

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



October 2, 2018

GI-2018-02-SCG-54

Mr. Jimmie Cho, Senior Vice President
Gas Operations and System Integrity
Southern California Gas Company
555 West 5th Street, GT21C3
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Subject: SED Closure Letter for the General Order (G.O.) 112-F Inspection of Southern California Gas Company's San Joaquin Valley Transmission Inspection Unit

Dear Mr. Cho:

The Safety and Enforcement Division (SED) of the California Public Utilities Commission reviewed Southern California Gas Company's (SoCalGas) response letter dated June 14, 2018 and a supplemental response letter dated on September 7, 2018 that addressed the findings identified during the G.O. 112¹ Inspection of SoCalGas' San Joaquin Valley Transmission Inspection Unit from February 26 through March 2, 2018.

Attached is a summary of SED's inspection findings, SoCalGas' responses to SED's findings, and SED's evaluation of SoCalGas' response to the identified probable violation and areas of concerns. SED will send a separate letter to SoCal Gas involving one of the Probable Violations.

This letter serves as an official closure of the 2018 G.O. 112-F Inspection of SoCalGas' San Joaquin Valley Transmission Inspection Unit.

If you have any questions, please contact Alula Gebremedhin at (415) 703-1816 or email at ag5@cpuc.ca.gov

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dennis Lee".

Dennis Lee, P.E.
Program and Project Supervisor
Gas Safety and Reliability Branch
Safety and Enforcement Division

CC: Troy A. Bauer, Sempra Energy Utility
Kenneth Bruno, SED/GSRB
Matthewson Epuna, SED/GSRB
Kan-Wai Tong, SED/GSRB
Kelly Dolcini, SED/GSRB
Alula Gebremedhin, SED/GSRB

Summary of Inspection Findings
2017 SoCalGas San Juaquin Valley Transmission Inspection Unit

I. Probable Violations

1. SED FINDING

Title 49 CFR §192.605(a) states in part:

*“Each operator shall prepare and **follow** for each pipeline, a manual of written procedures for conducting operations and maintenance activities”*

1.1 SCG’s Gas Standard 186.0103, *External Surface Preparation and Field Applied Coating for Buried Pipelines*, Section 4.3.2 states in part:

*“**Liquid coatings:** Approved coatings are:*

*4.3.2.1. **3M 323 Liquid Epoxy Coating**, 25 to 60 mils DFT with an average between 25 to 40 mils DFT”*

However, during review of SCG’s coating records, SED found that:

- i. Coating Inspection Report for project # WOA 92404, dated 11/22 - 23/2016, shows that the coating was approved with Dry Film Thickness (DFT) average value of 23.1 mils,
- ii. Coating Inspection Report for project # WOA 91802, dated 2/2/2016 shows that the coating was approved with DFT average value of 20 mils,

Therefore, SCG is in violation of GO 112-F, Referenced Title 49 CFR §192.605(a), for its failure to follow its own procedure by accepting out of range DFT values.

1.2 SCG’s Gas Standard 186.0103, *External Surface Preparation and Field Applied Coating for Buried Pipelines*, Section 4.2.1 states in part

“4.2. SURFACE PREPARATION:

4.2.2. All weld spatter or sharp edges shall be filed or ground flat by hand prior to blasting. Blast cleaned metal surfaces, whether using the dry or wet method, shall have a sharp angular anchor profile between 2-4 mils, as determined by replica tape (NACE RP 0287) or other suitable and reliable profiling tool. For power tool cleaned surfaces, any original surface profile should not be removed (i.e. surface shall not be buffed smooth) but left with minimum 1 mil profile whenever possible.”

And

SCG’s Gas Standard SCG 186.0104, *Surface Preparation and Coating for Above Ground Piping and Steel Components*, Section 4.3.3 also stated that, (PS: the 2011 version of the standard has also similar information)

“4.3. SURFACE PREPARATION:

4.3.3. The resulting surface anchor profile shall measure between 1.5 to 3.5 mils as confirmed by Testex replica tape (NACE RP0287) or other suitable profiling tool.”

In addition, SCG Standard 4005 *Coating Inspection Report (published on 02/11/2016), DATA ENTRY INSTRUCTIONS*, Section G, requires Anchor Profile (G3) and DFT Average (G4) values need to be recorded.

However, during review of SCG's coating records, SED found that:

Anchor profile was not recorded on the coating inspection forms for project # WOA 90887, dated 9/23/2016, and project # WOA 91337, dated 1/9/2015, to confirm its acceptability.

Therefore, SCG is in violation of GO 112-F, Referenced Title 49 CFR §192.605(a), for its failure to follow its own procedure by not recording the Anchor Profile to confirm they were within the acceptable range stated in its procedure.

SCG RESPONSE:

SoCalGas acknowledges that the Coating Inspection Forms contained errors however, SoCalGas disagrees with SED's determination. The coating on each project was installed by Operator Qualified technicians as required by the SoCalGas' Standards and DOT regulations.

SCG's CORRECTIVE ACTION:

An information bulletin will be issued for current coating inspectors related to importance of inspections, proper tools, records and reference to the applicable Gas Standards. The current Coating Inspection module in the Welding Inspector Elements Training will be expanded as a requirement for the coating inspectors.

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty, since SCG created the necessary corrective action plans. However, recurrence of the same violation in the future may result in enforcement action.

2. SED FINDING

Title 49 CFR §192.743(a) states in part:

“(a) Pressure relief devices at pressure limiting stations and pressure regulating stations must have sufficient capacity to protect the facilities to which they are connected.

Except as provided in §192.739(b), the capacity must be consistent with the pressure limits of §192.201(a). This capacity must be determined at intervals not exceeding 15 months, but at least once each calendar year, by testing the devices in place or by review and calculations”

However, during review of SCG's relief valve maintenance records, SED found that, neither relief valve capacity calculation nor annual capacity recheck performed for relief valves RV-1 and RV-2 at station 8120-0.01S, and no capacity check in 2017 for valve BRNG 156.

Therefore, SCG is in violation of GO 112-F, Referenced Title 49 CFR §192.743(a), for its failure to calculate the capacity of its relief valves and check it annually.

SCG RESPONSE:

Pursuant to Gas Standard 223.0345, a signature on the capacity card is not required if the technician does not believe a change was warranted by changes in the pipeline conditions that the PRV was designed to protect. Specifically, the MAXIMO work order job plan clearly lists the requirement to review the pipeline system and determine if any changes are necessary. In each case that SED cited above, the MAXIMO work orders were all signed and completed as required by the SoCalGas GS 223.0345 and DOT regulations.

SCG's CORRECTIVE ACTION:

SoCalGas plans to modify the Maximo work orders to illustrate that any changes in the system have been reviewed.

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty, since SCG created the necessary corrective action plans. However, recurrence of the same violation in the future may result in enforcement action.

3. SED FINDING

Title 49 CFR §192.739(a) states:

“(a) Each pressure limiting station, relief device (except rupture discs), and pressure regulating station and its equipment must be subjected at intervals not exceeding 15 months, but at least once each calendar year, to inspections and tests to determine that it is—“.

And

3.1. SCG Gas Standard 223.0345, Pressure Relief/Pressure Limiting Devices, Testing/Inspection, Section 11.6.4. states in part,

“11. Method — Pressure Limiting

11.6.4 Check lockup if applicable (i.e. – any soft seated regulator such as a Grove, Mooney, Fisher, etc.) Metal to metal seated regulators and valves used as control valves that are functioning as service regulators do not apply.”

However, during review of SCG's pressure limiting station maintenance records, SED found that, no lock-up test performed for station 85-94.305 (2016 & 2017 maintenances) and station 173-5.22 (2017 maintenance)

Therefore, SCG is in violation of GO 112-F, Referenced Title 49 CFR §192.739(a), for its failure to conduct complete inspection of its pressure regulating station as required by its procedure.

SCG RESPONSE:

The device 173-5.22 was removed from service on 9/27/16 and therefore did not require maintenance in 2017. The device 85-94.305 is a metal to metal seated valve and, as listed in Gas Standard 223.0345, does not require checking lock-up.

SCG's CORRECTIVE ACTION:

SoCalGas plans to modify Maximo work orders and remove the "lock up" field on the assets which are metal to metal valves

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty, since SCG created the necessary corrective action plan.

3.2. SCG Gas Standard 223.0345, Pressure Relief/Pressure Limiting Devices, Testing/ Inspection, that was revised and published on 12/29/2016, Section 13.2.1. states in part,

"13. Method – Pressure Relieving, Signaling Device

13.2. Is set to function at the correct pressure and, after closing, has a positive shut-off. This determined by test

*13.2.1. When inspections and tests disclose positive shut off does not occur **within 90% of set pressure**, take steps without delay to readjust, repair, replace or install additional devices as appropriate*

However, during review of SCG's relief valve maintenance records, SED found that, the relief positive shutoff or re-seat pressures was below 90% of set pressures and no corrective measures were taken as per SCG's standard, for stations 13.5, 85-78.60S, 103-9.14, & GNN 38339, during the 2017 maintenances of the valves.

Therefore, SCG is in violation of GO 112-F, Referenced Title 49 CFR §192.739(a), for its failure to conduct complete inspection of its relief valves as required by its procedure.

SCG RESPONSE:

While the PRV didn't reset to 90% of set pressure, it was verified that the PRV functioned at the correct set pressure. SoCalGas is in the process of revising GS 223.0345 so field employees can verify the positive shut-off pressure is within reasonable tolerance levels

SCG's CORRECTIVE ACTION:

Gas Standard 223.0345 will be revised and the impacted field employees will be trained on the updated Gas Standard.

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty, since SCG created the necessary corrective action plan.

4. **SED FINDING**

Title 49 CFR §192.463(a) states:

*“Each cathodic protection system required by this subpart must provide a level of cathodic protection that complies with **one or more of the applicable criteria contained in Appendix D of this part**. If none of these criteria is applicable, the cathodic protection system must provide a level of cathodic protection at least equal to that provided by compliance with one or more of these criteria”*

And,

Appendix D, Section III states in part, regarding 100mV polarization voltage shift criteria under Section I (3)

“III. The polarization voltage shift must be determined by interrupting the protective current and measuring the polarization decay”

During a field visit, SED observed that SCG takes an "on" read, and then compares it to a previously established lower limit. That voltage shift is then compared to the native potential to determine if the 100 mV shift criteria are met. SCG does not interrupt the rectifiers that are influencing the read point, rather SCG establishes a lower bound and upper bound, and if the read is in between these two reads, then the read is deemed OK. SED also observed this practice in other districts, which implies it is a system wide practice.

This is contrary to 192.463(a), which references Appendix D for measuring the 100 mV shift criteria. Appendix D Section III requires the protective current must be interrupted to measure the polarization shift voltage at that moment.

Further, the IR drop will change over time with changes in ground moisture and the current output from rectifier settings. This results in an unknown IR drop.

Therefore, SCG is in violation of GO 112-F, Referenced Title 49 CFR §192.463(a), for its failure to properly follow the requirement of Appendix D, referenced by Part 192, by not interrupting the protective current source to determine the adequacy of its cathodic protection under the 100mV polarization voltage shift criteria.

SCG RESPONSE:

Gas Standard 186.0036 Section 5.5, allows three methods (options) for annual monitoring of 100 mV systems. Two of those are described in the NOPV, the “on potential” read, which was observed by SED during the audit, or using the decay method, which is described above in the SED Citation as Appendix D Section III.

The minimum on potential read to establish acceptable criteria, when using on- Potential for annual read, is established in accordance with CFR 192 Appendix D Section III – Determination of Polarization Shift. For this reason, we feel this is an acceptable method for monitoring annual reads per 192.463 (a).

SoCalGas has established rigorous criteria for establishing, monitoring and evaluating its protected systems where the 100 mV Polarization Criteria is applied. This includes review and approval by our Pipeline Integrity Staff, of any new systems to be applied with the criteria., strict guidance on how to establish these system minimum annual reads, and

periodic monitoring with requirements for re-evaluating those systems for change over time.

Requiring a strict application of a decay method as described in Appendix D Section III, each year for monitoring would subject our pipelines to regular and lengthy depolarization periods (turning off protection), that are not in the best interest of corrosion control. SoCalGas understands that CFR Appendix D Section III was not intended to be applied as an annual criteria evaluation, but was intended to ensure that a minimum (cathodic) polarization voltage shift of 100 mV is established and achieved. We feel our method of establishing the on potential minimum value which complies with Appendix D, along with the rigorous 100mV Polarization Criteria procedures provide assurance that the 100mV shift is achieved, and appropriately monitored annually. Minor swings in IR values are not significant to significantly reduce achieving these levels.

SCG's CORRECTIVE ACTION:

None required.

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED will send a separate letter to SoCal Gas on this issue.

II. Areas of Concern and Recommendations

1. SED FINDING

SCG stated that the Coating Inspector is responsible for completing Coating Inspection Report (CIR). SCG also stated that the role of the inspector is to verify, observe or test, and document to a specific SCG Gas Standard and inspector may use their own tool to verify coating Dry Film Thickness (DFT) against the applicator's tool. One of the sections in the CIR is to record holiday inspection result(s).

SED believes Coating Inspector's role is very important for integrity of the gas pipeline. CFR Part 192 Section 192.461(c) also states:

“Each external protective coating must be inspected just prior to lowering the pipe into the ditch and backfilling, and any damage detrimental to effective corrosion control must be repaired”

However, SCG does not specify any standards for Coating Inspector's qualification and/or did not provide Inspector's qualification records.

SED is concerned that Coating inspection could be performed by personnel who weren't qualified and/or did not have the necessary qualification to perform the job, unless a written qualification requirements is set and followed by SCG.

In addition, SED also noticed that SCG is inconsistent in the use of Coating Inspection Report (CIR) forms and data entries on the CIRs. The following are examples from SED's review on selected projects.

- i. SCG revised its Coating Inspection Report form (Form 4005) and published on 02-11-2016. However, SED noted that SCG is still using old version form for the project # WOA 92404, dated 11/23/16, whereas SCG used its new version of the form for project WOA 90887, dated 9/23/2016.
- ii. Coating Inspection Report for the project with WOA 90887, dated 9/23/2016, stated SCG's Gas Standard 186.0104; however, its Daily Inspection Report for same project for same day stated Gas Standard 186.0103.

SCG RESPONSE:

SoCalGas agrees with SED's recommendation to create Operator Qualification (OQ) covered tasks for coating inspections. The OQ tasks, associated procedures, materials, tests and process will be drafted in an assessment and implementation plan. The assessment will include a review of appropriate industry standards as well as current company gas standards. The assessment will be completed by Q2 2019 and the Coating Inspector task is projected to be added to the OQ program by Q4 2019.

Additional resources and expertise will be needed to develop the associated procedures, materials, and tests and its continued management.

In the interim, an information bulletin will be issued for current coating inspectors related to the importance of inspections, proper tools, records and reference to the applicable Gas Standards. The current Coating Inspection module in the Welding Inspector Elements Training will be expanded as a requirement for coating inspectors

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty since SCG created the necessary corrective action plan for the rest.

2. SED FINDING

During SED's field visit of pressure limiting station 6351 maintenance, SED observed that the intermediate piping experienced an upstream pressure of 283 psig (MAOP 400 psig) during the monitor regulator set point check.

Even though, SED requested the MAOP establishment records, which validates the intermediate piping qualification for the upstream pressure (MAOP 400 psig), SCG has not provided test records with complete information showing the intermediate pipe, so far.

