

Western Region Unit Information

Inspector or State Office:	Washington	SMART Activity #	128483
Unit ID:	515	Unit Name:	WA-UTC/YELLOWSTONE PIPE LINE CO
Operator ID:	31684	Operator Name:	CONOCOPHILLIPS

Unit Boundaries

Description:	Device:	Latitude:	Longitude:
State border with Washington/Idaho to Moses Lake, WA			

Pre-Inspection

The information collected and documented here is in addition to other pre-inspection efforts [pulling unit summaries, SRCR's, Annual Reports, Accident/Incident Reports, previous PIM, Post-Inspection OQ & IMP reports, previous and outstanding enforcement actions, etc.]

<p>Operator-level Enforcement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5-2009-5014M, Sent 03/17/2009, NOA, CLOSED 5-2009-5015, Sent 03/17/2009, CP, OPEN 5-2008-5039W, Sent 10/15/2008, WL, CLOSED 5-2008-5038, Sent 10/15/2008, CO, OPEN 5-2008-5040M, Sent 10/15/2008, NOA, CLOSED <p>Unit-level Enforcement: None</p> <p>Special permits: None</p> <p>Accidents/Incidents [WA Only]: 2010-0006, 02/22/2010, Incorrect Operation</p>
--

Baseline Information

1) If accidents or incidents have occurred in this unit, what has the operator done to prevent recurrence? (select all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Added Equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> Procedural Change | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering Barriers Added |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Removed Equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Describe:

2) Will these actions adequately mitigate threats? Yes No

Please Explain:

3) Have any abnormal events occurred in this unit? Yes No

Describe Operator's Response:

4) Commodity Transported:

Liquid 1:	<input style="width: 150px;" type="text" value="Refined and/or Petroleum Pro"/>	Gas 1:	<input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Liquid 2:	<input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>	Gas 2:	<input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>

5) Year of Original Installation (yyyy): Pipe specification (e.g. API 5L, ASTM D2513)

6) Normal Operating Pressure (psig), min: max: % SMYS, max:

7) MOP/MAOP (psig), min: max: Changes in MOP/MAOP in previous year: Increase Decrease None

8) Seam Type:

9) Coating Type:

10) Overall Coating Quality: Poor Fair Good Coating Improvement Efforts: Yes No

Describe:

11) Potential for AC Interference? Yes No Has operator tested for stray current? Yes No

12) Parallel Construction/Crossing? Yes No Explain:

13a) [Gas Only] Is there a monitoring program for liquids? Yes No

Method:

Frequency:

13b) [Liquid Only] Are there Dead Legs? Yes No

Explain:

14) [Liquid Only] Number of cycles: per Day Week Month

Pressure range (psig):

15) Has equipment been deleted/added that changed the hydraulic profile of this line? Yes No

Explain:

16) Level of automation: Manual Control Local/SCADA Remote/SCADA

17) Total unit mileage:

18) HCA-Affecting Mileage (% of total mileage):

High Population Area (%):	
Other Population Area (%):	
Drinking Water USA (%):	
Ecological Resource USA (%):	
Commercially Navigable Waterway (%):	

19) Indicate the year of the most recent tool run and summarize results, including digs:

Tool Type	Year	Results Summary
Magnetic Flux Leakage	2010	Spokane to Fairchild 2 dents < 2%. Fairchild to Moses Lake four app

Post-Inspection Information

20) Using your engineering judgement, describe how well this unit's threats are being addressed:

- Corrosion Specific: Poor Fair Good
- Equipment Specific: Poor Fair Good
- Excavation Specific: Poor Fair Good
- Human Error Specific: Poor Fair Good
- Material/Weld Specific: Poor Fair Good
- Natural Force Specific: Poor Fair Good
- Overall: Poor Fair Good

Additional Assessments: