

2010

# Pipeline Safety Seminar Operator Qualification

- Did you have your program in place by April 27, 2001? Is there evidence to support that?
- Were all personnel performing covered tasks qualified by October 28, 2002? Is there evidence to support that?

- Have you re-qualified personnel in accordance with your written plan since Oct. 28, 2002?
- If so, was the re-qualification based on, On-the-Job (OJT) Training alone?
- Advisory Bulletin ADB-04-05

KSA's

 Does your program included assessments based on Knowledge, Skill and Ability?  Are Abnormal Operating Conditions considered for each specific task or just generic to the program?

What we have been seeing......

Inadequate AOC development

Training

OQ Testing

 OQ plan underdeveloped (e.g., parroting regulation)

 Lack of due diligence, the result, operators without an OQ plan.

 Lapses in subsequent qualification of personnel

- ✓ Other OQ non-compliance issues...
  - Lack of contractor personnel
     OQ tracking and assurance

 Limited/non-existent management-of-change documentation between O&M updates and OQ program

- ✓ Other OQ non-compliance issues...
  - Lack of personnel qualification documentation
    - 192.807/195.507 Each operator shall maintain records that demonstrate compliance with this subpart.
    - (b) Records supporting an individual's current qualification shall be maintained while the individual is performing the covered task.

Incidents with OQ qualified observers missing in action

- ✓ Other OQ non-compliance issues...
  - OQ personnel not following O&M and emergency response plans in the field, even though they were trained and tested to do so

80% SMYS Pipe under 49 CFR 192
 must be constructed using personnel
 qualified under the OQ Regulation

49 CFR 192.620 (c)(6)

- Qualified personnel should be conducting the installation of piping
- Non-qualified personnel performing tasks that would be "covered" if performed as maintenance activities

Contractor work must be supervised carefully

Several construction-related incidents
 caused damage to underground
 pipelines in CA, TX, VA & WY, resulting
 in deaths, injuries, property damage
 and disruption of service

- PHMSA AB 06-01 published in FR on 1/17/06 (71 FR 2613) damage prevention
- Qualified (One Call Notification, line locating and marking, and inspection of construction activities)

 PHMSA AB 02-01 published in FR on 5/24/02 (67 FR 36667) urged operators to follow the best practices on damage prevention found in the Common Ground (CGA) Study

- Investigations continue to show
- Construction-related incidents violate Federal pipeline safety regulations...
   and
- The operators construction and maintenance practices!!!

- ADB 06-03, Nov 17, 2006 recommends using Common Ground Alliance
- The operators own procedures when excavating around operating utilities and facilities.
- This is the third in a series of Advisory Bulletins addressing the same issue.

Good procedures can prevent accidents

only if they are followed. Among

problems discovered are the following:

✓ Operators do not always follow their procedures for constructing, repairing, ditching and backfilling in areas where there are existing pipelines (typically procedures prohibit machine excavation within 12 to 24 inches of existing pipelines)

✓ Inspectors at construction sites sometimes fail to assist the operator's employees, operator's contractors, and 3<sup>rd</sup> party construction contractors in verifying the marked locations of the existing pipeline facilities

- ✓ Current "as-built" drawings are not always made available to locators and excavators at construction sites before activities began
- ✓ Operators do not always mark pipelines at crossovers

✓ In locations with parallel pipelines, sometimes the wrong pipeline gets marked

- ✓ Operators do not always correctly mark all pipelines in the vicinity of the construction and maintenance activities
- ✓ Operators sometimes fail to assign personnel skilled enough to observe excavation and backfilling tasks