# G2 - HL Records & Field 8419

**UITC Standard Comprehensive Inspection Report**  
**Intrastate Hazardous Liquid**  
**FORM G2: State-Specific Requirements**

**NOTICE:** THIS FORM IS REQUIRED FOR USE FOR ALL INTRASTATE HL OPERATORS. USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE "BASELINE RECORDS, BASELINE FIELD OBSERVATIONS, AND BREAKOUT TANK INSPECTION" MODULES IN THE MOST CURRENT WA-SPECIFIC HL QUESTION SET

PRINT Form (select "save and keep working" first)  
PHMSA Advisory Bulletins

## Inspector and Operator Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection ID</th>
<th>Inspection Link</th>
<th>Inspector - lead</th>
<th>Inspector - Assist</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Records Location - City &amp; State</th>
<th>Inspection Start Date</th>
<th>Inspection Exit Interview Date</th>
<th>Engineer Submit Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8419</td>
<td>8419</td>
<td>Vinsel, Lex</td>
<td></td>
<td>BP NA</td>
<td>Cherry Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You must include the following in your inspection summary:

* Inspection Scope
* Facilities visited and Total AFOD
* Summary of Significant Findings

[8419]

**Inspection Scope** - Since last inspection (full year) and/or 3 years

**Facilities Visited and total AFOD**

- Pump Station
- Line # Crude
- Line # Butane

**Summary of Significant Findings**

## Instructions and Ratings Definitions

**INSTRUCTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S - Satisfactory</th>
<th>U - Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSPECTION RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory Responses</th>
<th>Remaining Unanswered Questions</th>
<th>Unanswered Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Area Of Concern** | **Area of Concern Responses** | **Area of Concern List**
--- | --- | ---
N/A - Not Applicable does not apply in this inspection | Not Applicable Responses | Not Applicable List
N/C - Not Checked/Evaluated (was not inspected during this inspection) | Not Checked / Evaluated Responses | Not Checked / Evaluated List

**Notes:** If an item is marked Area of Concern, Unsat, N/A, or N/C, an explanation must be included in the “Notes” block for that question, and summarized in the “Records: Required Comments” section.

### Records Review

### Mapping Records

**Question 1**
Do records indicate that the operator prepares, maintains, and provides to the commission upon request copies of maps, drawings, and records that pertain to their system? Are these documents in sufficient scale and detail to show size and type of material of all facilities?

**Q1 Reference**
WAC 480-75-600

**Q1 Result**

**Q1 Notes**

### Damage Prevention Records

**Question 2**
Does the operator have a quality assurance program in place for monitoring the locating and marking of facilities? Do records indicate that the operator conducts regular field audits of the performance of locators/contractors and take action when necessary?

**Q2 Reference**
PHMSA State Program Question

**Q2 Result**

**Q2 Notes**

**Question 3**
Do records indicate operator includes performance measures in facility locating services contracts with corresponding and meaningful incentives and penalties?

**Q3 Reference**
WAC 480-75-200

**Q3 Result**

**Q3 Notes**

**Question 4**
Do locate entities address performance problems for persons performing locating services through mechanisms such as retraining, process change, or changes in staffing levels?

**Q4 Reference**
WAC 480-75-200

**Q4 Result**

**Q4 Notes**

**Question 5**
Does the operator periodically review the Operator Qualification plan criteria and methods used to qualify personnel to perform locates?

**Q5 Reference**

**Q5 Result**
WAC 480-75-200

Q5 Notes

Records: Required Comments

RECORDS REVIEW SUMMARY: Comments are required for any rating other than "Satisfactory". Summarize the "Notes" blocks above, and ensure you annotate the question number for each comment.

Field Inspection Observations

Comments - Field Observations - Any rating other than Satisfactory requires comments. Ensure you annotate the question number for each comment.
Inspection Information

**Inspection Name:**
8419/8530 BP CP Crude/Butane

**Operator(s):**
BP PIPELINE (NORTH AMERICA) INC. (31189)

**Plan Submitted:**
6/1/2022

**Status:**
PLANNED

**Lead:**
Lex Vinsel

**Plan Approval:**
06/01/2022 by Scott Rukke

**Start Year:**
2022

**System Type:**
HL

**Observer(s):**
David Cullom, Dennis Ritter

**All Activity  Start:**
6/6/2022

**All Activity  End:**
6/10/2022

**Protocol Set ID:**
WA.HL.2022.01

**Supervisor:**
Scott Rukke

**Inspection Submitted:**
--

**Director:**
Sean Mayo

**Inspection Approval:**
--

**Inspection Summary:**
Validation report ran and plan approved 4/15/2022. Scott Rukke

4 remaining questions were answered based on existing information obtained from a second office visit and records review, and a validation report was ran on 8/3/2022. Scott Rukke

**Inspection Scope and Summary:**
The BP Crude/Butane system consists of two parallel pipelines:

- **Crude Oil Pipeline:**
  - 5 miles of 24-inch, 0.281", API 5L grade X-52, with an MOP of 698 psig.
  - Constructed with Class 600 flanges.
  - Built in 1970.
  - 1.8 miles of the length is in HCA’s (drinking water, other population).

- **Butane Pipeline:**
  - 5 miles of 6-inch, 0.188", API 5L grade B with an MOP of 285 psig limited by Class 150 flanges.
  - Normal operating pressure ranges from 100 psig to 179 psig.
  - Built in 1986.
  - 1.5 miles of the length are located in HCA’s (drinking water, ecological resource).

The 5-mile 24-inch Crude line starts at Lake Terrell Rd at the Kinder Morgan delivery and runs to BP Cherry Point Refinery.

The 5-mile 6-inch Butane line operates from Cherry Point Refinery to the Ferndale Terminal with the two breakout tanks operated by Alta Gas.

Field work (ROW) was conducted along the entire right of way length, both pipelines run parallel for most of their distance.

**Summary of Significant Findings:**
No violations or AOC’s were noted. One field observation was that the BP CP technician did not use a probe to determine if the casing of the rectifier was energized. The BP technician used the back of his hand to determine if voltage was present. It was recommended to BP that their field technicians use a probe for employee safety.

Also noted during this inspection was that BP has not provided their O&M manual to the WA UTC as required by the WAC.

It was discussed that they will provide this info on a secure web site with UTC access and this will be allowed.

**Primary Operator contacts and/or participants:**

**Jim Fraley**
DOT Compliance Advisor
Office: (360) 967-9494
Cell: (360) 316-4750

**Jim Bruen**
DOT Senior Compliance Advisor
Jim.bruen@bp.com
(630) 536 2535

**Jana Bruen**
Damage Prevention Program Manager
Jana.bruen@bp.com
(872) 245 2314

**Scope (Assets)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>Long Name</th>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Asset IDs</th>
<th>Excluded Topics</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>BP Cherry Point (Butane and Crude lines)</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Offshore</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Percent completion excludes unanswered questions planned as "always observe".

**Plans**

**Plan Implementations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>SMART Act#</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Focus Directives</th>
<th>Involved</th>
<th>Qst Type(s)</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Review</td>
<td>2022-01-01</td>
<td>06/06/2022</td>
<td>06/10/2022</td>
<td>all planned questions</td>
<td>all assets</td>
<td>all types</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>all assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Since questions may be implemented in multiple activities, but answered only once, questions may be represented more than once in the table.

2. Percent completion excludes unanswered questions planned as "always observe".

3. Question counts and completion percents are filtered to include only questions planned for and results applied to the filtered Assets.

**Forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Form Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Asset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## CR.CRMRR: Roles and Responsibilities

1. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

2. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

3. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

4. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

5. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

6. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

## CR.LD: Leak Detection (Non-CPM)

7. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

8. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

9. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
   - Yes, records were maintained.  
   - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

10. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

11. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

12. Are records of leak detection methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

## DC.CO: Construction

13. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

14. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

15. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

## DC.CO.CHP: Construction - Pump Stations

16. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

17. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

18. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.

19. Are records of construction methods maintained?  
    - Yes, records were maintained.  
    - No such activity/condition was observed during the scope of inspection.
Are welds being inspected to ensure compliance with the requirements of 195.260?

Are NDT activities performed in accordance with approved processes?

Do records indicate that pump stations are properly designed for adequate ventilation?

Do pumping stations have over-pressure safety devices and emergency shutdown capability?

Is fire protection installed at each pump station?

Do records demonstrate at least 10% of all welds are nondestructively tested over the entire circumference?

Are valves located as specified by 195.260?

Do records demonstrate 100% of the girth welds are nondestructively tested over their entire circumference?

Do pumps in system are under the control of the operator and at least 15.2 m (50 ft) from the boundary of the pump?
Do records indicate the operator filed a report?

No such activity/condition was observed during the time period.

Does the operator maintain qualification records?

No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the timely time period.

Are qualification records for contractor personnel covered tasks demonstrate adequate skills and knowledge?

(Operators OQ program manual)

Is pressure testing being adequately conducted?

No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the timely time period.

Is the leak detection system perform to the system design requirements?

(195.134(b), 195.134(c), 195.444(a), 195.444(b), 195.444(c))

Are pipeline maintenance construction and pipeline operations consistent with procedures to prevent damage to persons and property?

Reviewed test on 21Aug 22 for Crude line. No issues

Reviewed test on 11Mar22 for Butane line. No issues

Do pipeline system valves meet the requirements of ASME Pressure Vessel Code?

Section 6, ASME Boiler & Pressure Vessel Code Section IX)

(195.222(a) (195.222(b), 195.214(a), API-1104)

(195.222(a) (195.222(b), 195.214(a), API-1104)

(195.222(a) (195.222(b), 195.214(a), API-1104)

(195.222(a) (195.222(b), 195.214(a), API-1104)

(195.222(a) (195.222(b), 195.214(a), API-1104)
Reviewed Joseph Paquette training records. O&M Sat, EP.ERL.POSTEVNTREVIEW.R, 195.402(a) Do records indicate emergency communication
Do records indicate the operator provided training
Do records indicate receiving, identifying, locating.
NA, DC.WELDINSP.GIRTHWELDNDTUSED.R, Have annual reviews of the emergency response
Do emergency response supervisors demonstrate
NA, DC.WELDINSP.GIRTHWELDNDTLOCATE.R, Sat, EP.ETR.TRAININGSUPERVISE.R, 195.403(c)
Has the response plan been reviewed by a representative of the local fire and unless recommended by the local fire officials
Do records demonstrate 100% of the girth welds
Do records demonstrate that when installing used
OPA Plans are located on each field computer and
Sat, EP.ERL.NOTICES.R, 195.402(a) Note that these forms will be made available to
Reviewed documents were from a previous drill
NA, EP.ERL.COMMSYS.R, 195.408(b) Do records indicate verification that supervisors
Sat, EP.ETR.TRAININGREVIEW.R, 195.403(b) NA, EP.ERL.AUTHORITIES.R, 195.402(a) Do records demonstrate all girth welds installed
NA, EP.ETR.TRAININGSUPERVISE.O, 195.403(c) Do records indicate that liaison has been
Sat, EP.ERL.LOCATIONS.RECIP.R, 195.402(a) Do emergency response supervisors demonstrate
Do records indicate that notifications were made
Do records indicate verification that employees are knowledgeable of emergency response
Do records indicate verification that employees are knowledgeable of emergency response procedures for which they are responsible?
Appears adequate
Reviewed sample of revision log for Facility
Changes made as necessary to ensure it is effective?
Classifying and communicating notices of events requiring immediate response in accordance with
NA, EP.ERL.COMMSYS.R, 195.408(b) Table top drill will be August 11, in Castle Rock
REVIEW Notifications for fire, police, and public
the scope of inspection review.
No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No construction during time period
No construction during time period
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No construction during time period
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No construction during time period
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the scope of inspection review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Result Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are facilities adequately protected from vandalism?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there operator signs around each pumping station buildings?</td>
<td>Facilities have adequate signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has motive power, separate from pump station, been provided for that fire protection equipment?</td>
<td>Has adequate fire protection equipment been installed at pump station/breakout tank areas and is it maintained properly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are records of inspections of firefighting frame?</td>
<td>No smoking or open flames signs are posted on or near tanks or heads or at points of potential ignition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are records of inspections of firefighting equipment adequate?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do records document that steel atmospheric or low pressure tanks acceptable?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have warning devices that warn of the presence of flammable/combustible liquid or gas been installed at pump station/breakout tank areas and other applicable areas?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are routine in-service inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies documented during the scope of inspection review have been corrected?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have fire extinguishers been placed at the pump station, breakout tank area, and other applicable areas?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will routine ultrasonic thickness inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies found during inspections have been documented?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are records of inspections of firefighting equipment adequate?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do records indicate inspection and testing of each overpressure safety device on its non-HVL pipelines at intervals not to exceed 15 months, but at least once each calendar year?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has adequate ventilation been provided at pump station and is it maintained properly?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are records of inspections of firefighting overpressure safety device on HVL pipelines at intervals not to exceed 7.5 months, but at least overpressure safety device on its non-HVL pipelines at intervals not to exceed 15 months, but at least once each calendar year?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are records of inspections of firefighting equipment adequate?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there operator signs around each pumping station buildings?</td>
<td>Facilities have adequate signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has adequate fire protection equipment been installed at pump station/breakout tank areas and is it maintained properly?</td>
<td>Has adequate fire protection equipment been installed at pump station/breakout tank areas and is it maintained properly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are routine in-service inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies documented during the scope of inspection review have been corrected?</td>
<td>No such relevant facilities/equipment existed in the states of inspection review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do the pipeline system valves appear to be in satisfactory mechanical condition and to be functioning properly?

Are records indicating protection against ignitions and preventing static electricity, lightning, and stray currents during operation and maintenance?

Do records indicate each mainline valve was inspected and tested to their corresponding API or ASME standards or other applicable standards?

Are launchers and receivers equipped with relief vents and pressure/vacuum-relieving devices consistent with API Publication 2026?

Have aboveground breakout tanks been pressure tested to their corresponding API or ASME standards or other applicable standards?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Are records documenting the inspection and testing of relief valves on HVL pressure breakout tanks at the required interval? [Note: See MO.LMOPP #7]


does this appear to be handled as part of a polyurethane coating system?

FS.TS: Tanks and Storage

148. Question Result, ID, References

Do records document the inspection and testing of relief valves on HVL pressure breakout tanks at the required interval? [Note: See MO.LMOPP #7]

Are selected overfill protection systems on HVL pressure tanks acceptable?

Auscultation tests of in-service tanks is performed consistent with API Publication 2026?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Auscultation tests of in-service tanks is performed consistent with API Publication 2026?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Auscultation tests of in-service tanks is performed consistent with API Publication 2026?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Has a device for activating emergency shutdowns been designed, installed, and is it functioning properly?

Auscultation tests of in-service tanks is performed consistent with API Publication 2026?


does this appear to be handled as part of a polyurethane coating system?

FS.VA: Valves

111. Question Result, ID, References

Are pipeline system valves accessible and tested to their corresponding API or ASME standards or other applicable standards?

Auscultation tests of in-service tanks is performed consistent with API Publication 2026?
MO.LO: Liquid Pipeline Operations

114. Question: Have the over-pressure relief devices been inspected as required?
   Answer: Yes, inspected twice per calendar year 2019-2021.
   Result: Inspections performed as required.

115. Question: Are the pressure relief devices tested as required?
   Answer: Yes, tested.
   Result: Pressure relief devices tested as required.

116. Question: Is the non-over-pressure relief devices inspected as required?
   Answer: Yes, inspected as required.
   Result: Inspections performed as required.

MO.LMOPP: Liquid Pipeline Overpressure Protection

117. Question: Have the over-pressure relief devices been tested as required?
   Answer: Yes, tested.
   Result: Pressure relief devices tested as required.

118. Question: Have the non-over-pressure relief devices been inspected as required?
   Answer: Yes, inspected as required.
   Result: Inspections performed as required.

MO.LMOPP: Liquid Pipeline Overpressure Protection

119. Question: Have the surge analysis for Butane and Crude Lines been reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection.
   Answer: Yes, reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection.
   Result: Surge analysis reviewed.

120. Question: Have the surge analysis for Butane and Crude Lines been reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection?
   Answer: Yes, reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection.
   Result: Surge analysis reviewed.

MO.RW: ROW Markers, Patrols, Monitoring and Analysis

121. Question: Are the ROW markers located within the boundary of a controlled site?
   Answer: Yes, located within the boundary of a controlled site.
   Result: ROW markers located within the boundary of a controlled site.

122. Question: Are the ROW markers located within the boundary of a controlled site?
   Answer: Yes, located within the boundary of a controlled site.
   Result: ROW markers located within the boundary of a controlled site.

MO.ABNORMAL: Liquid Pipeline Abnormal Operations

123. Question: Are there any abnormal operations or indications of abnormal operations as required to be reported by the area supervisor?
   Answer: No, no abnormal operations or indications of abnormal operations.
   Result: No abnormal operations or indications of abnormal operations.

MO.RW: ROW Markers, Patrols, Monitoring and Analysis

124. Question: Are the ROW markers located within the boundary of a controlled site?
   Answer: Yes, located within the boundary of a controlled site.
   Result: ROW markers located within the boundary of a controlled site.

MO.LMOPP: Liquid Pipeline Overpressure Protection

125. Question: Have the surge analysis for Butane and Crude Lines been reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection?
   Answer: Yes, reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection.
   Result: Surge analysis reviewed.

126. Question: Have the surge analysis for Butane and Crude Lines been reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection?
   Answer: Yes, reviewed to ensure that the surge pressure was established in accordance with section on Launchers and Receivers Relief devices will be handled as part of a later inspection.
   Result: Surge analysis reviewed.
HO.RW. ROW Markers, Patrols, Monitoring and Analysis

129. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Do records indicate that depth of cover surveys were completed as required? 
Result Notes: Yes.Reviewed 5-year Depth of Cover survey on 08Jun22 prior to Field inspection.

HO.EW. Extreme Weather

131. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Do records identify the individual stakeholders in the event of a weather or natural disaster event? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

PD.DP. Damage Prevention

133. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Do records identify the process was followed for a change in class location periodically, but not less often than once every five years? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

PD.PA. Public Awareness

135. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Do records indicate that the operator conducted the abnormal operation effectiveness of the abnormal operation procedures and whether corrective actions were taken by operator personnel to determine the cause, rule out all possible causes, and then take the appropriate corrective actions? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

137. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Do records indicate that the operator reevaluated the requirement for hazard communication training as appropriate? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

139. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Did the pipeline facilities that were affected by an event? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

HO.LC. Liquid Conversion

141. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Does the pipeline facility have the capability to remove or exceed the baseline delivery frequencies (API RP 1162 Table 2-1)? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

Question Text: Are the pipeline facilities that were affected by an event? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

PD.DP: Damage Prevention
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HO.RW. ROW Markers, Patrols, Monitoring and Analysis

129. Question Result, ID, References
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HO.EW. Extreme Weather
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HO.LC. Liquid Conversion

141. Question Result, ID, References

Question Text: Does the pipeline facility have the capability to remove or exceed the baseline delivery frequencies (API RP 1162 Table 2-1)? 
Result Notes: Yes. 

Question Text: Are the pipeline facilities that were affected by an event? 
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142. Question Text: Did the operator attempt to measure bottom-line performance and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

143. Question Text: Has an annual self-evaluations of the program effectiveness been completed in 2020 and reviewed?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

144. Question Text: Have self-assessments been performed for 2014 to 2016?

Result Notes: No. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

145. Question Text: Were annual self-evaluations of the program effectiveness been completed in 2018 and 2020?

Result Notes: No. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

146. Question Text: Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of facility?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

147. Question Text: Are facilities adequately protected from vandalism and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

148. Question Text: Were materials and messages developed and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

149. Question Text: Has the contractor review, or regulatory inspections) used to complete the annual audit or review of the public awareness program implementation?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

150. Question Text: Was one or more of the three acceptable mitigation performed?

Result Notes: No. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

151. Question Text: Were needed changes and/or modifications to the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review.

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

152. Question Text: Were changes made to improve the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review.

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

153. Question Text: Was one or more of the three acceptable mitigation performed?

Result Notes: No. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

154. Question Text: Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of facility?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

155. Question Text: Are facilities adequately protected from vandalism and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

156. Question Text: Were materials and messages developed and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

157. Question Text: Has the contractor review, or regulatory inspections) used to complete the annual audit or review of the public awareness program implementation?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

158. Question Text: Was one or more of the three acceptable mitigation performed?

Result Notes: No. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

159. Question Text: Were needed changes and/or modifications to the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review.

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

160. Question Text: Were changes made to improve the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review.

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

**PD.RW: ROW Markers, Patrols, Monitoring**

161. Question Text: Did the operator attempt to measure bottom-line performance and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

**PD.SN: Facilities Signage and Security**

162. Question Text: Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of facility?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

163. Question Text: Are facilities adequately protected from vandalism and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)

164. Question Text: Were materials and messages developed and/or the implementation process based on the results of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Result Notes: Yes. Evaluation results are used to: (1) determine if the program identified and documented based on the scope of inspection review. 195.440(c) (API RP 1162 Section 2.3.1)
RPT.RR: Regulatory Reporting (Traditional)
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Pipe to soil reading appear adequate. After pipe
sat, TD.CPMONITOR.INTFRCURRENT.O, 2021 replaced ground bed.

Do records document the adequate re-evaluation
88979 (66)
reviewed in the field on 08Jun22

Reviewed records for 6-inch and 24-inch.

Sat, TD.CP.DEFICIENCY.R, 195.589(c)
88979 (66)

Sat, TD.CP.DEFICIENCY.R, 195.589(c)
88979 (66)

Sat, TD.CPMONITOR.CURRENTTEST.O,
Sat, TD.CPMONITOR.TESTLEADMAINT.R,
Sat, TD.CPMONITOR.CURRENTTEST.R,
All CP elements appear to be properly maintained
Test stations appear adequate

Sat, TD.CPMONITOR.TESTLEADINSTALL.R,
Test leads are adequate.

Are CP test lead wires properly maintained?

Sat, TD.CPMONITOR.TESTLEADMAINT.O,
Are areas of potential stray current identified,
NA, TD.CP.NEWOPERATE.R, 195.589(c)
Do records document adequate operator actions
Close interval survey was started 2020, and
Do records document adequate electrical isolation
Do records document, when circumstances
Sat, TD.CP.ISOLATE.O, 195.575(a) (195.575(b),
Do maps and or records document cathodic
Are measures performed to ensure electrical
No such event occurred, or condition existed, in
No such event occurred, or condition existed, in

TD.CPMONITOR: External Corrosion - Cathodic Protection Monitoring

184. Question Result, ID, References
183. Question Result, ID, References
181. Question Result, ID, References
180. Question Result, ID, References
179. Question Result, ID, References
177. Question Result, ID, References
175. Question Result, ID, References
174. Question Result, ID, References
169. Question Result, ID, References
168. Question Result, ID, References
167. Question Result, ID, References
165. Question Result, ID, References
164. Question Result, ID, References
161. Question Result, ID, References
160. Question Result, ID, References
158. Question Result, ID, References
157. Question Result, ID, References
156. Question Result, ID, References
155. Question Result, ID, References
154. Question Result, ID, References
153. Question Result, ID, References
152. Question Result, ID, References
151. Question Result, ID, References
150. Question Result, ID, References
149. Question Result, ID, References
148. Question Result, ID, References
Do records document adequate operator actions?

No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the status of inspection review.

Do records document that exposed buried piping?

No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.

Do records document that coatings for pipelines are adequately applied?

Do records document examination of removed pipe for evidence of internal corrosion?

No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the status of inspection review.

Are records complete or cannot be located?

No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the status of inspection review.

Do records document that corrosion inhibitors were adequately examined for corrosion and deteriorated coating?

Noted on R&I reports.

Do records document the adequate installation of protective coating?

No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the status of inspection review.

Do records document examination of removed pipe for evidence of corrosion and deteriorated coating?

No such event occurred, or condition existed, in the status of inspection review.

Verify that exposed buried piping is examined for corrosion and deteriorated coating.

No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.

Verify the qualification records are current, and that they accurately reflect the approved qualifications.

Sat, TD.ICP.INVEST.REMED.R, 195.589(c)

Verify the individuals performing covered tasks are cognizant of the AOCs that are applicable to the covered tasks.

Sat, TQ.PROT9.QUALIFICATION.STATUS.O, 195.501(a) (195.509(a))

Operator personnel are required to observe covered tasks in accordance with the contractor procedures.

Sat, TQ.PROT9.QUALIFICATION.STATUS.O, 195.501(a) (195.509(a))

Contractor procedures for probe for weight loss.

Is protective coating adequately applied?

No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.

Verify the qualification records are current, and that they accurately reflect the approved qualifications.

Sat, TD.CP.DEFICIENCY.R, 195.589(c)

Verify that exposed buried piping is examined for corrosion and deteriorated coating.

No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.

Verify that exposed buried piping is examined for corrosion and deteriorated coating.

No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.

Verify that exposed buried piping is examined for corrosion and deteriorated coating.

No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.
TQ.OQ: Operator Qualification

211. Question Result, ID, References
Sat, TQ.OQ.OQCONTRACTOR.R, 195.507(a)
(195.507(b))

Question Text
Are adequate records containing the required elements maintained for contractor personnel?

Assets Covered
88979 (66)

Result Notes
Records of operations appear adequate.

TQ.OQ: Qualification of Personnel - Specific Requirements

212. Question Result, ID, References
Sat, TQ.OQ.RECORDS.R, 195.507(a)
(195.507(b))

Question Text
Do records document the evaluation and qualifications of individuals performing covered tasks, and can the qualification of individuals performing covered tasks be verified?

Assets Covered
88979 (66)

Result Notes
Reviewed operator OQ records. Kevin Washington and Jerry Wismer

TQ.QU: Qualification of Personnel - Specific Requirements

213. Question Result, ID, References
Sat, TQ.QU.CORROSIONSUPERVISE.R, 195.589(c) (195.507(a), 195.507(b))
(also presented in: TD CP)

Question Text
Is qualification of supervisors in corrosion control procedures documented?

Assets Covered
88979 (66)

Result Notes
Reviewed certifications of Brian Stone

TQ.QUOMCONST: Qualification of Personnel - Specific Requirements (O and M Construction)

214. Question Result, ID, References
Sat, TQ.QUOMCONST.INSPECTORQUAL.R, 195.204

Question Text
Do records indicate adequate qualification documentation for personnel who conduct pipe or pipeline system construction inspections?

