DE PSC receives data from USPCD, as reported by utility operators, to evaluate the trend on the number of damages per 1000 locate requests each year. In addition, the DE PSC evaluates data submitted by the two major LDC's (Delmarva and Chesapeake) on their Annual Reports to evaluate the number of damages per 1000 locate requests for only the gas pipeline operators.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 5 | Did the state review operators' records of accidents and failures due to excavation damage to ensure causes of failure are addressed to minimize the possibility of recurrence as required by 192.617?
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

The DE PSC Pipeline Safety staff reviews the records of any "Incident". In 2010, there were no reportable "Incidents" due to excavation for any operator. Typically, the pipeline safety inspector reviews damages due to excavation while performing the annual damage prevention inspection for the major operators.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 6 | Part E: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 9
Total possible points for this section: 9

PART F - Field Inspection

Points(MAX) Score

1	Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative Info Only = No Points Name of Operator Inspected: Delmarva Power Name of State Inspector(s) Observed: Robert Schaeffgen Location of Inspection: Wilmington Date of Inspection: 10/03/2011 Name of PHMSA Representative:	Info Only	Info Only
---	--	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

Pipe Replacement- CI with new plastic main and services; Distribution system Gas Transmisson-IMP update-review. Discssion of NTSB recommendations and PHMSA Advisory Bulletins; Also brief review of DIMP implementation progress

2	Was the operator or operator's representative notified and/or given the opportunity to be present during inspection? New 2008 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
---	---	---	---

SLR Notes:

LDC inspector and Contractor Forman were present

3	Did the inspector use an acceptable inspection form/checklist and was the form/checklist used as a guide for the inspection? (New regulations shall be incorporated) Previous Question F.2 Yes = 2 No = 0	2	2
---	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

PSC inspector used State Inspection Check List and PHMSA OQ#9 Protocol

4	Did the inspector thoroughly document results of the inspection? Previous Question F.3 Yes = 2 No = 0	2	2
---	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

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.) New 2008 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
---	---	---	---

SLR Notes:

PSC inspector checked necessary equipment at site to perofrm butt fusion joint.

6	What type of inspection(s) did the state inspector conduct during the field portion of the state evaluation? (i.e. Standard, Construction, IMP, etc) New 2008 Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
---	--	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

Pipe Replacement- CI with new plastic main and services; Distribution system Gas Transmisson-IMP update-review. Discssion of NTSB recommendations and PHMSA Advisory Bulletins; Also brief review of DIMP implementation progress

7	Did the inspector adequately review the following during the field portion of the state evaluation? (check all that apply on list) New 2008, comprehensive question worth 2 points total Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
a.	Procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b.	Records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c.	Field Activities/Facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d.	Other (Please Comment)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

SLR Notes:

Pipe Replacement- CI with new plastic main and services; Distribution system Gas Transmisson-IMP update-review. Disccsion of NTSB recommendations and PHMSA Advisory Bulletins; Also brief review of DIMP implementation progress

8	Did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Liaison will document reasons if unacceptable) Previous Question F.8 Yes = 2 No = 0	2	2
----------	---	---	---

SLR Notes:

9	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) Previous Question F.10 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

Yes.

10	During the exit interview, did the inspector identify probable violations found during the inspections? Previous Question F.11 Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
-----------	--	---	---

SLR Notes:

PSC inspector discussed several items as part of an exit interview.

11	What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
-----------	---	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

Pipe Replacement- CI with new plastic main and services; Distribution system Gas Transmisson-IMP update-review. Disccsion of NTSB recommendations and PHMSA Advisory Bulletins; Also brief review of DIMP implementation progress

12	Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
-----------	--	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

13	Field Observation Areas Observed (check all that apply) 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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SLR Notes:

Pipe Replacement- CI with new plastic main and services; Distribution system Gas Transmisson-IMP update-review. Disccsion of NTSB recommendations and PHMSA Advisory Bulletins; Also brief review of DIMP implementation progress

14 Part F: General Comments/Regional Observations

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

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



PART G - PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan

Points(MAX) Score

Risk base Inspections - Targeting High Risk Areas

1 Does state have process to identify high risk inspection units? 1.5 1.5

Yes = 1.5 No = 0

Risk Factors (criteria) to consider may include:

Miles of HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density

Length of time since last inspection

History of Individual Operator units (leakage, incident and compliance history, etc.)

Threats - (Excavation Damage, Corrosion, Natural Forces, Other Outside Forces, Material or Welds, Equipment, Operations, Other)

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety Program Procedures specifically address inspection priorities and criteria to identify these priorities. The criteria include the operator's history (leaks, unaccounted for gas, number of incidents, compliance, etc.), length of time since last inspection, type of activity being inspected (new construction, maintenance, etc.), and amount of unprotected bare steel and cast iron pipe. Using these criteria, various inspections are scheduled. In addition, weekly reviews of planned construction and maintenance provided by the two major operators are used to aid in determining the priorities for additional inspections.

2 Are inspection units broken down appropriately? (see definitions in Guidelines) .5 0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Yes, DE PSC has the appropriate number of inspection units.

3 Consideration of operators DIMP Plan? (if available and pending rulemaking) Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

DE PSC, Delmarva Power and Chesapeake Utilities as well as the MMOs and LPG System Operators are aware of August 2, 2011 implementation date for DIMP rules. PSC inspector made frequent inquiries to the two major operators to ensure they were making adequate progress for implementation of their DIMP Plans.

4 Does state inspection process target high risk areas? .5 0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

DE PSC pipeline safety staff does target high risk areas based on identified Gas transmission lines, Delmarva Power's and Chesapeake Utilities construction activity plans, and the criteria described in PSC Inspection Procedures.

Use of Data to Help Drive Program Priority and Inspections

5 Does state use data to analyze effectiveness of damage prevention efforts in the state? (DIRT or other data, etc) .5 0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety Inspector performs a damage prevention inspection of the two major operators in the state (Delmarva Power and Chesapeake Utilities) each year. The Program Manager looks at the damage statistics. The Program Manager also reviews monthly line damage summary reports from USPCD, as well as data from operator Annual Reports, to analyze the effectiveness of the damage prevention efforts. This data is used to identify where to place the damage prevention efforts (Public awareness, excavator education, etc.)

6 Has state reviewed data on Operator Annual reports for accuracy? .5 0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

DE PSC reviews the Delmarva Power and Chesapeake Utilities Operator Annual reports for accuracy every year.

7 Has state analyzed annual report data for trends and operator issues? .5 0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety staff analyzes Delmarva Power and Chesapeake Utilities annual report data for trends. The Delmarva Power and Chesapeake Utilities Annual reports provide a comparison of the number of leaks by cause as well as the percentage of gas unaccounted for. In addition, the amount of unprotected bare steel and cast iron pipeline for each operator is analyzed to ensure these numbers are decreasing on an annual basis.

8	Has state reviewed data on Incident/Accident reports for accuracy?	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety staff reviews the data on Incident/Accident reports for accuracy. In CY-2010, there was one reportable incident. The Program Manager and Inspector responded to the site of this incident on the same day it was reported and tracked all reports and repairs through completion.

9	Does state do evaluation of effectiveness of program based on data? (i.e. performance measures, trends, etc.)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

DE PSC evaluated the effectiveness of the Pipeline Safety Program based on meeting the most current Revision of the DE Public Service Commission Pipeline Safety Program Procedures, whether it met the goal of the number of standard or construction inspections, and cause of incidents (if any). It also measures the effectiveness of the Program's damage prevention efforts based on the number of line damages per 1000 tickets. This is done by analyzing operator Annual Reports, as well as data from USPCD on all underground utility line damages.

10	Did the State input all operator qualification inspection results into web based database provided by PHMSA in a timely manner upon completion of OQ inspections? Previous Question B.15	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

DE PSC pipeline safety inspection staff uploaded eleven (11) Operator Qualification Inspection results for CY2010 in OQDB.

11	Did the State submit their replies into the Integrity Management Database (IMDB) in response to the Operators notifications for their integrity management program? Previous Question B.16	.5	NA
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

The State did not receive any notifications in CY2010 for operators' integrity management programs, so the State did not submit any replies.

12	Have the IMP Federal Protocol forms been uploaded to the IMDB? Previous Question B.17	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

PSC uploaded Oct 13, 2010 Delmarva Power IMP inspection results in IMDB.

13	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? Previous Question B.18	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

In CY2010, there was one plastic pipe defect identified that was traced to a specific manufacturing date. Both major operators (Delmarva & Chesapeake Utilities) were questioned, and both responded that they had not recently used this type of pipe.

14	Has state confirmed transmission operators have submitted information into National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) database along with any changes made after original submission?	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

Yes. DE PSC reviewed the NPMS database in CY2010 to ensure that information regarding the Delmarva transmission lines was accurate.

Accident/Incident Investigation Learning and Sharing Lessons Learned

15	Has state shared lessons learned from incidents/accidents? (i.e. NAPS meetings and communications)	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

The State provided a presentation on the overall status of the program at the 2010 Eastern Region NAPS Meeting. At that time, there were no incidents

from the previous year to discuss. However, at the 2011 Eastern Region Meeting, the details of an incident that occurred in late 2010 were provided and discussed.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|----|-----|
| 16 | Does the State support data gathering efforts concerning accidents? (Frequency/Consequence/etc) | .5 | 0.5 |
| | Yes = .5 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

DE PSC supports data gathering efforts by an operator who has had an accident. However, it is worth noting that the only incident/accident in DE in CY2010 was caused by natural forces.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 17 | Does state have incident/accident criteria for conducting root cause analysis? | Info Only | Info Only |
| | Info Only = No Points | | |

SLR Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 18 | Does state conduct root cause analysis on incidents/accidents in state? | Info Only | Info Only |
| | Info Only = No Points | | |

SLR Notes:

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|-----|
| 19 | Has state participated on root cause analysis training? (can also be on wait list) | .5 | 0.5 |
| | Yes = .5 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

PSC Inspector R. Schaeffen has participated in Root Cause training in Princeton, NJ Week of August 16, 2009

Transparency - Communication with Stakeholders

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|-----|
| 20 | Other than pipeline safety seminar does State communicate with stakeholders? (Communicate program data, pub awareness, etc.) | .5 | 0.5 |
| | Yes = .5 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

DE is constantly communicating with the stakeholders via telephone, e-mail, Public Awareness messages on the radio (for Damage Prevention), etc. Also, all requests for information were answered in CY2010.

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|---|
| 21 | Does state share enforcement data with public? (Website, newsletters, docket access, etc.) | .5 | 0 |
| | Yes = .5 No = 0 | | |

SLR Notes:

DE does not normally share enforcement data with the public -usually it is only shared with the operator with the violation(s). However, the State would provide any information requested as permitted by DE FOIA laws.

DE PSC webpage:
<http://depsec.delaware.gov/naturalgas.shtml>

-
- | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 22 | Part G: General Comments/Regional Observations | Info Only | Info Only |
| | Info Only = No Points | | |

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 9
Total possible points for this section: 9.5

PART H - Miscellaneous

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 1 | What were the major accomplishments for the year being evaluated? (Describe the accomplishments, NAPSR Activities and Participation, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

Through a series of mishaps, the DE Pipeline Safety Program was without a Program Manager in the beginning of CY2010. During the course of the year, this position was filled with selection of Jerry Platt. He attended the 2011 Eastern Region NAPSR Meeting, responded to all information requests from NAPSR and PHMSA, and generally became familiar with the program.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 2 | What legislative or program initiatives are taking place/planned in the state, past, present, and future? (Describe initiatives (i.e. damage prevention, jurisdiction/authority, compliance/administrative, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

As a 60105(a) state, the DE PSC reviewed to ensure that it fully encompassed the requirements of this status. Also, the USPCD indicated to the new Program Manager their interest in advocating for changes to the underground damage prevention laws. The USPCD indicated that they want to take the lead in developing these law changes while consulting with the DE PSC throughout the process.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 3 | Any Risk Reduction Accomplishments/Projects? (i.e. Cast iron replacement projects, bare steel, third-party damage reductions, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

In CY2009, Chesapeake Utilities eliminated the last of its cast iron pipeline. In CY2010, Delmarva Power continued to reduce their cast iron pipeline. Both operators also continued to reduce their amounts of unprotected bare steel pipelines.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPSR or PHMSA?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

DE participated in all surveys by NAPSR and PHMSA.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 5 | Sharing Best Practices with Other States - (General Program)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

The State attended the 2010 and 2011 Eastern Region NAPSR Meetings and provided an overall presentation of its Pipeline Safety Program.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 6 | Part H: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 3
Total possible points for this section: 3

PART I - Program Initiatives

Points(MAX) Score

Drug and Alcohol Testing (49 CFR Part 199)

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Has the state verified that operators have drug and alcohol testing programs?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes. PSC Pipeline safety inspector has reviewed the drug and alcohol testing programs of its two natural gas distribution companies as well as its transmission operators, and he continues to monitor these programs on an annual basis. Programs of contractors working for the natural gas distribution and transmission companies are also reviewed to ensure compliance.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 2 | Is the state verifying that operators are conducting the drug and alcohol tests required by the operators program (random, post-incident, etc.)
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety Inspector reviews the documentation of the drug and alcohol test summary reports for the natural gas distribution and transmission operators which includes the different types of tests (random, pre-employment, post accident, etc..)

- | | | | |
|----------|---|----|-----|
| 3 | Is the state verifying that any positive tests are responded to in accordance with the operator's program?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|---|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

DE PSC pipeline safety staff verifies that any positive tests are responded to by either not hiring (pre-employment test) or terminating for use on-duty or post-accident.

Qualification of Pipeline Personnel (49 CFR Part 192 Subpart N)

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Has the state verified that operators have a written qualification program?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety Inspector verifies that operators have an Operator Qualification program or are in the process of preparing one for new, or change of, operators (in the case of LP operators).

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 5 | Has the state reviewed operator qualification programs for compliance with PHMSA rules and protocols?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety staff has reviewed Operator Qualification programs to ensure that they are in compliance with PHMSA rules and protocols.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 6 | Is the state verifying that persons who perform covered tasks for the operator are qualified in accordance with the operator's program?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

- | | | | |
|----------|--|----|-----|
| 7 | Is the state verifying that persons who perform covered task for the operator are requalified at the intervals specified in the operator's program?
Yes = .5 No = 0 | .5 | 0.5 |
|----------|--|----|-----|

SLR Notes:

Gas Transmission Pipeline Integrity Management (49 CFR Part 192 Subpart O)

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 8 | Has the state verified that all operators with transmission pipelines have either adopted an integrity management program (IMP), or have properly determined that one is not required?
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Delmarva Power and Delaware Solid Waste Authority are the only two operators in the State with transmission pipelines. Each of these two operators have adopted an integrity management program.

9	Has the state verified that in determining whether a plan is required, the operator correctly calculated the potential impact radii and properly applied the definition of a high consequence area? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety staff has verified that in determining whether a plan was required that they correctly calculated the potential impact radii and properly applied the definition of a High Consequence Area (HCA).

10	Has the state reviewed operator IMPs for compliance with Subpart O? (In accordance with State Inspection plan) Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	---	----	-----

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety staff has reviewed the IMPs for compliance with Subpart O of each of the two transmission operators

11	Is the state monitoring operator progress on the inspections, tests and remedial actions required by the operator's IMP, including that they are being done in the manner and schedule called for in its IMP? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety Inspector has been monitoring any tests or remedial actions required by the two transmission operators to ensure that the operators are following their IMP programs. This is reflected in particular Inspection Reports.

12	Is the state verifying that operators are periodically examining their transmission line routes for the appearance of new HCAs? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

DE PSC Pipeline Safety Inspector periodically examines the transmission routes of both Delmarva Power and Delaware Solid Waste Authority (DSWA) to verify that there is no new appearance of an HCA.

Public Awareness (49 CFR Section 192.616)

13	Has the state verified that each operator has developed a continuing public awareness program? (due date was 6/20/06 for most operators, 6/20/07 for certain very small operators, 6/13/08 for master meters) Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

PSC Pipeline Safety staff has verified that each operator has a public awareness program. The larger operators have a written plan and produce various messages. The PSC Inspector has worked with the smaller operators to ensure they have a written plan and reviews the messages produced by these operators.

14	Has the state reviewed the content of these programs for compliance with 192.616 (by participating in the Clearinghouse or by other means)? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

DE PSC pipeline safety inspection staff has ensured that the Public Awareness Programs of Delmarva Power, Chesapeake Utilities and Delaware Solid Waste Authority Operations have all been reviewed with respect to 192.616. In addition, the PSC Inspector reviews the plans of the smaller operators (MMO's and LP) to ensure compliance with 192.616.

15	Is the state verifying that operators are conducting the public awareness activities called for in its program? Yes = .5 No = 0	.5	0.5
-----------	--	----	-----

SLR Notes:

DE PSC pipeline safety staff is verifying that operators are conducting the public awareness activities called for in its programs and MMO's are sending out public awareness messages semi-annually in accordance with the regulations for Public Awareness Programs.

16	Is the state verifying that operators have evaluated their Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162? Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
-----------	---	-----------	-----------

SLR Notes:

17 Part I: General Comments/Regional Observations
Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

SLR Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 9
Total possible points for this section: 9

