

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

## 2018 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE 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:** Kentucky

**Agency Status:**

**Date of Visit:** 08/26/2019 - 08/30/2019

**Agency Representative:** James D. Rice, Pipeline Safety Program Manager

**PHMSA Representative:** Agustin Lopez, State Evaluator

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

**Name/Title:** Michael J Schmitt, Chairman

**Agency:** Kentucky Public Service Commission

**Address:** 211 Sower Blvd.

**City/State/Zip:** Frankfort, KY 40602-0615

**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 10.5  
49 49  
15 15  
11 11  
8 8  
12 12  
0 0  
0 0

### TOTALS

118 115.5

**State Rating** .....

97.9

## PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>1</b> | 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:**

Verified operator and unit inspections with the KY PSC Data and the numbers are correct. KY PSC keeps a datasheet with a count of units inspected for the year.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

Reviewed KY PSC data to verify inspection activity submitted in Attachment 2. The data seems to be accurate with no issues identified.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>3</b> | 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:**

Verified operator list with PDM and there is one distribution operator missing in PDM. KY PSC will check to see which operator did not submit an annual report. Seems that Indiana Gas is not submitting an annual report for their piping in Kentucky. The KY PSC will be contacting the operator to assure annual reports are submitted in the future.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>4</b> | 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:**

Yes, there was one reportable incident in PDM and the KY PSC listed the incident in Attachment 4. There was an incident from 2017 that was finalized in 2018 so the KY PSC had it listed.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

Verified compliance actions with the KY PSC data and the data submitted in Attachment 5 is accurate. There is one carryover from 2015 that will be closed out in 2019. The operator had to construct a new pipeline so it has taken several years to build.

- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>6</b> | 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, keep electronic files and are well organized. Inspection reports and correspondence is kept in the Inspection Reporting System (IRS).

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>7</b> | 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:**

Yes, verified inspector training with T&Q Blackboard.

- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>8</b> | 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:**

KY PSC has automatic adoption in accordance with their State Statutes 278.495.

---

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:

The KY PSC listed their accomplishments for 2018 and their planned activities.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

The KY PSC is mainly complying with Part A of the Evaluation.

---

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:

Standard Inspection procedures are in the KY PSC Procedures Manual under Section III (B). The procedures have enough detail to give inspectors guidance to conduct standard inspections. Section III(A) has pre-inspection activities and Section IV (A) has post-inspection activities.

- |   |  |   |     |
|---|--|---|-----|
| 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 | 0.5 |
|---|--|---|-----|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

### Evaluator Notes:

The procedures need to include more guidance on how to conduct IMP and DIMP inspections. Section III(A) has pre-inspection activities and Section IV(A) has post-inspection activities. The procedures do not give enough guidance or detail to conduct consistent IMP/DIMP inspections.

- |   |  |   |     |
|---|--|---|-----|
| 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 | 0.5 |
|---|--|---|-----|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

### Evaluator Notes:

The procedures need to include more guidance on how to conduct OQ inspections. Section III(A) has pre-inspection activities and Section IV(A) has post-inspection activities. The procedures do not give enough guidance or detail to conduct consistent OQ inspections.

- |   |   |   |     |
|---|---|---|-----|
| 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 | 0.5 |
|---|---|---|-----|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

### Evaluator Notes:

The procedures need to include more guidance on how to conduct Damage Prevention inspections. Section III(A) has pre-inspection activities and Section IV(A) has post-inspection activities. The procedures do not give enough guidance or detail to conduct consistent Damage Prevention inspections.

- |   |  |   |     |
|---|--|---|-----|
| 5 | Any operator training conducted should be outlined and appropriately documented as needed. | 1 | 0.5 |
|---|--|---|-----|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

### Evaluator Notes:

Need to include operator training procedures. Need to give guidance on when and how the training is completed and how to document.

- |   |  |   |     |
|---|--|---|-----|
| 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 | 0.5 |
|---|--|---|-----|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

### Evaluator Notes:

The procedures need to include guidance on how to conduct Construction inspections. Section III(A) has pre-inspection activities and Section IV(A) has post-inspection activities.

- |    |   |                                      |  |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 7  | Does inspection plan address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements?<br>Yes = 6 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-5                               | 6                                    | 6  |
| a. | Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval)  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities)   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction)  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic areas, Population Density, etc)  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e. | Process to identify high-risk inspection units that includes all threats - (Excavation Damage, Corrosion, Natural Forces, Outside Forces, Material and Welds, Equipment, Operators and any Other Factors) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. | Are inspection units broken down appropriately?   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Section II(A) addresses the risk ranking of inspections which include high unaccounted gas, leaks, past history, type and condition of pipe per annual reports, time since last inspections, mileage of pipe and operator history.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The KY PSC Procedures give guidance on how to conduct standard inspections and pre and post inspection activities but need improvement on how to conduct IMP, DIMP, Damage Prevention, Operator Training, and Construction inspections. The procedures need to have enough guidance and detail for inspectors to conduct consistent inspections.

Total points scored for this section: 10.5  
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):  
409.50

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
220 X 4.06 = 893.93

Ratio: A / B  
409.50 / 893.93 = 0.46

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

Evaluator Notes:

Verified inspection days with inspector time to assure ratio is accurate. The numbers are correct with no issues identified.

- 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:

- a. Yes all lead inspectors are qualified to lead inspections.
- b. Yes, Melissa, James and Mike are qualified to lead DIMP/IMP inspections.
- c. Yes, Melissa has completed the Root Cause course.
- d. There are several local schools/seminars that the inspectors can attend.
- e. Yes, reviewed inspection reports to assure lead inspectors are qualified.

- 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:

Yes, Mr. James Rice is very knowledgeable of the pipeline safety program and regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There was no response required.

- 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 T&Q Seminar was on Sept 21, 2016 in Bowling Green, KY.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, reviewed inspection reports and all seem to have met their inspection intervals. The KY PSC conducts each type of inspection on a three year interval.

- 
- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>7</b> | 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:

The KY PSC uses the IA Equivalent form to conduct their inspections. They include a form which has additional NTSB and ADB questions.

- 
- |          |   |   |   |
|----------|---|---|---|
| <b>8</b> | 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:

Yes, NTSB and ADB questions are incorporated into KY PSC inspection forms to be covered during standard inspections.

- 
- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>9</b> | 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:

Yes, NTSB and ADB questions are incorporated into KY PSC inspection forms to be covered during standard inspections.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>10</b> | 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:

Yes, NTSB and ADB questions are incorporated into KY PSC inspection forms to be covered during standard inspections.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>11</b> | 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:

Yes, NTSB and ADB questions are incorporated into KY PSC inspection forms to be covered during standard inspections.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>12</b> | 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:

Yes, the KY PSC reviews annual reports and incident reports to look for trends or issues to prioritize their inspections.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>13</b> | 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:

Yes, the question is on the IA equivalent form which is used during standard inspections.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <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:

Yes, the inspectors use Form 14 to verify Drug and Alcohol programs. They also conduct Program evaluations using the D&A Protocol form.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <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:

Yes, the inspectors use the IA OQ equivalent form to conduct OQ Program inspections.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <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:

Yes, the inspectors use the IA Equivalent form which has the IMP questions and are asked during inspections. Separate IMP inspections are performed on large operators which are separate from a standard inspection. IMP inspections on small operators are performed during standard inspections.

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <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:

Yes, DIMP inspections are performed during the standard inspections. KY PSC used the IA equivalent form which covers DIMP.

- 
- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <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:

Yes, completed the first round of PAPEI in 2014

- 
- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <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:

Yes, the KY PSC communicates with stakeholders thru seminars, working with KY Gas Association and their own website.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There was one SRCR in 2018 submitted by Louisville Gas. Records of the SRC are kept in their database

- 21 Did the State ask Operators to identify any plastic pipe and components that has shown a record of defects/leaks and what those operators are doing to mitigate the safety concerns? 1 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the inspectors ask the question during standard inspections. The form has a separate question set that includes all NTSB and ADB questions.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Mr. James Rice responds to surveys or requests from NAPSRS and PHMSA.

- 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:

There is one waiver issued in 2003 to Catlettsburg Refining LLC(Marathon) that waives the compliance of 192. The waiver allows the pipeline from complying with 192.

- 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, Mr. James Rice attended the National meeting in Santa Fe, NM.

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

- a. Discussion of Potential Accelerated Actions (AA's) based on any negative trends Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐  
b. NTSB P-11-20 Meaningful Metrics Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed with Mr. Jim Rice the performance metrics which all seem to be improving. The damages per 1000 tickets is at about 2.96 which has been dropping steadily in the last several years. The gas distribution leaks have also been on a downward trend in the last several years. The KY PSC looks and analyzes the data to look for ways to improving the trends.

- 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 the SICT calculation and don't seem to have any issues with the calculated numbers. The KY PSC did not meet their required inspection days but it was mainly due to recent inspector retirements

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the inspection form has a set of all NTSB and ADB questions in which the pipe flow reversals verification will be incorporated into the form. There have not been any pipe flow reversals in KY.

---

**28** General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The KY PSC is mainly complying with Part C of the Evaluation.

---

Total points scored for this section: 49  
Total possible points for this section: 49



## 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:

Section IV and Section III(B) include procedures for the steps taken from the discovery to the resolution of a probable violation.

- a. Procedures stat that the notice is sent to company officials.
- b. Procedures states how to routinely review or follow up on compliance actions to prevent breakdowns.
- c. Procedures address how to close probable violations.

- |          |  |                                      |  |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <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:

Yes, reviewed inspection reports and compliance letters and were all adequately documented. The KY PSC uses their IRS system to document inspection reports and track compliance actions.

- a. Yes, reviewed compliance letters and they were addressed to company officials.
- b. Yes, reviewed inspection reports and all probable violations were documented.
- c. Yes, reviewed compliance actions and all were resolved.
- d. Yes, progress of probable violations are tracked in IRS and by the PM and inspector.
- e. Yes all inspection reports reviewed had documentation of an exit interview.
- f. Yes, all compliance actions reviewed were sent to the operator within 90 days.

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <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, inspections reviewed which had probable violations all had compliance actions sent to the operator. Verified all unsatisfactory questions in the inspection report were addressed in the letters.

The only issue of concern was the unsatisfactory checked on NTSB and ADB questions, in particular on the 2018 inspections of Fulton Public Works Department and Grayson Utilities Commission. Both inspection reports had "unsats" for a couple of the NTSB and ADB question but were not addressed on compliance letters. In talking with the inspector, the inspector discussed the issues with the operators but did not document. The KY PSC will assure that the NTSB and ADB "usats" will be either documented or issued as concerns in the future.

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 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:

Yes, compliance actions give reasonable due process to all parties involved. Section V of procedures addresses show cause hearings.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Mr. James Rice is very familiar with the states process of issuing civil penalties. It is also addresses in Section V of their Procedures and in their State Statutes 278.992

- 
- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 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:

Yes, the NY PSC issued Civil Penalties in 2018. There were four cases in which civil penalties were collected.

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

Evaluator Notes:

D.3 The only issue of concern was the unsatisfactory checked on NTSB and ADB questions, in particular on the 2018 inspections of Fulton Public Works Department and Grayson Utilities Commission. Both inspection reports had "unsats" for a couple of the NTSB and ADB question but were not addressed on compliance letters. In talking with the inspector, the inspector discussed the issues with the operators but did not document. The KY PSC will assure that the NTSB and ADB "usats" will be either documented or issued as concerns in the future.

---

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



## PART E - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

### Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Section VI of manual addresses incident/accident investigation procedures. The operators at emailed with contact information. There is a dedicated phone number that sends out a voice message to the pipeline safety staff.

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

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

### Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the operator emails incident notification to a dedicated email which is then forwarded to the pipeline safety staff. The program manager makes decision on who will investigate incident. Emails are kept as the reporting record.

- 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:

There was one reportable incident and an on-site investigation was conducted. Procedures do state that if there is no on-site, enough information will be gathered to make the decision why no on-site was necessary.

