UTC Standard Annual Review Inspection Report Intrastate Operators FORM A: Annual Review

Inspector and Operator Information

Inspection ID Inspection Link Inspector - Lead Inspector - Assist 8631 8631 Derek Norwood Hoxit, Jason

Operator Unit Records Location - City & State

Seaport Sound Terminal HQ Tacoma, WA Inspection Start Date Inspection Exit Interview Date Engineer Submit Date

11-08-2023 11-08-2023 11-27-2023

Inspection Summary

You must include the following in your inspection summary:

- *Inspection Scope and Summary
- *Facilities visited and Total AFOD
- * Summary of Significant Findings
- * Primary Operator contacts and/or participants

Inspection Scope and Summary
Inspection conducted at Seaport Sound Terminal in Tacoma. Reviewed annual reports, changes to procedures and damage prevention data. The most significant change to manuals was to the CRM plan based on findings from a previous inspection. No concerns or probable violations as a result of this inspection

Facilities visited and Total AFOD

Inspection completed at Seaport Sound Terminal, no facilities visited.

Summary of Significant Findings No concerns or probable violations as a result of this inspection

Primary Operator contacts and/or participants

Ted Lilyeblade

Rob Cohee

Instructions and Ratings Definitions

INSPECTION RESULTS: Annual Review

Satisfactory Responses Satisfactory List Number of Unanswered Questions Unanswered 1,3,8,14,15,16,17,24,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,37,

Unsatisfactory Responses Unsatisfactory List

0

Area of Concern Responses Area of Concern List

0

Not Applicable List Not Applicable Responses

22 4,5,6,7,9,10,11,12,13,18,19,20,21,22,23,25,35,39,40,42,43,44

Yes List No List Yes Responses No Responses 36. 3 34,38,41

Not Checked / Evaluated Responses Not Checked / Evaluated List

o

ANNUAL REPORT: ACCURACY/TRENDS

Question #1. 1. Result Was the Annual Report reviewed for accuracy and trends? If any trends were discovered, Satisfactory

1. Notes

please describe.

Reviewed annual report from 2022, data was accurate and consistent year to year, no trends

Access to Complete Distribution Annual Report

Year	Operator	SYSTEM TOTAL Miles of Main	Miles of Service	SYSTEM TOTAL NO. of Services	Average Service Length
No Repo					

Access to	Complete	Transmission	Annual	Report

7 tocos to complete nanomission 7 amaan teport									
YEAR	Operator	Commodity Group	Total Total Miles						
No Report records found									

Access to Complete Hazardous Liquid Annual

Report		
YEAR	Operator	Commodity Group
No Repor		

DAMAGE PREVENTION

Annual Report Damage Prevention data

	Year	Operator	Number of Excavation Tickets	Total Number of Excavation Damages By Apparent Root Cause:	Locating Practices Not Sufficient:	One-Call Notification Practices Not Sufficient:	Excavation Practices Not Sufficient:	Other:	Number of Services	Total Leaks - Excavation Damage	Total Main Leaks	Miles of Service MAIN	Number of Leaks per Mile of MAIN	Tc Lea 1,0 Loca
--	------	----------	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------	---	--------------------------

No Damages records found

^{**}If an item is marked Unsat, AOC, N/A, or N/C, an explanation must be included in the "Notes" block for that question and also summarized in the "SUMMARY OF REQUIRED COMMENTS" section at the end of this inspection form.

Damage Cause	Number of Reports		SubmitCompanyID - UTC	CfinalName	Number of Reports				
No Report records fo			No Report records found		Reports				
Question #2.									
Review the following	damage prevent	tion items:							
Q2. Is the damage provided Yes, no damages	evention informa	ation in the annual report complete?	$\mbox{\bf Q2.b.}$ Is the annual report damages root cause information complete and accurate? N/A, no damages						
02 4 D#			00 - 1-4		e				
N/A, no such events l		ess to evaluate the cause of "Locating practices not sufficient" category?	Q2.e. Is the operator or its or RECON contracted for locatin						
Q2.g. What is the nu	mber of damages	s resulting from mismarks?	Q2.h. What is the number of	damages resu	ılting from not loc	ating within the time require			
0			0						
Q2.j. Are mapping o	orrections timely	and according to written procedures?	Q2.k. Does the operator follows	ow a process t	o evaluate causes	for damages listed "Excavati			
N/A, no mapping err	ors discovered		N/A, no such events have oc	curred					
2. Notes									
NPMS SUBM	ISSIONS/	CHANGES							
Question #3. For transmission oper	rators, has the op	perator submitted information to the NPMS database, along with changes r		3. Result Satisfactory					
3. Notes		· -		-					
OSAVE notifications s	submitted on 6/1	4/23							
No changes									

▼ INCIDENT/SRC/AOC REPORTS REVIEW

Question #4
Were there any federally reportable incidents during the previous year? Are there any discernable trends to these incidents?

4. Results

Not Applicable

4. Notes

No incidents

Q4: Federally reportable incidents

NotificationID	Operator	Company	NRC #	Assign Engine		Date &	& Time of Incident		eet Address of ent/incident		cident Address: ity	Closure Date		eporting evel
lo Incident Notificat	ion records fou	nd												
equired in 192.617 (0									sponse. Is the operator of the minimize the possibility o			uation and resp	onse as	5. Result Not Applicable
. Notes														
o accidents or failure uestion #6.	es													
•	ts for the previo	ous year for ac	curacy an	d identify a	ny trends. If ar	ny trends d	iscovered p	lease d	lescribe. (Please see list o	f incide	nt data at end of ti	nis report)		
6: Incident Reports					1				I					6. Result Not
NotificationID Inspector Company Stre				Street Add	dress of ev	ent/incide	nt	Date & Time of Inc	ident	Is 30-Day Report Received?	Reporting L	evel	Applicable	
4002	Scott Anderson	n Seaport So	ound Tern	ninal, LLC	538 East F St	t.			04-06-2022 10:	00 AM		Non-Reportab	le	
. Notes o incident reports														
uestion #7.														
ere there reportable	or unreportable	le safety relate	d condition	ons during t	he previous ye	ear? If yes p	olease descr	ibe.						
7: Report of SRCs														7. Result
NotificationID	Company	Safety- Related Condition		ifetyRelate	dConditionCl	hoices	Reportabl	le?	Date & Time of Incident		Company Notif D	ied R ate	eport Date	Not Applicabl
No Incident Notificat	ion records fou	nd												
Notes o SRCs														
uestion #8.														8. Result
-	ems, were there	any abnormal	operating	g condition	s (as described	d in 192.60	5 (c) or 195.	402(d)) since the last annual rev	iew? If	yes please describ	e.		Satisfacto
Notes														
eaport conducts and nutdown pipeline in			wea aoc	ument for 2	U22, most com	nmon even	it is loss of co	ommur	nicationns (7 events in 20	22)				
ther included Flow I			oss. Leak	Warn and I	oss of Clear Pa	nth								
&M & EMEF														
uestion #9. the O&M Manual up	to date and we	ere changes m	ade in the	previous y	-	or Manuals	on Sharepo		. Result lot Applicable					
. Notes			2021											
eviewed annually bu nuestion #10. changes to the O&N					10. Res u Not App									
D. Notes					, , , , , ,	piledale								
eviewed annually bu uestion #11. /ere emergency plan														
I. Result lot Applicable		J 2 p. 37.00	- ,											
I. Notes eviewed annually bu	t no revisions to	the manual si	nce 2021											
uestion #12. /ere any changes to														
2. Result ot Applicable		•												
2. Notes eviewed annually bu	t no revisions to	o the manual si	nce 2021											
ITEGRITY N														
uestion #13 ere there changes to					or both, as ap	pplicable)?								13. Result Not Applicable
														. Aprilabile

13. Notes

Reviewed annually but no revisions to the manual since 2021 $\,$

Question #14. Is the DIMP/TIMP up to date? What are the results of the operator's program review (effectiveness evaluation) (DIMP every 5 years)? 14. Result

Satisfactory

14. Notes

ILI Effectiveness completed by Integrity Solutions in 2022

Recommendations include develop formal procedure to incorporate API 1163 and validate ILI data, verify records have been gathered and archived, Look for opportunities to continually

HCA analysis completed by TransMontaigne

Question #15 15. Result

Are IMP program changes acceptable? Satisfactory

15. Notes

No findings from 2021 UTC inspection, recommendations from Integrity Solutions reviewed

16. Results

Was appropriate assessment/repair work conducted during the past year? (monitor progress of IMP activities) Satisfactory

16. Notes

Last ILI was in 2020, no significant anomalies or repairs required

Next ILI is in 2025

Question #17 17. Results

Does the operator's HCA location data correspond to the positional data located in UTC GIS? Satisfactory

17. Notes

Entire line is identified as an HCA or could affect an HCA

18. Results Question #18

What assessment work is planned for the upcoming year? Not Applicable

18. Notes

No assessment planned until 2025

Question #19 19. Results

Within the operator's DIMP, are low pressure systems evaluated for overpressure threats? Applicable

19. Notes

Not a distribution operator

Question #20 20. Results

Did the operator develop and follow specific procedures for low pressure system construction or maintenance projects? (Note: this question is revisited in greater detail in the ADB review

Applicable

20. Notes

No low pressure distribution

21. Results

Are plastic pipe and components that have shown a record of defects/leaks being mitigated through the DIMP plans? Not Applicable

21. Notes

No PE

Question #22 22. Results

Has appropriate DIMP remediation work occurred during the past year? (monitor progress of DIMP activities)

Applicable

22. Notes

Not a distribution operator

23. Results Question #23

What DIMP remediation work is anticipated for upcoming year? Not Applicable

23. Notes

Not a distribution operator

OQ PROGRAM

Question #24 24. Results

Is the OQ program up to date? Were there changes to the Operator Qualification (OQ) program in the last year? If yes, please describe. Satisfactory

24. Notes

Use Veriforce for OQ qualification and tracking

No changes to the plan

Question #25 25. Results

Are the OQ plan updates satisfactory?

Not Applicable

25. Notes

No changes to the plan

Question #26 26. Results

Are personnel performing covered tasks (including contractors) properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operator's plan? Satisfactory

26. Notes

 $Reviewed \ a \ sample \ of \ OQs \ for \ personnel \ at \ Seaport, \ Sean \ Franck \ - \ Locating, \ Michael \ Affleje \ - \ Visual \ Inspection \ of \ Breakout \ Tank \ And \ An$

Complete Annual program review with veriforce, reviewed records from 2023, no concerns

OQs are verified during each standard and programmatic inspection

PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM

Question #27 27. Results

27. Notes

No changes to the plan

Question #28

28. Results Are changes to the PA program satisfactory? Satisfactory

28. Notes

Update excavator list as dig tickets come in, no changes to the plan

CONTROL ROOM PROGRAM

29. Results Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were there changes to the Control Room Management (CRM) program within the last year? Satisfactory

29. Notes

Revised procedure based on 2023 CRM inspection, Updated the training checklist and forms to include records for controller interviews

Question #30 30. Results

Are the CRM program changes satisfactory?

30. Notes

Updated manual sent to UTC on October 30, 2023

SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM API 1173

31. Results Is the operator developing and implementing an API 1173 Safety Management System? Satisfactory

31. Notes

Training for incident investigation, team training

Still looking at SMS to seek opportunities for implementation

Staff provided Pipeline SMS Booklet for reference

INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT OF INSPECTION UNITS

Question #32 32. Results

Are inspection units broken down appropriately? Do you recommend any changes to inspection units?

Satisfactory

Satisfactory

32. Notes

2.78 mile pipeline and 1 breakout tank

Inspection unit is adequate

Q32: List of current inspection units

	Unit Name	Distribution/Transmission	Intrastate or Interstate?	GAS or LIQUID	Operator - OPID	Unit ID
No Unit records found		ound				

OPERATOR'S PUBLIC WEB PAGE

Question #33

For informational purposes: Using the drop down selections available in the "Results" block, indicate whether the operator's web page contains the information listed by placing a check in the box adjacent to all items that are present.

33. Notes

https://www.transmontaignepartners.com/

Q33.A Pipeline Purpose and Reliability

Terminal Listing

Q33.B Damage Prevention

811 Brochure

Q33.C Pipe Location Information

Asset map on the website

Q33.D How to get additional information

811 Brochure talks about call before you dig

Q33.E National Pipeline Mapping System

811 brochure talks about NPMS

Q33.F One Call Requirements

811 Brochure talks about call before you dig

Q33.H Prevention Measures

811 Brochure talks about call before you dig

Q33.I Leak/Damage Recognition

811 Brochure has information on how to recognize a leak

Q33.K Pipeline Location Information

NPMS, Call before you dig

33. Results

Q33.A Pipeline Purpose and Reliability; Q33.B Damage Prevention; Q33.C Pipe Location Information; Q33.D How to get additional information; Q33.E National Pipeline Mapping System; Q33.F On Call Requirements; Q33.H Prevention Measures; Q33.I Leak/Damage Recognition; Q33.K Pipeline Location Information; Q33.L Integrity Management Programs; Q33.M Emergency Preparedness

Q33.L Integrity Management Programs

811 brochure has info about maintining pipeline integrity and safety

Q33.M Emergency Preparedness

811 brochure on website has emergency responder action in an emergency

ADVISORY BULLETIN REVIEW

Is there potential for damage to the operator's pipeline facilities caused by flooding, river scour, or channel migration?

ADB 2019-01 34. Results

ADB 2019-01 Flood Mitigation NO

Pipe is >80 feet below bottom of channel, puyallup river is not prone to scour or channel migration

Monitor conditions at Puyallup river and Hylebos waterway on ROW patrol

Question #35

If "YES" to Q34, did the operator take appropriate action in accordance with the guidance contained ADB 2019-01? Discuss ADB's guidance with operator's representative, and annotate any concerns.

ADB 2019-01 35. Results

ADB 2019-01: Flood Mitigation Not Applicable

35. Notes

Monitor conditions at Puyallup river and Hylebos waterway on ROW patrol

Question #36

Is there potential for the operator's system to be damaged by earth movement or other seismic/geological activities?

ADB 2019-02 36. Results

ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards

36. Notes

No risk for land movement but operator has identified risk of seismic activity to be a threat

Reviewed Emergency response plan in the event of an earthquake

Emergency Response Plan Section 9

Question #37

If "YES" to Q36, did the operator take appropriate action according to ADB 2019-02? Discuss suggested actions from ADB with operator's representative and annotate any concerns.

ADB 2019-02 37. Results Satisfactory

ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards

37. Notes

Reviewed Emergency response plan in the event of an earthquake

Emergency Response Plan Section 9

Question #38

Does the operator have any indoor meter sets or regulators in their system?

ADR 2020-01 38 Results ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets NO

38. Notes

No indoor meters

Question #39

If operator's system has indoor meter sets/regulators, did the operator review ADB 2020-0115? Discuss ADB guidance with operator's representative and annotate any concerns. Particular attention must be given to the operator's plan to conduct leak surveys, AC inspections, and other maintenance activities in locations that are difficult to access, as well as the inclusion of inside meters/regulators within the operator's DIMP plan, as applicable.

39. Results

ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets Applicable

39. Notes

No indoor meters

Question #40

 $Is the operator's \, record \, of \, locations \, for \, all \, indoor \, meter \, sets/regulators \, within \, their \, system \, complete \, and \, sufficently \, detailed??$

ADB 2020-01 40. Results ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets Applicable

40. Notes

No indoor meters

Question #41

Does the operator have any low pressure systems?

ADB 2020-02 41. Results ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems NO

41. Notes

No low pressure systems

Question #42

If "YES" to Q41, did the operator review ADB 2020-0025 for Overpressure Protection of Low-Pressure Natural Gas Distribution Systems? Review ADB guidance with operator and annotate any concerns.

ADB 2020-02

42. Results Not Applicable ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

42. Notes

No low pressure systems

Question #43

For low pressure construction/maintenance projects, does the operator have a process for review of engineering plans and constructibility reviews that are carried out through all applicable departments? Do all applicable departments review project plans for accuracy, completeness and correctness? How are control procedures developed that could identity system threats that could result in a common failure mode? How is the operator mitigating risk in their low presure system?

ADB 2020-02 43. Results

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems Not Applicable

43. Notes

No low pressure systems

Question #44

Does the operator include all low-pressure system risks in their DIMP program appropriately?

ADB 2020-02 44. Results ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems Not Applicable

44. Notes

No low pressure systems

SUMMARY OF REQUIRED COMMENTS

COMMENTS: Required for any ratings other than Satisfactory. Summarize/consolidate entries from the "Notes" blocks above. Ensure you annotate the question number for each comment.