DOT US Department of Transportation

PHMSA Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

OPS Office of Pipeline Safety

Eastern Region

Principal Investigator Alex Dankanich
Senior Accident Investigator Mike Yazemboski

Region Director Byron Coy

Date of Report 7/17/2013

Subject Failure Investigation Report – Buckeye Macungie Tank 230 bottom

weld failure

Operator, Location, & Consequences

Date of Failure 07/13/2012

Commodity Released Hazardous Liquid (Gasoline)
City/County & State Emmaus, Lehigh County, PA

Unit # & Unit Name 321 - Macungie - PA

SMART Activity # 140298

OpID & Operator Name

Milepost / Location Macungie Station, 5131 Buckeye Road, Emmaus, PA 18049

1845 - Buckeye Partners, LP

Latitude 40.513554, Longitude -75.53238

Type of Failure Leak from crack in weld between tank bottom and wall

Fatalities No Injuries No

Description of area impacted Leak was contained to the tank dike area. Facility is located a High

Consequence Area (HCA).

Total Costs \$380,538

Failure Investigation Report – Buckeye Tank 230 Leak

[Failure Date 7/13/2012]

Executive Summary

At 11:30 am on July 13, 2012, gasoline was discovered in the dike area of Tank 230 in the Buckeye Macungie Station located in Emmaus, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania. Tank 230 is designated as a breakout tank and is thus regulated under 49 CFR, Part 195. The leak was caused by a low cycle fatigue weld failure due to the filling and draining of the tank. Corrosion contributed to the weld failure. Approximately 9 barrels of gasoline leaked into tank dike area. The gasoline was totally contained on Operator-controlled property. Tank 230 is located in a designated high consequence area (HCA). There were no injuries or fatalities, evacuations, or supply disruptions as a result of the incident.

An inspector from PHMSA Eastern Region was dispatched to the location on August 16, 2012 to conduct an investigation into the cause of the release.

System Details

Buckeye Partners, LP owns and operates a break out tank farm in Macungie, PA (Appendix A). Refined products are regularly delivered to the tank farm, temporarily stored, and shipped out by pipeline and by truck to fill requests for product. A Buckeye owned system of pipelines enters and exits the tank farm.

Tank 230 is an atmospheric storage tank that was built in 1974. It is 110 foot diameter by 48 feet high and has an internal floating roof and a steel cone roof. It was last internally inspected on 4/2/1997 by DJA Inspection Services, Inc (Appendix B / Appendix C). At that time it had a magnetic flux leakage scan over 100% of the floor, and ultrasonic thickness readings taken on the bottom. Repairs were made on all pits as needed to achieve a calculated floor life of about 24 years. A 2008 external inspection (Appendix D) included ultrasonic thickness readings of the shell, nozzles and roof.

Events Leading up to the Failure

Prior to the leak that was discovered on July 13, 2012, Tank 230 was in normal service (Appendix E). There were no leaks or operational issues reported since the tank bottom was repaired following the 1997 out-of-service inspection.

Emergency Response

At 11:30 am on July 13, 2012, while performing a monthly tank inspection on Tank 230 at Buckeye's Macungie Station (Appendix F), a Buckeye operations employee noticed stained soil next to the tank. Emergency response procedures were initiated and all appropriate notifications were made. The tank was isolated and emptied. Three monitoring wells were excavated in the area of the stained soil. Gasoline odor was detected in the well closest to the tank, but no free product was observed. The monitoring wells were checked during the tank emptying process and no additional product was discovered. The tank was emptied and cleaned.

Summary of Return-to-Service

The tank bottom was inspected and repaired. Below is a list of the repairs completed. The tank was hydrostatically tested and returned to service in January of 2013.

- 1. New 30 inch wide annular ring installed
 - a. Vacuum box tested lap weld to existing tank bottom
 - b. Vacuum box and mag particle tested annular ring butt welds
 - c. Oil penetrant tested shell/annular ring corner weld
 - d. Helium tested entire tank bottom

Failure Investigation Report – Buckeye Tank 230 Leak

[Failure Date 7/13/2012]

- 2. Repaired 4 soilside pits
- 3. Installed new epoxy floor coating
- 4. Removed leak detection tubes
- 5. Installed new man-way and door sheet
- 6. Painted tank exterior shell course 1 (up to first horizontal weld 8')

Investigation Details

PHMSA Eastern Region received an NRC report 1017664 on 7-14-2012 regarding a possible tank leak after a routine plant patrol found gasoline at the chime area of Tank 230 at the Buckeye Macungie PA tank farm. The gasoline appeared to be coming from under the tank bottom. The gasoline was transferred to another tank, and the tank was cleaned and taken out of service for inspection. An internal inspection and investigation revealed a crack in the fillet weld at the base of the tank wall and bottom plate.

A metallurgical analysis (Appendix G) was performed on the failed weld. A summary of the metallurgical analysis is below. Tank 230 was repaired and returned to service.

A soil boring investigation was conducted and soil samples were sent for laboratory analysis. Soil results indicated that concentrations of target constituents of concern are below PADEP approved risk-based site specific standards for the Macungie Station; therefore, no additional environmental Investigation or remediation was conducted.

Metallurgical Analysis Summary:

The analysis states: "We believe the crack that ultimately formed the leak had initiated and propagated under cyclic fatigue loading. Specifically, the failure mechanism was low-cycle fatigue (LCF). LCF occurs under high-amplitude low-frequency loading. In this instance cyclic loading was a function of the applied pressure variations directly related to changing gasoline levels in the tank. While LCF can also be associated with thermal stress, this is not likely in this instance as such thermal stress changes are a function of temperature change. Since the tank only saw ambient temperatures, changes in thermal stresses would have been negligible. This initiated the crack from the inside of the tank that propagated through-wall, causing the leak. As previously noted, we were unable to identify features associated with fatigue from fracture surface evaluation. However, the presence of multiple cracks adjacent to the leak was an indicator of LCF. Multiple parallel cracks are common under LCF as the high strain amplitude can initiate several cracks. Only one preferential crack will continue to propagate while the others stop. The presence of these multiple transgranular cracks is a good indicator of an LCF mechanism. We are of the opinion that the root cause of cracking really resulted directly from the loss of wall associated with external pitting corrosion. The degree of external pitting observed would have increased the stress from applied service loads, in some cases more than doubling local stress. We believe the increase in stress caused by wall loss was sufficient to initiate and propagate an LCF crack adjacent to the weld toe in the floor plate".

Findings and Contributing Factors

The source of the release was determined to be a small crack in the floor plate near the tank shell. Laboratory analysis revealed that corrosion contributed to the weld failure. Weld failure was due to Low Cycle Fatigue from the filling and draining of the tank.

There were leak detection tubes near the failure location which had been placed there after the tank was built. The tubes were no longer being used, however, Buckeye believes that the placement of these

Failure Investigation Report – Buckeye Tank 230 Leak

[Failure Date 7/13/2012]

tubes displaced the firm soil foundation in the area where the leak occurred. This may have contributed to the cycling effect of the floor plate during filling and draining of the tank.

Appendices

Appendix	Description
Α	140298 Appendix A Maps
В	140298 Appendix B Bottom Inspection Report - 1997
С	140298 Appendix C Tank 230_mrt_calc 1997
D	140298 Appendix D API-653 In-Service Inspection - 2008
E	140298 Appendix E NRC Report 1017664
F	140298 Appendix F Buckeye O&M Inspection procedures
G	140298 Appendix G Metallurgical Test Report
Н	140298 Appendix H Accident Report 20120232 - 17205

Appendices A-D Removed Files available at PHMSA

140298 Appendix E NRC Report 1017664

NATIONAL RESPONSE CENTER 1-800-424-8802

*** For Public Use ***

Information released to a third party shall comply with any applicable federal and/or state Freedom of Information and Privacy Laws

Incident Report # 1017664

INCIDENT DESCRIPTION

*Report taken at 14:41 on 13-JUL-12

Incident Type: STORAGE TANK

Incident Cause: EQUIPMENT FAILURE

Affected Area:

The incident was discovered on 13-JUL-12 at 13:00 local time.

Affected Medium: OTHER DIKED AREA

SUSPECTED RESPONSIBLE PARTY

Organization: BUCKEYE PARTNERS

EMMAUS, PA 18049

Type of Organization: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

INCIDENT LOCATION

5131 BUCKEYE RD County: LEHIGH City: EMMAUS State: PA Zip: 18049

RELEASED MATERIAL(S)

CHRIS Code: GAS Official Material Name: GASOLINE: AUTOMOTIVE (UNLEADED)

Also Known As:

Qty Released: 25 BARREL(S)

DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT

THE CALLER REPORTED THAT WHILE DOING A TANK INSPECTION, PRODUCT STAINING WAS DISCOVERED ON THE DIKE FLOOR. THERE WAS A DEVIATION IN THE PRODUCT LEVELS LAST

NIGHT WHICH WOULD INDICATE 25 BBLS OF GASOLINE HAD DISCHARGED.