Assets Covered
88979 (66)

Result Notes
Reviewed records of Jim Cardell

TQ.TROMCONST: Training of Personnel - O and M Construction

215. Question Result, ID, References
NA, TQ.TROMCONST.NDT.R, 195.234(b)(2)

Question Text
Is training for personnel, who perform nondestructive testing of welds, documented and demonstrated?

Assets Covered
88979 (66)

Result Notes
No such activity/condition was observed during the inspection.

Except as required to be disclosed by law, any inspection documentation, including completed protocol forms, summary reports, executive summary reports, and enforcement documentation are for internal use only by federal or state pipeline safety regulators. Some inspection documentation may contain information which the operator considers to be confidential. In addition, supplemental inspection guidance and related documents in the library are also for internal use only by federal or state pipeline safety regulators (with the exception of documents published in the Federal Register, such as advisory bulletins). Do not distribute or otherwise disclose such material outside of the State or Federal pipeline regulatory organizations. Requests for such information from other government organizations (including, but not limited to, NTSB, ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Qst #</th>
<th>Question ID</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.CRMRR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CR.CRMRR.PRESSLIMITS.O</td>
<td>195.446(b)(2)</td>
<td>Are controllers aware of the current MOPs of all pipeline segments for which they are responsible, and have they been assigned the responsibility to maintain those pipelines at or below the MOP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CR.LD.EVAL.R</td>
<td>195.444(a) (195.444(b), 195.134(a), 195.134(b),)</td>
<td>Do records show that the operator evaluated the capability of its leak detection system to protect the public, property, and the environment and modified as necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR.LD.LDSYSTEM.R</td>
<td>195.404(c) (195.134(b), 195.444(b))</td>
<td>Do records demonstrate the operator's leak detection system is performing within the system design requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CR.LD.LDTRAINING.R</td>
<td>195.507(a) (195.507(b))</td>
<td>Do records show that pipeline controllers are trained to recognize leaks using the chosen leak detection method/system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CR.LD.LDTRAINING.O</td>
<td>195.505</td>
<td>Are the Pipeline Controllers trained to recognize leaks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CR.LD.ALARMDISPLAY.O</td>
<td>195.444(b)</td>
<td>Are the Leak Detection alarms adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>CR.LD.LDSTEST.R</td>
<td>195.134(b) (195.444(b))</td>
<td>Do records demonstrate the operator's leak detection system is performing within the system design requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CR.LD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CR.LD.LDSINSTRUMENT.R</td>
<td>195.444(b) (195.446(j))</td>
<td>Do records indicate the calibration of field instrumentation used in the leak detection system was performed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.CO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DC.CO.ASMECONSTRUCTION.R</td>
<td>195.265(a)</td>
<td>Are valves accessible to authorized employees and protected from damage or tampering?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.CO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>DC.CO.VALVEPROTECT.O</td>
<td>195.266(f) (195.260(a), 195.260(b), 195.260(c), 195.260(d), 195.260(e), 195.260(f))</td>
<td>Do records indicate that valves are located as specified by 195.260?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.CO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>DC.CO.VALLOCATION.R</td>
<td>195.260(a) (195.260(b), 195.260(c), 195.260(d), 195.260(e), 195.260(f))</td>
<td>Are valves located as specified by 195.260?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.CO</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>DC.CO.VALLOCATION.O</td>
<td>195.260(a) (195.260(b), 195.260(c), 195.260(d), 195.260(e), 195.260(f))</td>
<td>Are valves located as specified by 195.260?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.CO</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>DC.CO.RECORDS.R</td>
<td>195.266(a) (195.266(b), 195.266(c), 195.266(d), 195.266(e), 195.266(f))</td>
<td>Do records indicate that construction records are being maintained for the life of each pipeline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.VALVEPROTECT.O</td>
<td>195.258(a)</td>
<td>Are valves accessible to authorized employees and protected from damage or tampering?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.VALLOCATION.R</td>
<td>195.266(f) (195.260(a), 195.260(b), 195.260(c), 195.260(d), 195.260(e), 195.260(f))</td>
<td>Do records indicate that valves are located as specified by 195.260?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.VALLOCATION.O</td>
<td>195.260(a) (195.260(b), 195.260(c), 195.260(d), 195.260(e), 195.260(f))</td>
<td>Are valves located as specified by 195.260?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.PMPVENTILATE.O</td>
<td>195.262(a)</td>
<td>Is adequate ventilation provided in pump station buildings to prevent the accumulation of hazardous vapors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.PMPVAPOR.O</td>
<td>195.262(a)</td>
<td>Do pumping station buildings have devices to warn of the presence of hazardous vapors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td>Column 5</td>
<td>Column 6</td>
<td>Column 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.PMPOWERPRESS.O</td>
<td>195.262(b)</td>
<td>Do pumping stations have overpressure safety devices and emergency shutdown capability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.PMPROPERTY.R</td>
<td>195.262(d)</td>
<td>Do records indicate that pump stations are designed, sited, and constructed consistent with the requirements in WAC 480-75-380?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.PMPROPERTY.O</td>
<td>195.262(e)</td>
<td>Is pumping equipment installed on property that is under the control of the operator and at least 15.2 m (50 ft) from the boundary of the pump station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.COCMP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>DC.COCMP.PMPPROPERTY.O</td>
<td>195.228(a)</td>
<td>Do records indicate welds are inspected to ensure compliance with the requirements of 195.228?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.WELDINSPECT.R</td>
<td>195.234(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.WELDINSPECT.O</td>
<td>195.234(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.WELDNDT.R</td>
<td>195.234(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.WELDNDT.O</td>
<td>195.234(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.GIRTHWELDNDT.R</td>
<td>195.234(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.GIRTHWELDNDTLOCATE.R</td>
<td>195.234(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.GIRTHWELDNDTUSED.R</td>
<td>195.234(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>DC.WELDINSPI.GIRTHWELDNDTIEIN.R</td>
<td>195.214(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDERQUAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDERQUAL.WELDERQUAL.R</td>
<td>195.116(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.WELDPROCEDURE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>DC.WELDPROCEDURE.WELDPROCEDURE.R</td>
<td>195.116(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.DN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DC.DN.VALVE.O</td>
<td>195.116(h)</td>
<td>Does the leak detection system perform to the system design requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.DN</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>DC.DN.LDDESIGN.R</td>
<td>195.134(a)</td>
<td>Are pipeline maintenance construction and testing activities performed safely and in accordance with procedures to prevent damage to persons and property?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.DN</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>DC.DN.LDDESIGN.O</td>
<td>195.134(b)</td>
<td>Does the leak detection system perform to the system design requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>DC.MO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DC.MO.SAFETY.O</td>
<td>195.422(a)</td>
<td>Are pipeline maintenance construction and testing activities performed safely and in accordance with procedures to prevent damage to persons and property?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do records indicate that a study was prepared before moving or lowering a hazardous liquid pipeline?

