Distribution Integrity Management Program (DIMP) Inspection Form

For Operators of Gas Distribution Systems

For Requirements of 192.1005 - 192.1011

Version 9/23/2011

This inspection form is for the evaluation of a gas distribution integrity management program for all operators of gas distribution except operators of master meter or small liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) systems. The form contains questions related to specific regulatory requirements and questions which are strictly for informational purposes. The questions which are related to specific regulatory requirements are preceded by the rule section number which prescribes the applicable code citation for the question. The cell preceding informational questions states "information only".

S/Y stands for "Satisfactory" or "Yes", U/N stands for "Unsatisfactory" or "No", N/A stands for "Not Applicable", and N/C stands for "Not Checked". If an item is marked U/N, N/A, or N/C, an explanation must be included in the comments section.

Some inspection questions contain examples to further clarify the intent of the question. For example, question 5 asks, "Do the written procedures require the consideration of information gained from past design, operations, and maintenance (e.g. O&M activities, field surveys, One-Call system information, excavation damage, etc.)?" The list following "e.g." is not meant to be all inclusive or that all the items are required. Some of the items may not be applicable to an individual operator's system.

Some States require the operator to notify and send the State regulatory authority any changes to operator's plans and procedures. Operators in these states should also notify and send revisions of the DIMP plan to the State regulatory authority.

Operator Contact and System Information — Operator Information:

Name of Operator (legal entity):	City of Buckley
PHMSA Operator ID(s) Included in this Inspection:	1848
Type of Operator:	☐ Investor Owned ☐ Municipal ☐ Private ☐ LPG ☐ Other (e.g. cooperative)
States(s) included in this inspection:	Washington
Headquarters Address:	933 Main St, Buckley, WA 98321
Company Contact:	Brian Burbank, Gas Lead
Phone Number:	Off (360) 829-1921, Cell (253) 261-6754
Email:	bburbank@cityofbuckley.com
Date(s) of Inspection:	Click here to enter a date. TO Click here to enter a date.
	6/25/2013
Date of Report:	Click here to enter a date.

Persons Interviewed

Persons interviewea:			
Persons Interviewed (List the DIMP Administrator as the first contact)	Title	Phone Number	Email
Brian Burbank	Gas Lead	253-261-6754	bburbank@citybuckley.com
John Dansby	Public Works Supervisor	253-261-9826	jdansby@cityofbuckley.com

State or Federal Representatives:

Inspector Name & Agency	Phone Number	Email
Scott Rukke	360-664-1241	srukke@comcast.net

Inspector Comments (optional): This was a technical assistance visit.	

Question No.	Rule §192	Descr	ription		S/Y	U/N	N/A	N/C		
1	.1005	Was the plan written and implement 192.1005 by 08/02/2011?	ented per the require	ment of						
		<u>OR</u>								
		For a gas system put into service of a plan written and implemented p								
Inspector's	Comments	Implemented on 08/02/2011 but lack	ing procedures required	d in 192.1007	I	I				
		GUIDELINES - The DIMP plan does the plan was written and is being it	implemented.		res to o	demor	strate	that		
2	Information Only	Were commercially available prod development of the operator's wr	• • •		\boxtimes					
		Fully 🖂	Partially	N	lot at a	all 🗌				
		Commercial product(s)/templates	name if used: SHRIM	Р						
Inspector's	s Comments									
3	Information Only	Does the operator's plan assign responsibility, including titles and positions, of those accountable for developing and implementing required actions?								
Inspector's	s Comments	Section 11.1 assigns tasks and titles to development.	o the gas personnel in c	narge of plan im	plemer	ntation	and			
4	.1007(a)(1)	Do the written procedures identify sources used to determine the forto assess the threats and risks to t	ollowing characteristic	s necessary						
		,	 Design (e.g. type of construction, inserted pipe, rehabilitated pipe method, materials, sizes, dates of installation, mains and 							
		Operating Conditions (e.g. pre	essure, gas quality, etc	c.)?						
		 Operating Environmental Fact frost heave, land subsidence, damage, external heat sources paving, population density, diffugility, placement, etc.)? 	snow vall-to-wall							

		192.1007(a) Knowledge of the System				
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	U/ N	N/ A	N/C
5	.1007(a)(2)	Do the written procedures require the consideration of information gained from past design, operations, and maintenance (e.g. O&M activities, field surveys, One-Call system information, excavation damage, etc.)?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	Comments	See above				
6	Information Only	Do the written procedures indicate if the information was obtained from paper records, or subject matter expert knowledge (select all which approximately ap		ctroni	c recoi	ds,
		Electronic Paper Paper	SN	1E 🗌		
Inspector's	S Comments					
7	.1007(a)(3)	Does the plan contain written procedures to identify additional information that is needed to fill gaps due to missing, inaccurate, or incomplete records?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	s Comments					
8	.1007(a)(3)	Does the plan list the additional information needed to fill gaps due to missing, inaccurate, or incomplete records?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	Comments					
9	.1007(a)(3)	Do the written procedures specify the means to collect the additional information needed to fill gaps due to missing, inaccurate, or incomplete records (e.g., O&M activities, field surveys, One-Call System, etc.)?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	s Comments					
10	.1007(a)(5)	Do the written procedures require the capture and retention of data on any new pipeline installed?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	Comments	Modify Chapter 3 to include type of material and type of fittings etc.				
11	.1007(a)(5)	Does the data required for capture and retention include, at a minimum, the location where the new pipeline is installed and the material from which it is constructed?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	s Comments					
12	.1007(a)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the element "Knowledge of the System"?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	s Comments					
13	.1007(a)	Has the operator demonstrated an understanding of its system?		\boxtimes		

Inspector's Comments	The DIMP program is incomplete. So it is difficult to determine if the system knowledge is there. 8 years
	experience between 3 employees.

		192.1007(b) Identify Threats				
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C
14	.1007(b)	In identifying threats, do the written procedures include consideration of the following categories of threats to each gas distribution pipeline?				
Inspector's	Comments					
15	.1007(b)	Did the operator consider the information that was reasonably available to identify existing and potential threats?				
Inspector's	Comments		•			
16	Information Only	Does the plan subdivide the primary threats into subcategories to identify existing and potential threats?				
Inspector's	Comments	Yes, each category, where appropriate is subdivided. Example is corrosion whi external etc.	oken ii	nto inte	rnal,	
17	.1007(b)	In identifying threats did the information considered include any of the following? Incident and leak history				
Inspector's	Comments					
18	Information Only	Does the plan categorize primary threats as either "system-wide" or "lo	ocalize	d"?		
		All System-wide All Localized Some of Both		Not Ic	lentifie	d
Inspector's	Comments	All threats are considered system wide.	_			
19	Information Only	Do the written procedures consider, in addition to the operator's own information, data from external sources (e.g. trade associations, government agencies, or other system operators, etc.) to assist in identifying potential threats?				
Inspector's	Comments	No outside external sources were utilized due to the small system characterist	ics.			

20	.1007(b)	Does the documentation provided by the oper implementation of the element "Identify Three		demoi	nstrat	e	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments									
		192.1007(c) Evaluate and	Raı	nk R	isk					
Question No.	Rule §192	Description					S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C
21	Information	Was the risk evaluation developed fully or in p	art us	sing a	comm	ercially	availa	ble to	ol?	
	Only	Fully Partially		Not at	all					
		Commercial tool name if used: SHRIMP								
	Comments									
22	.1007 (c)	Do the written procedures contain the method the relative importance of each threat and est risks posed? Briefly describe the method. Probability times SHRIMP	imate	e and r	ank th					
Inspector's	Comments			1	•					
		For questions 23 – 25, do the written procedures to evaluate and rank risk consider:	Corrosion	Natural Forces	Excavation Damage	Other outside Force Damage	Material or Welds	Equipment Failure	Incorrect Operation	Other Concerns
23		Each applicable current and potential threat?	U	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
24	.1007 (c)	The likelihood of failure associated with each threat?	U	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
25		The potential consequence of such a failure?	U	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
		Mark each box above with one of the following N/A for "Not Applicable" and N/C for "Not Che	_		isfact	ory", U	for "U	nsatisf	actory'	,
•	Comments							ı	Г	ı
26	.1007 (c)	If subdivision of system occurs, does the plans into regions with similar characteristics and fo are likely to be effective in reducing risk? Briefly describe the approach.			•					
Inspector's	Comments	No subdivision – SMALL MUNICIPAL SYS	TEM						l	
27	Information Only	Is the method used to evaluate and rank risks	reaso	nable	?					
Inspector's	Comments									
28	.1007(c)	Are the results of the risk ranking supported by model/method?	y the	risk ev	/aluat	ion	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments									

29	.1007(c)	Did the operator validate the results generated by the risk evaluation model/method?				
		Briefly describe. Unknown, unclear on whether the rankings produced by SHRIMP were validated. Notes in section 5.2 appear to indicate that the SHRIMP ranking was overridden by the operator.				
Inspector's Comments		It is not clear if the operator overrode the SHRIMP ranking.				
30	.1007(c)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the element "Evaluate and Rank Risk"?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's Comments It is not clear as to whether the operator overrode the SHRIMP risk ranking or not. Notes appear to indicate this but the operator was unable to explain.						

	192.10	07 (d) Identify and implement measures to add	ress	risks				
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	U/ N	N/A	N/C			
31	.1007 (d)	Does the plan include procedures to identify when measures, beyond minimum code requirements specified outside of Part 192 Subpart P, are required to reduce risk?	\boxtimes					
Inspector's	Comments	Meets bare minimum. Page 14 and 15 need to explain why improving the a be improved.	ccuracy	of loca	ates nee	ds to		
32	.1007 (d) When measures, beyond minimum code requirements specified outside of Part 192 Subpart P, are required to reduce risk, does the plan identify the measures selected, how they will be implemented, and the risks they are addressing?		\boxtimes					
Inspector's	Inspector's Comments See above							
33	.1007 (d)	Complete the table at the end of this form: Threat Addressed, Measure	ıre to F	Reduce	Risk, a	nd		
Inspector's	Comments							
34	.1007 (d)	Does the plan include an effective leak management program (unless all leaks are repaired when found)						
		 Locate the leaks in the distribution system; Evaluate the actual or potential hazards associated with these leaks; Act appropriately to mitigate these hazards; Keep records; and Self-assess to determine if additional actions are necessary to keep people and property safe. 						
Inspector's	Comments							

35	.1007(d)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the measures, required by Part 192 Subpart P, to reduce risk?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's Comments		Lacking documentation. Example better locate quality. Example do CP reads	for atr	nosphe	eric corr	osion.

Ques No		Rule §192			Description	on			S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C
	.1007	7(e)		i) Number of hazardous leaks either eliminated or repaired, categorized by cause?	ii) Number of excavation damages?	iii) Number of excavation tickets received by gas department ?	iv) Total number of leaks either eliminate d or repaired categorize d by cause?	v' Numbe hazard leaks e elimina or repa catego by mat	er of ous ither ited iired, rized	meas opera are no evalu effect IM pr contr	vi) dditiona ures the ator dete eeded te ate the tiveness ogram i olling ea	ermines o of the n
36	proce opera	ach performa	w the ned a baseline	Y	Y	Y	Y	Υ		N/A		
37			ablish a performance	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	,	N/A		
38	proce	edures to coll ach performa		U	U	U	U	U				
39	requi	ne written pro re the opera- tor each perf sure?	tor to	U	U	U	U	U	l			
		Mark eac	h box above wi N/A f		U	for "Satisfac N/C for "Not	, ,	"Unsat	isfacto	ory",		
Inspe	ctor's	Comments										
40			When measur procedures pr							\boxtimes		
Inspe	ctor's	Comments										
		ormance measures identified by the operator in the ted, monitored, and supported?			e							
Inspe	ctor's	Comments										
42 .1007(e) Does the doc implementati Results, and E			on of the ele	ment "Meas	•				\boxtimes			
Inspe	ctor's	Comments	Results, and E	valuate Effec	ctiveness"?							