INCIDENT DETAILS

Description of Tank: GASOLINE Tank Above/Below Ground: ABOVE Transportable Container: NO

Tank Regulated: YES
Tank Regulated By: PHMSA

Tank ID: 23

Capacity of Tank: 73600 BARREL(S)
Actual Amount: 60074 BARREL(S)

DAMAGES

Fire Involved: NO Fire Extinguished: UNKNOWN

INJURIES: NO Hospitalized: Empl/Crew: Passenger: FATALITIES: NO Empl/Crew: Passenger: Occupant:

EVACUATIONS: NO Who Evacuated: Radius/Area:

Damages: NO

Length of Direction of

<u>Closure Type</u> <u>Description of Closure</u> <u>Closure</u> <u>Closure</u>

Air: N

Road: N Major Artery: N

Waterway: N

Track: N

140298 Appendix E NRC Report 1017664

Passengers Transferred: NO Environmental Impact: UNKNOWN

Media Interest: NONE Community Impact due to Material:

REMEDIAL ACTIONS

TANK WILL BE EMPTIED/ INVESTIGATION UNDERWAY

Release Secured: YES

Release Rate:

Estimated Release Duration:

WEATHER

Weather: CLEAR, °F

ADDITIONAL AGENCIES NOTIFIED

Federal:

State/Local: DEP/ FD State/Local On Scene: State Agency Number:

NOTIFICATIONS BY NRC

ATLANTIC STRIKE TEAM (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:49

DHS PROTECTIVE SECURITY ADVISOR (PSA DESK)

13-JUL-12 14:49

DOT CRISIS MANAGEMENT CENTER (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:49

U.S. EPA III (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:50

FLD INTEL SUPPORT TEAM PHILADELPHIA (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:49

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE COORD CTR (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:49

NJ STATE POLICE (MARINE SERVICES BUREAU)

13-JUL-12 14:49

NOAA RPTS FOR PA (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:49

PA STATE POLICE (BUREAU OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION)

13-JUL-12 14:49

PA EMERG MGMT AGCY (MAIN OFFICE)

13-JUL-12 14:49

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

*** END INCIDENT REPORT # 1017664 ***

Appendix F O&M Inspection Procedures Removed Files available at PHMSA

Appendix G Metallurgical Test Report Removed Files available at PHMSA

NOTICE: This report is required by 49 CFR Part 195. Failure to report can result in a civil penalty not to exceed \$100,000 for each violation for each day that such violation persists except that the maximum civil penalty shall not exceed \$1,000,000 as provided in 49 USC 60122.		OMB NO: 2137-0047 EXPIRATION DATE: 01/31/2014
<u> </u>	Original Report Date:	08/10/2012
U.S Department of Transportation	No.	20120232 - 17205
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration		(DOT Hee Only)

ACCIDENT REPORT - HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SYSTEMS

A federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a current valid OMB Control Number. The OMB Control Number for this information collection is 2137-0047. Public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to be approximately 10 hours per response (5 hours for a small release), including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. All responses to this collection of information are mandatory. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to: Information Collection Clearance Officer, PHMSA, Office of Pipeline Safety (PHP-30) 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, D.C. 20590.

INSTRUCTIONS

Important: Please read the separate instructions for completing this form before you begin. They clarify the information requested and provide specific examples. If you do not have a copy of the instructions, you can obtain one from the PHMSA Pipeline Safety Community Web Page at http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline.

PART A - KEY REPORT INFORMATION

	Original:	Supplemental:	Final:
Report Type: (select all that apply)		Yes	Yes
Last Revision Date:	02/04/2013		
Operator's OPS-issued Operator Identification Number (OPID):	1845		
2. Name of Operator	BUCKEYE PARTN	IERS. LP	
3. Address of Operator:			
3a. Street Address	FIVE TEK PARK		
3b. City	BREINIGSVILLE		
3c. State	Pennsylvania		
3d. Zip Code	18031		
4. Local time (24-hr clock) and date of the Accident:	07/13/2012 11:30		
5. Location of Accident:	•		
Latitude:	40.513554		
Longitude:	-75.53238		
6. National Response Center Report Number (if applicable):	1017664		
7. Local time (24-hr clock) and date of initial telephonic report to the National Response Center (if applicable):	07/13/2012 14:40		
Commodity released: (select only one, based on predominant volume released)	Refined and/or Pet	roleum Product (non-HVL)	which is a
- Specify Commodity Subtype:	Gasoline (non-Etha		
- If "Other" Subtype, Describe:	Cacomic (non Earl	21.01/	
If Biofuel/Alternative Fuel and Commodity Subtype is Ethanol Blend, then % Ethanol Blend: %:			
 If Biofuel/Alternative Fuel and Commodity Subtype is Biodiesel, then Biodiesel Blend (e.g. B2, B20, B100): B			
9. Estimated volume of commodity released unintentionally (Barrels):	8.70		
10. Estimated volume of intentional and/or controlled release/blowdown (Barrels):			
11. Estimated volume of commodity recovered (Barrels):	.02		
12. Were there fatalities?	No		
- If Yes, specify the number in each category:	•		
12a. Operator employees			
12b. Contractor employees working for the Operator			
12c. Non-Operator emergency responders			
12d. Workers working on the right-of-way, but NOT			
associated with this Operator			
12e. General public			
12f. Total fatalities (sum of above)			
13. Were there injuries requiring inpatient hospitalization?	No		
- If Yes, specify the number in each category:			
13a. Operator employees			
13b. Contractor employees working for the Operator			
13c. Non-Operator emergency responders			