Does the operator perform pipeline movements in accordance with 195.424?

Are pressure test records available and adequate?

Is pressure testing being adequately conducted?

Do records indicate pipe associated with tie-ins has been pressure tested?

Do records indicate the operator filed a report with the commission at least 45 days prior to pressure testing when increasing the MOP of the pipeline?

Are qualification records for contractor personnel maintained?

Do selected contractor individuals performing covered tasks demonstrate adequate skills and knowledge?

Does the operator maintain qualification records for operator personnel?

Do selected operator individuals performing covered tasks demonstrate adequate skills and knowledge?

Do records demonstrate individuals who oversee marking, trenching and backfilling operations are qualified?

Do selected individuals who oversee marking, trenching and backfilling operations demonstrate adequate skills and knowledge?

Do field observations confirm new aboveground atmospheric breakout tanks are designed and constructed to the specifications required by 195.132(b)(3)?

Do records indicate breakwater tanks were repaired, altered, or reconstructed in compliance with the requirements of 195.205(b)(1)?

Do field observations confirm new breakout tanks have cathodic protection installed in accordance with 195.565?

Do records indicate product level alarm devices were installed and set to alarm at a level above the normal and overfill protection levels in accordance with 195.428(c)?

Do field observations confirm product level alarm devices were installed and set to alarm at the design levels (level above the normal and overfill protection levels) in accordance with 195.428(c)?

Do field observations confirm the necessary firefighting equipment to respond to emergencies is included at the facility’s breakout tank area?
1. Do records indicate welding procedures and qualifying tests recorded in detail?
2. Do records indicate that welders are qualified in accordance with API-1104 or the ASME Boiler & Pressure Vessel Code?
3. Do records indicate welds are inspected to ensure compliance with the requirements of 195.228?
4. Are NDT activities performed in accordance with approved processes?
5. Do records demonstrate at least 10% of all welds that are made by each welder during each welding day are nondestructively tested over the entire circumference of the welds or that more welds are tested per the operator’s own procedures?
6. Do records demonstrate all girth welds installed each day in selected locations specified in 195.234(e) are nondestructively tested over their entire circumference?
7. Do records demonstrate that when installing used pipe, 100% of the old girth welds are nondestructively tested?
8. Do records demonstrate 100% of the girth welds have been nondestructively tested at selected pipe tie-ins?
9. Is the response plan maintained at required locations?
10. Are appropriate parts of the manual kept at locations where operations and maintenance activities are conducted?
11. Do records indicate that liaison has been established and maintained with appropriate fire, police, public officials, and utility owners?
12. Do records indicate receiving, identifying, classifying and communicating notices of events requiring immediate response in accordance with procedures?
13. Do records indicate that notifications were made to fire, police, and other appropriate public officials of hazardous liquid emergencies and were coordinated with preplanned and actual responses (including additional precautions necessary for an emergency involving HVLs)?
14. Do records indicate post-accident reviews of employee activities were performed to determine whether the procedures were effective in each emergency and take corrective action where deficiencies are found?
Do records indicate emergency communication system(s) use was as required?

Do records indicate the operator provided training to its emergency response personnel as required?

Have annual reviews of the emergency response training program been conducted and appropriate changes made as necessary to ensure it is effective?

Do records indicate verification that supervisors are knowledgeable of emergency response procedures for which they are responsible?

Do emergency response supervisors demonstrate adequate skills and knowledge?

Do records document that breakout tanks that are not steel atmospheric or low pressure tanks or HVL steel tanks built according to API 2510 have been inspected at the proper interval and that deficiencies found during inspections have been corrected?

Do records document that steel atmospheric or low pressure breakout tanks have received routine in-service inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies found during inspections have been documented?

Do records document that steel atmospheric or low pressure breakout tanks have received external inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies documented during inspections have been corrected within a reasonable time frame?

Do records document that steel atmospheric or low pressure breakout tanks have received ultrasonic thickness inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies found during inspections have been documented?

Do records document that steel atmospheric or low pressure breakout tanks have received formal internal inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies found during inspections have been documented?

Do records document that in-service pressure steel aboveground breakout tanks built to API Standard 2510 received visual external inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies found have been corrected?

Do records document that in-service pressure steel aboveground breakout tanks built to API Standard 2510 received internal inspections at the required intervals and that deficiencies found have been corrected?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Question or Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 FS.TSAPIINSPECT</td>
<td>18 FS.TS.BOINSPECTION.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 FS.FG</td>
<td>1 FS.FG.FACPROMOTE.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 FS.FG</td>
<td>2 FS.FG.IGNITION.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 FS.FG</td>
<td>4 FS.FG.SIGNAGE.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>FS.FG</td>
<td>9 FS.FG.FIREPROT.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.FG</td>
<td>10 FS.FG.FIREPROT.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.FG</td>
<td>11 FS.FG.PSFIREPROTPWR.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 FS.PS</td>
<td>2 MO.LMOPP.PRESSREGTEST.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 FS.PS</td>
<td>3 MO.LMOPP.PRESSREGTESTHVL.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.PS</td>
<td>4 FS.PS.VENTILATION.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.PS</td>
<td>6 FS.PS.VAPORALARM.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2 FS.PS</td>
<td>7 MO.LMOPP.PRESSREGTEST.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.PS</td>
<td>8 FS.PS.PSES.D.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.PS</td>
<td>9 FS.PS.PSAUXPWR.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.PS</td>
<td>10 FS.PS.PSLOCATION.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 FS.PS</td>
<td>13 MO.LMOPP.LAUNCHRECIVRELIEF.O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.TS</td>
<td>4 FS.TS.PRVTESTHVLBO.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>88979</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FS.TS</td>
<td>5 FS.TS.PRVTESTHVLBO.O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do records document the inspection and testing of overfill protection devices on aboveground breakout tanks at the required interval? [Note: This question applies to both non-HVL and HVL pressure breakout tanks.]

Do selected overfill protection systems on aboveground breakout tanks that were constructed or significantly altered after October 2, 2000 function properly and are they in good mechanical condition? [Note: This question applies to both non-HVL and HVL pressure breakout tanks.]

Is the condition of steel atmospheric or low pressure tanks acceptable?

Do records indicate protection against ignitions arising out of static electricity, lightning, and stray currents during operation and maintenance activities of aboveground breakout tanks?

Do records indicate access/egress onto floating roofs of in-service aboveground breakout tanks to perform inspection, service, maintenance, or repair activities of in-service tanks is performed consistent with API Publication 2026?

If a breakout tank first went into service after October 2, 2000 do records indicate it has an adequate impoundment?

If a breakout tank first went into service after October 2, 2000 does it have an adequate impoundment?

Do records indicate that normal/emergency relief venting and pressure/vacuum-relieving devices installed on aboveground breakout tanks after October 2, 2000 are adequate?

Have aboveground breakout tanks been pressure tested to their corresponding API or ASME Standard or Specification and do pressure test records contain the required information?

Do records indicate each mainline valve was inspected as required?

Do the pipeline system valves appear to be in good working order and are they protected from unauthorized operation?

Do records indicate annual reviews of the written procedures in the manual were conducted as required?

Do records indicate current maps and records of the pipeline system are maintained and made available as necessary?

Do records indicate periodic review of the work done by operator personnel to determine the effectiveness of the procedures used in normal operation and maintenance and corrective action taken where deficiencies are found?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>MO.LMOP</td>
<td>PRESSREGTEST.R</td>
<td>195.404(c) (195.428(a))</td>
<td>Do records indicate inspection and testing of each overpressure safety device on its non-HVL pipelines at intervals not to exceed 15 months, but at least once each calendar year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>MO.LMOP</td>
<td>MOPDETERMINE.R</td>
<td>195.402(c)(3) (195.406(a), 195.406(b), 195.302(b), 195.302(c))</td>
<td>Do records indicate the maximum operating pressure was established in accordance with 195.406?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>MO.LMOP</td>
<td>PRESSREGTESTHVLR.R</td>
<td>195.404(c) (195.428(a))</td>
<td>Do records indicate inspection and testing of each overpressure safety device on HVL pipelines at intervals not to exceed 7.5 months, but at least twice each calendar year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>MO.LMOP</td>
<td>PRESSREGTEST.O</td>
<td>195.428(a)</td>
<td>Are inspections of overpressure safety devices adequate (including HVL lines)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>MO.LMOP</td>
<td>LAUNCHRECVRELIEF.O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are launchers and receivers equipped with relief devices? Do records indicate that a surge analysis was completed to ensure that the surge pressure does not exceed one hundred ten percent of the MOP? Do records indicate ROW surface conditions and crossings under navigable waterways were inspected, and reporting and appropriate mitigation performed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>MO.LMOP</td>
<td>VALVEMAINT.R</td>
<td>195.404(c) (195.420(a), 195.420(b))</td>
<td>Do records indicate each mainline valve was inspected as required? Do records indicate operator’s personnel responded to indications of abnormal operations as required by the written procedures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>MO.RW</td>
<td>PATROL.R</td>
<td>195.412(a) (195.412(b))</td>
<td>Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of patrolling used? Are line markers placed and maintained as required? Do the pipeline system valves appear to be in good working order and are they protected from unauthorized operation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>MO.ABNORMAL</td>
<td>ABNORMAL.REVIEW.R</td>
<td>195.404(b) (195.402(d)(1))</td>
<td>Do records indicate post-event reviews of actions taken by operator personnel to determine the effectiveness of the abnormal operation procedures and whether corrective actions were taken where deficiencies were found?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>MO.RW</td>
<td>ROWCONDITION.O</td>
<td>195.412(a)</td>
<td>Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of patrolling used? Do records indicate each mainline valve was inspected as required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>MO.LM</td>
<td>VALVEMAINT.R</td>
<td>195.404(c) (195.420(a), 195.420(b))</td>
<td>Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of patrolling used? Do records indicate each mainline valve was inspected as required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>MO.RW</td>
<td>ROWMARKER.O</td>
<td>195.410(a) (195.410(b), 195.410(c))</td>
<td>Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of patrolling used? Are line markers placed and maintained as required? Do the pipeline system valves appear to be in good working order and are they protected from unauthorized operation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>MO.LM</td>
<td>VALVEMAINT.O</td>
<td>195.420(a) (195.420(c))</td>
<td>Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of patrolling used? Are line markers placed and maintained as required? Do the pipeline system valves appear to be in good working order and are they protected from unauthorized operation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>MO.ABNORMAL</td>
<td>ABNORMAL.REVIEW.R</td>
<td>195.404(b) (195.402(d)(5))</td>
<td>Do records indicate post-event reviews of actions taken by operator personnel to determine the effectiveness of the abnormal operation procedures and whether corrective actions were taken where deficiencies were found?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>MO.RW</td>
<td>DEPTHSURVEY.R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do records indicate that depth of cover surveys were completed as required by WAC 480-75-640? Do records indicate that the operator reevaluated class location periodically, but not less often than once every five years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>MO.RW</td>
<td>CHANGEINCLASS.R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do records indicate that depth of cover surveys were completed as required by WAC 480-75-640? Do records indicate that the operator reevaluated class location periodically, but not less often than once every five years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>MO.LC</td>
<td>CONVERSION.R</td>
<td>195.5(c) (195.5(a), 195.5(d))</td>
<td>Do records indicate that depth of cover surveys were completed as required by WAC 480-75-640? Do records indicate that the operator reevaluated class location periodically, but not less often than once every five years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>MO.EW</td>
<td>EXTWEATHERINSPIMPL.R</td>
<td>195.404(c) (195.414(a), 195.414(b), 195.414(c), 195.414(d))</td>
<td>Do records indicate the operator conducted the required inspection following and extreme weather or natural disaster event? Are the pipeline facilities that were affected by an extreme weather or natural disaster event back to a safe operating condition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>MO.EW</td>
<td>EXTWEATHERINSPSAFE.O</td>
<td>195.414(d)</td>
<td>Do records indicate the operator conducted the required inspection following and extreme weather or natural disaster event? Are the pipeline facilities that were affected by an extreme weather or natural disaster event back to a safe operating condition?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do records indicate the damage prevention program is being carried out as written?

Do records indicate that the operator provides the required information to excavators who damage pipeline facilities?

Do records indicate the operator reports to the commission when the operator or its contractor observes or becomes aware of the activities described in WAC 480-75-630(6)?

Do records indicate hazardous liquid pipeline locations have been marked in the timeframe outlined in RCW 19.122?

Do records 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 to which it sends public awareness materials and messages?

Did delivered messages specifically include provisions to educate the public, emergency officials, local public officials, and excavators on: (1) Use of a one-call notification system prior to excavation and other damage prevention activities; (2) Possible hazards associated with unintended releases from a hazardous liquid or carbon dioxide pipeline facility; (3) Physical indications of a possible release; (4) Steps to be taken for public safety in the event of a hazardous liquid or carbon dioxide pipeline release; and (5) Procedures to report such an event?

Were messages developed and delivered to advise affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents of pipeline facility location?

Did the delivery of materials and messages meet or exceed the baseline delivery frequencies specified in API RP 1162, Table 2-1?

Do records indicate that liaison has been established and maintained with appropriate fire, police, public officials, and utility owners?

Were materials and messages developed and delivered in other languages commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of non-English speaking populations in the operator’s areas?

Has an audit or review of the public awareness program implementation been performed annually since the program was developed?
Was one or more of the three acceptable methods (i.e., internal assessment, 3rd-party contractor review, or regulatory inspections) used to complete the annual audit or review of the public awareness program implementation?

Were changes made to improve the program and/or the implementation process based on the results and findings of the annual audit(s)?

Have effectiveness evaluation(s) of the program been performed for all stakeholder groups in all notification areas along all systems covered by the program?

In evaluating effectiveness, was actual program outreach for each stakeholder audience tracked?

In evaluating program effectiveness, was the percentage of each stakeholder audience that understood and retained the key information from the messages determined?

In evaluating program effectiveness, was evaluation made of whether appropriate preventive, response, and mitigative behaviors were understood and likely to be exhibited?

Were needed changes and/or modifications to the program identified and documented based on the results and findings of the program effectiveness evaluations?

Do records indicate ROW surface conditions and crossings under navigable waterways were inspected, and reporting and appropriate mitigation performed?

Are the ROW conditions acceptable for the type of patrolling used?

Are line markers placed and maintained as required?

Are facilities adequately protected from vandalism and unauthorized entry?

Is there signage that prohibits smoking and open flames around pump stations, launchers and receivers, breakout tank areas, or other applicable facilities?

Are there operator signs around each pumping station, breakout tank area, and other applicable facilities?

Do the records indicate that complete and accurate Annual Reports have been submitted?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>RPT.RR.9</td>
<td>Do Annual Reports include applicable information for gravity lines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>RPT.RR.11</td>
<td>Do Annual Reports include applicable information for regulated-only gathering lines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>RPT.RR.13</td>
<td>Do records indicate the original accident reports were filed as required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>RPT.RR.15</td>
<td>Do records indicate accurate supplemental accident reports were filed and within the required timeframe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>RPT.RR.17</td>
<td>Do records indicate immediate notifications of accidents were made in accordance with 195.52?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>RPT.RR.21</td>
<td>Do records indicate Safety-Related Condition Reports were filed as required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>RPT.RR.26</td>
<td>Do records indicate immediate notifications of accidents were made in accordance with 195.52?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>RPT.RR.27</td>
<td>Do records indicate that accurate maps (or updates) are provided for pipelines operating over 250 PSIG to specifications developed by the commission and sufficient to meet the needs of first responders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>RPT.RR.31</td>
<td>Do records indicate operator has reported all construction of new pipelines intended to operate at 20% SMYS or greater at or before June 15, representing all in service, idle and retired assets as of December 31 of the previous year, and if no modifications occurred an email to that effect was submitted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>RPT.RR.33</td>
<td>Do records indicate the operator has submitted reports of damage to the commission using the Damage Information Reporting Tool (DIRT) within 45 days?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>TD.ATM.4</td>
<td>Do records document inspection of aboveground pipe exposed to atmospheric corrosion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>TD.ATM.5</td>
<td>Is aboveground pipe that is exposed to atmospheric corrosion protected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>TD.CPBO.3</td>
<td>Do records adequately document when and how cathodic protection systems were inspected on breakout tanks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>TD.CPBO.4</td>
<td>Are cathodic protection monitoring tests performed correctly on breakout tank bottoms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>TD.CPBO.6</td>
<td>Do records document adequate operator actions taken to correct any identified deficiencies in break out tank corrosion control?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>2 TD.CP</td>
<td>Is qualification of supervisors in corrosion control procedures documented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>TD.CP.6</td>
<td>Do records document when cathodic protection was operational on constructed, relocated, replaced, converted to service, or otherwise changed pipelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 88979 (66)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>TD.CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>3 TD.CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>2 TD.CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189 88979 (66)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>TD.CPMONITOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do records document that the operator has an effective program in place to minimize the detrimental effects of interference currents on their pipeline system, and is minimizing detrimental effects of interference currents from their CP systems on other underground metallic structures?

Are areas of potential stray current identified, and if found, the detrimental effects of stray currents minimized?

Do records document adequate operator actions taken to correct any identified deficiencies in corrosion control? Do maps and or records document cathodic protection system appurtenances that have been installed on pipelines that have been constructed, relocated, replaced, or otherwise changed or been converted to hazardous liquid service?

Do records indicate that the operator electrically inspected all new coated pipe using a holiday detector? Do records document that coatings for pipelines constructed, relocated, replaced, or otherwise changed meet the requirements of §195.559?

Do records document that pipelines that have been converted to liquid service and were constructed after the applicable date in §195.401(c) have external coating?

Is protective coating adequately applied?

Do records document the repair or replacement of pipe that has been externally corroded to an extent that there is not sufficient remaining pipe wall strength?

Do records document adequate operator actions taken to correct any identified deficiencies in corrosion control? Do records document investigation and mitigation of the corrosive effects of hazardous liquids or carbon dioxide being transported?

Do records document that corrosion inhibitors have been used in sufficient quantity?

Do records document examination of removed pipe for evidence of internal corrosion?

Do records document the adequate installation of breakout tank bottom linings?
Verify the qualified individuals performed the observed covered tasks in accordance with the operator’s procedures or operator approved contractor procedures.
Verify the individuals performing the observed covered tasks are currently qualified to perform the covered tasks.
Verify the individuals performing covered tasks are cognizant of the AOCs that are applicable to the tasks observed.
Verify the qualification records are current, and ensure the personal identification of all individuals performing covered tasks are checked, prior to task performance.

Have potential issues identified by the OQ plan inspection process been corrected at the operational level?
Are adequate records containing the required elements maintained for contractor personnel?
Do records document the evaluation and qualifications of individuals performing covered tasks, and can the qualification of individuals performing covered tasks be verified?

Is qualification of supervisors in corrosion control procedures documented?
Do records indicate adequate qualification documentation for personnel who conduct pipe or pipeline system construction inspections?
Is training for personnel, who perform nondestructive testing of welds, documented and demonstrated?

1. Result is repeated (N) times in this report due to re-presentation of the question in multiple sub-groups.

Except as required to be disclosed by law, any inspection documentation, including completed protocol forms, summary reports, executive summary reports, and enforcement documentation are for internal use only by federal or state pipeline safety regulators. Some inspection documentation may contain information which the operator considers to be confidential. In addition, supplemental inspection guidance and related documents in the file library are also for internal use only by federal or state pipeline safety regulators (with the exception of documents published in the federal register, such as advisory bulletins).