(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| Name of Operator: Georgia P | acific Consumer Products LLC | |
|--|--|--|
| OP ID No. | | sentative (s): Patti Johnson |
| HQ Address: | Inspection D | Data(s): |
| 133 Peach Tree Street NE | | |
| Atlantia Coorgio 20202 | | 0-6, 7 and 8, 2008 for follow up & D/A for |
| Co. Official: | | |
| Phone No.: | 401 Adams | |
| Fax No.: | Camas, WA | 98607 |
| Emergency Phone No.: | | |
| Persons Interviewed | Title | |
| Laurie Lehman | HR Generalist | Phone No. |
| Roy Rogers | Consultant | 360 834 8125 |
| Curt Christianson | HR for the NW | 503 860 7435 |
| | THE TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE TOTAL CONTRACTOR OT THE TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE TOTAL CONTRACTOR OT THE TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE TO | 360 834 8123 |
| Prior to Koch purchase GO consortium, however, they a | was a standalone pool. Currently are part of the whole Georgia Paci has a standalone DOT drug plan t | y, GP is not part of a |
| Type of Facility: | .y. | • |
| _x Gas Transmission Pipe Gas Distribution System | | iquid Pipeline atural Gas |
| Alcohol Misuse Plan and Police Operator Contractor Consortium | y developed by: Alcohol Misuse Tes Operatorx_ Contractor Consortium | ting Program administered by: |
| | | |

| Contractor records maintained by: | Specimen collection conducted by: |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Operator | Operator Personnel On-Site |
| x Ĉontractor | Operator Personnel Off-Site |
| Consortium | Contractor Personnel On-Site |
| | <u>x</u> Contractor Personnel Off-Site |

This plan was last updated July 30, 2002 it was replaced by the new corporate plan September 22, 2008.

| §199.202 Alcohol misuse plan | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| ▼ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.202 | Does the operator maintain and follow a written Alcohol Misuse Plan (AMP)? | |
| | GP has a written plan | |
| | Does the AMP contain: | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.202 | Provisions for conducting alcohol tests in accordance with DOT procedures found in 49 CFR Part 40? | Note: Clarification of company policy vs. DOT requirements. Company policy should be identified by using bold and underlined type. |
| | | 10-8-08 Policy will be in bold and underlined in the 2008 Drug and Alcohol Manual 1. Page 5-2, section 5.2.1.3 and 1.4 are policy should be bold and underlined. Whole page should be reviewed to ensure policy and code separation. |
| | | 2. Page 5-2, section 5.2.1.6 is policy and should be underlined and bold. |
| | | 3. Page 5-3, section 5.2.2 is policy and should be underlined and bold. |
| | | 4. Page 5-2, section 5.2.1.6 is policy and should be |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| | | underlined and bold. |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| | | 5. Page 5-2, section 5.2.1.4 is policy and should be underlined and bold. |
| | | 6. 5.2.1.6 is policy and should be bold and underline |
| | | 7. 5.2.1.7 is policy and should be bold and underlined |
| | | 8. 5.4.1 last 2 sentences are policy and should be underlined and bold |
| | • | 9. Section 5.4.2, last 2 sentences are policy and should be bold and underlined |
| | | 10. Page 6, section 5.4.4 last sentence is policy and should be bold and underlined |
| | | 11. Page 5.5, Section 5.4.2 last 2 sentences are policy and should be bold and underlined |
| | | 12. Section 5.7.1 is policy and should be bold and underlined |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.202 | Provisions that include types of testing, recordkeeping, reporting, education and training elements? | |
| · . | • | • |

Comments

Manual uses controlled substances to include drug and alcohol and it doesn't work in some case. 10-8-2008 Controlled substances are not used in this manner in the 2008 Drug and Alcohol manuals.

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.209 Other requirements imposed by operators | | |
|--|--|---|
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.209(a) | Does the plan address authority of operator or rights of employee with regard to use or possession of alcohol or rehabilitation? | |
| □ YES □ NO §199.209(b) | Does the operator conduct pre- employment alcohol testing? (not required) If yes, the operator must— | |
| | Section 4.A.1, pg 5-4 manual says optional, 10-8-2008, No longer optional in 2008 manual | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.209(b)(1) | Conduct a pre-employment test before the first performance of covered functions by every covered employee. Section 4.A.1, Alcohol testing is optional. 10-8-2008, No longer optional in 2008 manual | Whether a new employee or someone who has transferred to a position involving the performance of covered functions. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.209(b)(2) | Treat all covered employees the same for the purpose of preemployment alcohol testing; Section 4.A.1, Optional alcohol testing not allowed in part 40, 10-8-2008, No longer optional in 2008 manual | Must not test some covered employees and not others |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.209(b)(3) | Conduct the pre-employment tests after making a contingent offer of employment or transfer, subject to the employee passing the pre-employment alcohol test; Section 4.A.1, Plan says optional. 10-8-2008, No longer optional in 2008 manual | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.209(b)(4) | Conduct all pre-employment alcohol tests using the alcohol testing procedures in DOT Procedures; and Procedure noted and lacked detail, 10-8-2008 included in | DOT Procedures found in 49 CFR Part 40 |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| | 2008 manual Appendix C urine collection and Appendix Drug | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Lab guidance | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.209(b)(5) | Not allow any covered employee to begin performing covered functions unless the result of the employee's test indicates an alcohol concentration of less than 0.04. GP more stringent | |
| §199.211 Requirement for | | <u> </u> |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.211 | Does the plan specify operator's procedures for notification to employees prior to conducting alcohol testing? | Plan must contain specific details on how this is accomplished and what information is provided to employees. Section 5.4.5 page 5-6 Procedure lacks detail, 10-8-2008 included in 2008 manual |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.211 | Does the plan clearly delineate under what authority the alcohol testing is being conducted? Section 5.4.5 page 5-6 Does not delineate under what authority, manual written for union personnel, wording did not say DOT, 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual | |

| §199.215 Alcohol concentration | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.215 | Does the plan specify that no employee may report for duty or remain on duty with an alcohol concentration of 0.04 Section 5.2.1.5 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.215 | Does the plan specify what actions will occur should the operator have actual | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| | knowledge that an employee | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | has an alcohol concentration | |
| | of 0.04 or greater? | |
| | Section 5.2.1.4 | |
| §199.217 On-duty use | | |
| □YES □NO □N/A | Does the plan specify that on- | |
| §199.217 | duty use of alcohol is | |
| | prohibited? | |
| | Section 5.2.1.1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan specify that no | |
| §199.217 | employee may be allowed to | |
| | perform or continue to | |
| | perform a covered function, if | |
| | an employee has used alcohol | |
| | while on-duty? | |
| | Section 5.2.1.1 | |
| §199.219 Pre-duty use | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan contain | |
| §199.219 | provisions that prohibit the use | |
| | of an employee who has used | |
| | alcohol within 4 hours of | |
| | reporting for duty? | |
| | Section 5.2.1.5 | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.219 Pre-duty use | | |
|---|--|----------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.219 | Does the plan address that an employee who has been notified to respond to an emergency must not use alcohol once notified to | |
| | report? Section 5.2.1.5 page 5-2 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.219 | Does the plan address that an operator who has actual knowledge that an employee has used alcohol, once being notified | |
| | to respond to an emergency shall not allow the employee to perform covered functions? Section 5.2.1.3 and 5.2.1.3 page 5-2 | |
| \$100 221 Use following on | | |
| §199.221 Use following an : ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.221 | Does the operator's plan provide that an employee shall be prohibited from using alcohol following an accident, in which the employee's action contributed or cannot be completely discounted? Section 5.4.3 page 5-5 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.221 | Does the plan require that an employee may not use alcohol for up to 8 hours following an accident or until a test has been administered? Section 5.4.3 page 5-5 | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.223 Refusal to submit | to a required alcohol test | |
|----------------------------|--|----------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan prohibit an | |
| §199.223 | employee's refusal to submit to a | · |
| | post-accident test? 199.225(a) | |
| | Section 5.4.4 page 6 | |
| | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan prohibit an | |
| §199.223 | employee's refusal to submit to a | • |
| | reasonable suspicion test? | |
| • | 199.225(b) | |
| | Section 5.4.2 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan prohibit an | |
| §199.223 | employee's refusal to submit to a | |
| | follow-up test? 199.225(d). | |
| | Section 5.2.1.7 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan address that an | |
| §199.223 | employee's refusal to submit to a | |
| | test shall result in that employee | |
| • . | not being permitted to perform or | |
| · | continue to perform covered | |
| | functions? | · |
| | Section 5.2.1.7 | |
| §199.225 Alcohol tests re | auired | |
| | Does the operator's plan provide | |
| <u>.</u> | for the following: | |
| | The task that the same that th | |
| | Post-Accident | |
| | | |
| □YES □NO □N/A | Does the plan specify alcohol | · |
| §199.225(a) | testing for post-accident and | • |
| - - | address the following: | |
| | Section 5.4.3 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 1. The operator shall | |
| §199.225(a)(1) | conduct the testing as | |
| | soon as practicable. | |
| | Section 5.4.3 | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.225 Alcohol tests required | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 2. Each surviving covered | |
| §199.225(a)(1) | employee shall be tested if an | |
| · | employee's performance | |
| | either contributed or cannot | |
| | be completely discounted. | |
| | Section 5.4.3 | · |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 3. The decision not to administer | This determination should |
| §199.225(a)(1) | a test must be based on the | be based on the best |
| | operator's determination that | available information at the |
| · | the covered employee's | time of the accident. |
| | performance could not have | |
| | contributed to the accident. | |
| | Section 5.4.3 not addressed but | |
| | implied always tested, 10-8- | |
| | 2008, included in 2008 manual | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 4. Is the test conducted within 2 | |
| §199.225(a)(2)(i) | hours? | |
| | Section 5.4.5.P2 says | |
| | immediately does not define 2 | · |
| | hours, 10-8-2008 included in | |
| | 2008 manual | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 5. If test was not conducted | |
| §199.225(a)(2)(i) | within 2 hours, does the | |
| | operator prepare and maintain | |
| | a record stating why the test | |
| · | was not administered. | |
| | Section 5.4.5.P2 not there, | |
| | implied, 10-8-2008, included in | |
| | 2008 manual | |
| | 6. Does the operator attempt | The operator may attempt |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | testing up to 8 hours | to test up to 8 hours after |
| §199.225(a)(2)(i) | following an accident? | which time all attempts |
| | Section 5.4.3. Page 5-5, | must cease. |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 7. Is a record prepared and | |
| §199.225(a)(2)(i) | maintained as to why a test | |
| | was not administered within 8 | |
| | hours? | |
| | Section 5.4.5.P2 not addressed, | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| | practice is to test. 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(a)(3) | 8. The plan must state the employee shall remain readily available until a post-accident test is conducted. Section 5.4.3 | |

WUTC

HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ALCOHOL MISUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.225 Alcohol tests required | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify that failure | | |
| §199.225(a)(3) | to remain readily available will be | | |
| | deemed as a refusal to test? | | |
| | Section 5.4.3 | · | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan address provisions | Note: No operator shall | |
| §199.225(a)(3) | regarding the need for medical | delay medical treatment or | |
| | attention? | delay emergency response | |
| | Section 5.4.3 | pending an alcohol test. | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan provide provisions | | |
| §199.225(a)(3) | regarding the need to leave an | | |
| | accident scene to obtain | | |
| | assistance in responding to the | | |
| | accident? | • | |
| | Section 5.4.3 | | |
| | Reasonable Suspicion | | |
| | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan specify reasonable | · | |
| §199.225(b)(1) | suspicion alcohol testing and | · | |
| 8 | address the following elements: | · | |
| | Section 5.4.2 | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 1. Decisions to test shall be | Note: The supervisor who | |
| §199.225(b)(2) | based on specific | makes the determination of | |
| | contemporaneous, articulable | reasonable suspicion shall | |
| | observations concerning the | not conduct the breath | |
| · | appearance, behavior, speech | alcohol test on that | |
| · | or body odor of the employee. | employee. | |
| · | not as clear as could be page 5- | · | |
| | 4, Section 5.4.2 wording varies | | |
| | to much from code 199.105 (d), | | |
| | depends on supervisor 60 | | |
| | minute training, 10-8-2008, | | |
| | included in 2008 manual | | |
| DATES DATE DATE | Requested training to review | | |
| YES NO NA | 2. The observations shall be | | |
| §199.225(b)(1) | made by one supervisor | | |
| | trained in detecting symptoms | | |
| | of alcohol misuse and must be | | |
| <u> </u> | documented. | | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| Page 5-4 Section 5.4.2 | |
|------------------------|--|
| COMMENTS | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.225 Alcohol tests required | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 2. Does the plan | When observations are | |
| §199.225(b)(3) | authorize testing only | required by §199.225(b)(2) | |
| | when observations are | | |
| | made during, just before | | |
| | or just after performing covered functions? | | |
| | Section 5.4.2.P1 | | |
| | page 5-4 States immediately | · | |
| · · | following the work day not just | | |
| | after performing covered | 4 | |
| | functions. wording issue, 10-8- | | |
| | 2008, included in 2008 manual | | |
| | | · | |
| · | Word accident removed and | | |
| | reasonable suspicious incident | | |
| | put in its place. This is | · | |
| | reasonable cause not post | | |
| · | accident ROY said the | \$ | |
| | paragraph belonged under Post Accident, 10-8-2008, included | | |
| | in 2008 manual | | |
| □YES □NO □N/A | 4. Is the test conducted within 2 | Note: If test in not | |
| §199.225(b)(4)(i) | hours? | conducted within 2 hours, | |
| | Section 5.4.2.P3 | operator must document | |
| | | reason. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 5. If test was not conducted | | |
| §199.225(b)(4)(i) | within 2 hours, does operator | · · | |
| | prepare and maintain a record | | |
| | stating why the test was not | | |
| | administered? | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Page 5.5 Section 5.4.2 6. Does the operator attempt | The exercise may attend | |
| §199.225(b)(4)(i) | testing up to 8 hours? | The operator may attempt to test up to 8 hours after | |
| §177.223(0)(T)(1) | Page 5.5 Section 5.4.2 | which time all attempts | |
| | Z mgo oto Nootzozi OtTiM | must cease. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 7. Is a record prepared and | | |
| §199.225(b)(4)(i) | maintained as to why a test | | |
| | was not administered? | | |

| The state of the s | | <u></u> |
|--|---|---------|
| | page 5-5 Section 5.4.2 P3 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(b)(4)(iii) | Does the plan specify that an employee may not perform or continue to perform under the influence or be impaired by alcohol until: Section 5.2.1.6 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.225(b)(4)(iii)(A) | 1. An alcohol test is administered with alcohol concentration of less than 0.02; or Section 5.2.1.6 | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.225 Alcohol tests required | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(b)(4)(iii)(B) | 2. The start of employee's next regular shift, but not less than 8 hours following determination to test. Section 5.2.1.4 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(b)(4)(iv) | Does the plan stipulate that no action be taken by the operator against an employee based solely on employee's behavior and appearance in absence of a DOT alcohol test? Section 5.4.2.P1 not there, policy says terminated after test, 10-8-2008 included in 2008 | Note: Clarification of company policy vs. DOT requirements. Company policy should be identified by using bold and underlined type. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(b)(4)(iv) | manual Does the plan specify any independent authority imposed by the operator? Section 5.7.1.MRO Return-to-Duty | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(c) | Section 5.2.1.6 Does the plan specify return-to-duty provisions? Section 5.2.1.6 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(c) | Does the plan specify prohibited conduct? Section 5.2.1.6 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(c) | Does the plan specify the employee be administered a return-to-duty alcohol test? Section 5.2.1.6 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(c) | Does the plan indicate that an employee must have a return-to-duty test with an alcohol concentration below 0.02? | | |

Zero tolerance

| §199.225 Alcohol tests required | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(d) | Follow-Up Tests Does the plan specify follow-up testing provisions to include: Section 5.2.1.6 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(d)(1) | Employees requiring assistance shall be subject to follow-up testing. Section 5.2.1.6 | Assistance includes resolving problems associated with alcohol misuse. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(d)(1) | 2. Employees shall be subject to testing in accordance with SAP determination. Section 5.2.1.6 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(d)(2) | 3. Testing shall be conducted just before the employee is to perform; while an employee is performing; or just after the employee has ceased performing a covered function. Section 5.2.1.6 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.225(e) | Retesting Does the operator's plan specify retesting when: | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.225(e) | 1. An employee's alcohol concentration is 0.02 or greater but less than 0.04. Section 5.2.1.6 | | |

WUTC

HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ALCOHOL MISUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.225 Alcohol tests required | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.225(e) | 2. An employee is to return-to- duty within 8 hours following administration of an alcohol test | | |
| · | with an alcohol concentration of 0.02 or greater but less than 0.04. Section 5.2.1.4 | | |
| §199.227/§40.333 Retention | of records | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.227(a) | Does the operator maintain records in a secure location with controlled access? Section 5.10 P3, last sentence | | |
| | GP keeps employee signed release in locked in HR all other documentation is with MRO | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b) | Does the plan require the operator to keep the following records: Section 5.12 | Do a review of records to verify that the plan is being carried out. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(1) | Records to be kept for 5 years 1. Employee alcohol tests results with alcohol concentration of 0.02 or greater. Section 5.12.1 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(1) | 2. Documentation of employee refusals to submit to required alcohol tests.5.2.1.7 and 5.12.1 | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(1) | 3. Calibration documentation. Section 5.11.page 5-11 | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(1) | 4. Employee evaluations and referrals. | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records. | |

| §199.227/§40.333 Retention of records | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(1) | 5. Alcohol MIS annual report data Section 5.12.1 | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §40.333 | Records to be kept for 3 years Information obtained from previous employers under §40.25 concerning drug and alcohol test results of employees. Section 5.12.1 | | |
| | Records to be kept for 2 years | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(2) /§40.333 | 1. Collection process records and training documentation. | Except calibration of EBT devices | |
| - | Section 5.9.1 and 5.4.1 and 5.12.1 | | |
| | Records to be kept for 1 year | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(b)(3) /§40.333 | 1. Records of all test results below 0.02 level. Section 5.12.1 | As defined by CFR 49 Part 40 | |
| : | Records related to collection process | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(1)(i) | 1. Collection log books (if used). Section 5.12.1 | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(1)(ii) | Calibration documentation for EBT devices. Section 5.12.1 | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.227(c)(1)(iii) | 2. Documents on BAT Training. Section 5.12.1 page 5-11 | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records | |

| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(1)(iv) | 3. Documents supporting decisions to administer reasonable suspicion tests. | Each employer or its agent shall maintain these records |
|---|---|---|
| | Section 5.12.1 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.227(c)(1)(v) | 4. Documents supporting decision to administer postaccident tests. Section 5.12.1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(1)(vi) | 5. Documents supporting medical explanation of inability to provide a breath for testing. Section 5.12.1 | |
| | Records related to results | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(2)(i) | 1. Operator's copy of test form. | Must include results of test. |
| | Section 5.12.1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 2. Documents of refusal to | |
| §199.227(c)(2)(ii) | submit to alcohol tests. Section 5.12.1 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.227(c)(2)(iii) | 3. Documents supporting employee's dispute to result of alcohol test. | |
| | Section 5.12.1 | , |
| YES INO IN/A | Records related to other violations of Part 199. | |
| §199.227(c)(3) | Section 5.12.1 | |
| | Records related to evaluations | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.227(c)(4)(i) | 1. Records of determination by SAP concerning covered employee's need for assistance. Section 5.12.1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 2. Records demonstrating | |
| §199.227(c)(4)(ii) | employee's compliance with | |

WUTC

HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ALCOHOL MISUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| SAP recommendations. | | |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Section 5.12.1 | | • |

COMMENTS

| §199.227 Retention of records | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(5) | 3. Records demonstrating operator's MIS annual testing data. Section 5.12.1 | | |
| | Records related to education | | |
| | and training | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(6)(i) | Alcohol Misuse Awareness materials. Section 5.12.1 | Obtain a copy of operator's policy on alcohol misuse. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(6)(ii) | 2. Documents of compliance with requirements of access to facilities and records. 199.231 Section 5.12.1 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(6)(iii) | 3. Documents on supervisor training for reasonable suspicion determinations. Section 5.12.1 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.227(c)(6)(iv) | 4. Documents certifying training requirements. Section 5.12.1 | | |
| §199.229 Reporting of alco | hol testing results | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.229(a)/§40.25 and App H | Does the plan specify alcohol testing data to be maintained and reported to RSPA annually? Section 5.12.1 | Note: Large operators must submit the report not later than March 15 each calendar year. Small operators will be randomly selected to report. This data is for the previous calendar year (Jan. 1 – Dec. 31). | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.229(a))/§40.25 and App H | Does the operator provide documentation that information collected is being maintained? | | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| COLUMN | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Section 5.12.1 | | | |
| | | | |

COMMENTS

| §199.229 Reporting of alcohol testing results | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE CRITERION GUIDANCE | | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.229(a))/§40.25 and App H | Does the operator provide documentation that "missed" test information is being collected and maintained? Section 5.12.1 | Missed test - a test that is not conducted within 8 hours. "Missed" test information must be submitted to OPS, (when the MIS information is submitted) for 3 years beginning in 1995. | | | |
| §199.231 Access to facilities | s and records | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.231(a) | Does the plan specify procedures regarding the release of employee information? Section 5.10 P2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.231(b) | Does the plan specify release of records pertaining to employee's use of alcohol? Section 5.10 P2 | Records should include alcohol test results. | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.231(b) | Does the plan address access to records by employee without payment restrictions? Section 5.7.1 employee does not have to pay | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.231(c) | Does the plan specify access to records by the Secretary of Transportation, RSPA, or other DOT/State agency representatives? Section 5.10.P2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.231(d) | Does the plan specify release of records including operator's alcohol testing results to the Secretary of Transportation, RSPA or other DOT/State agency representatives? Section 5.10.P2 | | | | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.231 Access to facilities and records | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan stipulate the release | | |
| §199.231(d) | of name-specific alcohol test | | |
| | results when requested by | • | |
| · | appropriate officials? | | |
| | Section 5.10.P2 | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify release of | | |
| §199.231(e)/§40.327(b) | records to NTSB as part of an | | |
| | accident investigation? | | |
| | Section 5.10.P2 | | |
| ☐YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan address provisions | | |
| §199.231(f)/§40.81(g) | for release of records by operator | | |
| | to subsequent employer? | | |
| | Section 5.10 | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify restrictions | | |
| §199.231(f)/§40.320 | on release of records? | | |
| | Section 5.10 | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify release of | | |
| §199.231(g)/§40.323 | employee information to the | | |
| | employee, decision makers in a | | |
| | lawsuit, grievance, or other | | |
| | proceeding initiated by or on | | |
| | behalf of the individual? | | |
| | Section 5.10 | | |
| | Does the plan address the release | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | of an employee's records upon | | |
| §199.231(h) /§40.321(b) | the specific, written consent of | | |
| | the information to an identified | | |
| | person? | | |
| | Section 5.10 | | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.233 Removal from covered function | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE CRITERION GUIDANCE | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan specify provisions | Prohibited Conduct - | | |
| §199.233 | on removal from covered | alcohol concentration of | | |
| | functions for violations of alcohol | 0.04 or greater, actual | | |
| | misuse? | knowledge of on-duty use, | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.5 & 5.2.2 | actual knowledge of pre- | | |
| | | duty use (4 hours prior to | | |
| | | work), use of alcohol | | |
| · | | resulting in an accident and | | |
| | | refusal to submit to an | | |
| | | alcohol test. | | |
| §199.235 Required evaluati | on and testing | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan address the | | | |
| §199.235 | requirement for a referral or | | | |
| | evaluation, following an | • | | |
| | employee engaging in prohibited | | | |
| | conduct? | · | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.6 | | | |
| §199.237 Other alcohol-rela | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify provisions | Note: A covered employee | | |
| §199.237 | where an employee has an | may not perform or | | |
| | alcohol concentration of 0.02 or | continue to perform | | |
| | greater but less than 0.04 to | covered functions if they | | |
| · | perform covered functions until: | have an alcohol concentra- | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.4 | tion of 0.02 or greater. | | |
| | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 1. Employee's alcohol | | | |
| §199.237(a)(1) | concentration is below 0.02, | | | |
| | or | | | |
| FIVE FINO FINA | Section 5.2.1.4 | | | |
| YES NO NA | 2. The employee's next | · | | |
| §199.237(a)(2) | scheduled tour of duty, or at | | | |
| | least 8 hours have elapsed? | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Section 5.2.1.4 | Howaran this dasse't | | |
| §199.237(b) | Does the plan specify that no | However, this doesn't | | |
| §199.237(b) | action against an employee can be taken solely on a test result of less | prohibit an operator from exercising their | | |
| | than 0.04? | independent authority. | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.4 | maependent aumonty. | | |
| | Section 5.4.1.4 | | | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.239 Operator obligation to promulgate a policy on the misuse of alcohol | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION GUIDANCE | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan address educational | | | | |
| §199.239(a) | materials that explain the alcohol | | | | |
| | requirements? | | | | |
| | Section 5.9.1 and 5.9.2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan stipulate that a | | | | |
| §199.239(a)(1) | copy of the material is provided | | | | |
| | to employees prior to the | | | | |
| | commencement of testing? | * | | | |
| | Page 5-6 Section 5.4.5 Reviewed | | | | |
| | EBA material, also Section 5 | | | | |
| | O&M, Labor Agreement and | | | | |
| | bulletin boards | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the operator maintain | | | | |
| §199.239(a)(2) | written documentation to verify | | | | |
| | notice? | | | | |
| | not in manual but Reviewed | · | | | |
| | EBA material. Included in 2008 | | | | |
| | manual | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Does the plan specify that | | | | |
| §199.239(a)(2) | materials provided to employees | | | | |
| | address the following: | · | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 1. Identify of persons to provide | | | | |
| §199.239(b)(1) | answers about operator's | · | | | |
| g155.255(0)(1) | materials. | | | | |
| | Page 5-1 last paragraph | | | | |
| □YES □NO □N/A | 2. A list of covered employee | | | | |
| §199.239(b)(2) | categories. | | | | |
| 8177.237(0)(2) | Section 5.3.3 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 3. Guidance on period of | Note: Just before, during | | | |
| §199.239(b)(3) | coverage during work day that | and just after ceasing to | | | |
| 3222.207(0)(0) | an employee is subject to | perform covered functions. | | | |
| | testing provisions. | portorin covered renemons. | | | |
| | Section 5.2.1 | · | | | |
| | DVCHUH J.#.1 | <u></u> | | | |

WUTC

HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ALCOHOL MISUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.239 Operator obligation to promulgate a policy on the misuse of alcohol | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 4. Procedures to be utilized to | | | |
| §199.239(b)(6) | test for presence of alcohol | | | |
| | Section 5.5.1 detailed | | | |
| | procedure not in manual 10- | | | |
| | 8-2008 included in 2008 | | | |
| | manual | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 5. Explanation of refusals and | | | |
| §199.239(b)(8) | consequences. | | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.7 | | | |
| □YES □NO □N/A | 6. Consequences of employee | | | |
| §199.239(b)(9) | violation of the prohibitions | | | |
| | of the plan and removal from | | | |
| | performing covered functions. | | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.7 | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 7. Consequences of testing at | | | |
| §199.239(b)(10) | 0.02 or greater but less than | | | |
| | 0.04 | | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.4 | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 8. Information on alcohol effects | | | |
| §199.239(b)(11) | on individual's health, work, | | | |
| | and personal life, signs and | | | |
| | symptoms of alcohol | | | |
| | problems, evaluating and | · | | |
| | resolving problems, referral to | | | |
| | an EAP or management. | | | |
| | Section 5.9.2 | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan discuss optional | Operators policy related to | | |
| §199.239(c) | materials and authority for | alcohol possessions, and | | |
| | issuance of such materials? | levels invoked by an | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.6 | operator's independent | | |
| · | | authority. | | |
| §199.241 Training for supervisors | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify that at least | | | |
| §199.241 | 60 minutes of training for | | | |
| <u> </u> | supervisors, who make | | | |
| | reasonable suspicion | | | |
| · | determinations? | | | |

| | Section 5.9.1 | |
|--|---------------|--|
| | COMMENTS | |

| §199.241 Training for supervisors | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE CRITERION GUIDANCE | | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan provide such | | | | |
| §199.241 | training shall include training on | | | | |
| · | the physical, behavioral, speech | | | | |
| | and performance indictors of | · | | | |
| | probable alcohol misuse? | A. Carlotte | | | |
| | Section 5.9.1 | | | | |
| §199.243 Referral, evaluat | on, and treatment | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan provide that | | | | |
| §199.243(a) | employees who engage in | | | | |
| | prohibited conduct shall be | | | | |
| | advised of available resources to | | | | |
| | evaluate and resolve problems | | | | |
| | associated with alcohol misuse? | | | | |
| | Section 5.9.2 and 3 and 5.2.1.6 | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan contain names, | It is acceptable if the plan | | | |
| §199.243(a) | addresses, and phone numbers of | provides that the Third | | | |
| | SAPs, counselors, treatment | Party provider network | | | |
| · | programs, and third party | gives the name and phone | | | |
| | provider networks? | number directly to the | | | |
| · · | Page 5-10, EBA refers for | employee. | | | |
| | everything. Phone numbers | · | | | |
| | were wrong (typo). Correct | | | | |
| | numbers included in 2008 | | | | |
| | manual | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan address that | | | | |
| §199.243(b) | employees who engage in | | | | |
| | prohibited conduct shall be | | | | |
| | referred to a SAP for evaluation? | | | | |
| | Section 5.9.3.1 | | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | Does the plan specify a return-to- | An employee must have a | | | |
| §199.243(c)(1) | duty test is required when an | test result of less than 0.02 | | | |
| | employee engages in prohibited | before returning to perform | | | |
| | conduct described in §§199.215 | covered functions. | | | |
| | through 199.223. | | | | |
| | Section 5.2.14 | | | | |

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.243 Referral, evaluation, and treatment | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE CRITERION GUIDANCE | | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(c)(2)(i) | Does the plan specify evaluation by SAP to determine that the employee has properly followed | | | | |
| | any prescribed program? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(c)(2)(ii) | Does the plan specify that an employee shall be subject to unannounced follow-up testing? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(c)(2)(ii) | Does the plan stipulate that a minimum of six tests be conducted within the first 12 months following an employee's return-to-duty test? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(c)(2)(ii) | Does the plan specify that follow- up testing may include testing for drugs? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 doesn't say, 10-8-2008 included in 2008 manual | Drug testing must be determined by the SAP. | | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.243(c)(2)(ii) | Does the plan specify that follow- up testing cannot exceed a 60 month period? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(c)(2)(ii) | Does the plan specify that the SAP may terminate follow-up testing after completion of the first six tests? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 doesn't say, 10-8-2008 included in 2008 manual | | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(d) | Does the plan specify evaluation and rehabilitation maybe provided by the operator, SAP under contract, or SAP not affiliated with the operator? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 doesn't say, | | | | |

| | 10-8-2008 included in 2008 | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|
| | manual | | |
| | | | |

WUTC HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ALCOHOL MISUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

(Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

| §199.243 Referral, evaluati | on, and treatment | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.243(e) | Does the plan specify provisions regarding referral to SAPs and restrictions that may apply? Section 5.9.3.1 P2 doesn't say, 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual | SAP can't refer an employee to the SAP's private practice, to a person or organization from which the SAP receives remuneration or in which the SAP has financial interests. |
| §199.245 Contractor emplo | yees | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.245(a) | Does the plan specify that the contractor may carry out alcohol testing, training, and education? Section 5.1 P3 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.245(b) | Does the plan stipulate that an operator is responsible for ensuring compliance with the alcohol provisions? Section 5.1 P3 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.245(c) | Does the plan specify that the operator, RSPA Administrator, and DOT/State agency representatives have access to property and records? Section 5.1 P3 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.245(c) | Does the plan have detailed specifications for monitoring contractor's compliance with the requirements of 49 CFR Parts 199 and 40? Section 5.1 P3 | |

WUTC HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ALCOHOL MISUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM (Old Camas Alcohol Inspection)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

| | Georgia Pacific Consu | ımer Produc | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| OP ID No. | | UTC Representative (s): Patti Johnson | | |
| HQ Address: | | | Inspection Date(s): | |
| 133 Peach Tree Street NE | | | 9-29and 30, 2008 for stand | |
| Atlantic, Georgia 30303 | | | | 2008 for follow up & D/A for |
| | | | old D/A manual | |
| Co. Official: | | | 401 Adams | · |
| Phone No.: | , | | Camas, WA 98607 | · |
| Fax No.: | | • | | |
| Emergency Phone No.: 🖔 | • | | · | |
| Persons Interviewe | ed · | Т | itle | Phone No. |
| Laurie Lehman | • | HR Gener | alist | 360 834 8125 |
| Roy Rogers | | Consulta | | 503 860 7435 |
| Curt Christianson | | HR for the | NW | 360 834 8123 |
| inspection the of F This is an inspectic corporate manual training is comple Prior to Koch puthowever, they ar | Koch's corporate Drug on of GP Camas Mill I was adopted on Septe te. Irchase GO was a sta e part of the whole G | and Alcoho Drug and Al mber 22, 20 Indalone po Georgia Pac | cohol Manual. Koch is t 08 and will be implement ool. Currently, GP is no | nustomized for Georgia Pacific he new owner and their ted after the October, 2008 of part of a consortium, as LLC pool employees. |
| Type of Facility: | | | | |
| | smission Pipeline oution System | - | Hazardous Liquid Pipe Liquefied Natural Gas | line |
| Anti-Drug Plan ar | nd Policy developed by | : Anti | i-Drug Testing Program | administered by: |
| x Operator | • | | Operator | |
| Contractor | · • | - | x Contractor | |
| Contractor Consortium | | | Consortium | |
| | | | | |

| Contractor records maintained by: | Specimen collection conducted by: |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| _x Operator Contractor Consortium | Operator Personnel On-Site Operator Personnel Off-Site Contractor Personnel On-Site x Contractor Personnel Off-Site |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.1 | 1. Does the operator test covered employees for the presence of drugs & alcohol? | |
| §199.3 Definitions | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.3/§195.50 | 1. Does plan contain applicable accident or incident definitions as defined in §§191.3 or 195.50? Section 5.2.1.1 | Plan must contain one or both definitions. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.3/§40.3 | Does plan contain complete definition of "covered employee"? Section 5.13 | Plan should address "applicants." Covered Employee: Any person who performs an operation, maintenance, or emergency-response on the pipeline or LNG facility that is regulated by Parts 192, 193, or 195. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.3 | 3. Does operator plan address testing for only the following drugs? Marijuana Opiates Cocaine Amphetamines Phencyclidine(PCP) Section 5.3.1 | |

| §199.101 Anti-drug plan | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.101(a) | 1. Does the operator maintain and follow a written anti-drug plan that confirms to §§ Part 199 & 40 (Procedures for Transportation Workplace)? Section 5.1 P2, 5.5.1, 5.7.1 the phone number is wrong: 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual updated | Plan must address requirements of Part 40, specifically the collection, laboratory and MRO procedures. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.101(a)(1) | 2. The plan must contain: a. Methods and procedures for compliance with all requirements of CFR 49 Part 199, including an employees assistance program: Section 5.9.2 | Note: Clarification of company policy vs. DOT requirements. Company policy should be identified by using bold and underlined type. 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual updated Section 5.2.1.7 is policy and should be underlined and bold |
| | | Section 5.2.1 is mostly policy and all policy should be underlined and bold |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.101(a)(2) | b. The name/address of each laboratory that analyzes the specimens collected for drug testing; and Section 5.6.1 phone number wrong: 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual updated | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.101(a)(3) | c. The name/address of the operator's medical review officer (MRO) and Substance Abuse Professional (SAP). Section 5.6.1 phone number wrong: 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual updated | |

WUTC HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ANTI-DRUG PROGRAM (Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| §199.101 Anti-drug plan | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | d. Specify procedures for | Plan must contain specific | |
| §199.101(a)(4) | notifying employees of the | details on how this is | |
| | coverage and provision of the | accomplished and what | |
| | plan. | information is provided to | |
| | Section 5.4.5 detailed procedure | employees. | |
| | lacking: 10-8-2008, included | | |
| | in 2008 manual updated | | |
| §199.103 Use of persons wh | | | |
| | 1. Does the anti-drug plan provide | | |
| | that an operator may not use as | | |
| | employee any person who: | | |
| | Section 5.7 P3 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | a. Fails a drug test required by | | |
| §199.103(a)(1) | §199.105 and the MRO deter- | | |
| | mines there is no legitimate | | |
| · | medical explanation for the | | |
| | confirmed positive test other | | |
| | than unauthorized use of a | | |
| | prohibited drug? | | |
| | Section 5.7.P3 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | b. Refuses to take a drug test | | |
| §199.103(a)(2) | required by Part 199? | | |
| | Section 5.2.1.7 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 2. Does the plan specify that a | | |
| §199.103(b) | person may be used in a | · | |
| | covered function if that person | | |
| ! | has: | | |
| · | Section 5.2.1.1 | <u>.</u> | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | a. Passed a DOT drug test? | | |
| §199.103(b)(1) | Section 5.9.3.1 | | |
| · | | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | b. Been recommended by the | Plan should specify action | |
| §199.103(b)(2) | SAP to return-to-duty? | taken if individual fails | |
| . ! | Section 5.9.3.1 | drug test after returning to | |
| ! | 1 | duty | |
| | | | |
| STORES INO IN/A | c. Not failed a drug test required | · | |
| §199.103(b)(3) | by Part 199 returning to duty? | | |
| | Section 5.9.3.1 | | |
| 1 | 1 | į l | |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| §199.105 Drug tests required | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(a) | Pre-Employment Testing Does the operator conduct the pre-employment testing which includes the following: a. All individuals pass a DOT drug test for the employer prior to employment or assignment in a covered function? Section 5.4.1 in one part says may and in other says will be tested. Must say will be tested: 10-8-2008, included in | Persons already covered by an anti-drug program conforming to Part 199 need not test. | |
| | 2008 manual updated | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(b) | Post-Accident Testing Does the operator conduct the post-accident testing which includes the following: a. Drug test each employee, as soon as possible but no later than 32 hours after an accident, whose performance either contributed to the accident or cannot be completely discounted as a contributing factor to the accident? Section 5.4.3 | | |
| | | | |

WUTC HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ANTI-DRUG PROGRAM (Old Camas Drug Inspection)

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| §199.105 Drug tests required | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(b) | b. Decision not to test has been based upon the best information available immediately after the accident that the employee's performance could not have Section 5.4.3 | Documentation pertaining to decision to test or not to test should be maintained by operator or contractor. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(b) | c. Decision not to test because of the time between the employee's performance and the accident; it is not likely that a drug test would reveal whether the performance was affected by drug use? Section 5.4.3 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(c) | Random Testing 1. Does the operator's anti-drug plan have specific procedures that provide for: a. Random employee selection process? Section 5.4.4.P2 | Specify type of random selection process. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(c)(2) | b. Determination of 25% annualized rate? (DOT notice dated 12/28/2006) Section 5.4.4P3 doesn't say if RSPA goes to 50% so will mill: 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual updated | Calculate 25% random rate for each year. Plan must specify random period (12 times a year, or 4 times a year, etc.) | |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| \$199.105(c)(5) procedure is based on a random table or on a computer-based number generation system, or another method meeting DOT requirements. Section 5.4.4 P2 d. The annualized rate of unannounced testing on random selection is based on the total number of personnel in covered positions. Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list of positions Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list or with minutes, plus travel to once notified by a condition of ficial. Determine random posize at beginning of calendar year or average pool size over 12-most period, based on the number of employees the time of each test or any other similar scheme that will take account the variable number of employees during the year PYES DOD N/A §199.105(c)(7) PYES NO NA §199.105(d) Reasonable Cause 1. Each employee who performs a covered function, and who is | | d | §199.105 Drug tests require | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| \$199.105(c)(5) procedure is based on a random table or on a computer-based number generation system, or another method meeting DOT requirements. Section 5.4.4 P2 d. The annualized rate of unannounced testing on random selection is based on the total number of personnel in covered positions. Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list of positions Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list or with minutes, plus travel to once notified by a condition of ficial. Determine random posize at beginning of calendar year or average pool size over 12-most period, based on the number of employees the time of each test or any other similar scheme that will take account the variable number of employees during the year PYES DOD N/A \$199.105(c)(7) PYES NO NA \$199.105(d) Reasonable Cause 1. Each employee who performs a covered function, and who is | GUIL | CRITERION | COMPLIANCE | GUIDANCE |
| d. The annualized rate of unannounced testing on random selection is based on the total number of personnel in covered positions. Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list of positions Section 5.4.2 P3, page 5-4 is list of any other similar scheme that will take account the variable number of employees during the year YES DODNA §199.105(c)(7) Section 5.4.4 PYES DODNA §199.105(d) Reasonable Cause d. The annualized rate of unannounced testing on random size at beginning of calendar year or average pool size over 12-mo period, based on the number of employees the time of each test of or any other similar scheme that will take account the variable number of employees during the year (Semi-annual and an are unacceptable.) Reasonable Cause | immediately collection sit minutes, plus once notified | procedure is based on a random table or on a computer-based number generation system, or another method meeting DOT requirements. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Note: An employee should immediately report to the collection site or within 30 minutes, plus travel time, once notified by a company official. |
| \$199.105(c)(6) announced testing on random selection is based on the total number of personnel in covered positions. Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list of positions Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list or any other similar scheme that will take account the variable number of employees during the year PYES DODNA \$199.105(c)(7) Section 5.4.4 Reasonable Cause announced testing on random size at beginning of calendar year or avera pool size over 12-more period, based on the number of employees the time of each test or any other similar scheme that will take account the variable number of employees during the year (Semi-annual and an are unacceptable.) Section 5.4.4 Reasonable Cause | Determine ra | | TIVES TINO TIN/A | Determine random pool |
| \$199.105(c)(7) through-out the year? Section 5.4.4 PYES DNO N/A \$199.105(d) 1. Each employee who performs a covered function, and who is | size at beginn calendar year pool size over period, based number of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear on umber of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear or any other scheme that waccount the vumber of ear or any other scheme that was account the vumber of ear | announced testing on random selection is based on the total number of personnel in covered positions. Section 5.4.4 P3, page 5-4 is list | i | size at beginning of calendar year or average pool size over 12-month period, based on the number of employees at the time of each test cycle or any other similar scheme that will take into account the variable number of employees |
| Section 5.4.4 □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(d) 1. Each employee who performs a covered function, and who is | (Semi-annua | e. Is plan spread reasonably | | (Semi-annual and annual |
| §199.105(d) 1. Each employee who performs a covered function, and who is | are unaccep | - | §199.105(c)(7) | are unacceptable.) |
| prohibited drugs, is tested for the presence of drugs in accordance with the regulations. Section 5.4.2 | s ng | 1. Each employee who performs a covered function, and who is reasonably suspected of using prohibited drugs, is tested for the presence of drugs in accordance with the regulations. | | |

| §199.105 Drug tests required | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(d) | 2. At least two supervisors, one of whom is trained in detection of the symptoms of drug use, substantiate and concur in the decision to test an employee who is reasonably suspected of drug use. Section 5.4.2 P2 | In the case of an operator with 50 or fewer covered employees subject to testing, only one supervisor of the employee, trained in detecting possible drug use symptoms shall substantiate the decision to test. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(d) | 3. Decisions to test are reasonable and articulable, and based on specific contemporaneous physical, behavioral or performance indicators of probable drug use. Section 5.4.2 P2 | The concurrence between the two supervisors may be by telephone. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.105(e)/§40.281-313 | 1. Covered employees who have refused a drug test or have returned to duty after having failed a DOT required drug test, must be evaluated face-to-face by a SAP, have properly followed any prescribed assistance, and be subject to a return-to-duty test. Section 5.2.1 | | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.105(f) | 1. Follow-up testing is performed on an un-announced basis, at a frequency established by the SAP, for a period of not more than 60 months. Section 5.2.1 Not permitted unless an employee tells GP before drug/alcohol tests that he needs help. | May include testing for alcohol in accordance with 49 CFR Part 40 as directed by the SAL. | |

WUTC

HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ANTI-DRUG PROGRAM

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 2. At least six tests must be | May include testing for |
|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| §199.105(f) | conducted within the first 12 | alcohol in accordance with |
| | months following the covered | 49 CFR Part 40 as directed |
| · | employee's return to duty. | by the SAL. |
| · | Section 5.2.1 | |
| | | |
| | | · · |

| §199.107 Drug testing laboratory | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.107(a) | 1. Does the operator use only those drug testing laboratories certified by the Department of | Check labs listed by operator against latest HHS/SAMHA certified lab list (dated | |
| | Health and Human Services (DHHS) under the DOT Procedures for all drug testing required by 49 CFR 199? Section 5.6.1 | 12/26/2006). | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.107(b)(1) | 2. Does the lab permit inspections by the operator prior to being awarded a testing contract? Section 5.6.1 P2 | Must allow un-announced inspections by the operator, plan administrator, or jurisdictional state agency representative. | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.107(b)(2) | 3. Does the lab allow unannounced inspections, including examination of records, at any time? Section 5.6.1 P2 | Must allow un-announced inspections by the operator, plan administrator, or jurisdictional state agency representative. | |
| §199.109 Review of drug testing | ng results | | |
| | MRO Qualifications and Responsibilities | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.109(a) | 1. Does the operator's plan designate a medical review officer? Section 5.7.1 | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.109(b)/§40.121 | 2. Does the operator's plan state that the MRO is a licensed physician and has the required qualifications required under §40.121? | What documentation is available to determine MRO's qualifications? | |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| | Section 5.7.1 | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| □YES □NO □N/A | 3. Does the MRO perform | |
| §199.109(c)/§40.123 | functions for the operator as | |
| | required under §40.123? | |
| | Section 5.7.1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 4. Does the MRO report all drug | |
| §199.109(d)/§40.163 | test results to the operator as | |
| | required by §40.163? | |
| | Section 5.7.1 P5 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A | 5. Does the operator ensure that | |
| §199.109(f) | the SAP does not refer covered | |
| | employees requiring | · |
| | assistance, to the SAP's | · |
| | private practice? | |
| | Section 5.9.2 | |

COMMENTS

| §199.111 Retention of sample and retesting | | |
|--|---|---|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.111(a) | 1. Are samples that yield positive results on confirmation retained by the laboratory in properly secured, long-term, frozen storage for at least 365 days as required by the DOT Procedures found? Section 5.6.5 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.111(b) | 2. If the MRO determines there is no legitimate medical reason for a confirmed positive test result, do the procedures permit the employee to submit a written request for a retest within 60 days of receipt of the final test results from the MRO? Section 5.7.1 P4 | Note: If a single specimen container is used, an employee has within 60 days to request a reanalysis after being notified of a positive test result. If a split specimen container is used, an employee has within 72 hours to request a reanalysis after receiving notification of a positive test result. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.111(b) | a. The employee may request retesting by a second DHHS | · |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| | certified lab. | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | Section 5.7.1 P4 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.111(b) | b. The employee must be reimbursed if the retest is negative.Section 5.7.1 P6 GP does not make employees pay | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.111(b) | c. The operator may require the employee to pay the associated retest costs in advance. Section 5.7.1 P6 GP does not make employees pay | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.111(c) | 3. If the employee requests retesting by a second laboratory does the original laboratory follow approved chain-of-custody transfer procedures? Section 5.7.1 P6 GP does not make employees pay | |

| §199.111 Retention of sample and retesting | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 3. Because it is possible that | |
| §199.111(d) | some analyses may deteriorate | |
| | during storage, the results of a | · |
| | retest are to be reported as | |
| | confirmation of the original | • |
| · | test results if the detected level | |
| | of the drug are (a) below the | · |
| | DOT established limits and, | |
| | (b) equal to or greater than the | |
| | sensitivity of the test. | |
| | Section 5.7.1 P5 lacks detail: | |
| | 10-8-2008, included in 2008 | |
| | manual updated | |
| §199.113 Employee Assistance Program (EAP) | | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 1. Does the operator provide an | |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| §199.113(a) | EAP for its employees and | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | supervisory personnel? | |
| | Section 5.9.2 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | a. Does the EAP include | · |
| §199.113(a) | education and training about | |
| | drug use? | |
| | Section 5.9.2 | |
| | 2. Does the operator, as part of | |
| | the EAP, display and | |
| , . | distribute: | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | Section 5.9.2 is doing, in | * |
| §199.113(b) | practice, but plan does not | |
| | say they distribute; reviewed | |
| | material EBA, contract, and | |
| | bulletin board: 10-8-2008, | |
| • | included in 2008 manual | + |
| | updated | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | b. Community service hot-line | |
| §199.113(b) | telephone number for | • |
| | employee assistance? | |
| | Section 5.9.2 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | c. The employer's policy | |
| §199.113(b) | regarding the use of prohibited | |
| · | drugs? | |
| | Section 5.9.2 | |
| | | |

| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A | 3. Does the operator provide at | |
| §199.113(c) | least a 60-minute period of | • |
| | training for supervisory | |
| | personnel which teaches the | |
| | specific contemporaneous | |
| | physical, behavioral, and | |
| | performance indicators of | |
| | probable drug use? | |
| | Section 5.9.1 | |

(Old Camas Drug Inspection)

| §199.115 Contractor employed | es | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.115 | Does the operator provide, by contract, that the drug testing, education and training of contractor employees required by 49 CFR Part 199 be carried out by contractor? Section 5.1.P3 | The contractor can provide the services through a consortia or third-party provider. 5.1 P3 |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.115(a) | 1. Does the operator remain responsible for ensuring compliancy with the requirements of 49 CFR 199, and Section 5.1.P3 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.115(b) | 2. Does the contractor allow access to property and records by the operator, DOT and any jurisdictional state agency for the purpose of monitoring the operator's compliance with the requirements of 49 CFR 199? Section 5.1.P3 | How does the employer "monitor" the contractor's compliance with Parts 199 and 40? |

| §199.117 Recordkeeping | | |
|------------------------------------|---|----------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(a) | 1. Does the anti-drug plan require the operator to keep the following record; and do records verify that the plan is being carried out? | |
| EVES ENO ENA | Section 5.12.1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(a)(1) | (1) Records demonstrating that the collection process conforms to Part 199 must be | |
| | kept at least 3 years. | |
| | Section 5.12.1 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.117(a)(2) | (2) Records that show an employee failed a drug test, the type of test failed, (e.g., post-accident) and records that demonstrate compliance | |
| | with the SAP's | |
| | recommendations, if any; and MIS annual report data shall be maintained for a minimum | |
| | of five years. | · |
| | Section 5.12.1 | |

| §199.117 Recordkeeping | | |
|------------------------------------|--|----------|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(a)(3) | Records showing an employee passed a drug test for at least 1 | |
| | year. Section 5.12.1 P1 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(a)(4) | Records confirming that supervisors and employees have been trained as required by this part for at least 3 years. | |
| | Section 5.12.1 list | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(b) | 2. Does the procedures prohibit the release of an individual's | |
| ; ; | drug test results or rehabilitation except as follows: | |
| • | Section 5.10 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(b) | a. Upon written consent of the individual; or Section 5.10 | |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.117(b) | b. Upon provided by DOT procedures (49 CFR Part 40); Section 5.10 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.117(b) | (1) As part of an accident investigation; or Section 5.10 | |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.117(b) | (2) For statistical evaluation (only without names); and training records. Section 5.10 | |

| §199.119 Reporting of anti-drug testing results | | |
|---|--|---|
| COMPLIANCE | CRITERION | GUIDANCE |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.119(a) | Does the plan make provisions for submitting an annual MIS report to PHMSA no later than March 15 of each year for the prior calendar year? Section 5.12.1 P1 | For "large" operators with more than 50 covered employees. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.119(c) | Does the operator correctly calculate the total number of covered employees eligible for random testing throughout the year? Section 5.4.4 page 6 | Operators conducting random testing more often than once per month (e.g., you select daily, weekly, bi-weekly), do not need to compute this total number of covered employees rate more than on a once per month basis. |
| □ YES □ NO □ N/A §199.119(d) | If used, does the operator ensure that the service agent used is testing at the appropriate percentage established for the industry and that only covered employees are in a random testing pool? Section 5.4.4 P2 | Service agents (e.g., C/TPA) may be used to perform random selections; and covered employees may be part of a larger random testing pool of covered employees. |
| ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A §199.117(e) | Are covered employees who perform multi-DOT agency functions (e.g., an employee performs pipeline maintenance duties and drives a commercial motor vehicle), counted only on the MIS report for the DOT agency under which he or she is randomly tested? not in manual but there are no other DOT agency functions: 10-8-2008, included in 2008 manual updated | Normally, this will be the DOT agency under which the employee performs more than 50% of his or her duties. |

WUTC **HEADQUARTERS INSPECTION FORM ANTI-DRUG PROGRAM** (Old Camas Drug Inspection)

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Standard Inspection Report for Intrastate Gas Transmission Pipelines Records Review and Field Inspection

A completed Standard Inspection Checklist, Cover Letter and Field Report is to be submitted to the Senior Engineer within 30 days from completion of the inspection.

| | Inspection Repo | ort | |
|------------------------------------|--|---------|-----------------------|
| Docket Number | 080098 | | |
| Inspector Name & Submit Date | Patti Johnson, 10-23-2008 | | |
| Sr. Eng Name & Review Date | David Lykken, 10-24-2008 | | |
| | Operator Informa | ation · | |
| Name of Operator: | Georgia Pacific Consumer Products, (Camas Mill) (LLC) OP ID #: 31096 | | OP ID #: 31096 |
| Name of Unit(s): | ne of Unit(s): Same | | |
| Records Location: | On site | | |
| Date(s) of Last (unit) Inspection: | 12-14-2005 Inspection Date(s): September 15, 16, 17, 29 30 & October 1, 2008 | | |

| Inspection | n Summary: |
|------------|------------|
|------------|------------|

Roy Roger's, Camas consultant, had filled out the standard form with all O&M Sections. I cut and pasted them into this form but did not check the O&M. This is a standard inspection Patti

| HQ Address: | | System/Unit Name & Address | : |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 133 Peach Tree Street NE Atlantic (| Georgia 30303 | 401 NE Adams Street, Camas, | , WA, 98607 |
| | | | · |
| Co. Official: Michael To | ompkins | Phone No.: | |
| Phone No.: (360) 834-8 | 3460 | Fax No.: | |
| Fax No.: | | Emergency Phone No.: | |
| Emergency Phone No.: | | | |
| Persons Interviewed | Tit | tle | Phone No. |
| Steve Young | Environmental P | rogram Director | (360) 834-8322 |
| Greg Collins | Power and Recover responsible for op- | | (360) 817-2155 |
| David Tucker | Mill Emergency Respons Lead | | (360) 834-8414 |
| Roy Rogers | Pipeline C | onsultant | (503) 860-7435 |
| Patrick Terry | EMS-Facility Support | Camas Mill (Welding) | (360) 834-8338 |

| | C staff conducted abbreviated procedures inspection on 192 O&M and WAC items | | 0 |
|-------------|--|--------|-------------|
| th | e last inspection. This checklist focuses on Records and Field items per a routine sta | andard | inspection. |
| | (check one below and enter appropriate date) | | |
| \boxtimes | Team inspection was performed (Within the past five years.) or, | Date: | 12/2005 |
| | | | |

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Standard Inspection Report for Intrastate Gas Transmission Pipelines Records Review and Field Inspection

| Other WUTC Inspector reviewed the O & M Manual (Since the last yearly review of the manual by | | | |
|---|---------------|-------|--|
| the operator.) | the manual by | Date: | |

| | | GAS SYST | TEM OPERATIONS | |
|------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Gas Supplie | r Williams Northwest Pipeline | | | |
| Number of re | portable safety related conditions last y | ear None | Number of deferred leaks in sys | tem None |
| Number of n | on-reportable safety related conditions la | ast year None | Number of third party hits last y | rear None |
| | smission pipeline within unit (total mile reas) 1.6 miles | s and miles in | | |
| Operating Pressure(s): | | | MAOP (Within last year) | Actual Operating Pressure (At time of Inspection) |
| Feeder: 2 | 250 psi | | 250 psi | 240 psi |
| Town: | 50 psig in plant ASME jurisdiction | | | |
| Other: | | | | |
| Does the ope | rator have any transmission pipelines? | yes | | |
| Compressor s | stations? Use Attachment 4. | NA | | |

| Pipe Specifications: | - | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Year Installed (Range) | 1993 | Pipe Diameters (Range) | 10" mainline |
| Material Type | steel | Line Pipe Specification Used | API 5L |
| Mileage | 1.6 miles | SMYS % | 10.4% |
| Supply Company | Williams Pipeline West | Class Locations | 3 |

Operator Qualification Field Validation

Important: Per OPS, the OQ Field Inspection Protocol Form (Rev 3, Feb 08) shall be used by the inspector as part of this standard inspection. When completed, the inspector will upload this information into the PHMSA OQ Database (OQDB) located at http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/oqdb/home.oq Date Completed: 9-16-2008

Public Awareness combined in this form

IMP – Plan completed and 9-10-2002, program implemented, have found and corrected issues, i.e a rock rubbed off coating. Coating repaired

Do you have a written procedure for every 192 and WAC code??? Yes according to Camas.

No other company besides GP directly or indirectly uses gas. Specialties Minerals is on site, they do not use Camas gas, and they do use NWN gas.

Joe did follow up for 2005 inspection and send closure letter signed by Alan Rathbun

Non jurisdictional metering station that verifies Williams meters and cuts pressure to 50 psig inside plant fence. 250 psig from Williams, GP gives plan 250 psig to plant and cuts to 50 psig inside plant. Regulators that cut to 50 are Non jurisdictional because of ASME.

30 C Street, Camas is William's gate station address.

Pipeline is ready to piggable.

GP does not odorize gas. NW odorizes all gas from Battle ground to Medford.

Williams's line by transfer flange has remote shut off valve controlled by Salt Lake. Williams would shut valve if approved GP personnel requested it.

Mass flow meter installed in 2007 replaced old turbine meter (purpose of this meter is just to verify Williams meter)

Plant does have SCADA for alarms only, for pressure from 250 to 250.

Williams has 2 full monitor runs for Camas and can dump full system with Anderson Greenwood Relief, Williams used ultra Sonic. The line is filtered and prevents any water in pipeline. Williams go from 800 psig thru heater to 240 delivery pressure at gate.

MERT (Mill Emergency Response Team) controls gas emergency, Camas MERT policy is to shut down in emergency. Maintenance would only shut off system for repairs if necessary. They would use Plidco bolt on clamps.

Pipeline never been worked on (no welding) - no mechanical - just coating dings.

Dennis Lloyd helped design pipeline.

| | *** | REPORTING RECORDS | Ŝ | Ü | N/A | N/C |
|----|--------|---|---|---|-----|-----|
| 1. | 191.5 | Telephonic reports to National Response Center (800-424-8802) None O&M Section 2.6.3 | х | | | |
| 2. | 191.15 | Written incident reports; supplemental incident reports (DOT Form RSPA F 7100.2) None O&M Section 2.6.1 | х | | | |

| | | REPORTING RECORDS | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|-----|------------------|--|------------|---|-----|-----|
| 3. | 191.17 (a) | Annual Report (DOT Form RSPA F 7100.2-1) O&M Section 3.8.3 | x | | | |
| 4. | 191.23 | Safety related condition reports None O&M Section 2.6.2 | х | | | |
| 5. | 192.727(g) | Abandoned facilities offshore, onshore crossing commercially navigable waterways reports None | х | | | |
| 6. | 480-93-200(1) | Telephonic Reports to UTC Pipeline Safety Incident Notification 1-888-321-9146 (Within 2 hours) for events which; O&M Section 2.6.1.2 | x . | | | |
| 7. | 480-93-200(1)(a) | Result in a fatality or personal injury requiring hospitalization; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1a | x | | | |
| 8. | 480-93-200(1)(b) | Results in damage to property of the operator and others of a combined total exceeding fifty thousand dollars; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1b | · x | | | |
| 9. | 480-93-200(1)(c) | Results in the evacuation of a building, or high occupancy structures or areas; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1c | х | | | |
| 10. | 480-93-200(1)(d) | Results in the unintentional ignition of gas; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1d | x | | | = |
| 11. | 480-93-200(1)(e) | Results in the unscheduled interruption of service furnished by any operator to twenty five or more distribution customers; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1e | . x | | | |
| 12. | 480-93-200(1)(f) | Results in a pipeline or system pressure exceeding the MAOP plus ten percent or the maximum pressure allowed by proximity considerations outlined in WAC 480-93-020; MAOP 250 operating pressure 240 psig O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1f | х | | | |
| 13. | 480-93-200(1)(g) | Is significant, in the judgment of the operator, even though it does not meet the criteria of (a) through (e) of this subsection; or None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.1g | x | | | |
| 14. | 480-93-200(2) | Telephonic Reports to UTC Pipeline Safety Incident Notification 1-888-321-9146 (Within 24 hours) for; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.2 & 2.6.3 | х | · | | |
| 15. | 480-93-200(2)(a) | The uncontrolled release of gas for more than two hours; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.2 a | x | | | |
| 16. | 480-93-200(2)(b) | The taking of a high pressure supply or transmission pipeline or a major distribution supply pipeline out of service; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.2 b | х | | | |
| 17. | 480-93-200(2)(c) | A pipeline operating at low pressure dropping below the safe operating conditions of attached appliances and gas equipment; or None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.2c | x | | | |
| 18. | 480-93-200(2)(d) | A pipeline pressure exceeding the MAOP None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.2d | x | | | |
| 19. | 480-93-200(5) | Written incident reports (within 30 days) including the following; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.4 | x | | | |
| 20. | 480-93-200(4)(a) | Name(s) and address(es) of any person or persons injured or killed, or whose property was damaged; None O&M Section 2.6.1.2.4a | x | * | | |

| | | REPORTING RECORDS | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|------------|---|---|--------------|---|---------|----------|
| 21. | | The extent of injuries and damage; | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(b) | | x | | | |
| 22. | | A description of the incident or hazardous condition including the date, time, and place, and | | - | | · · |
| | | reason why the incident occurred. If more than one reportable condition arises from a | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(c) | single incident, each must be included in the report; | x | | | |
| | | none | ŀ | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 23. | | A description of the gas pipeline involved in the incident or hazardous condition, the system | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(d) | | x | | | |
| , | | O&M Section 2.6.1.2.4d | | | | |
| 24. | | The date and time the gas pipeline company was first notified of the incident; | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(e) | None | х | | | |
| | | | ļ | | | |
| 25. | 480 03 200(4)(6) | The date and time the ((operators')) gas pipeline company's first responders arrived on-site; | l x | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(1) | | * | | | |
| 26. | | The date and time the gas ((facility)) pipeline was made safe; | <u> </u> | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(g) | None | x | | | |
| | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| 27. | 400.02.200(4)(1) | The date, time, and type of any temporary or permanent repair that was made; | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(h) | | x | | | |
| 28. | | The cost of the incident to the ((operator)) gas pipeline company; | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(i) | None | x | | | |
| | | O&M Section 2.6.2.4.i | | | | |
| 29. | | Line type; | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(j) | | x | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | |
| 30. | 480-93-200(4)(1/) | | l x | | | · · |
| | 460-93-200(4)(K) | | ^ | | | |
| 31. | 100.00.00(1)(1) | Any other information deemed necessary by the commission. | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(4)(l) | O&M Section 2.6.2.4.1 | X | | | |
| 32. | 480 02 200(5) | Submit a supplemental report if required information becomes available | x | | | |
| | 460-93-200(3) | O&M Section 2.6.2.4.m | | | | |
| 33. | | Written report within 45 days of receiving the failure analysis of any incident or | | | | İ |
| | 480-93-200(6) | | X | | , | ĺ |
| 3/1 | | Annual Reports filed with the commission no later than March 15 for the proceeding | | | | |
| 34. | 480-93-200(7) | | | | | |
| | 100 30 200(7) | O&M Section 3.8.3 | | | | |
| 35. | | A copy of PHMSA F-7100.1-1 and F-7100.2-1 annual report required by U.S. Department | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(7)(a) | of Transportation, PHMSA/Office of Pipeline Safety | x | | | |
| | | | ļ | | | ļ |
| 36. | 480-93-200(7)(b) | | x | | | |
| 27 | | | - | | | |
| 37. | 480-93-200(7)(b)(i) | | l x | | | |
| | 100 75 200(7)(0)(1) | | " | | | |
| 38. | | Number of third-party damages incurred; and | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(7)(b)(ii) | 2007 zero | x | | | |
| | | O&M Section 3.7.2 | | | | |
| 39. | | Cause of damage, where cause of damage is classified as | | | | İ |
| | | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | 1 |
| | 480-93-200(4)(b) 480-93-200(4)(c) 480-93-200(4)(d) 480-93-200(4)(e) 480-93-200(4)(f) 480-93-200(4)(h) 480-93-200(4)(i) 480-93-200(4)(j) 480-93-200(4)(l) 480-93-200(4)(l) 480-93-200(5) 480-93-200(7) 480-93-200(7)(b) 480-93-200(7)(b) 480-93-200(7)(b)(ii) | | х | | | 1 |
| | 1. 480-93-200(4)(b) 2. 480-93-200(4)(c) 3. 480-93-200(4)(d) 4. 480-93-200(4)(e) 5. 480-93-200(4)(f) 6. 480-93-200(4)(h) 8. 480-93-200(4)(i) 9. 480-93-200(4)(i) 1. 480-93-200(4)(l) 2. 480-93-200(5) 3. 480-93-200(6) 4. 480-93-200(7) 5. 480-93-200(7)(b) 7. 480-93-200(7)(b) 7. 480-93-200(7)(b) 7. 480-93-200(7)(b) 8. 480-93-200(7)(b) 9. 6. 480-93-200(7)(b) 9. 7. 480-93-200(7)(b) 9. 7. 480-93-200(7)(b)(ii) | (D) Excavator failed to call for a locate. | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | ' | 1 |
| 1 | | O&M Section 3.7.1.3 | | | | L |

| | | REPORTING RECORDS | S | ·U | N/A | N/C |
|-----|------------------|--|------------|----|-----|-----|
| 40. | | Reports detailing all construction defects and material failures resulting in leakage. Categorizing the different types of construction defects and material failures. The report must include the following: (i) Types and numbers of construction defects; and (ii) Types and numbers of material failures. | | | | |
| | 480-93-200(7)(c) | O&M Section 2.6.1.2.6 & 3.18.20 Georgia Pacific did not file a Construction Defects and Material Failures Report | · x | | | |
| | | with the Commission in a timely manner. Georgia Pacific did include the information on the Damage Prevention Report which was received in a timely manner. The Constructions Defects and Material Failure Report was turned in during the inspection. | | | · | |
| 41. | 480-93-200(8) | Providing updated emergency contact information to the commission and appropriate officials of all municipalities where gas pipeline companies have facilities Yes, Steve Young O&M Section 3.18.21 | x | | | |
| 42. | 480-93-200(9) | Providing by email, reports of daily construction and repair activities no later than 10:00 a.m. In O&M, haven't had any, Section 3.18.22 | x | | | |
| 43. | 480-93-200(10) | Submitting copy of DOT Drug and Alcohol Testing MIS Data Collection Form when required O&M Section See Reporting section of drug and alcohol plans. | x | | | |

| Documentation Review | ed: | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Document Title | Document Number | Revision Date | Date Range Reviewed | Pct of Data Reviewed |
| | | | | |

Comments:

O42a 480-93-018

Records.

(3) Each gas pipeline company must maintain a list of forms and data bases, including examples where applicable, that specify what records the company maintains. Each gas pipeline company must make this list available to the commission upon request.

Camas has a copy of every form in the O&M, Section 3.8

(4) Each gas pipeline company must record and maintain records of the actual value of any required reads, tests, surveys or inspections performed. The records must include the name of the person who performed the work and the date the work was performed. The records must also contain information sufficient to determine the location and facilities involved. Examples of the values to be recorded include, but are not limited to, pipe to soil potential reads, rectifier reads, pressure test levels, and combustible gas indicator reads. A gas pipeline company may not record a range of values unless the measuring device being used provides only a range of values.

They have had foreign leaks - March, 2006 leak was found during leak survey in plant. It was not gas and at old dump site.. Heath sendssample to Test America for testing. Sampling had no ethane. Reviewed Test American report

(5) Each gas pipeline company must update its records within six months of when it completes any construction activity and make such records available to appropriate company operations personnel. **OK system has never been changed**

GP has O&M says does not cover certain items because GP will never do, i.e. no pe pipe, no bare pipe, etc. Approved by pipeline

One Operations and Maintenance Manual Review for every year. Reviewed forms Verified 480-93-250 in it

Reviewed Section 3.7 Damage Prevention

Suggested add 19.122 damage definition. Roy agreed and will insert definition of 19.122 "damage"

| What | construction has h | · | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------|----------|--------------|----------------|
| 44. | Construction has h | | | | | |
| 77. | | | 1 | | | |
| | 192.225 | | x | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | |
| 45. | | | 1 | | | |
| | | For welding tests used GP used left over actual 10" pipeline pipe. Now they are teste on similar 10" schedule 40 pipe to keep it realistic. Test leads on casings (without vents) installed after 9/05/1992 O&M Section 3.3.13 One casing, bare steel, installed in 1993, with vents and test leads. Sealing ends of casings or conduits on Transmission lines and main O&M Section 3.3.13 Ends of the casing are sealed O&M Section 7 Sealing ends (nearest building wall) of casings or conduits on services O&M Section No Services Na no services, or crossings Visual Weld Inspector Training/Experience O&M Section 4.8 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | separate, boilers 600 psig steam lines and they weld on them. Just repaired an | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | 9 and Test to API 1104 Section 6, 18th edition, | | | | |
| | | 192.7 19th edition became effective March 28, 2008. Most current welding test | | | | |
| | | • | | | | |
| | | AOC Ron Higdon, tested 4-4-2008, API Section 6 to 18th | | | | |
| | • | | į | | | |
| | | AOC Randy Howe, 8-12-2008, API 1104 Section 6 18th edition | | | | |
| | | NOTE: NO ONE WELDED ON PIPELINE WHILE QUALIFIED TO 18TH | | | İ | |
| | | O&M says test to 19 th edition | | | | |
| | | Tested by radiographic inspection. 3 full ex rays. Tested every 6 months | | | | |
| | | 4 CED 100 007 O 110 / CW 11 | x | | | |
| • | AOC 1 | | " | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | l . | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | · | | 1 | | | ļ . |
| | · | 1We realize that no welding has been performed on the pipeline since its |] | | | |
| |] | | | | | · |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Manual specifies the 19 th edition. CFR 192.227 requires that after March 28, 2008 | 1 | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | |
| | | | | , | | |
| | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | |
| 46. | | | | | | |
| 40. | | | 1 | · . | | |
| | 480-93-080(1)(b) | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | х | | | |
| | , | | | | | |
| | | | - | | - | |
| | 480-93-115(2) | | x | | | |
| | 100 30 110(2) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 480-93-115(3) | | x | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | Ends of the casing are sealed O&M Section 7 | ļ· | L | | - |
| | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | 480-93-115(4) | | х | | 1 | |
| | | | ļ | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 192,241(a) | | x | | | 1 |
| | 1,2,2,11(0) | Inspected by welder and then By welding representative, the Mill welding expert, | | | | |
| | 1 | Section 4.8. AND every weld is 100% radiographic to API 1104. | 1 | <u> </u> | 1 | <u> </u> |

| hat c | onstruction has b | CONSTRUCTION RECORDS peen done or in progress. No natural gas piping has been done since 1993. | S | ₽ U | N/A | 'n |
|-------|-------------------|--|------------|------------|-----|----------|
| | 192.243(b)(2) | Nondestructive Technician Qualification O&M Section 4.8 | x | | | |
| | 192.243(c) | Radiographic certified SNT-TC-1A, interpretation of test by level 2 or level 3 NDT procedures O&M Section 4 Appendix | x | | | - |
| | | By Braun for qualification Total Number of Girth Welds | <u> ^</u> | | | |
| | 192.243(f) | O&M Section 4.8 all welds About 250 approx when line built, none since then | x | | | |
| | 192.243(f) | Number of Welds Inspected by NDT O&M Section 4.8 all welds 100% | х | = | | |
| | 192.243(f) | Number of Welds Rejected O&M Section 4.8 welds none | х . | | | |
| | 192.243(f) | Disposition of each Weld Rejected O&M Section 4.8 none | х | · | | |
| | 480-93-080(1)(b) | Use of testing equipment to record and document essential variables O&M Section 4.7.1 , | х | | | |
| | 480-93-115(2) | Test leads on casings (without vents) installed after 9/05/1992 O&M Section 3.3.13 One casing, bare steel, installed in 1993, with vents and test leads. | x | | | |
| | 480-93-115(3) | Sealing ends of casings or conduits on Transmission lines and main O&M Section 3.3.13 The one is sealed and vented. | х | | | <u> </u> |
| | 480-93-115(4) | Sealing ends (nearest building wall) of casings or conduits on services O&M Section No Services none | х | | | |
| | 192.303 | Construction Specifications The as built is in the manual, Reviewed 10-18-1993 As Built | x | | | l |
| | 192.325 | Underground Clearance O&M Section 7 3.03 | х | | | |
| | 192.327 | Amount, Location, Cover of each Size of Pipe Installed O&M Section 7 3.03 When 10" installed, it was installed at 60 inches | x | | | |
| | 480-93-160(1) | Detailed report filed 45 days prior to construction or replacement of transmission pipelines ≥ 100 feet in length O&M Section none | х | | | |
| | 480-93-170(3) | Pressure Tests Performed on new and replacement pipelines O&M Section 7 1.04 No replacement pipe, but did pressure for starting up. Was hydro tested to 1200 for | x | | | |
| | 480-93-170(10) | design to get 800 psig MAOP even though Dennis' proximity allows for only 250 MAOP. (10.4% SYMS) Pressure Testing Equipment checked for Accuracy/Intervals (Manufacturers Recom or Operators schedule) O&M Section 7 1.04d Reviewed hydro test instrument certification when built. Paul Baker provided instrument calibration for Pressure Tests. Reviewed annual locked in read from Passport system for calibration. It is a fraud proof system The Leak Survey FI unit used for the 2007 Leak survey was a rental and came with a letter dated 11-4-2007 certifying the calibration Reviewed Health Calibration sheet copy in my notes | x | | | |
| | 480-93-175(1) | Study prepared and approved prior to moving and lowering of metallic pipelines > 60 psig O&M Section 4.15 NONE | x · | | | |

Recent Pipeline Safety Advisory Bulletins: (Last 2 years)

| Number | <u>Date</u> | Subject |
|-----------|-------------------|--|
| ADB-06-01 | January 17, 2006 | Pipeline Safety: Notice to Operators of Natural Gas and Hazardous Liquid |
| | | Pipelines to Integrate Operator Qualification Regulations into Excavation Activities |
| ADB-06-02 | June 16, 2006 | Submission of Public Awareness Programs for Review |
| ADB-06-03 | November 22, 2006 | <u> </u> |
| | | Pipelines to Accurately Locate and Mark Underground Pipelines Before |
| | | Construction-Related Excavation Activities Commence Near the Pipelines |
| ADB-06-04 | December 28, 2006 | |
| | | Natural Gas Facility |
| ADB-07-01 | April 27, 2007 | Pipeline Safety: Senior Executive Signature and Certification of Integrity |
| | | Management Program Performance Reports |
| ADB-07-02 | September 6, 2007 | Pipeline Safety: Updated Notification of the Susceptibility to Premature |
| | | Brittle-Like Cracking of Older Plastic Pipe |
| ADB-07-02 | February 29, 2008 | Correction - Pipeline Safety: Updated Notification of the Susceptibility to |
| | | Premature Brittle-Like Cracking of Older Plastic Pipe |
| ADB-08-02 | February 28, 2008 | Identifying Issues with Mechanical Couplings that Could Lead to Failure |
| ADB-08-03 | March 10, 2008 | Dangers of Abnormal Snow and Ice Build-Up on Gas Distribution Systems |

| Comments: | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | • | | |
| | | | | | |

| Facility Type | Facility ID Number | Location |
|---------------|--------------------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Comments: | | |
| | | • |
| | | |
| | | |

| | S | U. | N/A | N/C | |
|---------|--|----|-----|-----|--|
| 192.491 | Remedial: Replaced or Repaired Pipe; coated and protected; corrosion evaluation and actions .483/.485 none | x | | | |

| Revision Date | Date Range Reviewed | Pct of Data Reviewed |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | Revision Date | Revision Date |

Comments: 480-93-110 Corrosion control.

(4) Each gas pipeline company's procedures manual must have written procedures explaining how cathodic protection related surveys, reads, and tests will be conducted. Examples of such procedures include, but are not limited to, how to determine IR drop (as defined in 49 CFR § 192 Appendix D), how to conduct electrical surveys, how to test casings for electrical isolation, how to test casings for shorted conditions, and how to measure and interpret 49 CFR § 192 Appendix D criteria.

Procedure in O&M 3.3.6 Section, suggested detail procedure need to be more detailed Roy making for interrupters, ir drops

| | PIPELINE INSPECTION (Field) | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|----------------------|---|-----|---|-----|-----|
| 192.161 | Supports and anchors | х | | | |
| 192.179 | Valve Protection from Tampering or Damage All double locked | х | · | | |
| 480-93-015(1) | Odorization levels | . x | | | |
| 192.463 | Levels of Cathodic Protection | х | | | |
| 192.465 | Rectifiers Inside salvage building | x | | | |
| 192.467 | CP - Electrical Isolation | х | | | |
| 192.469 | Test Stations (Sufficient Number) 18 on 1.6 mile pipeline | х | | | |
| 192.479 | Pipeline Components Exposed to the Atmosphere OQ test | х | | | |
| 192.481 | Atmospheric Corrosion - monitoring | х | | | |
| 480-93-115(2) | Casings – Test Leads (Casings w/o vents installed after 9/05/1992) One casing on Union St | x | | | |
| 192.605 | Knowledge of Operating Personnel | х | | | |
| 613(b), .703 | Pipeline condition, unsatisfactory conditions, hazards, etc. | х | | | |
| 480-93-124 | Pipeline Markers | х | | | |
| 192.751 | Warning Signs | х | | | |
| 192.719 | Pre-pressure Tested Pipe (Markings and Inventory) | х | | | |
| 192.739 | Pressure Limiting and Regulating Devices (Mechanical) | х | | | |
| 192.743 | Pressure Limiting and Regulating Devices (Capacities) | х | | | |
| 192.745 | Valve Maintenance | х | | | |
| 192.801 - 192.809 | Operator qualification questions – Refer to OQ Field Inspection Protocol Form (Rev 3, Feb 08) | х | | | |

| Faci | ilitv | Sites | Vic | ·hati |
|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| T'at | FILLA | DILLO | 7 13 | nicu. |

| F | | CORROSION CONTROL RECORDS | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|-----|------------------|--|---|---|-----|-----|
| | 192.453 | CP procedures (system design, installation, operation, and maintenance) must be carried out by qualified personnel Roy Rogers is NACE certified | х | | | |
| | 192.455(a)(2) | CP system installed on and operating within 1 yr of completion of pipeline construction (after 7/31/71) | х | | | |
| | 192.465(a) | Annual Pipe-to-soil Monitoring (1 per yr/15 months) for short sections (10% per year; all in 10 years) 18 test stations, Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 for casing also, have chart with native before line installed, they have instant offs for every year since plant was built. | x | | | |
| | 192.491 | Maps or Records .491(a) | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Examination of Buried Pipe when Exposed .459 Only exposed once in 2004 | х | | | |
| | 480-93-110(8) | CP test reading on all exposed facilities where coating has been removed No underground coating has every been removed | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Annual Pipe-to-soil Monitoring (1 per yr/15 months) .465(a) Done at test stations | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Rectifier Monitoring (6 per yr/2½ months) .465(b) Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Interference Bond Monitoring – Critical (6 per yr/2½ months) .465(c) none | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Interference Bond Monitoring – Non-critical (1 per yr/15 months) .465(c) none | х | | | |
| • | 192.491 | Prompt Remedial Actions .465(d) Section 3.3.9 | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Unprotected Pipeline Surveys, CP active corrosion areas (1 per 3 cal yr/39 months) .465(e) No unprotected pipe | х | | | |
| , , | 192.491 | Electrical Isolation (Including Casings) .467 Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 | х | | | |
| | 480-93-110(2) | Remedial action taken within 90 days (Up to 30 additional days if other circumstances. Must document) .465(d) Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 | x | | | |
| | 480-93-110(3) | CP Test Equipment and Instruments checked for Accuracy/Intervals (Mfct Rec or Opr Sched) Reviewed procedure Multi Meter Accuracy test, In manual Section 3.3.16 Bench Fluke meter is calibrated annually reviewed certificate of calibration back to 2005 | x | | | |
| | 480-93-110(5) | Casings inspected/tested annually not to exceed fifteen months Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 | х | | | |
| | 480-93-110(5)(a) | Casings w/no test leads installed prior to 9/05/1992. Demonstrate other acceptable test methods Line installed in 1993 NA | х | | | |
| | 480-93-110(5)(b) | Possible shorted conditions – Perform confirmatory follow-up inspection within 90 days Section 3.3.6.3 | х | | | |
| | 480-93-110(5)(c) | Casing shorts cleared when practical none | x | | | |
| | 480-93-110(5)(d) | Shorted conditions leak surveyed within 90 days of discovery. Twice annually/7.5 months Section 3.3.6.3 | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Interference Currents .473 Section 3.3.13, Do monitor for transmission electrical line. Currently is 8v, if it exceeds 12v will be corrected. | x | | | |
| | 192.491 | Internal Corrosion; Corrosive Gas Investigation .475(a) | x | | | |
| | 192.491 | Internal Corrosion; Internal Surface Inspection; Pipe Replacement .475(b) | х | | | |
| | 192.491 | Internal Corrosion Control Coupon Monitoring (2 per yr/7½ months) .477 No coupons, installing moisture monitor in Battleground, Williams checks filters and Roy ICDA concluded no internal wall loss at first 90. Did detailed ultra sonic of first 90 | х | | - | |
| | 192.491 | Atmospheric Corrosion Control Monitoring (1 per 3 cal yr/39 months onshore; 1 per yr/15 months offshore) .481 Reviewed Corrosion Control inspection report for 2006 and 2007 In field currently painting recoating the all exposed surfaces | x | | : | |

| | | OPERATIONS and MAINTENANCE RECORDS | S | -U± | N/A | N/C |
|---|------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | 192.709 | Pressure Limiting and Regulating Stations (1 per yr/15 months) .739 See Williams tests - Review email from Williams with their overprotection The reg stations that cuts from 250 to 50. Is per Dennis under jurisdiction of | х | | | |
| | | international Mechanical code. From custody flange ASME B 313 is for plant piping. Also, it is inside the plant fence | ٠ | | | |
| | 192.709 | Pressure Limiting and Regulator Stations – Capacity (1 per yr/15 months) .743 Maintenance group does maintenance on regulators, it is a dual monitor system, but we do not have jurisdiction. | х | | - | |
| | 192.709 | Valve Maintenance (1 per yr/15 months) .745 Reviewed 2006 and 2007 valve maintenance. In 2007, the mill 3 year makntance shut down occurred and all valves including the 3 emergency valves were 100 % operated. 480-93-100 Valves. (1) Each gas pipeline company must have a written valve maintenance program detailing the valve selection process, inspection, maintenance, and operating procedures. The written program must detail which valves will be maintained under 49 CFR § 192.745, 49 CFR § 192.747, and this subsection. FOUND IN SECTION 3.15 The written program must also outline how the gas pipeline company will monitor and maintain valves during construction projects to FOUND IN SECTION 3.15 ensure accessibility. The following criteria and locations must be incorporated in the written program. The written program shall explain how each of the following are considered in selecting which valves require annual inspections and maintenance under 49 CFR § 192.747: NA BECAUSE THEY INSPECT EVERY VALVE ANNUALLY O&M SAYS IN SECTION 3.15 (4) Each gas pipeline company must select which valves to inspect based on the unique operating conditions of the company's pipeline system(s). 100% INSPECTED (5) Each gas pipeline company must install and maintain valves for the purpose of resulting from a gas pipeline emergency and to aid in the timely control of an uncontrolled release of gas Each gas pipeline company must also incorporate its valve programs established in plan and other plans and procedures designed to protect life and property in the event of an emergency. Wording for protection of life and property not in valve section, it is in the Life and safety section 2 of O&M. Williams' remote valve takes care of physical aspect. | x | | | |
| | 192.709 | Vault Maintenance (≥200 cubic feet)(1 per yr/15 months) .749 NONE | Х | | , | |
| , | 192.603(b) | Prevention of Accidental Ignition (hot work permits) .751 Section 4.9 | х | | | |
| | 192.603(b) | Welding – Procedure .225(b) Section 4.1 Titled Repair Procedures | х | | | |
| | 192.603(b) | Welding – Welder Qualification .227/.229 ASME Boiler Vessel Section 9, tested API 1104 Section 6 19 th editions O&M 4.7. 03 | х | | | |
| | 192.603(b) | NDT – NDT Personnel Qualification .243(b)(2) | х | | | |
| | 192.709 | NDT Records (Pipeline Life) .243(f) O&M Section 4.8, | х | | | |
| | 192.709 | Repair: pipe (Pipeline Life); Other than pipe (5 years) O&M Section 4.8, save for life of pipeline | · x | - | | |

| Documentation Review | ed: | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Document Title | Document Number | Revision Date | Date Range Reviewed | Pct of Data Reviewed |
| | | | | |

Comments: Is WAC 480-93-250 in O&M into effect 6-2008 – yes and Roy will include 19.122 definition of damage

| | OPERATIONS and | MAINTENANCE I | RECORDS | | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|-----------------|---|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|----------|----------|
| 480-93-185(3) | Leaks originating from a fretained No certified letter sent be | | | | х | | | |
| 480-93-187 | Gas Leak records | Gas Leak records | | | | | | |
| 480-93-188(1) | Gas Leak surveys | laalia | | | х | | | |
| 480-93-188(2) | Annually, and found no Gas detection instruments 45 days) | | ervals (Mfct rec or mon | thly not to exceed | · x | | | |
| 480-93-188(2) | Goes someplace else deta | | | | | | | |
| 480-93-188(3) | Leak survey frequency (F | Refer to Table Below) | | | х | | <u> </u> | |
| | Business Districts (By 6/6 | 02/07) | 1/yr (15 | months) | | | | |
| | High Occupancy Struct | ures | 1/yr (15 | months) | | | | |
| | Pipelines Operating ≥ 25 | | 1/yr (15 | | | | | |
| Other | Mains: CI, WI, copper, un | protected steel | 2/yr (7.5 | months) | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | Caracial look gumunug D | trian ta marina an magrin | facing, following street a | Iterations or renairs | 1 | , | 1 . | ι - |
| 480-93-188(4)(a | Only special survey do | one in mid 1990. O& | M Section 3.2.2 | • | х | | | |
| 480-93-188(4)(b | Special leak surveys - areas where substructure construction occurs adjacent to underground gas facilities, and damage could have occurred none | | | | х | | | |
| 480-93-188(4)(c | Only special survey do | ne in mid 1990 | re active gas lines could | | х | | · | |
| 480-93-188(4)(d | Special leak surveys - areas and at times of unusual activity, such as earthquake, floods, and explosions Only special survey; don in mid 19 90s. | | | | x | | | |
| 480-93-188(5) | Gas Survey Records Reviewed annual gas I | eak records for 2006 | and 2007 | | х | | | |
| 480-93-188(6) | report is prepared by | ntinuing Surveillance Roy and given Cama | e Summary Section 2 Les | eak survey. This | х | | | |
| 192.709 | Patrolling (Refer to Ta Do bi monthly (6 times 2006 | ble Below) .705 s a year) Reviewed Pi | peline Right of Way Su | rvey, for 2007 and | x | | | |
| | Class Location | At Highway and | Railroad Crossings | At All Other Pla | ces |] | | |
| | 1 and 2 | 2/yr (7½ | ⁄2 months) | 1/yr (15 month | s) | | | • |
| | 3 4 | | 2 months) 2 months) | 2/yr (7½ month 4/yr (4½ month | | | | |
| 192.709 | Leak Su | rveys (Refer to Table | Below) .706 | <u> </u> | x | | | <u> </u> |
| 73203 | | | | Not Exceed | | 1 7 | <u> </u> | L |
| | Class Location 1 and 2 | <u> </u> | juired /yr | 15 months | | - | | |
| | 3 | | 2/yr | 7½ months | | 1 | | |
| | 4 | | l/yr | 4½ months | | | | |
|)-93-188 | | | | | | | | |
| 192.603b/.727g | Abandoned Pipelines; Un | derwater Facility Repo | orts .727 | | х | | | |
| 192.709 | Compressor Station Relie No compressor station | f Devices (1 per yr/15 | months) .731(a) | | х | | | |
| | | gency Shutdown (1 pe | r yr/15 months) .731(c | :) | х | | | |
| 192.709 | No compressor station | | • | | 1 ^ | | i | 1 |

| | | | | | 1 | _ |
|---------|-----------------|--|---|------------|-----|-----|
| | | OPERATIONS and MAINTENANCE RECORDS | S | U | N/A | N/C |
| | | * Refer to API RP 1162 for additional requirements, including general program recommendations, supplemental requirements, recordkeeping, program evaluation, etc. | | | | |
| | | 30 mailing on list – Don't have residence names – Roy physically drove up and down streets and got every address. People didn't want to talk to him because they do not buy gas from GP and Camas would not be here if not for GP. People are aware of GP gas main. GP does everything annually. Reviewed Hugh packet sent to public officials, Reviewed pages sent to residence along line. Reviewed mailing list of 50 residents on line. Upper management would be Greg Collins and he is directly involved in process, therefore no formal notification was sent to him. Steve is responsible for interaction with regulatory agencies. This is in process so he was not notified. Ok. Camas is measuring effectiveness by # of damages and there has only been one pipe exposure in 15 years by a Mill Contractor therefore program is effective. Reviewed Public Awareness Program 2007 Effectiveness Review | | in a plane | | |
| 192. | .603(b) | The program conducted in English and any other languages commonly understood by a significant number of the population in the operator's area616(g) Only English, no other prevalent languages | x | | | |
| 192. | .603(b) | Analyzing accidents and failures including laboratory analysis where appropriate to determine cause and prevention of recurrence .617 No failures but have had Heath do foreign leak test | x | | | |
| 192 | 2.517 | Pressure Testing No pressure testing since the line was built. In O&M Section 6, all information would be included it they did pressure test | x | | | |
| .55 | 53(b) | Uprating Don't plan on any | х | | | |
| 192 | 2.709 | Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP) .619 250 psi but designed for 800 psi | х | | | |
| 480-93 | 3-015(1) | Odorization of Gas – Concentrations adequate Provided by NW Natural at Williams Battleground Compressor station | х | | | |
| 4,80-93 | 3-015(2) | Monthly Odorant Sniff Testing 2007 Reviewed 1-2006 thru 12-2007 | х | | | |
| 480-93 | 3-015(3) | Prompt action taken to investigate and remediate odorant concentrations not meeting the minimum requirements Would be see O&M Section 3.1.2 | х | | | |
| 480-93 | 3-015(4) | Odorant Testing Equipment Calibration/Intervals (Annually or Manufacturers Recommendation) Use Heath Odorator, Reviewed Certification of calibration odorator serial number 2023-3 on 11/7/05, Same piece of equipment on 12/9/2006 and 11/29/2007 | х | | | |
| 480-93 | 3-124(3) | Pipeline markers attached to bridges or other spans inspected? 1/yr(15 months) (1) Each gas pipeline company must place pipeline markers at the following locations: (a) Where practical, over pipelines operating above two hundred fifty psig; Whole line every 250 feet and every 50 feet in Mill (b) Over mains and transmission lines crossing navigable waterways (custom signage may be required to ensure visibility); 2 Sign on island, markers on each bank (c) Over mains and transmission lines at river, creek, drainage ditch, or irrigation canal crossings where hydraulic scouring, dredging, or other activity could pose a risk to the pipeline (custom signage may be required to ensure visibility); non navigable water way only fishing (d) Over gas pipelines at railroad crossings; none (e) At above ground Valves have markers, where it cuts from 250 to 50 are markers (7) Each gas pipeline company must have records such as maps or drawings sufficient to indicate class yes | x | | | |
| | 3-124(4) (7) | Markers reported missing or damaged replaced within 45 days? Ok, do by monthly patrols, Reviewed Pipeline R/W inspection conducted by monthly for 2007 | х | | | |
| 480-93 | 3-185(1) | Reported gas leaks investigated promptly/graded/record retained none | х | | | |

| • | OPERATIONS and MAINTENANCE | RECORDS | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|--|
| 192.603(b) | Periodic review of personnel work – effectiven O&M Section Roy is subject matter expert and does work happy | | х | | | |
| 192.603(b) | Periodic review of personnel work – effectiveness of abnormal operation procedures .605(c)(4) | | | | | |
| Q 80, 192.709 | Damage Prevention (Miscellaneous) .614 *Section 3.7 *Reviewed List of contractors | | х | | | |
| 192,709 | Class Location Study (If Applicable) .609 | | х | | | |
| 192.603(b) | Location Specific Emergency Plan .615(b)(1) One duty officer on shift 24 7, and take all initi not natural gas, medical. Reviewed OQ Manual copy of training (have copy) Are OQed, *Roy does locates and Stands by during exca maintenance employees do stand by | al, Emergency Section 2 of O&M, Reviewed | x | , | | |
| 192.603(b) | Emergency Procedure training, verify effective See notes from above | ness of training .615(b)(2) | х | | | |
| 192.603(b) | Employee Emergency activity review, determine No emergency to review, they do drills last d | | х | | | |
| 192.603(b) Request copy of blue | Liaison Program with Public Officials .615(c Reviewed Mutual Aid Agreement. Mutual aid together, and MERT does Haz Mat for all, fire rescue (a) Each operator shall establish an police, and other public officials to: Addressed in Public Awareness. There are 3 (and 3Contractors. Section 2.3.1, Mill Wide En agency list (1) Learn the responsibility and resources of e respond to a gas pipeline emergency; Mutual A (2) Acquaint the officials with the operator's a emergency; Mutual Aid Agreement (3) Identify the types of gas pipeline emergenc and, Mutual Aid Agreement (4) Plan how the operator and officials can en to life or property. Mutual Aid Agreement | with Camas and Washougal, they train dept has trucks, MERT does water safety and and maintain liaison with appropriate fire, Mutual aid Agreement and training Groups 1.Public Agency 2. General Public, mergency Disaster Plan. Names on the Public each government organization that may air Agreement bility in responding to a gas pipeline ies of which the operator notifies the officials; | x | | | The same and the s |
| | Public Awareness Program requirements - Stak and content, delivery method and frequency, so evaluations, etc. (i.e. contact or mailing rosters contact documentation, etc. for emergency resp superintendents, program evaluations, etc.). See | equately reflects implementation of operator's ceholder Audience identification, message type applemental enhancements, program, postage receipts, return receipts, audience bonder, public officials, school see table below: | x | | | |
| 192.603(b) | Operators in existence on June 20, 2005, must have completed their written programs no later than June 20, 2006. See 192.616(a) and (j) for exceptions. | | | | | |
| | API RP 1162 Baseline* Reco | mmended Message Deliveries | 4 | | | |
| | Stakeholder Audience (Natural Gas Transmission Line Operators) Residents Along Right-of-Way and Places of Congregation Emergency Officials | Baseline Message Frequency (starting from effective date of Plan) 2 years Annual | | | | |
| | Public Officials Excavator and Contractors One-Call Centers | 3 years Annual As required of One-Call Center | | | | |

| OPERATIONS and MAINTENANCE RECORDS | | | | | N/A | N/C |
|------------------------------------|------------|---|---|--|-----|-------------|
| | | Procedural Manual Review – Operations and Maintenance (1 per yr/15 months) .605(a) O&M Section Reviewed the 2007, 2006, Operations and Maintenance Manual Update. It states which section have been updated | | | | |
| | | a) 192.603 General. Each operator shall prepare and follow for each pipeline, a manual of written procedures for conducting operations and maintenance activities and for emergency response. For transmission lines, the manual must also include procedures for handling abnormal operations. O&M Section 3 listed | | | | |
| | | Appropriate parts of the manual must be kept at locations where operations and maintenance activities are conducted. Following persons/places have copies; 1. Contractors, 2. Greg Collins, 3. MERT, 4. Steve Young and 5. Utilities have readily available in the offices. The O&M is always within 3000 feet (inside plant). If maintenance employee would do gas work they would make copy of task and carry with them Roy does physical pipeline work etc. It would be rare that a GP employee did any. GP employees are not just natural gas and they do not keep O&M with them. | | | | |
| | 192.603(b) | (3) Welder and plastic joiner qualification cards are subject to commission inspection at all times when qualified personnel are working on facilities subject to commission jurisdiction. Camas employees within 3000 feet of their qualification. They do not carry cards in accordance with 480-93-080. Number of Camas employees only carry badge because it is a controlled access facility and they are in mill work clothes. If Welding on pipeline is done Roy said that they would have welding certification on site. | x | | | |
| | | Last time the O&M manual was updated was in 2006, because of the 2005 order, copies of updates received, reviewed and accepted commission 2006. GP reviewed the manual but did not updated in 2007 Section 3.5 GP said make sure employees know changes. Roy does AOC and manual review every year for MERT and maintenance people Reviewed 2007 training day agenda have copy NOTE: Their valves manufacture (PVB) says don't maintain only use special lube when closing | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 192.603(b) | 192.605 Procedural manual for operations, maintenance, and emergencies (c) Abnormal operation. For transmission lines, the manual required by paragraph (a) of this section must include procedures for the following to provide safety when operating design limits have been exceeded: (1) Responding to, investigating, and correcting the cause of: (i) Unintended closure of valves or shutdowns; FOUND IN Section 3.1.5. and procedure 3.1.6 ok reviewed 9-30-2008 at plant (ii) Increase or decrease in pressure or flow rate outside normal operating limits; OQ001, OQ manual over pressurization of pipeline, | | | | |
| | 192.003(0) | page 2 of 4 reviewed annually with field workers ok (iii) Loss of communications; (iv) Operation of any safety device; and, OQ001 pg 3 of 4, reviewed Failure of pipeline components section | X | | | |
| | | (v) Any other foreseeable malfunction of a component, deviation from normal operation, or personnel error which may result in a hazard to persons or property. | | | 4.0 | |
| | 192.603(b) | O&M Section Availability of construction records, maps, operating history to operating personnel .605(b)(3) O&M Section Yes, always within 3000 feet | x | | | |

| | . CONSTRUCTION RECORDS | | S | IJ | N/A | N/C |
|----|------------------------|---|---|----|-----|-------|
| Wh | iat construction has | been done or in progress. No natural gas piping has been done since 1993. | | | | 70.47 |
| | | Cathodic Protection | | | | |
| | 192.455 | O&M Section 3.3 | x | | | |
| | · | Whole system protected with one rectifier. | | | | |

| Documentation Reviewe | ed: | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Document Title | Document Number | Revision Date | Date Range Reviewed | Pct of Data Reviewed |

Comments:

Requested Williams 2007 overpressure protection Reviewed WGP Regulator inspection report dated 11/26/2007

| | | OPERATIONS and MAINTENANCE RECORDS | S | U | N/A | N/C |
|---|---------------|--|---|-------|-----|-----|
| | 192.14 | Conversion To Service Performance and Records | | 11.57 | | |
| | 192.14 (a)(2) | Visual inspection of right of way, aboveground and selected underground segments O&M Section None | х | | | |
| | 192:14 (a)(3) | Correction of unsafe defects and conditions O&M Section None | x | - | | |
| • | 192.14 (a)(4) | Pipeline testing in accordance with Subpart J O&M Section At initial start up of pipeline | x | | | |
| | 192.14 (b) | Pipeline records: investigations, tests, repairs, replacements, alterations (life of pipeline) O&M Section None | х | | | |
| | 192.16 | Customer Notification (Verification – 90 days – and Elements) O&M Section NA no external customers Georgia Pacific only customer – no others | x | | | |