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

Yes = 3 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-2

- a. Observations and document review Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- b. Contributing Factors Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐
- c. Recommendations to prevent recurrences when appropriate Yes ☒ No ☐ Needs Improvement ☐

### Evaluator Notes:

Yes, there was one reportable incident that was investigated. There was an incident report in the KY PSC files (IRS). Investigation was documented by inspectors with conclusions.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

### Evaluator Notes:

There were no compliance actions issued due to incident investigations.

- 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:

The KY PSC is available to assist the AID at any time. The KY PSC responded to emails from AID requesting updates on incident notifications.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, lessons learned are shared during the NAPSRR region meeting.

- 8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The KY PSC is mainly complying with Part E of the evaluation.

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



## PART F - Damage Prevention

Points(MAX)    Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes the NTSB and ADB questions are incorporated into the standard inspection to be asked during the inspections. Reviewed report to assure question is being asked.

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

Yes the NTSB and ADB questions are incorporated into the standard inspection to be asked during the inspections. Reviewed report to assure question is being asked.

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

Yes, the inspector ask during inspections if the operator has adopted CGA best practices and if no encourages to operator to promote CGA and best practices. Question is in supplemental questionnaire.

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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, the KY PSC reviews annual reports and gathers data on the number of damages per 1,000 tickets. The data is evaluated by the pipeline safety staff for trends and find ways to reduce the damages.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The KY PSC is mainly complying with Part F of the evaluation.

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:

Atmos Energy

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Michael Nantz, Utility Inspector

Location of Inspection:

Shelbyville, KY

Date of Inspection:

August 29, 2019

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Agustin Lopez, State Evaluator

Evaluator Notes:

Evaluated Mr. Michael Nantz while conducting a standard inspection of Atmos Energy distribution system in Shelbyville, KY and surrounding areas. Mr. Nantz was inspecting regulator stations and having the operator inspect and assure regulators were operating. Mr. Nantz conducted himself very professionally and performed an excellent inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the operator was notified with enough notice to allow representatives to be present.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Mr. Nantz utilized the IA equivalent form while performing the inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Mr. Nantz took notes and documented results of the inspection on the inspection form.

- 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:

Yes, the inspector had the operator check regulators and made sure they had the proper equipment to perform the tasks.

- 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:

Mr. Nantz reviewed records, procedures and a field inspection of the facilities. I was only present to evaluate the field part of the inspection. He asked questions to the technicians and had them explain the process/procedures used while inspecting regulators. He performed an excellent job.

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:

Yes, Mr. Nantz has been with the KY PSC since 2018 but has industry experience and worked in other states pipeline safety programs. He is very knowledgeable of the pipeline safety program and regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Mr. Nantz conducted an exit interview for the days activities, but was going back to conduct his final exit interview with the operator.

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:

He did not have any issues for the inspection of regulators but did have other issues found during the week. He was going to discuss it with the operator during the final exit interview.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| m. | Line Markers                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| o. | Leak Surveys                      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| p. | MOP                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| q. | MAOP                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| r. | Moving Pipe                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| s. | New Construction                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| t. | Navigable Waterway Crossings      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| u. | Odorization                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| v. | Overpressure Safety Devices       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| w. | Plastic Pipe Installation         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| x. | Public Education                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| y. | Purging                           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| z. | Prevention of Accidental Ignition | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| A. | Repairs                           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

- |    |                             |                                     |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| B. | Signs                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| C. | Tapping                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| D. | Valve Maintenance           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| E. | Vault Maintenance           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| F. | Welding                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| G. | OQ - Operator Qualification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| H. | Compliance Follow-up        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| I. | Atmospheric Corrosion       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| J. | Other                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Evaluator Notes:

Mr. Nantz observed Atmos Energy technicians perform regulator inspections and checked to see if they were operating correctly. While in the field Mr. Nantz also checked for atmospheric corrosion, odorizers, signs and verified OQ records.

---

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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

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

Evaluator Notes:

KY PSC is not an Interstate Agent.

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:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <b>3</b> | 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.)<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

- |          |   |   |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

- |          |  |   |    |
|----------|--|---|----|
| <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:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

KY PSC does not have a 60106 Agreement.

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