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 Ellensburg
PHMSA Operator ID(s)	04400
Included in this Inspection:	
Type of Operator:	☐ Investor Owned ☐ Municipal ☐ Private
	☐ LPG ☐ Other (e.g. cooperative)
States(s) included in this inspection:	Washington
Headquarters Address:	501 North Anderson St
·	
	Ellensburg, WA 98926
Company Contact:	Steve Prue, Gas Engineer
Phone Number:	509-962-7229
Email:	prues@ci.ellensburg.wa.us
Date(s) of Inspection:	June 11, 2013
Date of Report:	06/18/2013
Persons Interviewed:	
Persons Interviewed	
(List the DIMP Administrator as the	

T CISOIIS IIICCI VICVICU.			
Persons Interviewed (List the DIMP Administrator as the first contact)	Title	Phone Number	Email
Steve Prue	Gas Engineer	509-962-7229	prues@ci.ellensburg.wa.us

State or Federal Representatives:	Discuss Normalism	F!1
Inspector Name & Agency	Phone Number	Email
Scott Rukke	360-664-1241	srukke@utc.wa.gov
Inspector Comments (optional):		-
mopositor commente (optionally)		

Question	Rule §192	Des	scription		S/Y	U/N	N/A	N/C
No. 1	.1005	Was the plan written and impleit 192.1005 by 08/02/2011?		ment of	37.	O/IN	N/A	, с
		<u>OR</u>						
		For a gas system put into service a plan written and implemented						
Inspector's	Comments	Initial document is dated 2010. Rev	viewed revisions up to cur	rent.	I			
2	Information Only	Were commercially available product(s)/templates used in the development of the operator's written integrity management plan?						
		Fully	Partially 🗵	N	lot at a	all 🔲		
		Commercial product(s)/template	es name if used: SHRIM	IP				
Inspector'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	Comments	Section 22.1G						
4	.1007(a)(1)	Do the written procedures ident sources used to determine the to assess the threats and risks to	following characteristic	s necessary				
		 Design (e.g. type of construction pipe method, materials, size services, etc.)? 						
		Operating Conditions (e.g. p	oressure, gas quality, etc	:.)?				
 Operating Environmental Factors (e.g. corrosive soil conditions, frost heave, land subsidence, landslides, washouts, snow damage, external heat sources, business districts, wall-to-wall paving, population density, difficult to evacuate facilities, valve placement, etc.)? 								
Inspector's	s Comments	Section 1.31 maop Section 1.3.2 maop limits Section 3 has design documents Should take credit for valve placem 22.8 page 16	ent.					

		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	Section 22.8, all past records are utilized where appropriate. Section 22.9						
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 reco	rds,		
		Electronic Paper Paper	S۱	∕ІЕ 🔀				
Inspector'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	Comments	No known information gaps. The 6" supply line off the Williams gate station of the maop of 150psig is based on the maximum operating pressure between				cords.		
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	No known informational gaps other than supply line pressure tests from 1950	5.					
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	Comments	No known informational gaps other than the supply line pressure tests from	1956.					
10	.1007(a)(5)	Do the written procedures require the capture and retention of data on any new pipeline installed?						
Inspector's	Comments							
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	Comments	Section 22.1H	ı					
		Ellensburg will modify this procedure to capture the grade of steel, type of PE, coating type, manufacturer etc.						
12	.1007(a)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the element "Knowledge of the System"?	\boxtimes					
Inspector's	Comments							

13	.1007(a)	Has the operator demonstrated an understanding of its system?	\boxtimes		
Inspector's	s Comments				

		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 Will add in a section to the program dealing with standby on certain crossings by (It is already being done but not in the program) O&M 9.1b requires additional program.					es.	
15	.1007(b)	Did the operator consider the information that was reasonably available to identify existing and potential threats?	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments					
16	Information Only	Does the plan subdivide the primary threats into subcategories to identify existing and potential threats?	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments					
17	.1007(b)	In identifying threats did the information considered include any of the following? Incident and leak history	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments					
18	Information Only	Does the plan categorize primary threats as either "system-wide" or "lo				
		All System-wide All Localized Some of Both		Not Id	entifie	d
Inspector's	Comments					
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?	\boxtimes			

Inspector's	Comments	Section 22.20D leakage surveys Section 22.5B info from the APGA								
20	.1007(b)	Does the documentation provided by the oper	ator	demoi	nstrate	2				
		implementation of the element "Identify Threats"?								
Inspector's	Comments							1	I	
		192.1007(c) Evaluate and	Rai	nk R	isk					
Question No.	Rule §192	Description					S/Y	U/ N	N/A	N/C
21	Information Only	Was the risk evaluation developed fully or in p	art u	sing a	comm	ercially	availa	ble to	ol?	
	Offity	Fully Partially 🛚		Not at	all [
		Commercial tool name if used: SHRIMP								
Inspector's	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. Based on known input from SME's, frequency X consequence.	imate	e and r	ank th	ne	\boxtimes			
Inspector's	Comments				1	1	T T			
		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?	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
24	.1007 (c)	The likelihood of failure associated with each threat?	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
25		The potential consequence of such a failure?	S	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								1	1
26	.1007 (c)	If subdivision of system occurs, does the plan so into regions with similar characteristics and for are likely to be effective in reducing risk? Briefly describe the approach.								
Inspector's	Comments	System is small and no subdivision is necessary	٧.				I			1
27	Information Only	Is the method used to evaluate and rank risks	reasc	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. SME's, Point system, SHRIMP			
Inspector's Comments					
30	.1007(c)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the element "Evaluate and Rank Risk"?	\boxtimes		
Inspector's	Comments				