Therefore, please provide a complete record that demonstrates the intermediate pipe is qualified for the upstream pressure or provide us with the necessary correction actions.

SCG RESPONSE

SoCalGas located the construction sketch as well as pressure test chart from the installation of ID6351N and shared this information with SED during the audit. The documentation does not clearly identify the end points of the pressure test, so it is not possible to verify that the intermediate piping of the station was tested. Nevertheless, SoCalGas will isolate this station and pressure test the intermediate piping to an MAOP of 400psig and provide a record containing this information.

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty since SCG created the necessary corrective action plan. Please also provide records, once the stated pressure test conducted.

3. SED FINDING

During SED's field visit of Valve maintenance, SED observed that the technician didn't check leakage on the equipment itself (CGI) he was using to check leaks, before performing a leak check on a pipe. Gas Standard 107.0287, section 4.4.1 requires to "Perform Sample Fault" to check leak on the equipment itself prior to the activity.

SCG RESPONSE:

SoCalGas agrees with SED's observation. A companywide bulletin was sent out on April 4th, 2018 to remind Supervisors and field employees to perform a 'Sample Fault' operation with the associated probe assemblies attached. This test is conducted each time the GMI Gasurveyor (CGI) is powered on or if the hose is removed or accidentally detached from a probe assembly and reattached to the instrument while powered on. Refresher training on the leak detection equipment was provided for all Field Supervisors completed on May 30, 2018.

In addition, SoCalGas Gas Standard 107.0287 GMI Gasurveyor-Combustible Gas Indicator (CGI) will be revised to include photos demonstrating the use of a disposable glove to perform the required "Flow Fault" test

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty since SCG created the necessary corrective action.

4. SED FINDING

- i. During SED's field visit of Valve 26.81-1 on Line 225 maintenance, SED observed an open wooden vault, which allowed dirt to pile up within the vault.*
- ii. During SED's field visit of Valve 45-1001-5 and 45-1001-6 maintenances, SED observed that the electronic record (MDT) showed the valves in open position, whereas the valves were found in closed position.*

SCG RESPONSE

- i. The above-mentioned vault is on a schedule to be replaced.*
- ii. Region Engineering researched the two valves in question, and found that they were supposed to be closed, matching the position found in the field. The update was posted to the Geographic Information System (GIS) on March 9, 2018, and the valves are now displayed as closed on company Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs).*

This update was communicated to SED by email on March 23, 2018

SED's CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty since SCG performed the necessary corrective action.

5. SED FINDING

Incorrect input in pressure limiting, relief valve, and pressure control valve maintenance forms:

- i. During record review, SED observed that SCG uses pressure limiting station maintenance forms to record input for relief valve and pressure control valve maintenances. As a result, incorrect information's recorded that doesn't apply either for relief or pressure control valves. For example,*

- a. A “Lock-Up” pressure value is recorded for relief valve, where that value is the relief valve’s “Re-Seat” pressure.
Examples: - Stations 85-78.60S, 13.5, & GNN 38339
 - b. A “Lock-Up” pressure value is recorded for pressure control valve, where that value is the control valve’s “Re-Open” or “Dead Bend” pressure.
Example: - Station 7053-8.25S
- ii. During a review of the 2017 pressure limiting station maintenance records used in Bakersfield and Visalia districts, SED observed in majority of the records where the unit for “As-Found setting” recorded as “EA”, which stands for “EACH”, that needs to be corrected to “PSIG” in the future.

SCG RESPONSE:

- i. SoCalGas is in the process of revising Gas Standard 223.0345 and plans to develop a new process for documenting the pressure setting on the PRVs and the pressure limiting equipment.
- ii. This error in how the value was displayed in SAP was corrected on SIR15363 May 2018.

SED’s CONCLUSION:

SED has opted not to impose a fine or penalty since SCG created the necessary corrective action for i. and performed a corrective action for ii.