



Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

JUL 10

Mr. John Y. Dupre Vice President, Manager Northern Operations Mobil Pipeline Company 3225 Gallows Road Room 5B2134 Fairfax, VA 22037

Re: CPF No. 3-2005-5013

Dear Mr. Dupre:

Enclosed is the Final Order issued by the Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety in the above-referenced case. It withdraws one of the allegations of violation and gives you a warning with respect to the other. Your receipt of the Final Order constitutes service of that document under 49 C.F.R. § 190.5.

Sincerely,

James Reynolds

Pipeline Compliance Registry

Office of Pipeline Safety

**Enclosure** 

cc:

Ivan A. Huntoon

Director, Central Region, PHP-300

<u>CERTIFIED MAIL – RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED</u>

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

In the Matter of	
Mobil Pipe Line Co.,	CPF No. 3-2005-5013
Respondent )	

## FINAL ORDER

On May 11-14, 2004, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 60117, a representative of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) conducted an onsite pipeline safety inspection of a 30-inch pipeline system in Moneka and Joliet, Illinois, and an 18-inch pipeline system in Patoka, Illinois. As a result of the inspection, the Director, Central Region, OPS, issued to Mobil Pipe Line Company (MPLCo), by letter dated March 2, 2005, a Notice of Probable Violation and Proposed Civil Penalty (Notice). In accordance with 49 C.F.R. § 190.207, the Notice proposed finding that MPLCo had committed violations of 49 C.F.R. Part 195 and proposed assessing a civil penalty of \$11,000 for the alleged violations.

MPLCo responded to the Notice by letter dated March 31, 2005. In its response, MPLCo clarified that, as operator of the 30-inch line, it was responding to the portions of the Notice relating to that line, and that Mustang Pipe Line Partners (MPLP), as operator of the 18-inch line, had agreed to respond to the portions of the Notice relating to that line. MPLCo did not contest Item 1 in the Notice, but did contest Item 2 and requested that it be withdrawn.

## WITHDRAWAL OF ALLEGATION

Item 2 of the Notice alleged that Respondent violated 49 C.F.R. § 195.579(b)(3) by failing to examine certain corrosion monitoring coupons at the Joliet refinery and the Moneka terminal at least twice each calendar year, but with intervals not exceeding 7 1/2 months. Specifically, the Notice alleged that five specified corrosion coupons were examined only once in 2003. In its response, Respondent presented information demonstrating that corrosion inhibitors have never been injected into the 30-inch pipeline system and breakout tanks. Therefore, the specified

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A separate Final Order addressed to MPLP relating to the 18-inch line will be issued concurrently with this Final Order.

coupons are not subject to the requirement for twice yearly examinations. Accordingly, I am withdrawing this allegation.

## **WARNING ITEM**

The Notice did not propose a civil penalty or corrective action for Item 1 in the Notice—Respondent's failure to update its maps with utility crossing information in accordance with 49 C.F.R. § 195.404(a)(2). Therefore, this is considered to be a warning item. Respondent presented information in its response showing that it has taken action to address the cited item. Respondent is warned that if it does not correct this item, enforcement action will be taken if a subsequent inspection reveals a violation.

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

Stacey Gerard

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety

JUL 10

Date Issued