	192.10	07 (d) Identify and implement measures to add	ress	risks		
Question No.	Rule §192	Description	S/Y	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	·	•		the pro	gram is
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	Comments		-		the pro	gram is
33	.1007 (d)	Complete the table at the end of this form: Threat Addressed, Measure	ure to F	Reduce	Risk, a	ınd
Inspector's	Comments					
34	.1007 (d)	Does the plan include an effective leak management program (unless all leaks are repaired when found) 1. Locate the leaks in the distribution system; 2. Evaluate the actual or potential hazards associated with these leaks; 3. Act appropriately to mitigate these hazards; 4. Keep records; and 5. Self-assess to determine if additional actions are necessary to keep people and property safe.				
No. Rule 3192						
35	.1007(d)	implementation of the measures, required by Part 192 Subpart P,	\boxtimes			

Inspector's Comments	

19	2.10	007(e) Me	easure per	formance	e, monit	or results	s, and ev	/alua	te e	ffec	tiver	ness																																												
Ques		Rule §192			Descriptio	n			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 ated aired, rized	meas opera are n evalu effec IM pr contr	vi) idditiona ures the ator dete eeded to ate the tiveness rogram i olling ea	ermines o of the n ach																																												
36	proce oper for e	the plan con edures for ho ator establish ach performa sure?	w the ed a baseline	S	S	S	S	S		S		S		S		S		S		S			S																																	
37	base	the plan esta line for each p sure?		S	S	S	S	S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S			S	
38	proce	the operator edures to coll ach performa sure?		S	S	S	S	S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S		S			S																											
39	requ moni	ne written pro ire the operat itor each perf sure?	tor to	S	S	S	S	S	i		S																																													
		Mark eac	h box above wi N/A f		_	for "Satisfac N/C for "Not		"Unsat	isfacto	ory",																																														
Inspe	ctor's	Comments																																																						
4(0	.1007 (e)	When measur procedures pr	•					\boxtimes																																															
Inspe	ctor's	Comments	Section 22 pag	e 44																																																				
4:	1	Information Only	Can the perfo				erator in th	e	\boxtimes																																															
Inspe	ctor's	Comments																																																						
4:	2	.1007(e)	Does the docu implementation Results, and E	on of the elei	ment "Meas	•			\boxtimes																																															
Inspe	ctor's	Comments																																																						

	192.1007(f)Periodic Evaluation and Improvement						
Question No. Rule §192 Description				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? 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					
Inspector's Comments		are not appropriate, refine/improve them?					
44	Information Only	Does the plan contain a process for informing the appropriate operating personnel of an update to the plan?					
Inspector's Comments		Section 1.2.3 of the O&M plan. DIMP is not specifically mentioned but is incorp	oorated	d in the	O&M p	olan.	
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		Annual submissions are sent to the UTC.					
46	.1007(f)	Does the documentation provided by the operator demonstrate implementation of the element "Periodic Evaluation and Improvement"?	\boxtimes				
Inspector C	comments						

	192.1007(g) Report results						
Question No.	Rule §192	Description				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		O&M 1.3.10,					
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?	\boxtimes				
Inspector's Comments							

192.1009 What must an operator report when mechanical fittings fail?						
Question No.	Rule §192	Description) 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?				
Inspector's Comments		Section 16 of their O&M.				

	192.1011 What records must an operator keep?					
Question No.	Rule §192	Description		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?				
Inspector's Comments		Section 22.1-I,				
52	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	.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	Excavation. 150 psi system Excavation. 40 psi PE system Excavation. Valves Excavation. 40 psi Steel System	Warning tape installe 25 above pipe. Each locate is reviewed and personnel are on site where necessary. Valves are installed above and be ond to reduce shutdown time.	Number of danflages resulting in leakage monitored on an annual basis. 2 4
2	Outside Force Damage	Generally limited to meters in alleys etc.	Active guard post program including installation of protection after any damage has occurred.	
3	Material or welds	Not subcategorized	Strictly API 1104 welding standards	
4				
5				

Other Inspector
Comments

Threats for this system are very limited. It is a small system with under 4,000 services. Being a municipality the City has greater control over third party contractors through the permitting process. The system has experienced very few leaks, mainly due to third party damage and they have implemented various programs to deal with this threat. Each locate is reviewed and contact is made with contractors that are going to excavate over or near pipeline facilities. A very proactive valve installation and maintenance program was implemented years ago and the system is easily isolated and shut down during emergencies. Currently there is a program to

install additional valves in a 7 block area of the downtown business core to be used as
emergency isolation valves.