



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2014 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

Louisiana Department of Natural Resources

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 -- Accident Investigations
- F -- Damage Prevention
- G -- Field Inspections
- H -- Interstate Agent State (if applicable)
- I -- 60106 Agreement State (if applicable)



2014 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2014
Hazardous Liquid

State Agency: Louisiana
Agency Status:
Date of Visit: 05/11/2015 - 05/22/2015
Agency Representative: Steven Giambrone
PHMSA Representative: Leonard Steiner
Commission Chairman to whom follow up letter is to be sent:
Name/Title: James H. Welsh, Commissioner
Agency: Louisiana Department of Natural Resources-Office of Conservation
Address: 617 North Third Street
City/State/Zip: Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802

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 2014 (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.

Field Inspection (PART G):

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

Scoring Summary

PARTS	Possible Points	Points Scored
A Progress Report and Program Documentation Review	10	10
B Program Inspection Procedures	13	13
C Program Performance	41	37
D Compliance Activities	15	15
E Accident Investigations	11	11
F Damage Prevention	8	8
G Field Inspections	12	12
H Interstate Agent State (if applicable)	0	0
I 60106 Agreement State (if applicable)	0	0
TOTALS	110	106
State Rating		96.4



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:
Accurate as reported

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

Evaluator Notes:
Accurate as reported

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:
Accurate as reported

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:
Accurate as reported

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

Evaluator Notes:
Accurate as reported

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, accessible

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:
Accurate as reported

8	Verification of Part 195,198,199 Rules and Amendments - Progress Report Attachment 8 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
----------	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:
Accurate as reported

9	List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5	1	1
----------	--	---	---



Evaluator Notes:
Yes, Accurate as reported

10 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points

Info Only|Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 10
Total possible points for this section: 10



PART B - Program Inspection Procedures

Points(MAX) Score

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

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Adequate procedures.

- 2 IMP 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.

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Adequate procedures.

- 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.

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Adequate procedures.

- 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.

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Adequate procedures.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Adequate procedures.

- 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.

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

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

- a. Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval)

Yes No Needs Improvement

- b. Operating history of operator/unit and/or location (includes leakage, incident and compliance activities) Yes No Needs Improvement
- c. Type of activity being undertaken by operators (i.e. construction) Yes No Needs Improvement
- d. Locations of operators inspection units being inspected - (HCA's, Geographic area, Population Density, etc) Yes No Needs Improvement
- 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 No Needs Improvement
- f. Are inspection units broken down appropriately? Yes No Needs Improvement

Evaluator Notes:

8 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points

Info Only Info Only

Evaluator Notes:

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



PART C - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

- 1** Was ratio of Total Inspection person-days to total person days acceptable? (Director of State Programs may modify with just cause) Chapter 4.3 5 5
 Yes = 5 No = 0
 A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
 158.00
 B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
 220 X 1.62 = 356.40
 Ratio: A / B
 158.00 / 356.40 = 0.44
 If Ratio >= 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0
 Points = 5

Evaluator Notes:

Ratio = .44

- 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 IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> | Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/prgram 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:

5 inspectors attended the Louisiana Gas Association training

- 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:

- 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, addressed all issues on the letter to the Commissioner.

- 5** Did State hold PHMSA TQ Seminar in Past 3 Years? Chapter 8.5 2 2
 Yes = 2 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Last Seminar in July 2014.

- 6** Did state inspect all types of operators and inspection units in accordance with time intervals established in written procedures? Chapter 5.1 5 2
 Yes = 5 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-4

Evaluator Notes:

Needs improvement. all PAP inspections were conducted, 16 IM inspections were not completed, 15 OQ inspections were not completed and 4 standard inspections were not 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 their inspections forms were adequate and address all items.

8	Did the state review operator procedures for determining areas of active corrosion on liquid lines in sufficient detail? (NOTE: PHMSA representative to describe state criteria for determining areas of active corrosion) Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
---	--	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, all active corrosion is determined.

9	Did the state adequately review for compliance operator procedures for abandoning pipeline facilities and analyzing pipeline accidents to determine their causes? (NOTE: PHMSA representative to describe state criteria for determining compliance with abandoning pipeline facilities and analyzing pipeline accidents to determine their causes) Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
---	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

yes Question on inspection form.

10	Is the state aware of environmentally sensitive areas traversed by or adjacent to hazardous liquid pipelines? (reference Part 195, review of NPMS) Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
----	--	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

yes, Inspects operator's data and compares to NPMS and state coastal zone maps.

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 195.402(c)(5)? Yes = 1 No = 0	1	1
----	--	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, question of inspection and review failures.

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, inspects all annual report, and all accident reports can checks for accuracy and analyzes for trends.

13	Did state input all applicable OQ, IMP inspection results into federal database in a timely manner? This includes replies to Operator notifications into IMDB database. Chapter 5.1 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	1
----	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Needs Improvement. they have not submitted the OQ Procotol #9 in the OQDB.

14	Has state confirmed intrastate 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, have question on inspection form and compares to PDM data.



15	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	NA
-----------	---	---	----

Evaluator Notes:

No drug and alcohol inspections were conducted in CY2014.

16	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 195 Part G Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
-----------	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes conducted an OQ inspection on selected operators.

17	Is state verifying operator's hazardous liquid integrity management (L IMP) Programs are up to date? This should include a previous review of LIMP 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). 49 CFR 195.452 Appendix C Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
-----------	--	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, and have those Safety Related Conditions from the IM program inspected for remediation.

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. 49 CFR 195.440 PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should have been completed by December 2013 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1	2	2
-----------	--	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Had completed all PAP inspections in early CY2014.

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:

They have an inclusive website, and members of pipeline safety attend various meetings. They cooperate with the State Police who has the authority to issue tickets for violations of the one-call law.

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	1
-----------	---	---	---

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, they follow up on SRCRs and submit documentation to the PHMSA Southwest Region.

21	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



22 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.(New Question for CY2013, no points until CY2015 evaluation conducted in CY2016.) 0 0
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:
No waivers were requested.

23 Did the state attend the National NAPS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated? (New Question for CY2014, no points first year) 0 0
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:
yes, 3 members attended the National NAPS meeting

24 Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site ? (question will be rolled up and included as part of Question C-12 on future evaluations) <http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm> 0 0
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:
Yes discussed how to use the website

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

Evaluator Notes:

Total points scored for this section: 37
Total possible points for this section: 41



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
- a. Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified Yes No Needs Improvement
- b. Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns Yes No Needs Improvement

Evaluator Notes:

Yes adequate procedures for resolution of a probable violation.

- 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? Chapter 5.1
 Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3
- a. Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board director if municipal/government system? Yes No Needs Improvement
- b. Were probable violations documented? Yes No Needs Improvement
- c. Were probable violations resolved? Yes No Needs Improvement
- d. Was the progress of probable violations routinely reviewed? Yes No Needs Improvement

Evaluator Notes:

Yes All probable violations were addressed in accordance with the commission's procedures.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes all probable violations were issued a compliance action.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, all operators were provided instructions of due process, No "show cause" hearings were required.

- 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) 2 2
 Yes = 2 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the program manager recommends civil penalties when necessary.

- 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:

Yes, Civil penalties are issued as required. In CY2014 \$16,000 in penalties were assessed and \$6,000 were collected.

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

Evaluator Notes:



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



PART E - Accident 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 they have adequate procedures to respond to an accident.

- 2 Does state have adequate mechanism to receive and respond to operator reports of accidents, including after-hours reports? And did state keep adequate records of Incident/Accident notifications received? Chapter 6 2 2
 Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, They have a methods for receiving reports of accidents. The MOUs and Agreements are on file and understood by the program manager.

- 3 If onsite investigation was not made, did state obtain sufficient information from the operator and/or by other means to determine the facts to support the decision to not go on-site? Chapter 6 1 1
 Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

There were three accidents and all were investigated on-site.

- 4 Were all accidents 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 where appropriate Yes No Needs Improvement

Evaluator Notes:

Yes the results of accidents were adequately documented with conclusions.

- 5 Did the state initiate compliance action for violations found during any incident/accident investigation? 1 1
 Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, no probable violations were discovered during the accident investigations.

- 6 Did the state assist region office by taking appropriate follow-up actions related to the operator accident 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:

yes, Louisiana communicates with the PHMSA Southwest Region about any report of an accident.

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

Evaluator Notes:



Yes, information of incidents are shared at NAPSIR meetings and safety seminars.

8 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

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



PART F - Damage Prevention

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:
A question about this is on the inspections form.

- | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|
| 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?
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:
Questions on the inspections about one-call notifications and the response.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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, the LDNR assisted the Louisiana CGA, and agencies that have jurisdiction of waterways.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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:
Yes Collects data and analyzes for trends.

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

Evaluator Notes:

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



PART G - Field Inspections

Points(MAX) Score

1 Operator, Inspector, Location, Date and PHMSA Representative Info Only Info Only
 Info Only = No Points

Name of Operator Inspected:
 Genesis Pipeline USA, L.P.
 Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:
 Mark Champagne with Steven Giambrone
 Location of Inspection:
 Baton Rouge, Louisiana
 Date of Inspection:
 August 20, 2015.
 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:

Adequate notification was provided.

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,

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the inspections was documented.

5 Did the inspector check to see if the operator had necessary equipment during inspection to conduct tasks viewed? (Maps, valve keys, half cells, etc) 1 1
 Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

No special equipment was needed.

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:

This was an inspection of construction procedures.

7 Did the inspector have adequate knowledge of the pipeline safety program and regulations? (Evaluator will document reasons if unacceptable) 2 2

Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, very knowledgeable of the requirements.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, an Exit interview was conducted.

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:

No probable violations were discovered due to the type of inspection.

10	General Comments: 1) What did the inspector observe in the field? (Narrative description of field observations and how inspector performed) 2) Best Practices to Share with Other States - (Field - could be from operator visited or state inspector practices) 3) Other Info Only = No Points	Info Only	Info Only
	a. Abandonment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	b. Abnormal Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	c. Break-Out Tanks	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	d. Compressor or Pump Stations	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	e. Change in Class Location	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	f. Casings	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	g. Cathodic Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	h. Cast-iron Replacement	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	i. Damage Prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	j. Deactivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	k. Emergency Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	l. Inspection of Right-of-Way	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	m. Line Markers	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	n. Liaison with Public Officials	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	o. Leak Surveys	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	p. MOP	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	q. MAOP	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	r. Moving Pipe	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	s. New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	t. Navigable Waterway Crossings	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	u. Odorization	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	v. Overpressure Safety Devices	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	w. Plastic Pipe Installation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	x. Public Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	y. Purging	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	z. Prevention of Accidental Ignition	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	A. Repairs	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	B. Signs	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	C. Tapping	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	D. Valve Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	E. Vault Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	



- F. Welding
- G. OQ - Operator Qualification
- H. Compliance Follow-up
- I. Atmospheric Corrosion
- J. Other

Evaluator Notes:

On August 20, 2015, I observed Mark Champagne, a Louisiana pipeline safety inspector, conducting an inspection of construction plans for Genesis Pipeline. The inspection consisted of reviewing plans, procedures and siting of pipeline construction. Mr. Champagne was knowledgeable of the construction requirements and provided valuable suggestions to their plans. Mr. Champagne conducted the inspection 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)? 1 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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.) 1 NA
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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