		192.1007(f)Periodic Evaluation and Improvemen	t			
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C
43	.1007 (f)	Do the written procedures for periodic review include: a. Frequency of review based on the complexity of the system and changes in factors affecting the risk of failure, not to exceed 5 years?	\boxtimes			
		b. Verification of general information (e.g. contact information, form names, action schedules, etc.)?				
		 c. Incorporate new system information? d. Re-evaluation of threats and risk? e. Review the frequency of the measures to reduce risk? f. Review the effectiveness of the measures to reduce risk? g. Modify the measures to reduce risk and refine/improve as needed (i.e. add new, modify existing, or eliminate if no longer 				
		needed)? h. Review performance measures, their effectiveness, and if they are not appropriate, refine/improve them?				
Inspector's	Comments			1		L
44	Information Only	Does the plan contain a process for informing the appropriate operating personnel of an update to the plan?		\boxtimes		
Inspector's	Comments					
45	Information Only	Does the plan contain a process for informing the appropriate regulatory agency of a significant update to the plan?	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments	Chapter 9	•	•		
46	.1007(f)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the element "Periodic Evaluation and Improvement"?		х		
Inspector C	Comments		1	1	1	

	192.1007(g) Report results						
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C	
47	.1007(g)	Does the plan contain or reference procedures for reporting, on an annual basis, the four measures listed in 192.1007(e)(1)(i) through (e)(1)(iv) to PHMSA as part of the annual report required by § 191.11 and the State regulatory authority?	\boxtimes				
Inspector's	Comments	Section 9 reporting.		•			
48 Information Only		When required by the State, does the plan identify the specific report form, date, and location where it is to be submitted?	\boxtimes				
Inspector's Comments						•	
49 .1007(g)		Has the operator submitted the required reports?					
Inspector's	Comments						

19	192.1009 What must an operator report when mechanical fittings fail?									
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C				
50	.1009	Does the operator have written procedures to collect the information necessary to comply with the reporting requirements of 192.1009?		\boxtimes						
Inspector's	Comments									

	192.1011 What records must an operator keep?								
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C			
51	.1011	Does the operator have written procedures specifying which records demonstrating compliance with Subpart P will be maintained for at least 10 years?	\boxtimes						
Inspector's	Comments								
52 .1011		Does the operator have written procedures specifying that copies of superseded integrity management plans will be maintained for at least 10 years?	\boxtimes						
Inspector's Comments									
53	53 .1011 Has the operator maintained the required records?		\boxtimes						

Inspector's Comments	

Table 1: Threat Addressed, Measure to Reduce Risk, and Performance Measure

For the top five highest ranked risks from the operator's risk ranking list the following:

- Primary threat category (corrosion, natural forces, excavation damage, other outside force damage, material or weld, equipment failure, incorrect operation, and other concerns);
- Threat subcategory (GPTC threat subcategories are acceptable. Try to be specific. Example, failing bonnet bolts of gate valve, manufacturer name, model #);
- Measure to reduce the risk (list the one measure the operator feels is most important to reducing the risk);
- Associated performance measure.

	Primary Threat Category	Threat Subcategory, as appropriate	Measure to Reduce Risk	Performance Measure
1	Excavation damage	Third Party	Improve line marking accuracy Monitor and audit excavation activities Install additional line markers Review map availability	Damages per 1,000 locates
2	Corrosion	Atmospheric corrosion	See page 15 for AA's	
3				
4				
5				

Other Inspector	Buckley has experienced below ground leaks on Steel inserted in conduit. Due to shielding from
Comments	CP. This threat should addressed above atmospheric corrosion due to potential consequences
	of underground gas migration.