

PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM EFFECTIVE INSPECTION SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Control Information

INSPECTION START DATE: 8/26/2013
 INSPECTION END DATE: 8/26/2013
 OPERATOR ID: 31051
 OPERATOR NAME: TIDEWATER, INC
 STATE/OTHER ID: WA
 ACTIVITY RECORD ID NUMBER: 2645
 COMPANY OFFICIAL: Bill Collins
 COMPANY OFFICIAL STREET: 671 Tank Farm Rd
 COMPANY OFFICIAL CITY: Pasco
 COMPANY OFFICIAL STATE: WA
 COMPANY OFFICIAL ZIP: 99301
 COMPANY_OFFICIAL_TITLE: Director EHS&S
 PHONE NUMBER: (360) 759-0306
 FAX NUMBER:
 EMAIL ADDRESS: billcollins@tidewater.com
 WEB SITE:
 TOTAL MILEAGE: 7
 TOTAL MILEAGE IN HCA: 7
 NUMBER OF SERVICES (DISTR): 0
 ALTERNATE MAOP (80% RULE): na
 NUMBER OF SPECIAL PERMITS: 0
 INITIAL DATE OF PAP: 9/16/2006
 TITLE OF CURRENT PAP: Pipeline Operator PAP
 CURRENT PAP VERSION: 4
 CURRENT PAP DATE: 8/15/2013
 DATE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL: 9/11/2013
 DIRECTOR APPROVAL:
 APPROVAL DATE:

OPERATORS COVERED UNDER PROGRAM:

OPERATOR ID	NAME
31051	TIDEWATER, INC

UNITS COVERED UNDER PROGRAM:

UNIT ID	NAME
12565	PASCO BREAKOUT LINE/TANKS

PERSON INTERVIEWED	TITLE/ORGANIZATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Josh Jarman	Environmental, Health & Safety	(509) 547-7701	
Ron McClaryeran	erminals Maintenanfce S	(509) 544-2211	
Mark Davis	Terminals Operations Supr	(509) 396-1179	

ENTITY NAME	PART OF PLAN AND/OR EVALUATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Above & Below ground Consultant	Affected public mailing		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Emergency official mailing		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Evaluations		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Excavator mailing		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Implementation		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Local public official mailing		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Mailings		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Message content development		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Plan development		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Pre-test materials		
Above & Below ground Consultant	Public meetings		
Service Center Company	Affected public mailing		
Service Center Company	Emergency official mailing		
Service Center Company	Evaluations		
Service Center Company	Excavator mailing		
Service Center Company	Implementation		
Service Center Company	Local public official mailing		
Service Center Company	Mailings		
Service Center Company	Message content development		
Service Center Company	Plan development		
Service Center Company	Pre-test materials		
Service Center Company	Public meetings		

INSPECTOR REPRESENTATIVE(S)	PHMSA/STATE	REGION/STATE	EMAIL ADDRESS	LEAD
Rex Evans	State	IL		<input type="checkbox"/>
Patti Johnson	State	DC		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Mileage Covered by Public Awareness Program (by Company and State)

Based on the most recently submitted annual report, list each company and subsidiary separately, broken down by state (using 2-letter designation). Also list any new lines in operation that are not included on the most recent annual report. If a company has intrastate and/or interstate mileage in several states, use one row per state. If there both gas and liquid lines, use the appropriate table for intrastate and/or interstate.

Jurisdictional to Part 195 (Hazardous Liquid) Mileage (Intrastate)

NAME	OPERATOR ID	PRODUCT TYPE	STATE	TRANSMISSION		REMARKS
				INTRASTATE		
TIDEWATER, INC	31051	diesel/gas	WA	6.984		all of pipeline considered HCA by Tidewater

1. Supply company name and Operator ID, if not the master operator from the first page (i.e., for subsidiary companies).
2. Use OPS-assigned Operator ID. Where not applicable, leave blank or enter N/A
3. Use only 2-letter state codes in column #3, e.g., TX for Texas.
4. Enter number of applicable miles in all other columns. (Only positive values. No need to enter 0 or n/a.)
5. *Please do not include Service Line footage. This should only be MAINS.

Please provide a comment or explanation for inspection results for each question.

1. Administration and Development of Public Awareness Program

1.01 Written Public Education Program

Does the operator have a written continuing public education program or public awareness program (PAP) in accordance with the general program recommendations in the American Petroleum Institute’s (API) Recommended Practice (RP) 1162 (incorporated by reference), by the required date, except for master meter or petroleum gas system operators?

- Verify the operator has a written public awareness program (PAP).
- Review any Clearinghouse deficiencies and verify the operator addressed previous Clearinghouse deficiencies, if any, addressed in the operator’s PAP.
- Identify the location where the operator’s PAP is administered and which company personnel is designated to administer and manage the written program.
- Verify the date the public awareness program was initially developed and published.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (h); § 195.440 (h)

S - Satisfactory (explain)

U - Unsatisfactory (explain)

N/A - Not Applicable (explain)

N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Comment 1. Reviewed contact sheet.

Comment 2: New PAP version. Updated plan to version #5 form for consistency.

Bullet 1. Tidewater has a written PAP.

Bullet 2. Clearing House issues addressed.

Bullet 3. A. Location: Josh Jarman is administrator and PAP administered from Tidewater Pasco location. Josh Jarman name was added back into PAP during inspection in Section 1.4.

Bullet 4. 9/16/2006 PAP initially developed.

1.02 Management Support

Does the operator's program include a statement of management support (i.e., is there evidence of a commitment of participation, resources, and allocation of funding)?

- Verify the PAP includes a written statement of management support.
- Determine how management participates in the PAP.
- Verify that an individual is named and identified to administer the program with roles and responsibilities.
- Verify resources provided to implement public awareness are in the PAP. Determine how many employees involved with the PAP and what their roles are.
- Determine if the operator uses external support resources for any implementation or evaluation efforts.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (a); § 195.440 (a), API RP 1162 Section 2.5 and 7.1

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1. Written Management support statement Section 4.1.

Bullet 2. Added to Section 1.4 during inspection

Bullet 3. Section 1.4 contains the names employees, titles and identifies their roles and responsibility. Added during PAP inspection

Bullet 4. in support statement

Bullet 5. External Resources used. Added to PAP during inspection

1.03 Unique Attributes and Characteristics

Does the operator's program clearly define the specific pipeline assets or systems covered in the program and assess the unique attributes and characteristics of the pipeline and facilities?

- Verify the PAP includes all of the operator's system types/assets covered by PAP (gas, liquid, HVL, storage fields, gathering lines etc).
- Identify where in the PAP the unique attributes and characteristics of the pipeline and facilities are included (i.e. gas, liquids, compressor stations, valves, breakout tanks, odorizers).

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (b); § 195.440 (b), API RP 1162 Section 2.7 and Section 4

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1 and 2: cross referenced to O&M during PAP inspection.

1.04 Stakeholder Audience Identification

Does the operator's program establish methods to identify the individual stakeholders in the four affected stakeholder audience groups: (1) affected public, (2) emergency officials, (3) local public officials, and (4) excavators, as well as affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents?

- Identify how the operator determines stakeholder notification areas and distance on either side of the pipeline.
- Determine the process and/or data source used to identify each stakeholder audience.
- Select a location along the operator's system and verify the operator has a documented list of stakeholders consistent with the requirements and references noted above.

Affected public

Emergency officials

Public officials

Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (d), (e), (f); § 195.440 (d), (e), (f), API RP 1162 Section 2.2 and Section 3

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1. Section 2.2 for each stakeholder group

Bullet 2. Section 2.2

Bullet 3. Reviewed map, 660 feet either side, has list attached to map

1.05 Message Frequency and Message Delivery

Does the operator's program define the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies to comprehensively reach all affected stakeholder audiences in all areas in which the operator transports gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide?

- Identify where in the operator's PAP the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies are included for the following stakeholders: (1) affected public (2) emergency officials (3) local public officials, and (4) excavators.

Affected public

Emergency officials

Public officials

Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (f); § 195.440 (f), API RP 1162 Sections 3-5

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

section 2.5. Reviewed messages

DELIVERY FREQUENCY: Section 2.6, this includes land developers

1.06 Written Evaluation Plan

Does the operator's program include a written evaluation process that specifies how the operator will periodically evaluate program implementation and effectiveness? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Verify the operator has a written evaluation plan that specifies how the operator will conduct and evaluate self-assessments (annual audits) and effectiveness evaluations.
- Verify the operator's evaluation process specifies the correct frequency for annual audits (1 year) and effectiveness evaluations (no more than 4 years apart).
- Identify how the operator determined a statistical sample size and margin-of-error for stakeholder audiences surveys and feedback.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c),(i); § 195.440 (c),(i)

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1: page 9, section 2.8
uses phmsa check list for internal audit, audit procedure is found in PPM and procedure is cross referenced

Bullet 2:
Section 2.8

Bullet 3: Statistical sample size and margin of error added to PAP during inspection. Procedure Section 2.5

Comment: in previous standard inspection a probable violation was written for not providing PAP annual report documentation. So did not write again here. A 4 year evaluation was conducted in 2011.

2. Program Implementation

2.01 English and other Languages

Did the operator develop and deliver materials and messages in English and in other languages commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of non-English speaking populations in the operator's areas?

- Determine if the operator delivers material in languages other than English and if so, what languages.
- Identify the process the operator used to determine the need for additional languages for each stakeholder audience.
- Identify the source of information the operator used to determine the need for additional languages and the date the information was collected.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (g); § 195.440 (g), API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1: yes , section 2.5

Bullet 2: also section 2.5

Bullet 3: was 2010 census section 2.5. In 2013 started using both English and Spanish.

2.02 Message Type and Content

Did the messages the operator delivered specifically include provisions to educate the public, emergency officials, local public officials, and excavators on the:

- Use of a one-call notification system prior to excavation and other damage prevention activities;
 - Possible hazards associated with unintended releases from a gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide pipeline facility;
 - Physical indications of a possible release;
 - Steps to be taken for public safety in the event of a gas, hazardous liquid, or carbon dioxide pipeline release; and
 - Procedures to report such an event (to the operator)?
-
- Verify all required information was delivered to each of the primary stakeholder audiences.
 - Verify the phone number listed on message content is functional and clearly identifies the operator to the caller.

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (d), (f); § 195.440 (d), (f)

<input checked="" type="radio"/> S - Satisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/A - Not applicable (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/C - Not Checked (explain)
--

COMMENTS:
 Bullet 1-7: All information included. And Tidewater is a member of LEPC which have meeting with local fire departments, part of Franklin county emergency response plan - it on line. Tidewater conducts other activities such as spill drills and will include those in the annual report in the future

2.03 Messages on Pipeline Facility Locations

Did the operator develop and deliver messages to advise affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents of pipeline facility location?

- Verify that the operator developed and delivered messages advising municipalities, school districts, businesses, residents of pipeline facility locations.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (e)(f); § 195.440 (e)(f)

<input checked="" type="radio"/> S - Satisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/A - Not applicable (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/C - Not Checked (explain)
--

COMMENTS:
 Bullet: 1.
 Section 2.02

2.04 Baseline Message Delivery Frequency

Did the operator’s delivery for materials and messages meet or exceed the baseline frequencies specified in API RP 1162, Table 2-1 through Table 2.3? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Identify message delivery (using the operator’s last five years of records) for the following stakeholder audiences:
 - Affected public
 - Emergency officials
 - Public officials
 - Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c)

S - Satisfactory (explain)

U - Unsatisfactory (explain)

N/A - Not applicable (explain)

N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:
 Bullet 1. page 9, section 2.6

2.05 Considerations for Supplemental Program Enhancements

Did the operator consider, along all of its pipeline systems, relevant factors to determine the need for supplemental program enhancements as described in API RP 1162 for each stakeholder audience?

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

Determine if the operator has considered and/or included other relevant factors for supplemental enhancements.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 6.2

S - Satisfactory (explain)

U - Unsatisfactory (explain)

N/A - Not applicable (explain)

N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:
 supplement in section 3.2 - part of annual review procedure is to review all items in section 3.2

During inspection added that Tidewater considers all of pipeline an HCA

Section 3.4 is procedure for supplemental information and/or justification why no supplemental.

2.06 Maintaining Liaison with Emergency Response Officials

Did the operator establish and maintain liaison with appropriate fire, police, and other public officials to: learn the responsibility and resources of each government organization that may respond, acquaint the officials with the operator's ability in responding to a pipeline emergency, identify the types of pipeline emergencies of which the operator notifies the officials, and plan how the operator and other officials can engage in mutual assistance to minimize hazards to life or property?

- Examine the documentation to determine how the operator maintains a relationship with appropriate emergency officials.
- Verify the operator has made its emergency response plan available, as appropriate and necessary, to emergency response officials.
- Identify the operator's expectations for emergency responders and identify whether the expectations are the same for all locations or does it vary depending on locations.
- Identify how the operator determined the affected emergency response organizations have adequate and proper resources to respond.
- Identify how the operator ensures that information was communicated to emergency responders that did not attend training/information sessions by the operator.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c), § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 4.4

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
- U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- N/A - Not applicable (explain)
- N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

liason established thru LEPC.

Emergency response called intergritated continuity Plan. Plan is available to all emergency response officials thru LEPC

Bullet 1:

Maintains relation by drills ie

1. RevisewdSnake River Terminal Equipment
2. deployment drill.
3. local fire dept Frankland dist 3

Bullet 2: Emergeny plan has been made availabe PAP updated PAP to state that during inspection

Bullet 3 Expectations are the same since this is the only facility

Bullet 4; Tidewater uses NRC as its contractor. Use them because of other federal regulations and coast guard requirements. Having said that still drill with the fire department.

Bullet 5. The mailer is the only other item as well as LEPC meeting.

3. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Annual Implementation Audits)

3.01 Measuring Program Implementation

Has the operator performed an audit or review of its program implementation annually since it was developed? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Verify the operator performed an annual audit or review of the PAP for each implementation year.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c), (i); § 195.440 (c), (i), API RP 1162 Section 8.3

S - Satisfactory (explain)
 U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 N/A - Not applicable (explain)
 N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1. As mentioned probable violation written in last standard for no records of PAP annual report prior to 2013

Tidewater added procedure for annual and 4 year evaluation to PAP. Reviewed 2013 annual report - Not enough time for them to complete a 4 year evaluation yet. Will do follow up

3.02 Acceptable Methods for Program Implementation Audits

Did the operator use one or more of the three acceptable methods (i.e., internal assessment, 3rd-party contractor review, or regulatory inspections) to complete the annual audit or review of its program implementation? If not, did the operator provide valid justification for not using one of these methods?

• Determine how the operator conducts annual audits/reviews of its PAP.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.3

S - Satisfactory (explain)
 U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 N/A - Not applicable (explain)
 N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

bullet 1.2013 did internal assessment used form 21., section 2.8

2013

3.03 Program Changes and Improvements

Did the operator make changes to improve the program and/or the implementation process based on the results and findings of the annual audit? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

• Determine if the operator assessed the results of its annual PAP audit/review then developed and implemented changes in its program, as a result.

• If not, determine if the operator documented the results of its assessment and provided justification as to why no changes were needed.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.3

S - Satisfactory (explain)
 U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 N/A - Not applicable (explain)
 N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1 and 2: as a result of standard audit a new plan was written.

4. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Effectiveness Evaluations)

4.01 Evaluating Program Effectiveness

Did the operator perform an effectiveness evaluation of its program (or no more than 4 years following the effective date of program implementation) to assess its program effectiveness in all areas along all systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

• Verify the operator conducted an effectiveness evaluation of its program (or no more than 4 years following the effective date of program implementation).

• Document when the effectiveness evaluation was completed.

- Determine what method was used to perform the effectiveness evaluation (in-house, by 3rd party contractor, participation in and use the results of an industry group or trade association).
- Identify how the operator determined the sample sizes for audiences in performing its effectiveness evaluation.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP1162 Section 8.4

<input checked="" type="radio"/> S - Satisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/C - Not Checked (explain)
--

COMMENTS:

first 4 yr eval was conducted with documentation in 2011 but no report was generated. As mentioned probable violation written during previous standard inspection.

A. prior to 2011 85 mailers sent, and 10 feed back cards returned and the 2011 4 year based on that.

Bullet 1 - 2: 4 year evaluation procedure in PAP but no time since this new PAP written to conduct and document PAP.

Bullet 3 in house surveys

Bullet 4 margin of error and sample size determined in new PAP

4.02 Measure Program Outreach

In evaluating effectiveness, did the operator track actual program outreach for each stakeholder audience within all areas along all assets and systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Examine the process the operator used to track the number of individuals or entities reached within each intended stakeholder audience group.
- Determine the outreach method the operator used to perform the effectiveness evaluation (e.g., questionnaires, telephone surveys, etc).
- Determine how the operator determined the statistical sample size and margin-of-error for each of the four intended stakeholder audiences.

- [] Affected public
- [] Emergency officials
- [] Public officials
- [] Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1

<input checked="" type="radio"/> S - Satisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/C - Not Checked (explain)
--

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1: Everybody sent survey. Reviewed map and compared list.

