



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington DC 20590

2015 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

MARYLAND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Document Legend

PART:

- O -- Representative Date and Title Information
- A -- Progress Report and Program Documentation Review
- B -- Program Inspection Procedures
- C -- Program Performance
- D -- Compliance Activities
- E -- Accident Investigations
- F -- Damage Prevention
- G -- Field Inspections
- H -- Interstate Agent State (if applicable)
- I -- 60106 Agreement State (if applicable)



2015 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2015
Hazardous Liquid

State Agency: Maryland
Agency Status:
Date of Visit: 04/11/2016 - 05/19/2016
Agency Representative: John Clementson, Assistant Chief Engineer
 Carlos Acosta, Pipeline Safety Engineer
 Negussie Tesfaye, Pipeline Safety Engineer
PHMSA Representative: Glynn Blanton, US DOT/PHMSA State Evaluator
Commission Chairman to whom follow up letter is to be sent:
Name/Title: W. Kevin Hughes, Chairman
Agency: Maryland Public Service Commission
Address: 6 St. Paul Street, 19th Floor
City/State/Zip: Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

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 2015 (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	9.5
C Program Performance	42	40
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	111	105.5
State Rating		95.0

PART A - Progress Report and Program Documentation Review

Points(MAX) Score

- | | | 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:
Reviewed progress report attachment 1. No errors found or noted.

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

Evaluator Notes:
A reviewed of attachment 2 found no errors or omissions.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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:
A reviewed of attachment 3 found no errors or omissions.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 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:
Reviewed progress report attachment 4. No errors were found.

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

Evaluator Notes:
Reviewed progress report attachment 5. Noted three compliance actions were taken and no civil penalties were assessed.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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, files were well maintained. No areas of concern.

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

Evaluator Notes:
Yes, a review of attachment 7 and TQ records indicate Carlos Acosta and John Clementson have completed all required courses.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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:
Maryland Public Service Commission (MD PSC) has adopted all regulations and civil penalty amounts. They have automatic adoption of federal rules and regulations in their state law. No issues.

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | List of Planned Performance - Did state describe accomplishments on Progress Report in detail - Progress Report Attachment 10 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed attachment 10 and had no areas of concern. It was suggested the nine elements of an affect damage prevention program may need to be revisited with the Maryland/DC Damage Prevention organization and include their comments in the future filing of attachment 10.

10 General Comments:
Info Only = No Points

Info OnlyInfo Only

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

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

2 1

Evaluator Notes:

A review of MD PSC Hazardous Liquid (HL) Program procedures found this item is listed under "Inspections" located on page 1. However, the procedures did not provide a pre-inspection activity. Improvement is needed in adding a pre-inspection activity to the procedures. A loss of one point occurred because the written plan is weak and needs additional clarification.

- 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

1 0.5

Evaluator Notes:

A review of MD PSC HL program procedures found this item is listed under Inspections located on page 1. Post inspection activity is listed on page 4. However, the written plan does not contain the pre-inspection activity. A loss of half a point occurred.

- 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

1 0.5

Evaluator Notes:

A review of MD PSC HL program procedures document found this item is listed under Inspections located on page 1. Post inspection activity is listed on page 4. However, the written plan does not contain the pre-inspection activity. A loss of half a point occurred.

- 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

1 0.5

Evaluator Notes:

A review of MD PSC HL program procedures found this item is listed under Inspections located on page 1. Post inspection activity is listed on page 4. However, the written plan does not contain the pre-inspection activity for damage prevention inspections. A loss of half a point occurred.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

1 0.5

Evaluator Notes:

A review of MD PSC HL program procedures found this item is not listed. Improvement is needed. A loss of half a point occurred.

- 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

1 0.5

Evaluator Notes:



A review of MD PSC HL program procedures found this item is not listed. Improvement is needed. A loss of half a point occurred.

-
- 7 Does inspection plan address inspection priorities of each operator, and if necessary each unit, based on the following elements? 6 6
Yes = 6 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-5
- a. Length of time since last inspection (Within five year interval) Yes 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:

A review of MD PSC HL program procedures found these items are listed under "Inspections" located on page 3. The schedule time intervals are listed on Attachment 2. No issues with this item.

8 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

A loss of points occurred on each question B1 to B6.

Total points scored for this section: 9.5
Total possible points for this section: 13



PART C - Program Performance

Points(MAX) Score

- 1** Was ratio of Total Inspection person-days to total person days acceptable? (Director of State Programs may modify with just cause) Chapter 4.3 5 5
 Yes = 5 No = 0
 A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2):
 11.00
 B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):
 220 X 0.10 = 22.00
 Ratio: A / B
 11.00 / 22.00 = 0.50
 If Ratio >= 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0
 Points = 5

Evaluator Notes:

- A. Total Inspection Person Days (Attachment 2)= 11
 B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the program(220*Number of Inspection person years(Attachment 7)=22
 Formula:- Ratio = A/B = 11/22 = 0.5
 Rule:- (If Ratio >=.38 then points = 5 else Points = 0.)
 Thus Points = 5

- 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 No Needs Improvement
 - b. Completion of Required IMP Training before conducting inspection as lead Yes No Needs Improvement
 - c. Root Cause Training by at least one inspector/prgram manager Yes No Needs Improvement
 - d. Note any outside training completed Yes No Needs Improvement
 - e. Verify inspector has obtained minimum qualifications to lead any applicable standard inspection as the lead inspector. Yes No Needs Improvement

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, a review of SABA transcript confirmed all inspectors have completed the OQ training course prior to performing an inspection and completed IMP courses before conducting an inspection as a lead. Two inspectors have successfully completed the root cause course and hazardous liquid courses to perform standard inspections as the lead.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, John Clementson has over eighteen years in pipeline safety and hazardous liquid inspection experience.

- 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, Chairman Hughes response letter was received on December 1, 2015 and within the 60 day requirement.

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

Evaluator Notes:

The last seminar was held on April 16-18, 2013. The numbers of attendees were one hundred and forty operators who represented hazardous liquid, natural gas, propane, master meter and transmission systems operating in the State of Maryland.



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

Evaluator Notes:

A review of files and inspection reports revealed the one hazardous liquid operator was inspected but not all scheduled inspection intervals were performed in accordance to written procedures. Improvement is needed. A loss of one point occurred.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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, MD PSC uses both federal and state forms in performing inspections of operators under their jurisdictional authority.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 8 | 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, a review of files found MD PSC staff reviewed the spill that occurred on Petroleum Fuel & Terminal facilities on April 29, 2015. No issues.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 9 | 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, MD PSC staff members review operator's annual reports when reports are filed. Data in the reports are entered into a spreadsheet and reviewed for trends and operator issues.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 10 | Did state input all applicable OQ, LIMP 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 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, a review of OQ & LIMP databases found all reports were uploaded within a reasonable time. No issues.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 11 | 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 | 0 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No, a review of forms and inspection reports revealed this item was not checked nor reviewed with the operator. A loss of one point occurred.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 12 | Is the state verifying operators are conducting drug and alcohol tests as required by regulations? This should include verifying positive tests are responded to in accordance with program. 49 CFR 199
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this is verified by using Form EN # 10, Drug & Alcohol.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 13 | 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, this is verified by using Forms EN # 32 OQ 37- page Protocol & # 32-9, OQ Field Inspection.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 14 | 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, this is accomplished by using Form EN #38 which is scheduled on a three year cycle with the operator.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 15 | 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 be conducted every four years per RP1162
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, MD PSC inspectors conducted twenty eight inspections in CY2015 and reviewed the gas operator's plans for updates and other relative information on the program.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 16 | Does the state have a mechanism for communicating with stakeholders - other than state pipeline safety seminar? (This should include making enforcement cases available to public).
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, MD PSC staff members meet with operators on a quarterly schedule at the Gas Operator Advisory Committee meetings to discuss issues pertaining to damage prevention or enforcement items.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|----|
| 17 | Did state execute appropriate follow-up actions to Safety Related Condition (SRC) Reports? Chapter 6.3
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|---|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

NA

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 18 | Did the state participate in/respond to surveys or information requests from NAPSRS or PHMSA?
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, NAPSRS and NARUC surveys are completed and filed with the organizations.

- | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| 19 | 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.
Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | NA |
|-----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

NA

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 20 | Did the state attend the National NAPSRS Board of Directors Meeting in CY being evaluated?
Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, John Clementson attended the NAPSRS National Meeting in Tempe, AZ.

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 21 | Discussion on State Program Performance Metrics found on Stakeholder Communication site ? http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/states.htm | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Needs Improvement = 1 No = 0 Yes = 2

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

Evaluator Notes:

Discussion with John Clementson, Program Manager, and a review of Maryland Public Service Commission's State Program Metrics website found excavation damages per 1,000 tickets reflects a downward trend over the last four years. Calendar year 2014 has the lowest rate of 1.2 damages per 1,000 tickets and may be contributed to MD PSC action in placing a higher priority inspection on gas construction activities.

22 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

A loss of points occurred on question C6 and C14.

Total points scored for this section: 40
Total possible points for this section: 42



PART D - Compliance Activities

Points(MAX) Score

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, a review of MD PSC HL program procedures found this item is listed under Enforcement Procedures on page 4.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 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 | 4 | 4 |
| a. | Were compliance actions sent to company officer or manager/board director if municipal/government system? | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Document probable violations | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Resolve probable violations | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| d. | Routinely review progress of probable violations | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| e. | Were applicable civil penalties outlined in correspondence with operator(s) | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, reviewed files and found a warning letter to Petroleum Fuel and Terminal dated August 24, 2015. Letter was sent to company officer, probable violations were documented, company representative did respond to making corrections. The letter contained civil penalty amounts or action the operator could take or request to resolve the violations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, three compliance actions were taken in CY2015 against operators for non-compliance with the regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, due process was described in the letters.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, in the gas safety program, four civil penalties were assessed and two collected in the amount of \$15,250.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the civil penalties assessed and collected in the gas safety program is an example of enforcement authority being used.

- | | | | |
|----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 7 | General Comments: | Info Only | Info Only |
|----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

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:

A review of MD PSC HL program procedures found this item is listed under Incident Investigation Procedures on page 2.

- 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, program manager and inspectors are familiar with the MOU's.

- 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:

Yes, this item is listed under Accident Investigation Procedures on page 2.

- 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, a review of files found one incident or spill occurred on Petroleum Fuel & Terminal facility located at 5101 Erdman Avenue Baltimore, MD on April 29, 2015. A complete report of the incident was documented.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No action was required to be taken.

- 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, MD PSC has followed up with the PHMSA Eastern region on three incident reports. Action was taken in a reasonable time schedule in responding to additional information needed.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, during the NAPS Eastern Region meeting information about incidents and other safety issues is shared with state program managers.

8 General Comments:

Info OnlyInfo Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

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:

Yes, this is reviewed during field and office inspection audits. Additionally, this item is reviewed in the operator's written procedures prior to conducting an inspection.

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

On the construction activity form, this question and items are listed. The inspector is required to verify the ticket number is active.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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 this is discussed at the damage prevention committee meetings.

- | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|
| 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, MD PSC collects data and shares the results with operators at the GOAC meetings. This information is also presented at the NAPS Eastern Region Meeting.

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

Evaluator Notes:

No loss of points occurred in this section of the review.

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:
 Petroleum Fuel & Terminal Company
 Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:
 Carlos Acosta & Negussie Tesfaye
 Location of Inspection:
 Baltimore, MD
 Date of Inspection:
 05/19/2016
 Name of PHMSA Representative:
 Glynn Blanton

Evaluator Notes:
 This was a records & maintenance review inspection using MD PSC Form EN53-Records. The inspection was conducted in the office of Mr. David Frey, Compliance Officer for Petroleum Fuel & Terminal Company.

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

Evaluator Notes:
 Yes, Mr. David Frey was notified of the inspection three weeks prior to May 19, 2016 by MD PSC representative Carlos Acosta.

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, Carlos Acosta used MD PSC form EN53 in recording down the answers to the question asked and information reviewed with Mr. Frey.

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

Evaluator Notes:
 Yes, it was observed by this writer Carlos Acosta and Negussie Tesfaye taking notes and recording down information provided by the operator's representative Mr. Frey.

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:
 Yes, the operator had all necessary documentation available and provided Carlos Acosta and Negussie Tesfaye with copies of records when requested.

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:
 A detailed review of records, annual reports and construction plans pertaining to a plan dig regarding an anomaly on the



pipeline was discussed with the operator. MD PSC inspectors requested the operator notify them prior to uncovering the pipeline.

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, Carlos Acosta and Negussie Tesfaye both have completed all hazardous liquid courses at TQ.

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) 1 1
 Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, an exit interview was performed and no issues of concern were found.

9 During the exit interview, did the inspector identify probable violations found during the inspections? (if applicable) 1 1
 Yes = 1 No = 0

Evaluator Notes:

No violations or areas of concerns were noted or found.

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 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
- h. Cast-iron Replacement
- i. Damage Prevention
- j. Deactivation
- k. Emergency Procedures
- l. Inspection of Right-of-Way
- m. Line Markers
- n. Liaison with Public Officials
- o. Leak Surveys
- p. MOP
- q. MAOP
- r. Moving Pipe
- s. New Construction
- t. Navigable Waterway Crossings
- u. Odorization
- v. Overpressure Safety Devices
- w. Plastic Pipe Installation
- x. Public Education
- y. Purging
- z. Prevention of Accidental Ignition
- A. Repairs



- B. Signs
- C. Tapping
- D. Valve Maintenance
- E. Vault Maintenance
- F. Welding
- G. OQ - Operator Qualification
- H. Compliance Follow-up
- I. Atmospheric Corrosion
- J. Other

Evaluator Notes:

This was a records and procedures review inspection.

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:
N/A

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:
N/A

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:
N/A

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:
N/A

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:
N/A

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:
N/A

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:
N/A

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

Evaluator Notes:
N/A

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

Evaluator Notes:
N/A

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

Evaluator Notes:
N/A

3 Were any probable violations identified by state referred to PHMSA for compliance? 1 NA
(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

Evaluator Notes:
N/A

4 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:
N/A

5 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:
N/A

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

Evaluator Notes:
N/A

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

Evaluator Notes:
N/A

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

