



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Research and  
Special Programs  
Administration**

400 Seventh St. S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590

OCT 30 2003

Mr. John H. Kramer  
Senior Vice President  
Pacific Operators Offshore, Inc.  
2225 Sperry Avenue, Suite 1300  
Ventura, California 93003-7450

Re: CPF No. 56902

Dear Mr. Kramer:

Enclosed is the Final Order issued by the Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety in the above-referenced case. It makes findings of violation and finds that you have completed the corrective actions proposed in the Notice. This case is now closed. Your receipt of the Final Order constitutes service of that document under 49 C.F.R. § 190.5.

Sincerely,

Gwendolyn M. Hill  
Pipeline Compliance Registry  
Office of Pipeline Safety

Enclosure

**CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION  
OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY  
WASHINGTON, DC 20590

In the Matter of

Pacific Operators Offshore, Inc.

Respondent.

CPF No. 56902

**FINAL ORDER**

During April 2-4, 1996, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 60117, a representative of the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) conducted an on-site pipeline safety inspection of Respondent's facilities and records in Ventura, California and offshore on Platforms Houchin and Hogan. As a result of the inspection, the Director, Western Region, OPS issued to Respondent, by letter dated May 28, 1996, a Notice of Probable Violation and Proposed Compliance Order (Notice). In accordance with 49 C.F.R. § 190.207, the Notice proposed finding that Respondent had violated 49 C.F.R. §§ 192.605(a), 195.402(a), 199.7 and 199.202, and proposed that Respondent take certain measures to correct the alleged violations.

Respondent responded to the Notice by letter dated June 20, 1996 (Response). Respondent did not contest the allegations but requested more time to comply with one of the proposed corrective actions. In a letter dated September 11, 1996, the Western Regional Director granted Respondent an extension. Respondent submitted further response on October 30, 1996, on April 30, 2002 and August 30, 2002. Respondent did not request a hearing, and therefore has waived its right to one.

**FINDINGS OF VIOLATION**

Item 1 in the Notice alleged that Respondent had violated §192.605(a) because it did not have a manual of written procedures for its natural gas pipeline system. This regulation requires an operator to prepare and follow for each natural gas pipeline, a manual of written procedures for conducting operations and maintenance activities and for emergency response. Respondent did not contest this allegation. On October 30, 1996, Respondent submitted a manual of written procedures for conducting operation and maintenance activities on its subsea gas pipelines. Accordingly, I find that Respondent violated 49 C.F.R. § 192.605(a) because it did not have a written manual addressing procedures for operations, maintenance and emergencies for its natural gas pipelines when the inspection took place in April 1996.

Item 2 alleged that Respondent violated 49 C.F.R. § 195.402 (a), which requires that an operator of a hazardous liquid pipeline prepare and follow for each pipeline system a manual of written procedures for conducting normal operations and maintenance activities and handling abnormal operations and emergencies. The Notice alleged that Respondent's manual lacked many of the written procedures required to be in the manual. Respondent did not contest this allegation and submitted a manual for its hazardous liquid pipeline operations on April 30, 2002 with further revisions August 30, 2002. Accordingly, I find that Respondent violated 49 C.F.R. § 195.402(a) because when the inspection took place in April 1996, it did not have a written manual of procedures addressing operations, maintenance and emergencies for its hazardous liquid pipelines.

Item 3 alleged that Respondent did not have a written anti-drug plan as required by 49 C.F.R. §199.7. Respondent did not contest this allegation and submitted its anti-drug plan on October 30, 1996. Accordingly, I find that Respondent violated §199.7 because it did not have a written anti-drug plan when the inspection took place in April 1996.


Item 4 alleged that Respondent violated §199.202 for not having a written alcohol misuse plan that conforms to the requirements of subpart C in Part 199, and to the DOT alcohol testing requirements in Part 40. Respondent did not contest this allegation and submitted its alcohol misuse plan on October 30, 1996. Accordingly, I find that Respondent violated 49 C.F.R. § 199.202 because it did not have a written alcohol misuse plan when the inspection took place in April 1996.

These findings of violation will be considered prior offenses in any subsequent enforcement action taken against Respondent.

### COMPLIANCE ORDER

The Notice proposed a compliance order for the four items. Respondent has demonstrated corrective action addressing the items in the proposed compliance order. Respondent submitted its manual for gas operations and its anti-drug and alcohol misuse plan on October 30, 1996. On April 30, 2002, Respondent submitted its manual for hazardous liquid operations, with additional revisions to the plan on August 30, 2002. Because Respondent's actions satisfied the proposed compliance terms, no need exists to issue a compliance order.

The terms and conditions of this Final Order are effective on receipt.

  
Stacey Gerard  
Associate Administrator  
for Pipeline Safety

OCT 30 2003

Date Issued