Bullet 2: 2011 4 year reply cards (10 cards from 85 mailed)

Bullet 3: Statistical sample size and margin of error for each stakeholder group added to new PAP -

4.03 Measure Percentage Stakeholders Reached

Did the operator determine the percentage of the individual or entities actually reached within the target audience within all areas along all systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- Document how the operator determined the statistical sample size and margin-of-error for each of the four intended stakeholder audiences.
- Document how the operator estimated the percentage of individuals or entities actually reached within each intended stakeholder audience group.

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1

<input checked="" type="radio"/> S - Satisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/C - Not Checked (explain)
--

COMMENTS:
 prior to 2011 and the purchase of nu star only had 85 mailers Now with Nu star have approx 1637

 Bullet 1 and 2 in new PAP

4.04 Measure Understandability of Message Content

In evaluating effectiveness, did the operator assess the percentage of the intended stakeholder audiences that understood and retained the key information in the messages received, within all areas along all assets and systems covered by its program? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual? (Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.2)

- Examine the operator’s evaluation results and data to assess the percentage of the intended stakeholder audience that understood and retained the key information in each PAP message.
- Verify the operator assessed the percentage of the intended stakeholder audience that (1) understood and (2) retained the key information in each PAP message.
- Determine if the operator pre-tests materials.

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.2

<input type="radio"/> S - Satisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain) <input type="radio"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain) <input checked="" type="radio"/> N/C - Not Checked (explain)
--

COMMENTS:

 Bullet 1 and 2: Has not had time with new PAP to complete 4 year evaluation. For 2011, 4 year had documentation for bullets 1 and 2. Will conduct follow up inspection early in 2014 to verify written 4 year evaluation was completed

 Bullet 3. Pre test material in house.

4.05 Measure Desired Stakeholder Behavior

In evaluating its public awareness program effectiveness, did the operator attempt to determine whether appropriate preventive behaviors have been understood and are taking place when needed, and whether appropriate response and mitigative behaviors would occur and/or have occurred? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- ☑Examine the operator's evaluation results and data to determine if the stakeholders have demonstrated the intended learned behaviors.
- ☑Verify the operator determined whether appropriate prevention behaviors have been understood by the stakeholder audiences and if those behaviors are taking place or will take place when needed.

[] Affected public

[] Emergency officials

[] Public officials

[] Excavators

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.3

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullets 1 and 2. Determined in 2011 that stakeholders understood and demonstrated the intended learned behaviors.

4.06 Measure Bottom-Line Results

In evaluating its public awareness program effectiveness, did the operator attempt to measure bottom-line results of its program by tracking third-party incidents and consequences including: (1) near misses, (2) excavation damages resulting in pipeline failures, (3) excavation damages that do not result in pipeline failures? Did the operator consider other bottom-line measures, such as the affected public's perception of the safety of the operator's pipelines? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- ☑Examine the operator's process for measuring bottom-line results of its program.
- ☑Verify the operator measured bottom-line results by tracking third-party incidents and consequences.
- ☑Determine if the operator considered and attempted to measure other bottom-line measures, such as the affected public's perception of the safety of the operator's pipelines. If not, determine if the operator has provided justification in its program or procedural manual for not doing so.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 8.4.4

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
 - U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
 - N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
 - N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1 - 3: Tracking bottom line results in Section 2.8. This is accomplished by tracing third party damage. Tidewater has never had any third party damage.

4.07 Program Changes

Did the operator identify and document needed changes and/or modifications to its public awareness program(s) based on the results and findings of its program effectiveness evaluation? If not, did the operator provide justification in its program or procedural manual?

- ☑Examine the operator's program effectiveness evaluation findings.
- ☑Identify if the operator has a plan or procedure that outlines what changes were made.
- ☑Verify the operator identified and/or implemented improvements based on assessments and findings.

CODE REFERENCE: § 192.616 (c), § 195.440 (c), API RP 1162 Section 2.7 Step 12 and 8.5

- S - Satisfactory (explain)
- U - Unsatisfactory (explain)
- N/A - Not Applicable (explain)
- N/C - Not Checked (explain)

COMMENTS:

Bullet 1 - 2: As result of 2011 standard inspection a probable violation for not having a written a 4 year evaluation, the new PAP manual was written and implemented. During the same timeframe Tidewater purchased Nu Star and has included it into the PAP.

5. Inspection

SUMMARY:

2012 Tidewater purchased Nu Star. Tidewater revised their PAP. Prior to the new PAP, Tidewater had completed the requirements and provided documentation. However, Tidewater did prepare a written 4 year evaluation. As a result, a follow up inspection for only the 4 year evaluation will be conducted in 2014.

FINDINGS: