

**PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS INSPECTION
SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

Control Information

Inspection Start Date*:	04/12/2017	
Inspection End Date*:	04/12/2017	
OpID:	31096	
Parent Operator Name:	Georgia Pacific Consumer Product; Camas LLC	
Unit ID (s):	Georgia Pacific Corp. – Camas Mill	
State/Other ID:	NA	
Activity Record ID No.	NA	
Address of Company Official*: 401 NE Adams ST, Camas, WA 98607	Company Official*:	Joseph Ertolacci
	Title*:	Vice President
	Phone Number*:	(360) 834-8162 Office
	Fax Number:	
	Email Address*:	joseph.ertolacci@gapac.com
Web Site:		
Total Mileage (from page 3)*:	1 mi.	
Total Mileage in HCA:	.64 mi.	
Number of Services (For Distribution):	N/A	
Alternate MAOP (80% Rule):	N/A	
No. of Special Permits:	N/A	

Initial Date of Public Awareness Program*:	6/17/2006
Title of Current PAP*:	GP Camas Public Awareness Plan
Current PAP Version*:	Fifth Version
Current PAP Date*:	7/26/2012

Post Inspection Information	
Date Submitted for Approval:	
Director Approval:	
Approval Date:	

* *Required field*

PHMSA Form 21 Public Awareness Program Effectiveness Inspection, July 21, 2011, Rev 0

Persons Interviewed*	Title/Organization*	Phone Number	Email Address
Carson Blocker	Reliability Leader	(360) 834-8419	carson.blocker@gapac.com
Ron Simmons	GP Regulated Pipeline Manager	(404) 652-4608	ronald.simmons@gapac.com
Bob Cosentino	Cosentino Consulting Inc.	(360) 200-4959	bob@cosentinoconsulting.com

To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.

External Support Entity Name*	Part of Plan and/or Evaluation*	Phone Number	Email Address
UNC-Utility Notification Center 811			
PAPA			
Cathodic Protection Engineering			
Common Ground Alliance			
Clark County LEPC			
Clark Utilities Coordinating Council			

To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.

Inspector Representative(s)*	PHMSA/State*	Region/State*	Email Address	Lead*
Anthony Dorrrough	Washington	Western	adorroug@utc.wa.gov	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N
				<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N
				<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N
				<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N
				<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N

To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.

*** Required field**

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 are both gas and liquid lines, use the appropriate table for intrastate and/or interstate.

Jurisdictional to Part 192 (Gas) Mileage (Interstate)

Company Name (Gas Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Interstate Gathering Mileage*	Interstate Transmission Mileage	Interstate Distribution Mileage^*	Remarks (new or in HCA)
NA							

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

Jurisdictional to Part 192 (Gas) Mileage (Intrastate)

Company Name (Gas Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Intrastate Gathering Mileage*	Intrastate Transmission Mileage*	Intrastate Distribution Mileage^*	Remarks (new or in HCA)
Georgia Pacific Consumer Products Camas LLC	31096	Nat Gas	WA		1	.64	

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

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

Company Name (Liquid Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Interstate Transmission Mileage*	Remarks (new or in HCA~)
NA					

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

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

Company Name (Liquid Operator)	Operator ID	Product Type*	State*	Intrastate Transmission Mileage*	Remarks (new or in HCA~)
NA					

(To add rows, press TAB with cursor in last cell.)

Total Mileage:	Total Mileage 1
-----------------------	------------------------

- Supply company name and Operator ID, if not the master operator from the first page (i.e., for subsidiary companies).
 - Use OPS-assigned Operator ID. Where not applicable, leave blank or enter N/A
 - Use only 2-letter State codes, e.g., TX for Texas.
 - Enter number of applicable miles in applicable columns. (Only positive values. No need to enter 0 or N/A.)
- ^ Please do not include Service Line footage. This should only be MAINS.
 * Required Field
 ~ Use Total HCA as reported on annual reports.

Please provide a comment or explanation for each inspection 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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (h); § 195.440 (h))

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See Section 2 (Page 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP was notified April 17, 2007 there were two Clearinghouse deficiencies. These were addressed May 11, 2007 and were accepted by the WUTC on December 27, 2007. • PAP was submitted to PHMSA Clearinghouse on May 14, 2011 • The Georgia-Pacific Consumer Products (Camas) LLC Public Awareness Plan is presently administered onsite by Ron Simmons, Georgia Pacific, LLC Atlanta, GA with local coordination provided by Carson Blocker with support by Cosentino Consulting Inc. • The Georgia-Pacific Consumer Products (Camas) LLC Public Awareness Plan was submitted to the Public Awareness Program Clearinghouse (PHMSA) on June 19, 2006. <p>*Note: It was suggested by Staff and agreed upon by GP Camas to change the way it is shown that company personnel administers the PAP.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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)?

(Reference: § 192.616 (a); § 195.440 (a); API RP 1162 Section 2.5 and 7.1)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See Section 2 (Page 7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Resources: <p>-Jeremy Ness, <i>Vice President</i> - Management Support -Kristi Ward, <i>Public Affairs Manager</i> - Public Affairs Group -Carson Blocker, <i>Reliability Engineer</i> - Public Awareness Coordinator/Operations/Row Personnel -Ron Simmons, <i>GP Pipeline Manager</i> -Public Awareness Administrator -Rachell Walla, <i>Emergency Response Manager</i></p> <p>Utility Notification Center - One Call system Cathodic Protection Engineering (Roy Rogers) - Inspection Contractor Paradigm - Communications and Recordkeeping PAPA (Pipeline Association for Public Awareness) - Outreach Clark County LEPC - Outreach Clark County Utilities Coordinating Council – Outreach</p> <p>*Note: It was suggested by Staff and agreed upon by GP Camas to change the way it is shown which company personnel administers the PAP.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (b); § 195.440 (b); API RP 1162 Section 2.7 and Section 4)

- 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 station, valves, breakout tanks, odorizer).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See Item IV (Page 8)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	

<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

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

- 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See Section 5 (Page 9)
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Sections 3-5)

- Identify where in the operator’s PAP the combination of messages, delivery methods, and delivery frequencies are included for the following stakeholders:

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See Sections VII & VIII (Page 13)
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c), (i); § 195.440 (c), (i))

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See Section 11 (Page 18) See also table with Frequencies (Page 21)
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

1. 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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (g); § 195.440 (g); API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: • -Based upon the demographic composition of Camas/ Washougal Clark County area GP Camas messages are in English only. US Census Bureau Data from 2009-2013 was used to make this determination. The percentage of Non-English speaking population was less than 4.86%
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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)?

(Reference: § 192.616 (d); (f); § 195.440 (d), (f))

- 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.

Examples of GP Camas messages delivered:

Message	Type	Location
GP Newspaper Advertisements	Damage Prevention Leak/Damage Recognition One Call Requirements Potential Hazards	Post Record Newspaper (Camas/Washougal) Columbian Newspaper (South West Washington)
811 postcards PAPA handouts	Damage Prevention One Call Requirements	Paradigm
PAPA LEPC	Damage Prevention One Call Requirements	Paradigm PAPA
PAPA LEPC	Damage Prevention One Call Requirements ROW Encroachments	Paradigm PAPA
PAPA LEPC	Damage Prevention Leak/Damage Recognition Emergency Preparedness One Call Requirements Potential Hazards ROW Encroachments	PAPA G-P Mill
Mill email or newsletters		Camas Mill

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (e), (f); § 195.440 (e), (f))

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verified; Notification to these groups made once yearly. GP has a signed agreement with Paradigm to develop the distribution list of municipalities, school districts, businesses, residents and begin a direct mail program.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c))

- Identify message delivery (using the operator’s last five years of records) for the following stakeholder audiences:

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See Section 8 (Page 13)
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 6.2)

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

- Affected public
- Emergency officials
- Public officials
- Excavators

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See 2016 program evaluation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Program Enhancements:</u> -Face to Face contact with public & excavators -Newspaper Advertisements -Annual Paradigm mailings with reader response cards and statistical breakdown. -Membership in PAPA; New-member of National Excavators Intitative
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 4.4)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Emergency Response Plan is available to Responders, and mentioned in direct mailings and at meetings. • The expectations of Responders are to: 1) Secure the area to restrict access 2) Notify GP Camas The capabilities of the responders differ but the expectations remain the same. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is communicated through discussion and coordination with MERT • Emergency responders are mailed a copy of the GP Camas Public Awareness mailing.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

2. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Annual 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?

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See the 2016 Program Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GP Camas Public Awareness Program is reviewed annually by Cosentino Consulting Inc. (CCI); Reviewed copies of these reports.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See the 2016 Program Evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.3)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAP audit results were addressed May 11, 2007 and were accepted by the WUTC on December 27, 2007. Two changes were made; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The relevant factors for consideration of program enhancements were added
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	

	<p>to the plan.</p> <p>2. The inclusion of instructions on how to obtain additional information and NPMS information were added to the message content.</p> <p>In 2012 Paradigm was contracted as its direct mail provider to all stakeholders.</p>
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

3. Program Evaluation & Continuous Improvement (Effectiveness)

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See the 2016 Program Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An effectiveness evaluation was completed by CCI. It was reported that the program was achieving the expected results and changes were not recommended at that time.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1)

- 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See the 2016 Program Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GP Camas has implemented PAP outreach through contacts with the residents and business owners in the identified corridor near the pipeline. <p><i>One Call Advertising:</i> Camas is in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area and is the beneficiary of the advertising and public awareness activities of the Oregon and SW Washington UNC activities which include television and radio advertising promoting 811 and dig safety awareness. GP Camas places ads in local newspapers with pipeline safety messages. GP Camas attended local LEPC monthly program for Clark County, involved in MERT group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GP Camas has contracted Paradigm to conduct a survey with annual mailings.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616) (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1)

- 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments:</p> <p>See the 2016 Program Evaluation; Paradigm Report.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See the 2016 Program Evaluation; Paradigm Report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation was based on contact with stakeholder individuals located near the pipeline or in the HCA areas to measure the respondent’s comprehension of the messages and their demonstrated behavior.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.3)

- 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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	Comments: See the 2016 Program Evaluation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP Camas bases evaluation results, prevention behavior on these bottom line results. No unauthorized excavations. No damage. No leaks.
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	

Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 8.4.4)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments: See the 2016 Program Evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP Camas measures bottom line results by reviewing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number of excavation notifications/locate requests -Number of ROW encroachments -Number of incidents of damage -Number of leaks <p>For 2016 GP Camas will use Paradigms survey results.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

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?

(Reference: § 192.616 (c); § 195.440 (c); API RP 1162 Section 2.7 Step 12 and 8.5)

- 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S – Satisfactory (explain)*	<p>Comments: See the 2016 Program Evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP Camas is comprehensively assessing the PAP
<input type="checkbox"/> U - Unsatisfactory (explain)*	
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A - Not Applicable (explain)*	

<input type="checkbox"/> N/C – Not Checked (explain)*	and has engaged Paradigm to handle mailings and has implemented the CCI PAP for uniformity with other industrial pipelines in the region.
Check exactly one box above. * Required field	

4. Inspection Summary & Findings

5.01 Summary

Staff discussed with CCI recommendations for changes to the PAP that would enhance and improve the overall clarity of the document. A few of these suggested changes have been adopted by GP Camas (as referenced above) and will be incorporated into the next version of the PAP.

5.02 Findings

Staff found no apparent violations or areas of concern at this time.