



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2010 Natural Gas State Program Evaluation

for

MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Document Legend

PART:

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



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

State Agency: Mississippi

Agency Status:

Date of Visit: 04/11/2011 - 06/10/2011

Agency Representative: Mark McCarver, Director - Pipeline Safety

PHMSA Representative: Don Martin for Office Records Portion
Dale Bennett for Field Inspection Portion

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

Name/Title: Lynn Posey, Chairman

Agency: Mississippi Public Service Commission

Address: 501 North West Street, Suite 201A

City/State/Zip: Jackson, MS 39201

Rating:

60105(a): Yes **60106(a):** No **Interstate Agent:** No

INSTRUCTIONS:

Complete this evaluation in accordance with the Procedures for Evaluating State Pipeline Safety Program. The evaluation should generally reflect state program performance during CY 2010 (not the status of performance at the time of the evaluation). All items for which criteria have not been established should be answered based on the PHMSA representative's judgment. A deficiency in any one part of a multiple part question should be scored as needs improvement. Determine the answer to the question then select the appropriate point value. If a state receives less than the maximum points, include a brief explanation in the space provided for general comments/regional observations. If a question is not applicable to a state, select NA. Please ensure all responses are COMPLETE and ACCURATE, and OBJECTIVELY reflect state program performance. Increasing emphasis is being placed on performance. This evaluation together with selected factors reported in the state's annual certification/agreement attachments provide the basis for determining the state's pipeline safety grant allocation.

Field Inspection (PART F):

The field inspection form used will allow different areas of emphasis to be considered for each question. Question 13 is provided for scoring field observation areas. In completing PART F, the PHMSA representative should include a written summary which thoroughly documents the inspection.

Scoring Summary

PARTS

	Possible Points	Points Scored
A General Program Qualifications	26	26
B Inspections and Compliance - Procedures/Records/Performance	24.5	24.5
C Interstate Agent States	0	0
D Incident Investigations	2.5	2.5
E Damage Prevention Initiatives	9	8
F Field Inspection	12	12
G PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan	9.5	9
H Miscellaneous	3	3
I Program Initiatives	9	9

TOTALS

95.5 94

State Rating **98.4**

PART A - General Program Qualifications

Points(MAX) Score

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

SLR Notes:

No information was found to be inaccurate based upon the review of office records.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC maintains electronic logging of incidents. A file is created when an incident is reported. A file is created in the report filing system on the MPSC's computer network drive. There were no reportable incidents reported by operators in 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC conducts a pipeline safety seminar for its operators each year. The MPSC conducted seminars in 2008,2009 and 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The file systems were well organized and easy to access for conducting the program evaluation.

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

SLR Notes:

Mr. McCarver is knowledgeable of pipeline safety regulations and the requirements for a state pipeline safety program outlined in the Guidelines For A State Pipeline Safety Program.

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

SLR Notes:

The response was received within 60 days.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 7 | What actions, if necessary, did the State initiate as a result of issues raised in the Chairperson's letter from the previous year? Did actions correct or address deficiencies from previous year's evaluation? (No response is necessary if no items are requested in letter and mark "Yes") (Chapter 8.1) Previous Question A.8/A.9
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

The MPSC took steps to insure the accuracy of Certification information.

Personnel and Qualifications

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. All inspectors that have reached the 3 year and five year deadlines have completed all of the required courses listed in Appendix C of the Guidelines.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| 9 | Brief Description of Non-TQ training Activities:
Info Only = No Points

For State Personnel:
All inspectors attended the Mississippi Natural Gas Association annual conference training courses during 2010.

For Operators:
Assisted the Mississippi Natural Gas Association in training courses for operators.

For Non-Operator Entities/Parties, Information Dissemination, Public Meetings:
Participated with Mississippi 811 in Mississippi Damage Prevention Summit (Regional CGA event). | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|--|-----------|-----------|

SLR Notes:

See notes above.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. Upon a review of the OQ database and training records, the inspectors assigned to lead OQ inspections completed the required training prior to the time inspections were conducted.

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

SLR Notes:

Lyla Carnley, Wiley Walker and Michael Sharp have completed the training. They are the only inspectors that lead IMP inspections.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 12 | Was the ratio acceptable of Total inspection Person-days to Total Person-days charged to the program by state inspectors? (Region Director may modify points for just cause) (Chapter 4.3) Previous Question B.12
Yes = 5 No = 0

A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
523.00

B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
220 X 5.60 = 1232.00

Ratio: A / B
523.00 / 1232.00 = 0.42

If Ratio >= 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0
Points = 5 | 5 | 5 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC records show that 523 inspection person days were experienced during 2010. The resulting ratio was 0.42 which exceeded the minimum ratio of 0.38.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no changes to the inspector staffing levels during 2010.

14 Part-A General Comments/Regional Observations

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has generally complied with Part A of this evaluation.

Total points scored for this section: 26

Total possible points for this section: 26



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

Points(MAX) Score

Inspection Procedures

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

SLR Notes:

Inspection plan addresses all of the concerns above.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC utilizes the concerns above in addition to the relative risk ranking model that it utilizes to identify key risks.

Inspection Performance

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

SLR Notes:

Records kept by the MPSC indicated that it had complied with its inspection frequency procedures during 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC uses the federal inspection forms for all inspections except for construction inspections. The MPSC developed its own construction inspection form. Upon a review of the form, it appears to cover all items covered on the federal construction inspection form.

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

SLR Notes:

Upon a review of randomly selected inspection reports, all applicable questions on the forms were completed indicating results.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no safety related conditions reported by intrastate natural gas operators during 2010.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|----|
| 7 | Did the state review operator procedures for determining if exposed cast iron pipe was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary remedial action was taken? (NTSB) Previous Question B.7 | .5 | .5 |
| | | Yes = .5 No = 0 | |

SLR Notes:

The MPSC reviews cast iron pipe concerns when conducting an operator headquarter's inspection which covers operation and maintenance procedures of the operator. The MPSC verifies that the operator has procedures to examine exposed cast iron pipe for graphitization.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|----|
| 8 | Did the state review operator procedures for surveillance of cast iron pipelines, including appropriate action resulting from tracking circumferential cracking failures, study of leakage history, or other unusual operating maintenance condition? (Note: See GPTC Appendix G-18 for guidance) (NTSB) Previous Question B.8 | .5 | .5 |
| | | Yes = .5 No = 0 | |

SLR Notes:

The MPSC encourages operators to implement cast iron replacement programs. The MPSC reviews this issue when conducting an operator headquarter's inspection which covers operation and maintenance procedures of the operator. The MPSC verifies that a procedure exists to monitor circumferential cracking.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|----|
| 9 | Did the state review operator emergency response procedures for leaks caused by excavation damage near buildings and determine whether the procedures adequately address the possibility of multiple leaks and underground migration of gas into nearby buildings Refer to 4/12/01 letter from PHMSA in response to NTSB recommendation P-00-20 and P-00-21? (NTSB) Previous Question B.9 | .5 | .5 |
| | | Yes = .5 No = 0 | |

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC verifies that operator's procedures require the identification of the extent of leak migration. The MPSC reviews leak survey and leak repair records during its standard inspections to verify operators are following their procedures.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|----------------|---|
| 10 | Did the state review operator records of previous accidents and failures including reported third party damage and leak response to ensure appropriate operator response as required by 192.617? (NTSB) Previous Question B.10 | 1 | 1 |
| | | Yes = 1 No = 0 | |

SLR Notes:

The MPSC covers Part 192.617 requirements when it conducts standard inspections of operators. The MPSC reviews operator's response times when reviewing operator's leak repair records.

Compliance - 60105(a) States

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

SLR Notes:

Upon a review of randomly selected inspection reports completed in 2010, probable violations were documented appropriately.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC office procedures describe the steps to be taken until the probable violations are corrected. The MPSC issues a non-compliance notification to an operator when a probable violation is found. An operator is given 30 days to respond to the notice. Followup inspections are conducted to monitor the progress of corrective actions. Operators are given the opportunity to provide information showing that a probable violation did not occur or an opportunity to request a hearing before the Commissioners to argue that a probable violation did not occur.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC's office procedures state that a written non compliance notification is sent to an operator whenever a probable violation is identified. Operators are given 30 days to respond.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 14 | Does the state have a written procedure for routinely reviewing the progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns of the enforcement process, as required by the "Guidelines for States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program"? (Chapter 5.1(5)) Previous Question D(1).3 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

SLR Notes:

The MPSC's procedures state that follow up inspections will be scheduled after written notification of probable violation has been sent to an operator.

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

SLR Notes:

Upon a review of randomly selected inspection reports, all inspections that discovered probable violations were followed up with written notifications of non compliance.

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

SLR Notes:

Upon a review of randomly selected inspection report files, corrective actions were documented or another follow up inspection was scheduled for a later date.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC stated there were no actions on the part of an operator that required a "show cause hearing" in 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC had response letters from operators in its files. The MPSC also documents the date that operators corrective actions were accepted by the MPSC. This date is entered into a spreadsheet record.

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

SLR Notes:

Upon a review of randomly selected inspection files, all non-compliance letters were addressed to a company officer or appropriate management official of public operators.

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

SLR Notes:

Operators are provided with the opportunity to provide information that shows that an probable violation did not occur or if unresolved, operators can petition the Commissioners for a "show cause" hearing.

Compliance - 60106(a) States

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

SLR Notes:

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

SLR Notes:

- 23** Were any probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance? (NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.) Previous Question D(2).3 1 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

SLR Notes:

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

SLR Notes:

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

SLR Notes:

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

SLR Notes:

- 27** Is the program manager familiar with state process for imposing civil penalties? Were civil penalties considered for repeat violations (with severity consideration) or violations resulting in incidents/accidents? (describe any actions taken) Info Only NA
Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has generally complied with Part B of this evaluation.

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



PART C - Interstate Agent States

Points(MAX) Score

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 4 | Were any probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance? (NOTE: PHMSA representative has discretion to delete question or adjust points, as appropriate, based on number of probable violations; any change requires written explanation.) Previous Question D(3).4
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | NA |
|----------|---|---|----|

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is not an interstate agent.

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

PART D - Incident Investigations

Points(MAX) Score

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC has followed the procedures contained in the Guidelines detailing the procedures and expectations for cooperation; however, there were no reportable incidents during 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC exhibited knowledge of the cooperation statements contained in the MOU between PHMSA and the NTSB. There were no incident investigations in 2010 whereby the MOU was needed.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC kept records of incidents that met state reporting requirements; however, there were incidents during 2010 that met federal reporting requirements.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no incidents in 2010 that met federal reporting requirements.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no incidents in 2010 that met federal reporting requirements.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no incidents in 2010 that met federal reporting requirements.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no incidents in 2010 that met federal reporting requirements.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has generally complied with Part D of this evaluation. No deficiencies were noted that resulted in the reduction of evaluation points.

Total points scored for this section: 2.5
Total possible points for this section: 2.5



PART E - Damage Prevention Initiatives

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Has the state reviewed directional drilling/boring procedures of each pipeline operator or its contractor to determine if they include actions to protect their facilities from the dangers posed by drilling and other trench less technologies? Previous Question B.11
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes. Operator's procedures are reviewed annually. The MPSC has verified that operators have included directional/boring procedures in their Operation and Maintenance Procedures.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 2 | Did the state inspector check to assure the pipeline operator is following its written procedures pertaining to notification of excavation, marking, positive response and the availability and use of the one call system? New 2008
Yes = 2 No = 0 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

SLR Notes:

Yes. Operators' procedures are reviewed annually. During standard inspections, the MPSC verifies that operators follow through with their damage prevention programs required by Part 192.614.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC includes an item on its standard inspection form that initiates a discussion of best practices with operators.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Has the agency or another organization within the state collected data and evaluated trends on the number of pipeline damages per 1,000 locate requests? New 2008
Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 0 |
|----------|---|---|---|

SLR Notes:

The MPSC did not collect this information or initiate trending of the information. 1.0 points could not be given for this requirement. The MPSC is going to start using the information that is now required on operators' annual report forms. The MPSC has revised its database to incorporate this information and establish trends in the future.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. During its standard inspections, the MPSC reviews operator's records on leaks and failures during its review of operator's records documenting compliance with Part 192.617.

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

SLR Notes:

Question E.4 - The MPSC did not collect this information or initiate trending of the information. 1.0 points could not be given for this requirement.

Total points scored for this section: 8
Total possible points for this section: 9

PART F - Field Inspection

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, Centerpoint Energy and Moss Point Gas Department

Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:

Bill Ward, Lewis Davis and Wiley Walker

Location of Inspection:

Tupelo, MS, Oxford, MS and Moss Point, MS

Date of Inspection:

4/10-14/2011

Name of PHMSA Representative:

Dale Bennett

SLR Notes:

Bill Ward - I did a field inspection on the Tupelo System operated by Atmos Energy This inspection consist of a field review of a regulator station in Saltillo (Grove Station) and also the Saltillo input station. Guntown input station, the West Main reg station in Tupelo, Eason Blvd main input station and exposed creek crossing at King and Industrial.

Lewis Davis - A field inspection was performed: Inspection Site (A) Main Gate Regulator Station Harmon Town. This is a duel line monitoring system inlet pressure 760 psig outlet pressure 500 psig maop 750 psig .

Ps. Mr. Bennett it has been a pleasure working with you.

Wiley Walker - On this date we inspected the progress of the Moss Point Consent Order and revisited some parts of the system. Nick Worden gave an update on the progress of the leak surveys and the leak repair effort. The contractor is not keeping up with the leak surveyor in the repairing of the grade 1 leaks. As of this date the leak survey has located about 700 leaks. Of these, approximately 50% were grade 1 leaks.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes The operators were notified in March 2011.

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

SLR Notes:

The inspectors used PHMSA'S inspection form for a standard inspection of a natural gas operator.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes The inspectors checked the applicable box as they progressed through 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.) New 2008 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Yes The inspectors check the necessary equipment needed by the operator during the inspection.

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

SLR Notes:

The inspectors conducted a standard field inspection.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes The inspectors checked the procedures with the field activity.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes The inspectors attended the minimum number of T&G courses to lead a natural gas pipeline safety inspection.

- 9** Did the inspector conduct an exit interview? (If inspection is not totally complete the interview should be based on areas covered during time of field evaluation) Previous Question F.10 1 1
Yes = 1 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Yes The inspectors briefed the operators at the conclusion of the inspection. The concerns and probable violations were explained in detail to the operators.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes The inspectors identified concerns and probable violations found during the inspection and were explained in detail to the operator.

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

SLR Notes:

Mark McCarver and Lewis Davis were on hand for the inspection of Atmos Energy in Tupelo, MS.
Mark McCarver and Bill Ware were on hand for the inspection of Centerpoint Energy in Oxford, MS.
Mark McCarver and Mike Sharp were on hand for the inspection of Moss Point Gas Department in Moss Point, MS.

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

SLR Notes:

There were no best practices identified that should be shared with states or Regions.

- 13** Field Observation Areas Observed (check all that apply) Info Only Info Only
Info Only = No Points
- a. Abandonment ☐
 - b. Abnormal Operations ☐
 - c. Break-Out Tanks ☐
 - d. Compressor or Pump Stations ☐
 - e. Change in Class Location ☐
 - f. Casings ☐

g.	Cathodic Protection	<input checked="" 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 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"/>

SLR Notes:

The inspectors reviewed procedures and records for the items listed above.

14 Part F: General Comments/Regional Observations

Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

SLR Notes:

The inspectors did an excellent job conducting their inspections

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

PART G - PHMSA Initiatives - Strategic Plan

Points(MAX) Score

Risk base Inspections - Targeting High Risk Areas

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

Yes = 1.5 No = 0

Risk Factors (criteria) to consider may include:

Miles of HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density

Length of time since last inspection

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

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

SLR Notes:

During 2010, the MPSC implemented a risk based evaluation process to relatively rank inspection units. The MPSC uses the risk factors above in addition to others.

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

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Yes. The inspection units are broken into units as described in the "Guidelines For States Participating in the Pipeline Safety Program" (Guideline).

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

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

The DIMP rule is not in effect until August, 2011.

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

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has implemented a process to evaluate risk of inspection units relative to each other. The process can identify high risk areas within each unit.

Use of Data to Help Drive Program Priority and Inspections

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

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

The MPSC reviews data from non-compliance issues from inspections and operator data related to damages to pipelines. The MPSC reviews data contained in CGA's DIRT system.

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

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

The MPSC requires that operators provide it with a copy of its Annual Reports submission to PHMSA each year. The MPSC reviews the information for accuracy and comparison to the previous year report. The operators are informed of any inconsistencies found during the reviews.

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

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

The MPSC monitors the mileage of cast iron mains remaining in each operator's system and the total within the state of Mississippi. The MPSC maintains a spreadsheet with the mileage of cast iron for each operator over a period of ten years.

8 Has state reviewed data on Incident/Accident reports for accuracy? .5 0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC reviews data on incident reports to ensure that the reports are complete (all entries are completed), the proper status is checked (original,

supplemental or final), and that the operator's stated cause of the gas release is reasonable and is consistent with the MPSC's investigation. There have not been any incidents since 2009.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC reviews data on Annual reports from operators. The MPSC reviews data on operators' progress on replacing cast iron and bare steel pipe. The MPSC reviews the number of leak repairs shown in the Annual Reports and compares to previous years.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has been diligent in uploading these results. The MPSC continues to upload the results of inspections on operator's performance related to their plans as documented on Protocol 9 forms.

11	Did the State submit their replies into the Integrity Management Database (IMDB) in response to the Operators notifications for their integrity management program? Previous Question B.16	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

All notifications were responded to.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC 2011 Certification lists 18 gas transmission operators. Some private distribution operators have gas transmission facilities. The MPSC has conducted IMP inspections for natural gas pipeline operators that have transmission pipelines except for one. These inspections total over twenty. The Gas IMP data base contains approximately twelve inspections that have been uploaded. Four inspections were uploaded in 2010. The MPSC must upload all IMP inspections to comply with this requirement. 0.5 points can't be given for this requirement.

13	Did the State ask Operators to identify any plastic pipe and components that has shown a record of defects/leaks and what those operators are doing to mitigate the safety concerns? Previous Question B.18	.5	0.5
	Yes = .5 No = 0		

SLR Notes:

The MPSC covers this safety concern in its standard inspection forms.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The operator is questioned as to whether they have made their submittals during standard inspections. The results are noted on the inspection forms.

Accident/Incident Investigation Learning and Sharing Lessons Learned

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC presented an update of its program at the NAPSIR Southern Region Meeting held in 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has not been contacted about a request for data related to incidents or accidents. The MPSC has cooperated with any requests from the Southern Region Office related to incidents reported to the National Response Center.

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

SLR Notes:

Root cause analysis has not been incorporated as yet.

18 Does state conduct root cause analysis on incidents/accidents in state?

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

Not at this time.

19 Has state participated on root cause analysis training? (can also be on wait list)

.5

0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

Wiley Walker completed the root cause training in 2009.

Transparency - Communication with Stakeholders

20 Other than pipeline safety seminar does State communicate with stakeholders? (Communicate program data, pub awareness, etc.)

.5

0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

The MPSC participates in the Mississippi Damage Prevention Committee. The MPSC participates in Mississippi Gas Association meetings and conferences. Mark McCarver authors an article each month in the damage prevention magazine circulated in Mississippi. The MPSC participates in local Utility Coordinating Committee meetings.

21 Does state share enforcement data with public? (Website, newsletters, docket access, etc.)

.5

0.5

Yes = .5 No = 0

SLR Notes:

The public has access to the MPSC docket system where enforcement cases seeking civil penalties or other Commission action is available. The MPSC also has live video streaming of its proceedings. The MPSC provides access to the Commission's website and the MPSC produces an Annual Report that is provided to the public.

22 Part G: General Comments/Regional Observations

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

SLR Notes:

Question G.12 - The MPSC 2011 Certification lists 18 gas transmission operators. Some private distribution operators have gas transmission facilities. The MPSC has conducted IMP inspections for natural gas pipeline operators that have transmission pipelines except for one. These inspections total over twenty. The Gas IMP data base contains approximately twelve inspections that have been uploaded. Four inspections were uploaded in 2010. The MPSC must upload all IMP inspections to comply with this requirement. 0.5 points can't be given for this requirement.

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

PART H - Miscellaneous

Points(MAX) Score

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC participated in the Mississippi Damage Prevention Council meetings throughout the year working toward proposals to improve the damage prevention laws in the state. The MPSC used One Call Grant funds to provide locator training across the state. The MPSC continues to encourage the replacement of cast iron mains in the state. Significant progress was made on the systems in Canton and Picayune.

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

SLR Notes:

In its work with the Mississippi Damage Prevention Council, the MPSC is developing with all stakeholders proposed legislation to improve damage prevention and enforcement of the damage prevention law.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC is strongly encouraging the replacement of cast iron mains in the state and improving damage prevention laws.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC adequately responded to all requests that it received.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC shared information with other states in NAPSRS Meetings and initiatives.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has generally complied with Part H of this evaluation.

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

PART I - Program Initiatives

Points(MAX) Score

Drug and Alcohol Testing (49 CFR Part 199)

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC has completed the review of all operators' drug and alcohol testing programs and has followed up with reviews when Part 199 rules have been amended or operator's plans have been revised. The MPSC conducted three drug and alcohol inspections during 2010.

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

SLR Notes:

Operators records are reviewed during standard inspections to verify random drug testing rates exceed 25 percent.

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

SLR Notes:

When positive results are shown in an operator's records, the MPSC questions operators of the actions taken as a result of the positive test(s). The MPSC verifies if the operator complied with its procedures.

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

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

SLR Notes:

Upon a review of the OQ Database, the MPSC has completed the review of all operators' Operator Qualification Plans. The results of these inspections have been uploaded to PHMSA's OQ database.

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

SLR Notes:

PHMSA OQ Inspection Protocols cover PHMSA's OQ Rules. The MPSC utilized the protocol forms to inspect operators' OQ Plans. The protocol forms were uploaded into PHMSA's OQ database.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC verifies that requalifications are performed within the timeframes established in the operator's OQ Plan as a part of its standard inspections. The MPSC also conducts Protocol 9 inspections.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC verifies qualification records during its standard inspections to insure that operators are requalifying individuals according to the operators' requalification intervals outlined in their plans.

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

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has completed Integrity Management Plan inspections for all operators that have gas transmission pipelines.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC uses and completes all information in the integrity management protocol forms while conducting its inspections of Integrity Management Plans. The protocol form covers this requirement.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC uses the Integrity Management Plan inspection protocols while conducting its IMP inspections. The protocol forms covers the requirements in Subpart O.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has conducted these reviews.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC completes the Integrity Management Inspection Protocols. The protocols cover this requirement.

Public Awareness (49 CFR Section 192.616)

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC participated in the Public Awareness Clearinghouse review of operator's plans. The MPSC verified that all operators submitted their Public Awareness Plans within the timeframe prescribed by the regulations.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC participated in the review conducted by the Public Awareness Clearinghouse. The MPSC reviewed the results submitted by the Clearinghouse. The MPSC followed up with operators on any deficiencies identified by the Clearinghouse.

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

SLR Notes:

Yes. The MPSC reviews an operator's activity records when conducting standard inspections.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC will be initiating these inspections in 2011 after completing the training and receiving PHMSA's inspection form.

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

SLR Notes:

The MPSC has generally complied with Part I of this evaluation.

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