

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

## 2016 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation

for

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION, Office of Pipeline Safety

### 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)



2016 Hazardous Liquid State Program Evaluation -- CY 2016  
Hazardous Liquid

**State Agency:** Arizona  
**Agency Status:**  
**Date of Visit:** 04/24/2017 - 04/28/2017  
**Agency Representative:** Dennis Randolph  
**PHMSA Representative:** Michael Thompson  
**Commission Chairman to whom follow up letter is to be sent:**  
**Name/Title:** Tom Forese, Chairman  
**Agency:** Arizona Corporation Commission  
**Address:** 1200 West Washington Street  
**City/State/Zip:** Phoenix, Arizona 85007

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

**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 2016 (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**

<b>PARTS</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Points Scored</b>
A Progress Report and Program Documentation Review	10	10
B Program Inspection Procedures	13	10
C Program Performance	43	42.5
D Compliance Activities	15	15
E Accident Investigations	6	6
F Damage Prevention	8	8
G Field Inspections	12	12
H Interstate Agent State (if applicable)	7	7
I 60106 Agreement State (if applicable)	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>110.5</b>
<b>State Rating</b> .....		<b>96.9</b>



# 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<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

No Issues; Found in the Arizona constitution under Article XV, Section 2 and Arizona Revised Statutes 40-441

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Issues; They use daily, monthly and annual activity reports for each inspector to track this data. I reviewed the records for accuracy.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, they use their audit inspection schedule to track the information. The records were reviewed to confirm accuracy

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable incidents in 2016

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

Evaluator Notes:

No issues, 12 probable violations were found in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, all files were well organized and made available for review during the evaluation. (They had just moved to a new location and were setting everything up, but still in good shape)

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this was very well documented on a spread sheet showing all employees and the training they have received since joining the AZCC.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Arizona needs to take steps to adopt the following Rules and Amendments before the time requirement of being adopted within 24 months of the effective date of the final rule or two general sessions of the State Legislature, whichever is longer. That date is rapidly approaching, so action needs to take place soon.



Rules and amendments that need adoption by state; 119-80FR168 (3/26/15), 120-80FR12779 (10/1/15), 25-80FR168(3/6/15), and 26-80FR168 (3/6/15)

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. In attachment 10 of the progress report, the state has provided a description of their planned annual and long term goals, along with their accomplishments.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

A8 - Arizona needs to take steps to adopt the following Rules and Amendments before the time requirement of being adopted within 24 months of the effective date of the final rule or two general sessions of the State Legislature, whichever is longer. That date is rapidly approaching, so action needs to take place soon.  
Rules and amendments that need adoption by state; 119-80FR168 (3/26/15), 120-80FR12779 (10/1/15), 25-80FR168(3/6/15), and 26-80FR168 (3/6/15)

---

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:

The AZCC needs to provide greater detail in their Standard inspection procedures for Post Inspection activities.

- 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:

The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its IMP inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. Inspection forms were not easily found so clear instructions on all steps are needed. (Example; where inspection forms are stored)

- 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:

The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its OQ inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. (more specific steps)

- 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:

The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its Damage Prevention inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. Steps for notifying operator of probable violations found during inspection and how to do the follow up afterwards are one need.

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

Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:

AZCC covers this in Section 7, page 6 of the inspection procedures manual.

- 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:

The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its Construction inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. Steps for notifying operator of probable violations found during inspection and how to do the follow up afterwards are one need.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. Arizona takes all of the above items into consideration when scheduling and conducting inspections. All operators; Gas, LPG, LNG, and hazardous liquid operators with the exception of Priority 2 master meter operators are inspected every year. Priority 2 master meter operators are described in Arizona policies and procedures and are inspected once every two years. If the inspector feels that there is an increased risk based on leaks or other risk factors such as increased number of violations, the procedure allows the inspector to reclassify the inspection to a higher risk priority 1 status requiring annual inspections.

8 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

B1 ? (1 point) The AZCC needs to provide greater detail in their Standard inspection procedures for Post Inspection activities.

B2 ? (.5 points) The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its IMP inspection procedures in the Pre - Active and Post inspection processes. Inspection forms were not easily found so clear instructions on all steps are needed. (Example; where inspection forms are stored)

B3 ? (.5 points) The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its OQ inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. (more specific steps)

B4 ? (.5 points) The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its Damage Prevention inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. Steps for notifying operator of probable violations found during inspection and how to do the follow up afterwards are one need.

B6 ? (.5 points) The AZCC needs to provide greater clarification to its Construction inspection procedures in the Pre, Active and Post inspection processes. Steps for notifying operator of probable violations found during inspection and how to do the follow up afterwards are one need.

Total points scored for this section: 10  
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):  
 43.00  
 B. Total Inspection Person Days Charged to the Program (220 X Inspection Person Years) (Attachment 7):  
 220 X 0.40 = 88.92  
 Ratio: A / B  
 43.00 / 88.92 = 0.48  
 If Ratio >= 0.38 Then Points = 5, If Ratio < 0.38 Then Points = 0  
 Points = 5

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes the ration was acceptable. The Arizona CC had a .48 ratio for the 2016 inspection cycle. 0.10 percent of the 2016 inspections were Construction Inspections. They have a plan in place and are increasing the number now

- 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, the training records kept by the AZCC and the records in SABA were reviewed to verify accuracy.

- 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:**

The AZCC Program Manager is new to the position, but has prior program and industry experience. He is becoming more familiar with the PHMSA state guidelines and has a pretty good handle on the state's own processes and record keeping. He has completed all TQ courses for Standard inspections and needs only a few to cover IMP, DIMP and OQ.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes, the AZCC response letter was received on September 16, 2016.

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

**Evaluator Notes:**

Yes, the seminar was held on 2/15/2015. (Need to conduct seminar by 2/11/2018)

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



Evaluator Notes:

Reviewed completed inspections and found no issues.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, No Issues

---

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>8</b> | Did the state review operator records of previous accidents and failures including reported third party damage and leak response to ensure appropriate operator response as required by 195.402(c)(5)?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 | 1 | 1 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. this is completed during annual inspection using inspection form.

---

- |          |  |   |   |
|----------|--|---|---|
| <b>9</b> | Has the state reviewed Operator Annual reports, along with Incident/Accident reports, for accuracy and analyzed data for trends and operator issues?<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

The Arizona CC uses mandatory quarterly reports for leaks and accidents/damages from operators to track this information. It give a good real time account of the information .

---

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>10</b> | 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<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, reviewed the data base and state records. They have an inspector tasked with this responsibility.

---

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>11</b> | Has state confirmed intrastate operators have submitted information into NPMS database along with changes made after original submission?<br>Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5 | 1 | 1 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, this information is reviewed by inspectors prior to conducting inspections and is found in question 191.22 on their form.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, No Issues

---

- |           |   |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| <b>13</b> | Is state verifying operators OQ programs are up to date? This should include verification of any plan updates and that persons performing covered tasks (including contractors) are properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operators plan. 49 CFR 195 Part G<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the AZCC uses the federal checklist to verify the operator/contractors are in compliance.

---



- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>14</b> | 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). (Are the State's largest operators programs being contacted or reviewed annually?). 49 CFR 195.452 Appendix C<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, during the annual inspections.

---

- |           |  |   |   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| <b>15</b> | Is state verifying operators Public Awareness programs are up to date and being followed. State should also verify operators have evaluated Public Awareness programs for effectiveness as described in RP1162. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should have been completed by December 2013. PAPEI Effectiveness Inspections should be conducted every four years by operators. 49 CFR 195.440<br>Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1 | 2 | 2 |
|-----------|--|---|---|

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, No Issues

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Arizona maintains a public website, (it has been updated for improved ease of use) maintains a working relationship and meets with the Arizona Utility Group. Arizona is a member of; the AZ National Utility Contractors Association, One call ticket resolution committee, Arizona Emergency Response Committee Advisory Board, the Arizona and National Common Ground Alliance. Arizona participates as a sponsoring member of the AZ 811 Alliance. Arizona meets quarterly with their largest LDC, Southwest Gas Corporation to discuss possible safety issues, ongoing maintenance, operational issues and vintage pipe replacement projects or other issues relevant to the safe operation of pipelines in Arizona.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

No Issues

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, they provided records of their responses to NAPSRS surveys.

---

- |           |  |   |    |
|-----------|--|---|----|
| <b>19</b> | 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.<br>Needs Improvement = .5 No = 0 Yes = 1 | 1 | .5 |
|-----------|--|---|----|

Evaluator Notes:

The AZCC needs to improve this by verifying the condition of their waivers. There are at least 8 waivers that exist and some have been on the books for many years.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

- 
- 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:

The states excavation damages have lowered steadily from 2013 to 2015 from 1.7 to 1.4 damages per 1000 locate requests.

Inspection days for gas pipelines has decreased from 2013 and 2014 at 13 days per 1000 miles to 11 days in 2015.

Inspection days for MMO/LPG also dropped from a high of 1.1 days in 2013 to .8 in 2014 and .820 in 2015.

Hazardous Liquid inspection days are down from 110 days in 2012, 60 in 2013 and 65 in 2014.

The percentages for Inspector qualifications has stayed basically the same for both Gas and Hazardous Liquids in 2014 and 2015.

Enforcement for Gas has come up from 2013 to 100 percent then same as in 2012 and 2011.

Enforcement for Hazardous Liquids has dropped from 100 percent in 2012 right at 88 percent in 2013 and 2014.

Incident Investigation is steady at 100 percent for both Gas and HL.

- 
- 22** Discussion with State on accuracy of inspection day information submitted into State Inspection Day Calculation Tool. (No points) Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Had discussion and AZCC will verify its numbers again.

- 
- 23** Did the State verify Operators took appropriate action regarding Pipeline Flow Reversals, Product Changes and Conversions to Service? See ADP-2014-04 (No Points) Info Only Info Only  
Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

The AZCC covered these topics at their quarterly meetings with operators.

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

Evaluator Notes:

C19 ? (.5 points) The AZCC needs to improve this by verifying the condition of their waivers. There are at least 8 waivers that exist and some have been on the books for many years.

---

Total points scored for this section: 42.5  
Total possible points for this section: 43



# 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<br>Yes = 4 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1-3 | 4                                    | 4  |
| a. | Procedures to notify an operator (company officer) when a noncompliance is identified  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| b. | Procedures to routinely review progress of compliance actions to prevent delays or breakdowns  | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |
| c. | Procedures regarding closing outstanding probable violations   | Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> | No <input type="radio"/> Needs Improvement <input type="radio"/> |

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Section 5, Page 1 for Compliance Officer and Section 5, Page 5 for Compliance Actions in their policy and procedures manual.

- |    |  |                                      |  |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 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<br>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, there were 12 compliance actions taken in 2016.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, No issues found

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Dennis has familiarized himself with the states process for imposing civil penalties.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the AZCC used it's fining authority in 2016 with a Gas operator, but has not used it with a Hazardous Liquids operator in last two years.



7 General Comments:

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

Info OnlyInfo Only

---

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, in section 10 of their policies and procedures manual and in their training manual.  
 (comment) AZCC should make contact with all operators to refresh what their expectations are and update contact names and numbers.

- 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 dedicated phone number (602-252-4449) that forwards after hours calls to the on call inspector.  
 (comment) AZCC should make contact with all operators to refresh what their expectations are and update contact names and numbers.

- 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, they investigates all reportable accidents.

- 4 Were all accidents investigated, thoroughly documented, and with conclusions and recommendations? 3 NA  
 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:

No reportable incidents in 2016

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable incidents in 2016

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

Evaluator Notes:

No reportable incidents in 2016



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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, the AZCC shares information on all incidents at the annual NAPSRS Western Region meeting and also post them on the NAPSRS web site.

---

8 General Comments:

Info Only Info Only

Info Only = No Points

Evaluator Notes:

E1 &2 (comment) AZCC should make contact with all operators to refresh what their expectations are and update contact names and numbers.

---

Total points scored for this section: 6  
Total possible points for this section: 6



# 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? 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. This is found on the standard inspection form, page 2, and is also addressed during the in-house training course for master meters and with major operators during inspections.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. This is on the standard inspection check list on page 2 questions c1 to C5 and is reviewed during each standard inspection.

---

- 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.) 2 2  
Yes = 2 No = 0 Needs Improvement = 1

Evaluator Notes:

Yes. They attend monthly meetings with stake holders, participation at public awareness seminars around the state and use a training DVD that covers the Arizona Underground Facilities Law as part of their enforcement process.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, The AZCC gets quarterly damage reports from all operators (except master meter) that includes the number of tickets, number of damages and the cause of the damages. This information is reviewed by the AZCC.

---

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

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:  
 Swissport Fueling Services  
 Name of State Inspector(s) Observed:  
 Eric Villa, Lead Inspector  
 Location of Inspection:  
 Phoenix, AZ  
 Date of Inspection:  
 June 12-13, 2017  
 Name of PHMSA Representative:  
 Agustin Lopez, State Programs

Evaluator Notes:  
 Evaluated Mr. Eric Villa perform a construction inspection on Swissport Fueling Services. The inspection consisted of records review and a field inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:  
 Yes, the operator was notified in advance to allow the operator's representatives to be present during inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:  
 Yes, the inspector used a state form as a guide while performing the inspection.

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

Evaluator Notes:  
 Yes, the inspector documented any findings and the results of the inspection on the inspection form.

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

Evaluator Notes:  
 Yes, the inspector checked to see if the operator had the equipment to perform tasks reviewed. The inspector verified the technician had the equipment to take pipe to soil readings.

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

- a. Procedures
- b. Records
- c. Field Activities
- d. Other (please comment)

Evaluator Notes:  
 Yes, Mr. Eric Villa reviewed the operator's procedures, records and performed a field inspection of the new pipeline construction.



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:

Mr. Eric Villa has been with the ACC for many years as a pipeline inspector and is very knowledgeable of the pipeline safety program rules and regulations.

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

Evaluator Notes:

Yes, Mr. Villa conducted an exit interview after completing the construction inspection. He documented the exit interview on the inspection form and was signed by the operator.

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:

Yes, the inspector found that the operator was utilizing a different edition of API 1104 than the version that is incorporated by reference.

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:

Mr. Villa performed a new construction inspection of Swissport Fueling Services pipeline. He reviewed records and performed a field inspection which included; checking ROW and checking cathodic protection.

---

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

**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 1  
Yes = 1 No = 0 Needs Improvement = .5

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:  
Yes

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

Evaluator Notes:  
All questions in this section were reviewed with the Western Region Director for PHMSA.

Total points scored for this section: 7  
Total possible points for this section: 7



**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:

**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:

**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:

**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:

**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:

**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:

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

Evaluator Notes:

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

