

Form A- Annual Review 8794

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

Inspector and Operator Information

Inspection ID 8794	Inspection Link 8794	Inspector - Lead Scott Anderson	Inspector - Assist
Operator McChord Pipeline	Unit McChord	Records Location - City & State Tacoma, WA	
Inspection Start Date 09-30-2024	Inspection Exit Interview Date 10-01-2024	Engineer Submit Date 10-02-2024	

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 inspection consisted of a records and field review of McChord Pipeline. The line is 14.25 miles of 6.625" pipe that serves JBLM from the US Oil Refinery.

Facilities visited and Total AFOD

2 AFOD

Summary of Significant Findings

No significant findings

Primary Operator contacts and/or participants

Joel Roppo, Chief Engineer, Par Pacific

John Williamson, Senior Inspector, Par Pacific
Maureen Burns, Transportation Safety Regulatory Manager, Par Pacific

Operator executive contact and mailing address for any official correspondence

Andrew Troske

VP, McChord Pipeline Company

3001 Marshall Ave.

Tacoma, WA 98421

Instructions and Ratings Definitions

INSPECTION RESULTS: Annual Review

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

**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
Contacts and manuals are up to date.

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	Tc Le: 1,C Loca
------	----------	------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--------	--------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------

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?

Y

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

Y

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

Y

Q2.e. Is the operator or its contractor qualified and following procedures for locating and

Y

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 require

0

Q2.j. Are mapping corrections timely and according to written procedures?

No mapping deficiencies

Q2.k. Does the operator follow a process to evaluate causes for damages listed "Excavati

Y

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? Satisfactory

3. Result

3. Notes

Submitted 11/9/22 CY 2021, 10/5/23 CY 2022, 6/5/24 CY 2023. 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

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.

5. Result

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?

Not Applicable

5. Notes

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

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

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
Not Applicable

8. Notes

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

Manual up to date.

Question #10.

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

10. Result
Satisfactory

10. Notes

Yes

Question #11.

Were emergency plans changed during the previous year?

11. Result

Not Applicable

11. Notes

Question #12.

Were any changes to emergency plans satisfactory?

12. Result

Satisfactory

12. Notes

Yes

INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Question #13

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

13. Result
Not Applicable

13. Notes

This was not an IMP inspection

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
Not Applicable

14. Notes

This was not an IMP inspection

Question #15

Are IMP program changes acceptable?

15. Result
Not Applicable

15. Notes

This was not an IMP inspection

Question #16

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

16. Results
Not Applicable

16. Notes

This was not an IMP inspection

Question #17	Does the operator's HCA location data correspond to the positional data located in UTC GIS?	17. Results Not Applicable
17. Notes	This was not an IMP inspection	
Question #18	What assessment work is planned for the upcoming year?	18. Results Not Applicable
18. Notes	This was not an IMP inspection	
Question #19	Within the operator's DIMP, are low pressure systems evaluated for overpressure threats?	19. Results Not Applicable
19. Notes	This was not an IMP inspection	
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	MPL is a liquid operator.	
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	MPL is a liquid operator.	
Question #22	Has appropriate DIMP remediation work occurred during the past year? (monitor progress of DIMP activities)	22. Results Not Applicable
22. Notes	MPL is a liquid operator.	
Question #23	What DIMP remediation work is anticipated for upcoming year?	23. Results Not Applicable
23. Notes	MPL is a liquid operator.	

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	Manual is up to date.	
Question #25	Are the OQ plan updates satisfactory?	25. Results Satisfactory
25. Notes	Yes	
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	Personnel are qualified.	

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	PA plan is up to date.	
Question #28	Are changes to the PA program satisfactory?	28. Results Satisfactory
28. Notes	Yes	

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	CRM is up to date.	
Question #30	Are the CRM program changes satisfactory?	30. Results Satisfactory
30. Notes	Yes	

SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM API 1173

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

INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT OF INSPECTION UNITS

Question #32

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

32. Results

Satisfactory

32. Notes

MPL is only 1 unit.

Q32: List of current inspection units

Unit Name	Distribution/Transmission	Intrastate or Interstate?	GAS or LIQUID	Operator - OPID	Unit ID	Date Created
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.G Potential Hazards ; Q33.J ROW Encroachment ; Q33.K Pipeline Location Information

33. Notes

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

ADB 2019-01 Flood Mitigation

34. Results

NO

34. Notes

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

ADB 2019-01: Flood Mitigation

35. Results

Not Applicable

35. Notes

Question #36

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

ADB 2019-02

ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards

36. Results

NO

36. Notes

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

ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards

37. Results

Not Applicable

37. Notes

Question #38

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

ADB 2020-01

ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets

38. Results

NO

38. Notes

MPL is a liquid operator.

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.

ADB 2020-01

ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets

39. Results

Not Applicable

39. Notes

MPL is a liquid operator.

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

MPL is a liquid operator.

Question #41

Does the operator have any low pressure systems?

ADB 2020-02

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

41. Results

NO

41. Notes

MPL is a liquid operator.

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

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

42. Results
Not
Applicable

42. Notes

MPL is a liquid operator.

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?

ADB 2020-02

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

43. Results
Not
Applicable

43. Notes

MPL is a liquid operator.

Question #44

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

ADB 2020-02

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

44. Results
Not
Applicable

44. Notes

MPL is a liquid operator.

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.