Form A- Annual Review 8431

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

Inspector and Operator Information -

Inspection ID 8431	Inspection Link 8431	Inspector - Lead Derek Norwood	Inspector - Assist
Operator City of Enumclaw	Unit City of Enumclaw - Gas Department	Records Location - City & State Enumclaw, WA	
Inspection Start Date 05-04-2022	Inspection Exit Interview Date 05-17-2022	Engineer Submit Date 05-23-2022	

Inspection Summary ÷

You must include the following in your inspection summary:

*Inspection Scope and Summary

- *Facilities visited and Total AFOD * Summary of Significant Findings
- * Primary Operator contacts and/or participants

Inspection Scope and Summary

This inspection was a review of City of Enumclaw's manual revisions, annual reports, incidents from 2021 and PHMSA advisory bulletins.

Facilities visited and Total AFOD

The inspection was completed at Enumclaw's office. No gas facilities were visited. 1 AFODs

Summary of Significant Findings (DO NOT Discuss Enforcement options)

There are no probable violations or areas of concern as a result of this inspection.

Primary Operator contacts and/or participants

Nick Peelo Gas Utility Manager AJ Haas Gas Engineer

Operator executive contact and mailing address for any official correspondence

Mr. Ian Molinaro Mayor 2041 Railroad St Enumclaw, WA 98022

Instructions and Ratings Definitions

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

**If an item is marked Unsat, AOC, N/A, or N/C, an explanation must be included in the "Notes" block for that question and also summarized in the "SUMMARY OF REQUIRED COMMENTS" section at the end of this inspection form.

Crew Inspection History

Click Link for Full List of Cr	ck Link for Full List of Crew Inspections											
Determination crew inspection Date	Inspector	Operator	Unit	Type of Work	Foreman Name	Contractor Name	Comments / Observations for Operator					
10-10-2022	Scott Anderson	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw - 7911	Main Extension	Kelly Oles							
02-22-2022	Scott Anderson	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw - 7911	Main Install	Chuck Speece							

Facility Inspection History

Link for Full List of Facility Inspections

Date	Inspection ID	Form A Operator Name	Other Company	Inspector	Type of Inspection	Do you have inspection pictures or file attachments?
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes

Forms -

2.001 10						
Date	Inspection ID	Form A Operator Name	Other Company	Inspector	Type of Inspection	Do you have inspection pictures or file attachments?
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
04-26-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
03-16-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
03-16-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
03-16-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	No
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-11-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-04-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-04-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
01-04-2023	7911	City of Enumclaw		David Cullom	Pre-Field	Yes
03-08-2022	7911	City of Enumclaw		Darren Tinnerstet	Facility	Yes
03-08-2022	7911	City of Enumclaw		Darren Tinnerstet	Facility	Yes
03-08-2022	7911	City of Enumclaw		Darren Tinnerstet	Facility	Yes
03-08-2022	7911	City of Enumclaw		Darren Tinnerstet	Facility	Yes

Scheduled Inspection History

Annual Review Inspection History

Year of Inspection	Facility - Operator	Unit Name	Inspection ID	Inspection Type	Inspection Status	Closed Date	Next Inspection Interval	SHAREPOINT
City of Enumcl	aw (13 Inspection re	ecords)						
2023	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8596	Standard - Annual Review	Complete	06-13-2023	05-19-2024	Documents
2023	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8597	OQ - Operator Qualification	Complete	06-13-2023	05-19-2027	Documents
2023	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8598	DIMP - Gas Distribution Integrity Management	Complete	06-13-2023	05-19-2026	Documents
2023	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8599	Standard Comprehensive - GD	Complete	06-13-2023	05-19-2026	Documents
2022	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8430	OM PPR GAS - Operations & Maintenance, Plans & Procedures Review	Complete	06-02-2022	05-17-2026	Documents
2022	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8431	Standard - Annual Review	Complete	06-02-2022	05-17-2023	Documents
2022	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8504	Section 114	Complete	06-02-2022	05-17-2023	Documents
2021	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8263	PA - Public Awareness	Complete	04-19-2021	04-05-2025	Documents
2021	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8264	Standard - Annual Review	Complete	04-19-2021	04-05-2022	Documents
2020	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8060	Standard Comprehensive - GD	Complete	08-17-2020	07-23-2023	Documents
2020	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8061	DA - Drug & Alcohol	Complete	07-30-2020	07-28-2024	Documents
2020	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8062	DIMP - Gas Distribution Integrity Management	Complete	08-17-2020	07-29-2023	Documents
2020	City of Enumclaw	City of Enumclaw- Natural Gas Department	8065	Standard - Annual Review	Complete	07-30-2020	07-22-2021	Documents

GAS System Operations History

Annual Report	- Miles of Main					Annual Report GAS Transmission Miles
Year	Operator	SYSTEM TOTAL Miles of Main	Miles of Service	SYSTEM TOTAL NO. of Services	Average Service Length	

Forms -

Year	Operator	SYSTEM TOTAL Miles of Main	Miles of Service	SYSTEM TOTAL NO. of Services	Average Service Length	YEAR	Total Total Miles	e. Total tool mileage inspected
2022	City of Enumclaw	119.9	83.24	5072	86.65			in calendar year using
2021	City of Enumclaw	116.731	78.72	5038	82.5	82.5 80		in-line inspection tools
2020	City of Enumclaw	114.9	74.98	4949	80			
2019	City of Enumclaw	111.6	71.85	4742	80	No Repor	No Report records found	
2018	City of Enumclaw	102.28	68.02	4489	80			
2017	City of Enumclaw	98.6	65.47	4321	80			
2016	City of Enumclaw	97.25	65.00	4288	80			
2015	City of Enumclaw	95.87	64.33	4246	80			

Annual Report - Leaks

Year	Operator	Cause of Leak Mains Total	Cause of Leak Mains Hazardous Total	Cause of Leak Services Total	Cause of Leak Services Hazardous Total	NUMBER OF KNOWN SYSTEM LEAKS AT END OF YEAR SCHEDULED FOR REPAIR
2022	City of Enumclaw	0	0	32	0	0
2021	City of Enumclaw	1	0	29	3	0
2020	City of Enumclaw	5	2	28	3	0
2019	City of Enumclaw	0	0	14	8	0
2018	City of Enumclaw	2	1	20	4	0
2017	City of Enumclaw	1	0	17	5	0
2016	City of Enumclaw	1	1	11	4	0
2015	City of Enumclaw	0	0	13	5	0

Annual Report - EFV

тот	_	610	6903	526	3052	5	331
City of Enumclaw	2010	68	331				
City of Enumclaw	2011	56	387				
City of Enumclaw	2012	38	425				
City of Enumclaw	2013	28	453				
City of Enumclaw	2014	75	528				
City of Enumclaw	2015	100	628				
City of Enumclaw	2016	68	696				
City of Enumclaw	2017	33	729			0	0
City of Enumclaw	2018			113	842	0	0
City of Enumclaw	2019			181	967	2	79
City of Enumclaw	2020			232	1243	2	84
City of Enumclaw	2021	96	1339			١	84
City of Enumclaw	2022	48	1387	0			84
Operator	Year	Number of EFV's Installed This Calendar Year on Single Family Residential Services:	Estimated Number of EFV's in the system at the End of The Year:	Total Number of Services with EFV Installed During Year:	Estimated Number of Services with EFV In The System At The End of The Year:	* Total Number of Manual Service Line Shut-off Valves Installed During Year:	* Estimated Number of Services with Manual Service Line Shut-off Valves Installed in the System at End of Year:

HL System Operations History

HL Annual Report - Miles of Pipe by Decade YEAR Operator Commodity Group Part I - Total Miles of Pipe by Decade Unknown Pre-20s 1920-1929 1930-1939 1940-1949 1950-1959 1960-196 No Report records found HL Annual Report - HL Miles / HCAs HL Annual Report - HL Miles / HCAs HL Annual Report - HL Miles / HCAs

I IL Annual Ne	port-riciviles / ri								
YEAR	Operator	Commodity Group	Total Segment Miles that Could Affect HCAs	High Population	Other Population	Drinking Water	Ecological Resource	Comm Navigable Water	YEAR
No Report re	ecords found								

No Report

ANNUAL REPORT: ACCURACY/TRENDS

Question #1.

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

1. Notes

Access to Complete Distribution Annual Report

Year	Operator	SYSTEM TOTAL Miles of Main	Miles of Service	SYSTEM TOTAL NO. of Services	Average Service Length
2022	City of Enumclaw	119.9	83.24	5072	86.65
2021	City of Enumclaw	116.731	78.72	5038	82.5
2020	City of Enumclaw	114.9	74.98	4949	80
2019	City of Enumclaw	111.6	71.85	4742	80
2018	City of Enumclaw	102.28	68.02	4489	80
2017	City of Enumclaw	98.6	65.47	4321	80
2016	City of Enumclaw	97.25	65.00	4288	80
2015	City of Enumclaw	95.87	64.33	4246	80

Access to Complete Transmission Annual Report

YEAR	Operator	Commodity Total		Report				
TEAK	Operator	Group	Total Miles	YEAR	Operator	Commodity Group		
No Report	t records found	l	No Repo	rt records found				

DAMAGE PREVENTION

Annual Report Damage Prevention data

	3												
Year	Operator	Number of Excavation Tickets	Total Number of Excavation Damages By Apparent Root Cause:	Locating Practices Not Sufficient:	One-Call Notification Practices Not Sufficient:	Excavation Practices Not Sufficient:	Other:	Number of Services	Total Leaks - Excavation Damage	Total Main Leaks	Miles of Service MAIN	Number of Leaks per Mile of MAIN	
2022	City of Enumclaw	2081	9	0	3	6	0	5072	0	0	119.9		
2021	City of Enumclaw	2434	2	0	0	2	0	5038	0	116.731	78.72		
2020	City of Enumclaw	1905	5	1	1	3	0	4949	4	4	114.9		2.09
2019	City of Enumclaw	2002	8	1	1	5	1	4742					
2018	City of Enumclaw	1519	5	1	0	4	0	4489					
2017	City of Enumclaw	711	5		1	3	1	4321					
2016	City of Enumclaw	639	5	0	0	3	2	4290					
2015	City of Enumclaw	664	5	0	0	3	2	4246					

DIRT data on mismarks for prior year

Damage Cause	Number of Reports
No Report records fo	ound

DIRT Timeliness - Prior Year Reports must be submitted within 45 days of the d

Late	no	Totals
SubmitCompanyID - UTCfinalName	Number of Reports	Number of Reports
City of Enumclaw	<u>10</u>	10
Totals (1 groups)	10	10

Question #2.

Review the following damage prevention items:

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

Q2.b. Is the annual report damages root cause information complete and acc Yes

Q2.d Does the operator follow a process to evaluate the cause of "Locating practices not sufficient" category? Have process in place and used during event in 2020

Q2.e. Is the operator or its contractor qualified and following procedures for ${\sf I}$ Reviewed sampling of OQs for locating pipeline

Forms -

1. Result

Satisfactory

Access to Complete Hazardous Liquid Annual

Forms -

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

Q2.h. What is the number of damages resulting from not locating within the t 0

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

Q2.k. Does the operator follow a process to evaluate causes for damages lists 2-G-6(e)

2. Notes

NPMS SUBMISSIONS/CHANGES

Question #3. 3. Result For transmission operators, has the operator submitted information to the NPMS database, along with changes made after the original submission? Not Applicable

3. Notes

No transmission

INCIDENT/SRC/AOC REPORTS REVIEW

Question #4

Were there any federally reportable incidents during the previous year? Are there any discernable trends to these incidents?

4. Notes

Q4: Federally reportable incidents

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

Question #5.

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

5. Notes

Enumclaw had no reportable events in 2021. I reviewed non-reportable report for damage to 1/2" PE service, no concerns. Enumclaw had an issue with an excavator not requesting locates but has since worked to remedy the problem via public outreach. They will be attending the 2022 Enumclaw Street fair to give 811 information.

Question #6.

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

Q6: Incident Reports

Q6: Incident Reports							6. Result
NotificationID	Inspector	Company	Street Address of event/incident	Date & Time of Incident	ls 30-Day Report Received?	Reporting Level	Satisfactory
No Incident Notificatio	n records found						

6. Notes

No reportable events occurred in 2021, reviewed non-reportable report for damage to 1/2" PE service, no concerns

Question #7.

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

07: Report of SRCs

Q7: Report of SRCs								7. Result
NotificationID	Company	Safety- Related Condition	SafetyRelatedConditionChoices	Reportable?	Date & Time of Incident	Company Notified Date	Report Date	Not Applicable
No Incident Notific	ation records fo	und						

4 Results

Not Applicable

5. Result

7. Notes

Question #8.

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

8. Notes

O&M & EMERGENCY PROGRAMS ÷

Question #9.

Is the O&M Manual up to date and were changes made in the previous year? Satisfactory 9. Notes Many revisions in 2021 such as Electrofuse procedure update, OQ task list update, Gas Breaker Calculator for EFV added, Section 114 Question #10. 10 Result If changes to the O&M were made, are changes acceptable? Satisfactory

10. Notes

Reviewed a sampling of updates, Full O&M review being performed this year (ID 8430) will review all procedures Question #11.

Were emergency plans changed during the previous year?

11. Result

Satisfactory

11. Notes

Reviewed but no changes

Question #12.

Were any changes to emergency plans satisfactory?

12. Result

Not Applicable

12. Notes

INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Question #13 Were there changes to the Integrity Management programs (TIMP, DIMP or both, as applicable)?	13. Result Satisfactory
13. Notes	
City of Enumclaw uses SHRIMP, their processes have not changed but the data changes year-to-year, reviewed SHRIMP data	
Question #14. Is the DIMP/TIMP up to date? What are the results of the operator's program review (effectiveness evaluation) (DIMP every 5 years)?	14. Result Satisfactory
14. Notes Effectiveness evaluation performed every year, reviewed evaluation from 2020	
Question #15	15. Result
Are IMP program changes acceptable?	Satisfactory
15. Notes	outoidotory
IJ. NOES	
Question #16	16. Results
Was appropriate assessment/ repair work conducted during the past year? (monitor progress of IMP activities)	Satisfactory
16. Notes	Subsuccory
To. Notes Replacing farm taps where needed and have plan to replace all steel service lines with PE	
	17. Results
Question #17 Does the operator's HCA location data correspond to the positional data located in UTC GIS?	Not
Does the operator since to cation data correspond to the positional data located in one ors:	Applicable
17. Notes	
Enumclaw has no transmission pipelines	
Question #18	18. Results
What assessment work is planned for the upcoming year?	Not
	Applicable
18. Notes	
Question #19	19. Results
Within the operator's DIMP, are low pressure systems evaluated for overpressure threats?	Not Applicable
19. Notes	
Question #20	20. Results
Did the operator develop and follow specific procedures for low pressure system construction or maintenance projects? (Note: this question is revisited in greater detail in the ADB review	Not
section)	Applicable
20. Notes	
Question #21	21. Results
Are plastic pipe and components that have shown a record of defects/leaks being mitigated through the DIMP plans?	Not Applicable
21. Notes	
Continue to monitor but there have been no indications of defects on PE	
Question #22	22. Results

8. Result Not Applicable

Operator Manuals on Sharepoint

9. Result

	What DIMP remediation work is anticipated for						Satisf
	23. Notes						
	Ongoing maintenance and replacement of serv	vices as needed					
	OQ PROGRAM						
	Question #24 Is the OQ program up to date? Were there char	ngos to the Operator Qualification (C)) program in the last year? If y	or place describe	24. Resul Satisfacto		
	24. Notes	nges to the Operator Qualification (C	JQ/ program in the last year : if y	es, please describe.	Jatislacio	y iy	
	No significant changes to the program, update	ed task list					
	Question #25				25. Resul		
	Are the OQ plan updates satisfactory? 25. Notes				Satisfacto	ory	
	23. Notes						
	Question #26				26. Resul		
	Are personnel performing covered tasks (includ	ding contractors) properly qualified a	and requalified at intervals deter	mined in the operator's p	olan? Satisfacto	ory	
	26. Notes Reviewed a sample of personnel OQs, 6 person	nnel perform OQ tasks					
	PUBLIC AWARENESS PRO	GRAM					
	Question #27			27. Results			
	Is the PA program up to date? And were there o	changes to the Public Awareness (PA	.) program within the last year?	Satisfactory			
	27. Notes Review performed October 26, 2021, no chang	nes					
	Question #28	geo		28. Results			
	Are changes to the PA program satisfactory?			Not Applicable			
	28. Notes						
)	CONTROL ROOM PROGRA Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then		agement (CRM) program within	29. Resul			
)			agement (CRM) program within				
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then 29. Notes Question #30		agement (CRM) program within	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
)	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory?		agement (CRM) program within	the last year? Not Appl	icable ts		
)	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then 29. Notes Question #30		agement (CRM) program within	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory?	re changes to the Control Room Mana	agement (CRM) program within	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were there 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes	re changes to the Control Room Mana	agement (CRM) program within	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were them 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing and	re changes to the Control Room Mana	31. Results	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were ther 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst	31. Results	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking	re changes to the Control Room Mana <u>'STEM API 1173</u> an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173	31. Results tem? Satisfactory	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were them 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT	re changes to the Control Room Mana <u>'STEM API 1173</u> an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173	31. Results tem? Satisfactory	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts	32 R osults	
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were then 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 OF INSPECTION UN	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts	32. Results Satisfactory	
)	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were them 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 OF INSPECTION UN	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were them 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32 Are inspection units broken down appropriated 32. Notes	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 OF INSPECTION UN	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts		
)	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were there 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 1. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32 Are inspection units broken down appropriated 32. Notes Q32: List of current inspection units	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 OF INSPECTION UN dy? Do you recommend any changes	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS to inspection units?	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resul Not Appl	icable ts icable	Satisfactory	
)	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were them 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32 Are inspection units broken down appropriated 32. Notes	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 OF INSPECTION UN	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resu l	icable ts	Satisfactory UTC Operator	
)	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were there 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32 Are inspection units broken down appropriated 32. Notes Q32: List of current inspection units Unit Name	re changes to the Control Room Mana 'STEM API 1173 an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 OF INSPECTION UN dy? Do you recommend any changes	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS to inspection units?	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resul Not Appl	ts icable	Satisfactory UTC	
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were them 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32 Are inspection units broken down appropriated 32. Notes Q32: List of current inspection units Unit Name City of Enumclaw (11 Unit)	re changes to the Control Room Mana <u>'STEM API 1173</u> an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 <u>OF INSPECTION UN</u> Hy? Do you recommend any changes Distribution/Transmission	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS to inspection units? Intrastate or Interstate?	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resul Not Appl GAS or LIQUID	ts ts Licable UTC Unit ID	Satisfactory UTC Operator ID	
	Question #29 Is the CRM program up to date? And were there 29. Notes Question #30 Are the CRM program changes satisfactory? 30. Notes SAFETY MANAGEMENT SY Question #31 Is the operator developing and implementing at 31. Notes Implemented incident reporting form, looking INSPECTOR ASSESSMENT Question #32 Are inspection units broken down appropriated 32. Notes Q32: List of current inspection units Unit Name	re changes to the Control Room Mana <u>'STEM API 1173</u> an API 1173 Safety Management Syst to get copy API 1173 <u>OF INSPECTION UN</u> Hy? Do you recommend any changes	31. Results tem? Satisfactory IITS to inspection units?	the last year? Not Appl 30. Resul Not Appl	ts icable	Satisfactory UTC Operator	

Forms -

For informational purposes: Using the drop down selections available in the "Results" block, indicate whether the operator's web page contains the information listed by placing a check in the box adjacent to all items that are present.

Q33.B Damage Prevention ; Q33.C Pipe Location Information ; Q33.D How to get additional information ; Q33.F On Call Requirements ; Q33.G Potential Hazards ; Q33.H Prevention Measures ; Q33.I Leak/Damage Recognition ; Q33.M Emergency Preparedness

ADVISORY BULLETIN REVIEW

Question #34

33. Notes

6/14/23, 2:53 PM

22. Notes

Question #23

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

Replaced two farm taps in 2020 and one in 2021, 3 services replaced due to atmospheric corrosion

Is there potential for damage to the operator's pipeline facilities caused by flooding, river scour, or channel migration?

Satisfactory

23. Results

ADB 2019-01

Forms -

34.	Results
YES	

ADB 2019-01 ADB 2019-01 Flood Mitigation	34. Results YES
34. Notes Focus area on 6-month bridge patrols and special leak surveys would be done following flooding	
Question #35 If "YES" to Q34, did the operator take appropriate action in accordance with the guidance contained ADB 2019-01? Discuss ADB's guidance wit concerns.	th operator's representative, and annotate any
ADB 2019-01 ADB 2019-01: Flood Mitigation	35. Results Satisfactory
35. Notes Focus area on 6-month bridge patrols and special leak surveys would be done following flooding	
Question #36	
Is there potential for the operator's system to be damaged by earth movement or other seismic/geological activities?	
ADB 2019-02 ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards	36. Results YES
36. Notes	
Leak survey following seismic event	
O&M Section 2-D-2.6	
Question #37 If "YES" to Q36, did the operator take appropriate action according to ADB 2019-02? Discuss suggested actions from ADB with operator's repre	esentative and annotate any concerns.
ADB 2019-02 ADB 2019-02: Earth Movement/Geological Hazards	37. Results Satisfactory
37. Notes	
Leak survey following seismic event	
O&M Section 2-D-2.6	
Question #38	
Does the operator have any indoor meter sets or regulators in their system?	
ADB 2020-01 ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets	38. Results NO
38. Notes	
Question #39 If operator's system has indoor meter sets/regulators, did the operator review ADB 2020-0115? Discuss ADB guidance with operator's represen attention must be given to the operator's plan to conduct leak surveys, AC inspections, and other maintenance activities in locations that are diffining meters/regulators within the operator's DIMP plan, as applicable. ADB 2020-01 ADB 2020-01 ADB 2020-01	ficult to access, as well as the inclusion of 39. Results Not
39. Notes	Applicable
Question #40	
Is the operator's record of locations for all indoor meter sets/regulators within their system complete and sufficently detailed??	
ADB 2020-01 ADB 2020-01 Inside Meter Sets	40. Results Not Applicable
40. Notes	, pproduce
Question #41	
Does the operator have any low pressure systems?	
ADB 2020-02	41. Results
ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems 41. Notes	NO
Question #42 If "YES" to Q41, did the operator review ADB 2020-0025 for Overpressure Protection of Low-Pressure Natural Gas Distribution Systems? Review any concerns.	w ADB guidance with operator and annotate
ADB 2020-02	42. Results
ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems	Not Applicable
42. Notes	
Question #43	
For low pressure construction/maintenance projects, does the operator have a process for review of engineering plans and constructibility revie departments? Do all applicable departments review project plans for accuracy, completeness and correctness? How are control procedures dev could result in a common failure mode? How is the operator mitigating risk in their low presure system?	aws that are carried out through all applicable veloped that could identity system threats that
ADB 2020-02 ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems	43. Results Not
	Applicable

43. Notes

Question #44

Does the operator include all low-pressure system risks in their DIMP program appropriately? ADB 2020-02

ADB 2020-02 Low Pressure Systems

44. Notes

SUMMARY OF REQUIRED COMMENTS

COMMENTS: Required for any ratings other than Satisfactory. Summarize/consolidate entries from the "Notes" blocks above. Ensure you annotate the question number for each comment.