Western Region Unit Information

Inspector or State Office: Kuang Chu/Washington State

SMART Activity #

Unit ID: 3675

Unit Name: WA-UTC/Redmond District

Operator ID: 13845

Operator Name: Northwest Pipeline Corporation

Unit Boundaries

Description:	Device:	Latitude:	Longitude:
The Williams Redmond District is bordered to the north by the Sumas District and is bordered to the south by the Battle Ground District. The district consists of 214 miles of right-of-way and 64 miles are in class 3 locations. There are 3 compressor stations at Snohomish, Sumner, and Tumwater. The 30" line runs through the entire district. The 36" line runs 12 miles from Snohomish to Sammamish and 25 miles from Ft. Lewis to Rainier			

Pre-Inspection

The information collected and documented here is in addition to other pre-inspection efforts [pulling unit summaries, SRCR's, Annual Reports, Accident/Incident Reports, previous PIM, Post-Inspection OQ & IMP reports, previous and outstanding enforcement actions, etc.]

The 8" North Seattle lateral has experienced near neutral SCC along the circumferential orientation. A leak was discovered during a hydrotest in October 2011 and a section of 300 feet long was replaced. The operator was not entirely convinced that it was SCC as the operating stress was only 40% SMYS and the cracks were not on axial orientation. They suspect the cracks were caused by pipe manufacturing process. The current IMP is to hydrotest the line every 7 years.

Baseline Information

1) If accidents or incidents have occurred in this unit, what has the operator done to prevent recurrence? *(select all that apply)*

☐ Added Equipment ☐ Procedural Change ☐ Engineering Barriers Added

☐ Removed Equipment ☐ Additional Training ☐ Other

Describe: No accidents or incidents occurred in this unit during the last 2 years.

2) Will these actions adequately mitigate threats? ○ Yes ○ No

Please Explain:

3) Have any abnormal events occurred in this unit? ○ Yes ◉ No

Describe Operator's Response:

4) Commodity Transported:

Liquid 1: Gas 1: Natural Gas

Liquid 2: Gas 2:

5) Year of Original Installation (yyyy): 1971, 2006(36") Pipe specification (e.g. API 5L, ASTM D2513) API 5L

6) Normal Operating Pressure (psig), min: 809 max: 960 % SMYS, max: varies

7) MOP/MAOP (psig), min: 809 max: 960 Changes in MOP/MAOP in previous year: ○ Increase ○ Decrease ◉ None

8) Seam Type: DSAW, ERW

9) Coating Type: FBE, Coal Tar Enamel

10) Overall Coating Quality: ○ Poor ○ Fair ◉ Good Coating Improvement Efforts: ◉ Yes ○ No

Describe:

11) Potential for AC Interference? ◉ Yes ○ No Has operator tested for stray current? ◉ Yes ○ No

12) Parallel Construction/Crossing? ◉ Yes ○ No Explain: The loop lines are parallel construction

13a) [Gas Only] Is there a monitoring program for liquids? ◉ Yes ○ No

Method: Liquid separator at the compressor stations.

Frequency: Continuous.

13b) [Liquid Only] Are there Dead Legs? ○ Yes ○ No

Explain:

14) [Liquid Only] Number of cycles: per ○ Day ○ Week ○ Month

Pressure range (psig):

15) Has equipment been deleted/added that changed the hydraulic profile of this line? ○ Yes ◉ No

Explain:

16) Level of automation: ○ Manual Control ◉ Local/SCADA ○ Remote/SCADA

17) Total unit mileage: 214.33

18) HCA-Affecting Mileage (% of total mileage):

High Population Area (%):	63.76
Other Population Area (%):	N/A
Drinking Water USA (%):	N/A
Ecological Resource USA (%):	N/A
Commercially Navigable Waterway (%):	N/A

19) Indicate the year of the most recent tool run and summarize results, including digs:

Tool Type	Year	Results Summary
Magnetic Flux Leakage	2011	One dig from Snohomish compressor station to Sumner
Geometry	2011	compressor station. No digs from Sumner compressor station to
		Chehalis compressor station.

Post-Inspection Information

20) Using your engineering judgement, describe how well is the manager addressing this unit's threats:

Corrosion Specific:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good
Equipment Specific:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good
Excavation Specific:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good
Human Error Specific:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good
Material/Weld Specific:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good
Natural Force Specific:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good
Overall:	○ Poor	○ Fair	◉ Good

Additional Assessments: