Western Region -- Unit Information

							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Operator ID:	13845	5	Unit	ID: 3675					
		Device		Latit	ude	Long	gitude		
Unit End Point 1				46.794		-12	2.754		
Unit End Point 2			48.		32	-12	2.054		
Due Inchesti				•				1	
	collecte					fforts [pulling unit sumi d outstanding enforcen		al Reports,	
PHMSA Involvement		CPF/Document	t #	Description					
PCO		5-2007-1001	Sen	Sent 01/29/07, OPEN					
NOA		5-2007-1004M		CLOSED					
		Γ		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Report I	D	Date		Reported Cause	Narrative				
20090009		01/08/2009		erial/Weld	Butt Weld, May be this unit, Snohomish County (this is in a Diff				

				·					
Baseline Inf	<u>ormati</u>	<u>ion</u>							
1) If accidents	or incide	nts have occurred	in this u	nit, what has the op	perator done t	o prevent recurrence?	(select all that apply)	
	Added E	quipment		Procedural Cha	nge	Engineering	Barriers Added		
Removed Equipment			▼ Additional Training ▼ Other						
			Fort Lewis C/S was entered by cutting a fence to steal wiring and vandalize a CP rectifier red the damaged fence and replaced the rectifier.						
2) Will these ac	ctions ad	equately mitigate	threats?	(Yes	î No				
			g for employees and additional public awareness will not mitigate the malicious but increased awareness should prevent serious injury						
3) Have any ab	onormal	events occurred ir	this unit	? (Yes (No No				
Describe Operator's Response:			not in pas	n past 5 years					
4) Commodity	Transpo	orted:							
Liquid:			Gas:	Natu	ural Gas				
5) Year of Insta	allation (yyyy): various, se	e chart	Pipe spe	ecification (e.g	. API 5L, ASTM D2513)	various, see chart		
6) Normal Ope	erating P	ressure (psig): v	arious, se	e chart	YS: va	arious, see chart			

7) MOP/MAOP (psig):	various	Changes in MOP/N	MAOP in previous year: ` C Increase C Decrease				
8) Seam Type: various							
9) Coating Type: various							
10) Overall Coating Qua	ality: \(\text{Poor}\) \(\text{Fa}\)	air (• Good	Coating Improvement Efforts:				
Describe:	CP programs uses CIS d	ata and CP readin	gs to assist in evaluating locations were re-coating efforts should				
11) Potential for AC Inte	erference?	⊂ No	Has operator tested for stray current? (Yes (No				
12) Parallel Construction	on/Crossing (Yes	⊂ No E	xplain: large unit with loop lines and other utilities in the				
13a) [for gas] Is there a	monitoring program for	liquids?	S C No				
Method:	Design evaluations to comply with 192.476. Gas meets tariff requirements for water. Other liquids are						
Frequency:	on a Design Basis						
13b) [for liquid] Are the	ere Dead Legs? (Yes	€ No					
Explain:	N/A. not any liquid	lines in unit					
14) [for liquid] Number	of shut-down cycles:	/A	per C Day C Week C Month				
Pressure ran-	ge (psig): N/A	mind the first section of the sectio					
15) Has equipment been deleted/added that changed the hydraulic profile of this line? (Yes No							
Explain:	-						
16) Level of automation	n: (Manual Control	♠ Local/SCADA	← Remote/SCADA				
17) Total unit mileage: 214.33							
18) HCA-Affecting Miles	age (% of total mileage):						
High Populat	ion Area:	63.76					
Other Popula	Other Population Area:		·				
Drinking Water USA:		N/A					
Ecological Resource USA:		N/A					
Commercially Navigable Waterway:		N/A					
19) Indicate the year of	the most recent tool run	and summarize re	esults, including digs:				
Tool Type		Year	Results Summary				
			see attached table				
	44						
		1					

Overall:	Overall good mitigation strategies when anticipated threats are recognized. No concerns at this time.
Corrosion Specific:	CP program
Equipment Specific:	Training Programs and Root Cause Analysis evaluation/communicaiton
Excavation Specific:	Work plans, Site safety meetings during construction, Damage Prevention Program
Human Error Specific:	Training
Material/Weld Specific:	construction Welding Procedure, 3rd party inspection,
Natural Force Specific:	Aerial patrols

20) Describe mitigation strategies related to the anticipated threats [please list specific items of concern, if any]: