

**Utilities and Transportation Commission
Pipeline Safety
Operator Annual Review Checklist**

A completed **Annual Review form and Cover Letter/Field Report** must be submitted to the Chief Engineer within **30 days** from completion of the inspection.

Inspection Report			
Inspection ID/Docket Number	7848		
Inspector Name & Submit Date	Anthony Dorrough – 12/20/2019		
Chief Eng Name & Review/Date	Joe Subsits – 12/20/2019		
Operator Information			
Name of Operator:	McChord Pipeline	OP ID #:	31049
Records Location:	3001 Marshall Ave, Tacoma WA 98421		
Inspection Date:	11/6/2019		

<p>Review Summary:</p> <p>Staff reviewed the Annual report for McChord Pipeline and then interviewed Mr. Peelo, there were no significant findings.</p>
--

<p>HQ Address: 3001 Marshall Ave, Tacoma WA 98421</p>	<p>System/Unit Name & Address:</p>	
<p>Co. Official: Phone No.: 3143 Fax No.:</p>	<p>Phone No.: Fax No.: Emergency Phone No.:</p>	
Persons Interviewed	Title	Phone No.
Nicholas Peelo	Chief Engineer	(253) 593-6085

**Utilities and Transportation Commission
Pipeline Safety
Operator Annual Review Checklist**

SYSTEM OPERATIONS	
Number of reportable safety related conditions last year: 0	Number of deferred leaks in system: 0
Number of <u>non-reportable</u> safety related conditions last year 0	Number of excavation damage hits last year: 0
Miles of transmission pipeline within unit (total miles and miles in Class 3 & 4 locations): 14.25 mi.	Miles of main within inspection unit (total miles and miles in Class 3 & 4 locations): 14.25 mi.
Operating Pressure(s): 450 psig	MAOP: 720 psig
Does the operator have any transmission pipelines?	YES
Compressor stations? Use Attachment 1.	NO

Pipe Specifications:			
Year Installed (Range)	1996-1999	Pipe Diameters (Range)	6
Material Type	Carbon Steel	Line Pipe Specification Used	API 5L / A53 Gr B
Mileage	14.25	SMYS %	36

REVIEW QUESTIONS		S/Yes	U/No	N/A
1.	Was the Annual Report reviewed for accuracy and trends? If any trends discovered, please describe:	Yes		
2.	For transmission operators, has the operator submitted information to the NPMS database, along with changes made after the original submission?	Yes		
3.	Were there federally reportable incidents during the previous year?		No	
4.	Were Incident reports reviewed for accuracy and trends? If any trends discovered please describe: --- No incidents to report.			X
5.	Were there reportable or unreportable safety related conditions during the previous year? If yes please describe.		No	
6.	Were there any abnormal operating conditions (as described in 49 CFR 192.605 (c) or 49 CFR 195.402(d))? If yes please describe		No	
7	Were there changes to the O&M Manual during the previous year?		No	
8	Are the changes acceptable? --- No changes to report.			X
9	Is the O&M Manual up to date?	Yes		
11	Were the changes satisfactory? --- No significant changes to report.			X
12	Were there changes to the Integrity management program (TIMP and DIMP for LDC's)?		No	

**Utilities and Transportation Commission
Pipeline Safety
Operator Annual Review Checklist**

13	Is the integrity management program up to date? What are the results of the operators program review (effectiveness evaluation) (DIMP every 5 years)? --- Per. IMP Sep 25-26/2017 D.Cullom <i>Significant Notes from IMP/2017: Section 8 and 8.1 – They contracted Keifner and Assoc. to assess the long seam threat and cyclic loading. The evaluation report is included as Appendix F for reference. The evaluation determined that the line is not susceptible to longitudinal seam weld failure. The evaluation also determined that pipeline only requires pressure testing every 76 years based on the pressure cycling and pipeline stresses. Based on these factors McChord Pipeline Co. has removed the requirement to pressure test the pipeline from the IMP due to the fact the ERW pipe seams in use are not susceptible to longitudinal seam failure. §195.452(c)(i)(B) Assessment of the MPL will address corrosion and deformation anomalies by using an in-line inspection tool (smart pig) and field verifications. MPL will select an in-line inspection tool that has the sensitivity to classify potential repair conditions.</i>	Yes		
14	Are the changes acceptable? --- No significant changes to report.			X
15	Is appropriate assessment/ repair work conducted during the past year? (monitor progress of IMP activities)	Yes		
16	What assessment work is planned for the upcoming year? --- Has not been decided yet at time of inspection			X
17	Has appropriate DIMP remediation work occurred during the past year? (monitor progress of DIMP activities) --- No significant changes to report.			X
18	What DIMP remediation work is anticipated for upcoming year? --- Had not been decided yet at time of inspection			X
19	Were there changes to the Operator Qualification program? If yes, please describe.		No	
20	Is the Operator Qualification program up to date? --- See OQ Nov 5/2019 A.Dorrrough	Yes		
21	Are plan updates satisfactory?	Yes		
22	Are personnel performing covered tasks (including contractors) properly qualified and requalified at intervals determined in the operators plan? --- Staff reviewed selected records.	Yes		
23	Were there changes to the public awareness program?		No	
24	Are changes to the public awareness program satisfactory? --- No significant changes to report.			X

**Utilities and Transportation Commission
Pipeline Safety
Operator Annual Review Checklist**

26	<p>Is the following information on the operator's web page? (Not a regulatory question)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pipeline purpose and reliability • Damage Prevention • Pipe location information • How to get additional information • National Pipeline Mapping system • One call requirements • Potential Hazards • Prevention measures • Leak/ damage recognition • ROW encroachment • Pipeline location information • Integrity management programs • Emergency preparedness <p style="color: green;">---Less than 50% of the above information was detectable to staff.</p>	Yes		
27	Were there changes to the Control Room Management Program?		No	
28	Is the control room management program up to date? ---Last updated Feb 3, 2019	Yes		
29	Are the control room management program changes satisfactory?	Yes		
30	Are inspection units broken down appropriately? Do you recommend any changes to inspection units in terms of size?	Yes		
31	Were there any flow reversals, product changes, or conversions to service since the last review?		No	
32	If yes, is the operator taking appropriate actions in accordance with ADB-2014-04?			

PHMSA ADVISORY BULLETINS: [LINK](#)