



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2018 Gas State Program Evaluation

for

KANSAS CORPORATION 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: Kansas

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 08/27/2019 - 08/28/2019

Agency Representative: Leo Haynos, Chief Engineer

Suzanne Gonzales, Assistant Pipeline Safety Supervisor

PHMSA Representative: David Lykken - Program Evaluator, Leonard Steiner - Field Evaluator

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

Name/Title: Mr. Dwight D. Keen, Chairman

Agency: Kansas Corporation Commission

Address: 1500 Southwest Arrowhead Road

City/State/Zip: Topeka, KS 66604-4027

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
13
46
15
9
8
12
0
0

10
13
46
15
9
8
12
0
0

TOTALS

113 113

State Rating

100.0

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Accuracy of Jurisdictional Authority and Operator/Inspection Units Data - Progress Report Attachment 1
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No issues noted. Inspection Unit totals by operator type on Attachment 3 are consistent with the Inspection Unit totals on Attachment 1. The KCC legislative team will be requesting a statutory amendment to address the gas gathering/transmission pipeline jurisdictional issue in the 2020 Kansas legislative session.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The program has a robust database to track inspection staff's time in the field. The minimum number of inspection days required for CY2018 was 499. Actual was 659. Inspection days entered for each operator type and inspection type essentially match the records kept by the program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Information essentially the same as last year. No issues noted.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The incident listed is consistent with the incident report information contained in the PDM.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The number carried over from previous year was submitted as "13". The number reported in CY2017 to be Corrected/Carry-over was put at 32. The CY2018 number is the correct number. Reporting error attributed to timing of transition from old database to new. No impacts to PR scoring.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Program has completed transition to new database. Files are organized and readily available.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

All rules and amendments listed in Attachment 8 have been adopted. The KSCC will be requesting a statutory amendment in

the 2020 legislative session to match the maximum penalty amounts requested by PHMSA of \$100,000 per day up to \$1,000,000 for violations of the pipeline safety regulations. Current civil penalty cap for a single violation is \$25K.

- 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:

Yes. The program completed a review of operator's qualification and drug & alcohol plans. Additional training for pipeline safety inspection staff through in-house and PHMSA-TQ achieved. The program organized five classes focused on emergency response training for small municipal operators, training 107 personnel from 28 small operators across the state. The program also participated in a multi-state inspection of Black Hills Energy.

10 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No point deduction under Part A.

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:

General guidance provided under Section 5.4 and 5.5. Pre-inspection activities (5.4.2a), Inspection activities (5.4.2b), Post-inspection activities (5.4.2c).

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

General guidance provided under Section 5.4 and 5.5. Pre-inspection activities (5.4.2a), Inspection activities (5.4.2b), Post-inspection activities (5.4.2c). TIMP (5.5.4). DIMP (5.5.5).

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

General guidance provided under Section 5.4 and 5.5. Pre-inspection activities (5.4.2a), Inspection activities (5.4.2b), Post-inspection activities (5.4.2c). OQ (5.5.6).

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

General guidance provided under Section 5.4 and 5.5. Pre-inspection activities (5.4.2a), Inspection activities (5.4.2b), Post-inspection activities (5.4.2c). Section 5.6 - Damage Prevention Inspections & Frequency.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Section 5.5.3 "Onsite Operator Training Provided by KCC".

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 6 | Construction Inspection procedures should give guidance to state inspectors that insure consistency in all inspections conducted by the state? The following elements should be addressed at a minimum - pre-inspection activities, inspection activities, post-inspection activities. | 1 | 1 |
|---|--|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

General guidance provided under Section 5.4 and 5.5. Pre-inspection activities (5.4.2a), Inspection activities (5.4.2b), Post-inspection activities (5.4.2c). Section 5.5.2 "Construction Inspections".

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

Inspection priorities derived from factors (elements) listed under Section 5.3 of written procedure. Example of Risk Ranking Model provided under Appendix 5 of manual.

8 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

No issues noted. No point deductions under Part "B".

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



PART C - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

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

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
659.13

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
 $220 \times 4.17 = 916.67$

Ratio: A / B
 $659.13 / 916.67 = 0.72$

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

- | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | Completion of Required OQ Training before conducting inspection as lead? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Completion of Required DIMP*/IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead? *Effective Evaluation CY2013 | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/program manager | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Note any outside training completed | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e. | Verify inspector has obtained minimum qualifications to lead any applicable standard inspection as the lead inspector. | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. a) OQ training necessary for conducting OQ inspections. b) Inspection staff who have conducted TIMP and CRM inspections as lead have completed all required training. c) Haynos, Powers and Bolinder have completed the T&Q Root Cause training. d) Out-side training included KS State Fire Marshall incident investigation, NACE conferences, attendance at KMEA/KMGA conferences. e) Inspectors who conducted standard inspections as lead have attend all necessary T&Q courses.

- 3 Did state records and discussions with state pipeline safety program manager indicate adequate knowledge of PHMSA program and regulations? Chapter 4.1,8.1 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues noted. Program Manager has many years of experience in pipeline safety and is well acquainted with PHMSA 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:

Yes, the State Program's letter to the Chairman went out on 3/8/2019. The Chairman's response letter was received on 4/10/2019. Deficiencies addressed.

- 5 Did State conduct or participate in pipeline safety training session or seminar in Past 3 Years? Chapter 8.5 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, KS conducts a Training Seminar annually. The 2018 seminar was conducted on Nov 7/8, 2018 in Junction City, KS. Reviewed copy of seminar agenda and attendance list.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Program appears to be meeting the program's established timeframes. Inspection tracker part of program database. Database automatically populates next inspection required date when last is completed.

-
- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 7 | Did inspection form(s) cover all applicable code requirements addressed on Federal Inspection form(s)? Did State complete all applicable portions of inspection forms? Chapter 5.1
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No issues noted. Forms questions are incorporated in to the programs pipeline safety database. Program staff conduct a review every year to ensure form contents are up to date. database questions also provided complete CFR and state rule language as guidance.

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Did the state review operator procedures for determining if exposed cast iron pipe was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary remedial action was taken? (NTSB) Chapter 5.1
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this item is included in the programs gas distribution question set.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this item is covered under the programs written procedures and included in the programs list of gas distribution questions (Distribution Records and Procedures Guides). NTSB Recommendations called out as separate questions under the program's "Procedures Guide".

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this item is covered under Emergency Procedures of the programs "Procedures inspection Guide" question set.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, covered under Failure Investigation & Operations and Maintenance of the program's "Procedures inspection Guide" question set. Discussed with program the need to consider paying special attention to ATMOS and the possible need to conduct additional inspections if warranted.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Operator's are required to file annual reports with the KSCC. AR's are reviewed prior by inspectors performing standard inspections. AR data is entered in the program's risk model (Database).

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Question 23 on the program's Gas Transmission "Records" question set.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The KSCC noted 122 D&A inspection completed in CY2018. The program has incorporated the question set found in the old PHMSA Form 13 but does ensure the use of the comprehensive D&A form 3.1.11 for each operator not to exceed four years between inspections.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. 39 field days were devoted to OQ inspections. The IA primarily used for documenting OQ inspection results. 79 Protocol 9 inspections and 6 plan reviews recorded in the IA.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Three IMP inspections conducted in CY2018 utilizing the IA to document inspection results.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Two DIMP inspections conducted in CY2018 utilizing the IA to document inspection results.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. No PAPEI inspections conducted in CY2018. Last round conducted in CY2017.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. The KSCC website provided basic information on NG Safety, Call B4 You Dig, summary of enforcement history by calendar year, pipeline safety rules, Safety seminar presentations, and pipeline staff contact information. Docketed cases which have been closed are available for review on-line.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reported SRC's in CY2018.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. This question is listed on the KSCC standard inspection form. Questions 153 and 176.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes.

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

Evaluator Notes:

There are presently no open waivers/special permits.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, was attended by the PM. Meeting held in Santa Fe, NM.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 25 | Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site - http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm
No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 Yes = 2 | 2 | 2 |
| a. | Discussion of Potential Accelerated Actions (AA's) based on any negative trends | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | NTSB P-11-20 Meaningful Metrics | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Damages per 1000 tickets trending up slightly since CY2017. Ratio is approximately 2.2 damages per which is lower than the national average of 2.9. Inspector qualification core training remains high but 5 year retention percentage continues to remain low as in the past.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 26 | Discussion with State on accuracy of inspection day information submitted into State Inspection Day Calculation Tool (SICT) Has the State updated SICT data?
No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Discussed. Tool was updated in CY2018. No significant changes to inspections day calculation and have not identified any additional staffing needs.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A no flow reversal, product changes, and/or conversion to service.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues identified. No Point deductions. N/A's for questions 20,23, and 27.

Total points scored for this section: 46
Total possible points for this section: 46



PART D - Compliance Activities**Points(MAX) Score**

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

Evaluator Notes:

- a. Section 5.8 (Procedures for notifying an operator when non-compliance is identified). b & c. Section 5.9 (Follow-up Procedures).

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state follow compliance procedures (from discovery to resolution) and adequately document all probable violations, including what resolution or further course of action is needed to gain compliance? (Incident Investigations do not need to meet 30/90 day requirement) Chapter 5.1
Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4 | 4 |
| a. | Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board member if municipal/government system? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Document probable violations | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Resolve probable violations | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Routinely review progress of probable violations | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e. | Within 30 days, conduct a post-inspection briefing with the owner or operator of the gas or hazardous liquid pipeline facility inspected outlining any concerns; and | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| f. | Within 90 days, to the extent practicable, provide the owner or operator with written preliminary findings of the inspection. | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. 2018 Inspection reports sent to appropriate company officer. Probable Violations well documented. Tracks and reviews progress and resolution of PV's in pipeline database. 30 day and 90 day requirements to communicate findings met via exit interview which is performed at the end of each inspection and written notice via compliance letter to company officer or manager which typically goes out in one to two weeks after completion of inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Reviewed inspection documentation and associated correspondence. Compliance actions correlate with numbers submitted under Attachment 5 of the Progress Report.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Correspondence to operators outline procedures for challenging where a penalty or corrective action has been recommended.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. PM is familiar with the process. Penalties are considered for repeat violations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Civil penalties are considered. Last civil penalty issued in CY2014 in the amount of 8K. CV to be issued in CY2019 for CY2018 inspection. Civil penalties issued in the amount of \$34,500 for violation of dig law involving damage to pipeline facilities.

- 7 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No issues. No point deductions under Part D.

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 6 (Investigation of Pipeline Failures and Safety Related Conditions)

- 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:

Each operator is to notify the gas pipeline safety section by telephone. If an incident occurs outside the commission's working hours, the operator contacts an employee of the gas pipeline safety section. The commission provides a list of pipeline staff and their telephone numbers to each operator.

- 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 NA

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. The program did conduct an on-site investigation for the one reportable incident in CY2018.

- 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. Incident investigations are well documented and include conclusions and recommendations when warranted. Excellent use of photographs and illustrations as part of the incident investigation reports.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

No PV's identified for the single reportable incident in CY2018.

- 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 program has demonstrated in the past of maintaining good communications with both AID and CR.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, at the NAPS Central Region Meeting and also during the state Pipeline Safety Seminars.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No issues identified. On N/A under question E-5. No point deductions.

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



PART F - Damage Prevention

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Item is incorporated in the database question set under rule reference CFR 192.614 as part of the database guidance material. Assumption is the inspector covers this under the broader question which is "Is the Operator meeting the requirements of One Call Laws and regulations?". Suggested to the PM an enhancement be made to the question set or other mechanism to bring this item to the inspector's attention.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state inspector verify pipeline operators are following their written procedures pertaining to notification of excavation, marking, positive response and the availability and use of the one call system?
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|---|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Incorporated the programs database inspection question set.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Via the Kansas One-Call and Underground Utility Coordinating Council. Information posted on the KSCC web site.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Operators are required to file reports of damage report data to the KSCC. KSCC has a virtual DIRT program they use to review the damages per 1,000 locate requests and they upload the data from the operators into CGA's Virtual DIRT Program.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No point deductions. One recommendation to Program Manager concerning question F-1.

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:

KANSAS GAS SERVICE COMPANY, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC. OPID 31159

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Chris Greve, lead inspector/Lyle Powers/Jon Bolinder/Kris Fulkerson/Wade Shoemaker

Location of Inspection:

Topeka, Kansas

Date of Inspection:

May 7 - 9, 2019

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Leonard Steiner

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, area and division personnel were present or readily available for the inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Kansas has developed a checklist to include the enhanced regulatory requirements of Kansas Pipeline Safety Regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Each inspector was assigned an area to inspect. Each inspector recorded the results in the section of his area. The lead inspector consolidates the results.

- 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:

- 6 Did the inspector adequately review the following during the field portion of the state evaluation? (check all that apply on list) 2 2
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

a. Procedures ☐

b. Records ☒

c. Field Activities ☒

d. Other (please comment) ☐

Evaluator Notes:

Yes,

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

The inspectors were knowledgeable with one inspector in training, and had not attended any training.

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

The lead inspector conducted an exit interview up to the point of this inspection

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

The lead inspector did not have a specific violation of a regulation as of the end of this evaluation. However, several issues were to be reviewed and later discussed with the Program Manager.

- | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|-----------|
| 10 | General Comments: 1) What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) 2) Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) 3) Other.
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----|---|-----------|-----------|

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Abandonment | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Abnormal Operations | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Break-Out Tanks | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Compressor or Pump Stations | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | Change in Class Location | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. | Casings | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. | Cathodic Protection | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. | Cast-iron Replacement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i. | Damage Prevention | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j. | Deactivation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k. | Emergency Procedures | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l. | Inspection of Right-of-Way | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| m. | Line Markers | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n. | Liaison with Public Officials | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| o. | Leak Surveys | <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. | Tapping | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Evaluator Notes:

On May 7 through May 9, 2019, I evaluated the Kansas Commerce Commission inspecting the Kansas Gas Service Company, an operator of distribution and transmission gas pipelines. The lead inspector developed an agenda for the inspection. The agenda had the time assigned to each day, and the items to be inspected. Each inspector had the blank inspection form and was designated the items to inspect. At the end of each day, the inspectors had a meeting for a review of the progress of the inspection. This review was about 1 - 1 1/2 hours long.

This inspection was well planned and conducted in a organized and professional manner. The inspectors conducted there self in a courteous and professional manner.

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



PART H - Interstate Agent State (If Applicable)**Points(MAX) Score**

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a interstate agent agreement.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 8 | General Comments:
Info Only = No Points | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

N/A. Does not have a 60106 agreement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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