

**Form A- Annual Review 8601**

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

**Inspector and Operator Information**

<b>Inspection ID</b> 8601	<b>Inspection Link</b> 8601	<b>Inspector - Lead</b> David Cullom	<b>Inspector - Assist</b> Hoxit, Jason
<b>Operator</b> McChord US Oil and Refining	<b>Unit</b> McChord US Oil and Refining	<b>Records Location - City &amp; State</b> Tacoma, Wa.	
<b>Inspection Start Date</b> 09-26-2023	<b>Inspection Exit Interview Date</b> 10-19-2023	<b>Engineer Submit Date</b>	

**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**

This Annual Review was conducted in conjunction with our O&M and Integrity Management Program inspections

**\* Facilities visited and Total AFOD**

No facilities were visited for the Annual Review inspection. This Annual Review checklist was 1 AFOD.

**\* Summary of Significant Findings**

There were no Areas of Concern or Probable Violations noted during this inspection.

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

First Name Last Name Phone Email Organization Position  
 Joel Roppo (253) 383-1651 jroppo@parpacific.com Par Pacific Chief Engineer  
 John Williamson (253) 383-1651 jwilliamson@parpacific.com Par Pacific Senior Inspector

**Instructions and Ratings Definitions**

**INSPECTION RESULTS: Annual Review**

<b>Satisfactory Responses</b> 19	<b>Satisfactory List</b> 1,3,8,9,10,13,14,15,16,17,18,24,25,26,27,29,30,32,35,	<b>Number of Unanswered Questions</b> 0	<b>Unanswered List</b>
<b>Unsatisfactory Responses</b> 0	<b>Unsatisfactory List</b>		
<b>Area of Concern Responses</b> 0	<b>Area of Concern List</b>		
<b>Not Applicable Responses</b> 20	<b>Not Applicable List</b> 4,5,6,7,11,12,19,20,21,22,23,28,31,37,38,39,40,42,43,44		
<b>Yes Responses</b> 2	<b>Yes List</b> 34,36,	<b>No Responses</b> 1	<b>No List</b> 41
<b>Not Checked / Evaluated Responses</b> 0	<b>Not Checked / Evaluated List</b>		

\*\*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.

**ANNUAL REPORT: ACCURACY/TRENDS**

**Question #1.**

Was the Annual Report reviewed for accuracy and trends? If any trends were discovered, please describe.

**1. Result**

Satisfactory

**1. Notes**

14.25 miles All HCAS. 13.25 ERW. Note that one mile of the system was replaced with SMLS (Seamless) pipe in the 1990's due to a reroute on Waller Rd and that is the reason for the mileage differences.

**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 Report records found					

**Access to Complete Transmission Annual Report**

YEAR	Operator	Commodity Group	Total Total Miles
No Report records found			

**Access to Complete Hazardous Liquid Annual Report**

YEAR	Operator	Commodity Group
No Report records found		

**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	Total Leaks Per 1,000 Locates	Number of Hits Per 1,000 Ticket Requests	Number of Hits Per 10,000 Services	Number of Hits of Tickets
No Damages records found																

**DIRT data on mismarks for prior year**

Damage Cause	Number of Reports
No Report records found	

**DIRT Timeliness - Prior Year Reports must be submitted within 45 days of the damage.**

SubmitCompanyID - UTCfinalName	Number of Reports
No Report records found	

**Question #2.**

Review the following damage prevention items:

**Q2. Is the damage prevention information in the annual report complete?**

Yes

**Q2.b. Is the annual report damages root cause information complete and accurate?**

Yes

**Q2.c. Does the operator have a process to evaluate the cause of "One-call notification practices not sufficient" category?**

0 damages to review. I was unable to locate a process for this in the PA program.

**Q2.d. Does the operator follow a process to evaluate the cause of "Locating practices not sufficient" category?**

Yes but 0 damages

**Q2.e. Is the operator or its contractor qualified and following procedures for locating and marking facilities?**

OQ Records available.

**Q2.f. Is the operator appropriately requalifying locating locators to address**

**performance deficiencies?**

An individual failed the WBT and retested in 2022.

**Q2.i. Is the operator appropriately addressing discovered mapping errors resulting in excavation damage?**  
0 mapping errors. N/A

**Q2.L. Is the operator appropriately focusing damage prevention education and training to address the causes of excavation damage?**  
Section 8 (Continuous Improvement)  
No damages

**Q2.g. What is the number of damages resulting from mismarks?**  
0

**Q2.h. What is the number of damages resulting from not locating within the time requirements?**  
0

**Q2.j. Are mapping corrections timely and according to written procedures?**  
N/A - No mapping errors have been noted that require corrections

**Q2.k. Does the operator follow a process to evaluate causes for damages listed "Excavation Practices Not Sufficient"?**  
0

2. Notes

## NPMS SUBMISSIONS/CHANGES

**Question #3.**

For transmission operators, has the operator submitted information to the NPMS database, along with changes made after the original submission?

**3. Result**

Satisfactory

**3. Notes**

The last submission was on 10/5/2023.

## 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**

0 - No incidents for the past three years.

**Q4: Federally reportable incidents**

NotificationID	Operator	Company	NRC #	Assigned Engineer	Date & Time of Incident	Street Address of event/incident	Incident Address: City	Closure Date	Reporting Level
No Incident Notification records found									

**Question #5.**

Review operator records of previous year's accidents and failures including reported third party damage and leak response. Is the operator ensuring appropriate evaluation and response as required in 192.617 (Gas) or 195.402 (HL) to determine cause of failure? Is the operator taking appropriate steps to minimize the possibility of recurrence?

**5. Result**

Not Applicable

**5. Notes**

No accidents or failures per the operator. None noted in the Commission's database.

**Question #6.**

Review incident reports for the previous year for accuracy and identify any trends. If any trends discovered please describe. (Please see list of incident data at end of this report)

**Q6: Incident Reports**

NotificationID	Inspector	Company	Street Address of event/incident	Date & Time of Incident	Is 30-Day Report Received?	Reporting Level
No Incident Notification records found						

**6. Result**

Not Applicable

**6. Notes**

No accidents or failures

**Question #7.**

Were there reportable or unreportable safety related conditions during the previous year? If yes please describe.

**Q7: Report of SRCs**

NotificationID	Company	Safety-Related Condition	SafetyRelatedConditionChoices	Reportable?	Date & Time of Incident	Company Notified Date	Report Date
No Incident Notification records found							

**7. Result**

Not Applicable

**7. Notes**

No SRCs

**Question #8.**

For transmission systems, were there any abnormal operating conditions (as described in 192.605 (c) or 195.402(d)) since the last annual review? If yes please describe.

**8. Result**

Satisfactory

**8. Notes**

Pipeline was shut down on a low differential alarm. Inspectors drove the line and repressurized it prior to restarting. It happens a couple of times a year.

## O&M & EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

**Question #9.**

Is the O&M Manual up to date and were changes made in the previous year?

Operator Manuals on Sharepoint

**9. Result**

Satisfactory

**9. Notes**

O&M inspection had no issues.

**Question #10.**

If changes to the O&M were made, are changes acceptable?

**10. Result**

Satisfactory

**10. Notes**

There were no changes.

**Question #11.**

Were emergency plans changed during the previous year?

**11. Result**

Not Applicable

**11. Notes**

There were no changes.

**Question #12.**

Were any changes to emergency plans satisfactory?

**12. Result**

Not Applicable

**12. Notes**

There were no changes.

**INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS****Question #13**

Were there changes to the Integrity Management programs (TIMP, DIMP or both, as applicable)?

**13. Result**

Satisfactory

**13. Notes**

No changes to IMP. ILI planned 2024. Results incorporated to IMP.

**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**

No DIMP. See TIMP In question 13.

**Question #15**

Are IMP program changes acceptable?

**15. Result**

Satisfactory

**15. Notes**

LIMP inspection was performed in October 2023.

**Question #16**

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

**16. Results**

Satisfactory

**16. Notes**

No assessment work or repairs were performed.

**Question #17**

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

**17. Results**

Satisfactory

**17. Notes**

The operator's system is in a developed area so there are some, but not major changes. The system is all "Could Affect" HCA. The line location in our GIS has remained the same

**Question #18**

What assessment work is planned for the upcoming year?

**18. Results**

Satisfactory

**18. Notes**

CIS 2023 and ILI 2024

**Question #19**

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

**19. Results**

Not Applicable

**19. Notes**

No - N/A. It is a HL line.

**Question #20**

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 section)

**20. Results**

Not Applicable

**20. Notes**

No - N/A. It is a HL line.

**Question #21**

Are plastic pipe and components that have shown a record of defects/leaks being mitigated through the DIMP plans?

**21. Results**

Not Applicable

**21. Notes**

No - N/A. It is a HL line.

**Question #22**

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

**22. Results**

Not Applicable

**22. Notes**

No - N/A. It is a HL line.

**Question #23**

What DIMP remediation work is anticipated for upcoming year?

**23. Results**

Not Applicable

**23. Notes**

No - N/A. It is a HL line.

**OQ PROGRAM****Question #24**

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

**24. Results**

Satisfactory

**24. Notes**

No changes

**Question #25**

Are the OQ plan updates satisfactory?

**25. Results**

Satisfactory

**25. Notes**

No changes

**Question #26**

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

**26. Results**

Satisfactory

**26. Notes**

Matrix, Madsen, and Northwest Corrosion were working on the system for this inspection time period and were checked.

**PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM****Question #27**

Is the PA program up to date? And were there changes to the Public Awareness (PA) program within the last year?

**27. Results**

Satisfactory

**27. Notes**

2022 PA program results reviewed. For 2023, the materials will be revised for the mailings.

**Question #28**

Are changes to the PA program satisfactory?

**28. Results**

Not Applicable

**28. Notes**

Nothing changed in the last year for the PA program.

**CONTROL ROOM PROGRAM****Question #29**

Is the CRM program up to date? And were there changes to the Control Room Management (CRM) program within the last year?

**29. Results**

Satisfactory

**29. Notes**

A complete CRM inspection was performed last year.

**Question #30**

Are the CRM program changes satisfactory?

**30. Results**

Satisfactory

**30. Notes**

Please review 2022 CRM inspection findings. No changes other than than the findings from that inspection.

## SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM API 1173

**Question #31** **31. Results**  
Is the operator developing and implementing an API 1173 Safety Management System? Not Applicable

**31. Notes**  
Not at this time. Still under PSM for the refinery.

## INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT OF INSPECTION UNITS

**Question #32** **32. Results**  
Are inspection units broken down appropriately? Do you recommend any changes to inspection units? Satisfactory

**32. Notes**  
This unit is of suitable size. The system is only 14.25 miles long.

### Q32: List of current inspection units

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

## 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. 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.G Potential Hazards ; Q33.H Prevention Measures ; Q33.I Leak/Damage Recognition ; Q33.J ROW Encroachment ; Q33.K Pipeline Location Information ; Q33.L Integrity Management Programs ; Q33.M Emergency Preparedness

### 33. Notes

Pipeline purpose and reliability <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/> Reconfirmed in 2023

Damage Prevention <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/damageprev.html>

Pipe location information <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/pipelinegeninfo.html>

How to get additional information <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/contact.html> and <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/pipelinegeninfo.html> (at the bottom of page)

National Pipeline Mapping system <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/map.html>

One call requirements <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/damageprev.html>

Potential Hazards <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/about.html> (on right side bar of every page)

Prevention measures <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/contextcainfo.html>

Leak/ damage recognition <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/about.html> (on right side bar of every page)

ROW encroachment <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/damageprev.html> (3/4 the way down in the text)

Pipeline location information [http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/pdfs/McChord\\_Pipeline\\_Map.pdf](http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/pdfs/McChord_Pipeline_Map.pdf)

Integrity management programs <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/integemnt.html>

Emergency preparedness <http://www.mcchordpipeline.com/emeresp.html>

\*\*\*Notes – 100% of the items were found on the McChord Pipeline website\*\*\*

## ADVISORY BULLETIN REVIEW

**Question #34**  
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 YES

**34. Notes**  
There are 3 river crossings. There is a weekly ROW inspection. The 5 year Puyallup (Navigable water way) was done 2 years ago.

**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 Satisfactory

**35. Notes**  
The operator performs specialized patrols in addition to the 5 year patrols.

**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 YES

**36. Notes**  
Western Washington is susceptible to tectonic movement.

**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**  
ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards Not Applicable

**37. Notes**  
There is potential, but historically the system has not suffered damage. There is a portion of the manual (Maint Manual E-13) Section 3.6 that discusses flood, landslide, earthquake SRCs. The Section D-2, Sub-Section 1.2.

**Question #38**  
Does the operator have any indoor meter sets or regulators in their system?

**ADB 2020-01** **38. Results**  
ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets Not Applicable

**38. Notes**  
No assets of this type

**Question #39**  
If operator's system has indoor meter sets/regulators, did the operator review ADB 2020-01? 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 indoor meters/regulators within the operator's DIMP plan, as applicable.

**ADB 2020-01** **39. Results**  
ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets Not Applicable

**39. Notes**  
No assets of this type

**Question #40**  
Is the operator's record of locations for all indoor meter sets/regulators within their system complete and sufficiently detailed??

**ADB 2020-01**

ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets

**40. Results**

Not Applicable

**40. Notes**

No assets of this type

**Question #41**

Does the operator have any low pressure systems?

**41. Results**

NO

**ADB 2020-02**

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

**41. Notes**

No assets of this type

**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.

**42. Results**

Not Applicable

**ADB 2020-02**

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

**42. Notes**

No assets of this type

**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 identify system threats that could result in a common failure mode? How is the operator mitigating risk in their low pressure system?

**43. Results**

Not Applicable

**ADB 2020-02**

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

**43. Notes**

No assets of this type

**Question #44**

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

**44. Results**

Not Applicable

**ADB 2020-02**

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

**44. Notes**

No assets of this type

**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.