No
THE TANK WAS ISOLATED AND EMPTIED
NI.
No No
0
07/13/2012 11:30
07/13/2012 11:30
Yes
ions (2-12)
ons (13-15)
Pennsylvania
18049
EMMAUS LEHIGH
LL: IIOII
MACUNGIE STATION
ZG
No
Totally contained on Operator-controlled property
Tank, including attached appurtenances
No
Interstate
Interstate Onshore Breakout Tank or Storage Vessel, including Attached Appurtenances

3. Item involved in Accident:	Tank/Vessel
- If Pipe, specify:	Turny v 65561
3a. Nominal diameter of pipe (in):	
3b. Wall thickness (in):	
3c. SMYS (Specified Minimum Yield Strength) of pipe (psi):	
3d. Pipe specification:	
3e. Pipe Seam , specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
3f. Pipe manufacturer:	
3g. Year of manufacture:	
3h. Pipeline coating type at point of Accident, specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Weld, including heat-affected zone, specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Valve, specify:	
- If Mainline, specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
3i. Manufactured by:	
3j. Year of manufacture:	
- If Tank/Vessel, specify:	Single Bottom System
- If Other - Describe:	Chigie Bottom Cystem
- If Other, describe:	
Year item involved in Accident was installed:	1974
Teal item involved in Accident was installed. Material involved in Accident:	Carbon Steel
	Carbon Steel
- If Material other than Carbon Steel, specify:	Lagle
6. Type of Accident Involved:	Leak
- If Mechanical Puncture – Specify Approx. size:	
in. (axial) by	
in. (circumferential)	
- If Leak - Select Type:	Crack
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Rupture - Select Orientation:	
- If Other, Describe:	
Approx. size: in. (widest opening) by	
in. (length circumferentially or axially)	
- If Other – Describe:	
- If Other – Describe:	
- If Other – Describe: PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply:	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply:	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial 2. Soil contamination:	
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial 2. Soil contamination: 3. Long term impact assessment performed or planned:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial 2. Soil contamination: 3. Long term impact assessment performed or planned: 4. Anticipated remediation:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial 2. Soil contamination: 3. Long term impact assessment performed or planned: 4. Anticipated remediation: 4a. If Yes, specify all that apply:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes No No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes Yes Yes Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial 2. Soil contamination: 3. Long term impact assessment performed or planned: 4. Anticipated remediation: 4a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Surface water - Groundwater - Soil - Vegetation - Wildlife 5. Water contamination: 5a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Ocean/Seawater - Surface - Groundwater - Surface - Groundwater - Surface - Groundwater - Drinking water: (Select one or both) - Private Well - Public Water Intake 5b. Estimated amount released in or reaching water (Barrels): 5c. Name of body of water, if commonly known: 6. At the location of this Accident, had the pipeline segment or facility been identified as one that "could affect" a High Consequence Area (HCA) as determined in the Operator's Integrity Management Program? 7. Did the released commodity reach or occur in one or more High	Yes No No
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact:	Yes Yes Yes Yes
PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION 1. Wildlife impact: 1a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Fish/aquatic - Birds - Terrestrial 2. Soil contamination: 3. Long term impact assessment performed or planned: 4. Anticipated remediation: 4a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Surface water - Groundwater - Soil - Vegetation - Wildlife 5. Water contamination: 5a. If Yes, specify all that apply: - Ocean/Seawater - Surface - Groundwater - Surface - Groundwater - Surface - Groundwater - Drinking water: (Select one or both) - Private Well - Public Water Intake 5b. Estimated amount released in or reaching water (Barrels): 5c. Name of body of water, if commonly known: 6. At the location of this Accident, had the pipeline segment or facility been identified as one that "could affect" a High Consequence Area (HCA) as determined in the Operator's Integrity Management Program? 7. Did the released commodity reach or occur in one or more High	Yes Yes Yes Yes

Was this HCA identified in the "could affect"	
determination for this Accident site in the Operator's	
Integrity Management Program?	
- High Population Area:	Yes
Was this HCA identified in the "could affect"	
determination for this Accident site in the Operator's	Yes
Integrity Management Program?	
- Other Populated Area	
Was this HCA identified in the "could affect" determination	
for this Accident site in the Operator's Integrity	
Management Program?	
- Unusually Sensitive Area (USA) - Drinking Water	Yes
Was this HCA identified in the "could affect" determination	
for this Accident site in the Operator's Integrity	Yes
Management Program?	100
- Unusually Sensitive Area (USA) - Ecological	
Was this HCA identified in the "could affect" determination	
for this Accident site in the Operator's Integrity	
Management Program?	
8. Estimated Property Damage:	
o. Estimated Property Damage.	
8a. Estimated cost of public and non-Operator private property	\$ 0
damage	
8b. Estimated cost of commodity lost	\$ 0
8c. Estimated cost of Operator's property damage & repairs	\$ 370,115
8d. Estimated cost of Operator's emergency response	\$ 10,423
8e. Estimated cost of Operator's environmental remediation	\$ 0
8f. Estimated other costs	\$ 0
Describe:	
8g. Total estimated property damage (sum of above)	\$ 380,538
	<u> </u>
PART E - ADDITIONAL OPERATING INFORMATION	
1. Estimated pressure at the point and time of the Accident (psig):	.00
2. Maximum Operating Pressure (MOP) at the point and time of the	00
Accident (psig):	.00
Describe the pressure on the system or facility relating to the	
Accident (psig):	Pressure did not exceed MOP
Not including pressure reductions required by PHMSA regulations	
(such as for repairs and pipe movement), was the system or facility	
relating to the Accident operating under an established pressure	No
restriction with pressure limits below those normally allowed by the	
MOP?	
- If Yes, Complete 4.a and 4.b below:	
4a. Did the pressure exceed this established pressure	
restriction?	
4b. Was this pressure restriction mandated by PHMSA or the	
4b. Was this pressure restriction mandated by Friwisk of the	
State?	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore	N.
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2?	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below)	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2?	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source:	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source:	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source:	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft):	No
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools?	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation?	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's,	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.)	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic flux leakage internal inspection tools)	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic flux leakage internal inspection tools) - Other -	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic flux leakage internal inspection tools) - Other -	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic flux leakage internal inspection tools) - Other -	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic flux leakage internal inspection tools) - Other -	
State? 5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? - If Yes - (Complete 5a. – 5e. below) 5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: 5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? - If No, Which physical features limit tool accommodation? - Changes in line pipe diameter - Presence of unsuitable mainline valves - Tight or mitered pipe bends - Other passage restrictions (i.e. unbarred tee's, projecting instrumentation, etc.) - Extra thick pipe wall (applicable only for magnetic flux leakage internal inspection tools) - Other -	(select all that apply)

- Excessive debris or scale, wax, or other wall buildup - Low flow or patient pressure(s) - Low flow or absence of flow - Incompatible commodity - Other - If Other, Describe: 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place or the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 1 Yes - 1	- Low flow or absence of flow - Incompatible commodity - Other	
- Low flow or absence of flow - Incompatible commodity - Other	- Low flow or absence of flow - Incompatible commodity - Other - Investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control or oth specified in presting the controller(s) and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified incorrect protection or controller one or provision identified in correct protection - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified areas other than those above: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident fuse in page and and control testing requirements of DOT's Quay & Alcohol Testing requirements of DOT's Q	
- Incompatible commodity - Other - In Coher, Describe: St. Function of pipeline system: 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? If Yes - Ga. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6. Use a fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6. Use a fully functional at the system of the Accident of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident of the Accident? 7. Was at CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially its fully ful	- Incompatible commodity - Other - Other If Other, Describe: 51. Function of pipeline system: 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? If Yes - 6a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), even(s), andior volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), even(s), andior volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), even(s), andior volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a toperating at the time of the Accident? 7. To. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. To. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. B. How was the Accident in information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the contimentation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident in information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the controller, alert of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident in information of the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or one of the Accident? 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s); (select at that in apply) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s); (select at that apply) 2 Investigation identified incorrect ontrol or according explanation for why not perator, and other factors associated with flatigue perator or explan	
- Other - If Other, Describe: 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 1 Yes - 6a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7s. Was a toperating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7s. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the operators. If Partor, or Guard Partor by Operator or its contractor's is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) accions or control room issues was necessary due to: - If Yes, specify investigation inestifies; invested with fatigue - Investigation intentified more control room issues was necessary due to: - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the Operator, and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation indentified to control room issues was necessary on the operator, and other factors associ	- Other - - If Other, Describe: 5. Function of pipeline system: 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 1f Yes - 6a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 6a. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7c. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7 a. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7 b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7 c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7 d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control rom issues were necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator by Operator or its controller(s) actions or control rom issues were necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator due not investigation in the factor associated with fatigue 1 if No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the Controller(s) actions or control rom issues were the relative associated with fatigue 1 investigation identified incorrect procedures 1 investigation identified incorrect procedures 1 investigation identified incorrect procedures 1 inv	
6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 6. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a to perating at the time of the Accident? 7. Was a to perating at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it in trilly functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Was a time involved in the Accident? 7. Was it in trilly functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it in trilly functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it in trilly functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 8. H'Own controller, "used Operating Personnel," usuality contractors "Air Partol", or Guard Patrol by Operator "I Other, Specify: Ba, If "Controller", "used Operating Personnel," usuality contractors "Air Partol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator" is contractors," "Air Partol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator is controller(s) actions or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 If Yes, peoply investigation result(s) (socid	- If Other, Describe: 5. Function of pipeline system: 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? If Yes - 6a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alart(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alart(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7c. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7 b. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7 c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7 d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7 d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7 d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 8 d. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel," including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its controller(s) accident initially identified for the Operator," and event place and explanation for why the operator did not incorticate and the apply) 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) actions or control comissues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If Yes, specify investigation resolutes with a papely of the Operator), a	
St. Function of pipeline system: A. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? If Yes Ga. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? Gb. Was it tilly functional at the time of the Accident? Gc. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? Gb. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it perating at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it perating at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak election system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. To. Did CPM leak election system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. But the confirmation of the Accident? 7. But the confirmation of the Accident? 7. If Did CPM leak election system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor's is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control oron issues was necessary due to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to the controller(s) acti	6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 6. Was it duply functional at the time of the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility vinvolved in the Accident? 7. Was in tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to controller(s) actions or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to controller(s) actions or controller or an explanation for why the operator did not investigate to the controller(s) actions or controller are available to the controller(s) actions	
6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline of facility involved in the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system in formation (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM lack detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractors', "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors' is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) accinos or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) accinos or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation f	5. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 6. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigation) 1. If Yes, specify investigation in tesult(s): (select all that apply) 1. Investigation identified in control or on issues 2. Investigation identified in control or on issues 3. Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller sponse 3. Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller response 4. Investigation identified incorrect controller action o	
If Yes 6a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it fully functional at the calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. But a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control from issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control or such assess were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control or one issues was necessary due to provide an explanation for why the Operator of the controller(s) actions or control from issues was necessary due to provide an explanation for why the Operator, and other factors associated with fatigue 9. Was an investigation identified no control room issues was necessary due to provide an explanation for why the Operator, and other factors associated with fatigue 9. Was an explanation for why the Operator, and other factors asso	If Yes - (B. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? (B. Was it ityli functional at the time of the Accident? (B. Was it ityli functional at the time of the Accident? (B. Was it ityli functional at the time of the Accident? (B. Was it ityli functional at the time of the Accident? (B. Was it ityli functional at the time of the Accident? (B. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? (B. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? (C. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? (C. Did CPM leak detection of the Accident? (D. Did CPM leak detection of t	
If Yes Bo. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? Bo. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? Go. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? Go. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in formation (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it in the detection of the Accident? 7. D. Was a it is compared to the Accident? 7. D. Was a it is compared to the Accident? 7. D. Was a it is compared to the Accident? 7. D. Was a it is compared to the Accident? 7. D. Was a it is compared to the Accident? 7. D. Was a it is compared to the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control from issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initialised into whether or not the controller(s) accounted to the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation resulfs): (seecled the apply) 1. If Yes, specify investigation installed in the Accident or the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation installed in the Accident or the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation in the Accident or the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation in the Accident or the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation in the Accident or the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation in the Accident or the Accident or the Accident or the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify	System in place on the pipeline of tacility involved in the Accident? 6a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), and/or volume calculations) assists with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1. If Yes, specify investigation results, is selected in the apply or Investigation or why the operator did not find that an investigation of the Controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to (provide an explanation of why the operator did not investigate) 1. If Yes, specify investigation results, is selected that apply or the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation identified no control room issues 1. Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation of the provide an explanation for why the operator of th	
GB. Was it up creating at the time of the Accident? GB. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? GB. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? GB. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it tully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was an Accident mittally identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident mittally identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control oron issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1. If No., the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control oron issues was necessary due to (provide an explanation for why the Operator). And other factors associated with farigue 1. If vestigation identified in control oron issues was necessary due to: 2. Investigation identified more control room issues 3. Investigation identified incorrect controller accident or controller issues 4. Investigation identified incorrect cont	6a. Was it uptractional at the time of the Accident? 6b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), aler(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), aler(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it up for the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. If Other Accident? 7. If Other Accident? 7. If Other Accident? 7. Local Operating Personnel*, including contractors*, "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors*," Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors*," Sepecify the collowing: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the controller(s) actions or control grow issues was necessary due to (provide an explanation of why the operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control grow of the operator did not find that the population of the controller(s) actions or controller and population of the controller(s) actio	
Bb. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) accions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigation (environment of the Accident?) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): Genet all that apply) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): Genet all that apply) 1 Investigation identified to control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigation identified on control room issues 1 Investigation	6b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. If Yes: 7. If Yes: 7. If Yes: 7. Judy CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Judy CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor' is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) accions or control controller(s) actions or control or on issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control or on issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or controller(s) act	
Sc. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Busing the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Busing the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Deparator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Deparator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor's 'air Patrot', or 'Guard Patrot by Operator or its contractor's 'air Patrot', or 'Guard Patrot by Operator or its controller(s) accidents or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 For No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) accidents or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 For Yes, specify investigation install(s): (select all hist apply) 1 Investigation indentified to control room issues 1 Investigation identified on c	6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractors', "air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors', "air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or the Accident? 1f No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1f Yes, specify investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller (s) response 2 Investigation identified incorrect controller response 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected controller(s) involved or impacted the	
slert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6th Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident or system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7b. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the contirection is selected in Question as specify: 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation or explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation or explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation or explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation or explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation or explanation for why the Operator, and other factors associated with flatigue 1. If Yes, Specify investigation result(is): Gelect all that apply 1. Investig	alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. If Yes: 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control controller(s) actions or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified no controller results of the Accident identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller response 1 Investigation identified maintenance ac	
the detection of the Accident? 6th Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident and the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation intelled in the whether or not the controller(s) or control or is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation intelled into whether or not the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for thy the operator did not investigate) 1. The extractions of the Accident or the accident of th	the detection of the Accident? 6td. Did SCAD-Abseate information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor's "sir Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor's assessment to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 9. Investigation identified incorrect controller rotation or controller (s) investigation identified incorrect controller rotation or controller (s) investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller (s) investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller (s) investigation identified maintenance activities that affected con	
6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), ander(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. B. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7. D. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. D. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. D. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigate) 1. If Yes, S. 7. If Oh, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the Controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator) and other factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation resulties; (select all that apply) 1. Investigation identified on control room issues 1. Investigation identified no control room issues 1. Investigation identified no control room equipment operation 1.	del. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. If Yes: 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. If "Controller," "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) around a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified no control room issues 1 Investigation identified no control room issues 1 Investigation identified for ocontroller action or controller error 2 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response 1 Investigation identified maintena	
alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor' is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? • If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) • In Yes, specify investigation result(s); (select all that apply) • Investigation indentified in control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator), and other factors associated with fatigue • Investigation identified in control room issues • Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller special on explanation for why not: • Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller response • Investigation identified in correct controller seasonse • Investigation identified incorrect controller explan	alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patro", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control orm issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the Controller(s) actions or control (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation and Operator as associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified or control room issues 1 Investigation identified or control or issues 1 Investigation identified or control or issues 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect procedures 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller response 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: 1 Investigation identified incorrect procedures 2	
the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the election of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the contimination of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the contimination of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How as investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation identified in correct (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller response 1. Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller is provided an explanation identified in correct controller action or controller action	the confirmation of the Accident? 7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 1 if Yes: 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 if No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not fine controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 if Yes, specify investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error. 1 investigation identified incorrect procedures 1 investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error. 1 investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error. 1 investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error. 1 investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error. 1 investigation identified incorrect pr	
7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it tuliy functional at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor' is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control from issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1ff No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator) and other factors associated with fatigue 1ff Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller response 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller exponse 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller exponse 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller exponse 1 Invest	7. Was a CPM leak detection system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator or its contractors', "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) actions or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 fl No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 fl Yes, specify investigation results; (select all that apply) 1 Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified or control room issues 1 Investigation identified or control room issues 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller (s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller response 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's DIV.	
involved in the Accident? 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator or its contractor's is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1f No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) 1f Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1f Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1f Investigation identified no control room issues 1 Investigation identified no control room issues 1 Investigation identified in control room issues 1 Investigation identified incorrect procedures 1 Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation. 1 Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation. 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: 1 Inv	involved in the Accident? If Yes: 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control ross issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apphy) If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apphy) Investigation and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation of the Accident of the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why the Operator of the Operator) and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation of the Controller selection or controller (s) investigation identified no controller issues Investigation identified no controller selection or controller (s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or co	
- If Yes: 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigation for investigation of the operator did not investigation for who an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all their apply) - Investigation identified on control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified for cortroller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller on equipment operation - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified or an explanation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified oreas of the procedures of the procedures of the procedures of the	- If Yes: 7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control rom issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 ff No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control rom issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 ff Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller isnued to investigation identified incorrect controller issues 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: 1 Describe: 1 PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's	
7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation identified in control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - Investigation identified in control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified in control room issues - Investigation identified in control room issues - Investigation identified in control room issues - Investigation identified in correct control room equipment operation - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified or controller activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller activities that a	7a. Was it operating at the time of the Accident? 7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 1f Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation identified one ontrol room issues - Investigation identified one control room issues - Investigation identified one control room issues - Investigation identified one control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: - PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TEST	
7b. Was if fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controllers", "in Parol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) actions or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation resituits): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller sisues - Investigation identified no controller sisues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control or operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control or operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	7b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Accident? 7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified hat fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's DTUS ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION	
7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initiality identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initiality identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or contractor' is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select aff that apply) 1 Investigation identified no control room issues continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: 1 Investigation identified no controller sisues 1 Investigation identified no controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect procedures and or controller response 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller response 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	7c. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation identified or control room issues 2 Investigation identified or control room issues 1 Investigation identified no control room issues 2 Investigation identified no control room issues 1 Investigation identified no control room issues 2 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - If Yes, specify investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no controller rissues - Investigation identified no controller rissues - Investigation identified no controller rissues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe:	alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 9. If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 9. If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1. If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1. Investigation identified or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1. Investigation identified no control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1. Investigation identified or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation identified no control room issues 1. Investigation identified no controller issues 1. Investigation identified no controller issues 1. Investigation identified no controller issues 1. Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation 1. Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1. Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol test	
with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If Other, Specify: 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation indentified no control room issues - Investigation identified or controller action or controller error - Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller incorrect procedures - Investigation identified in correct controller action or controller incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller response - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe:	with the detection of the Accident? 7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 1 ff Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 ff No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 ff Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation dientified most exprice (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified no control room issues 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified no controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller on operation 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1 Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If Other, Specify: 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller sylinovled or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller sylinovled or impacted the involved controller sylinovled or impacted the involved controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe:	7d. Did CPM leak detection system information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1 If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1 If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1 Investigation and other factors associated with fatigue 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified in cornect controller room issues 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified no controller issues 1 Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller (s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 2 Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 2 Investigation identified areas other than those above: 2 Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If Other, Specify: 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? 1. If Other, Specify: 8. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? 1. If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) 1. If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) 1. Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue 1. Investigation identified no control room issues 1. Investigation identified no control reom issues 1. Investigation identified no control reom issues 1. Investigation identified no controller issues 1. Investigation identified no control reom issues 1. Investigation identified no control room equipment operation 1. Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1. Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response 1. Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Nestigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller (s) moved on equipment operation - Investigation identified incorrect controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	with the confirmation of the Accident? 8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator? - If Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no controller or room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operation, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- If Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) investigation identified incorrect controller seasons - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe:	8. How was the Accident initially identified for the Operator?	
- If Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control orom issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller supposes - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above:	- If Other, Specify: 8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	including contractors
8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above:	8a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel", including contractors", "Air Patrof", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller esponse - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller esponse - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller explanation or controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe:	contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Guard Patrol by Operator or its contractors" is selected in Question 8, specify the following: 9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	9. Was an investigation initiated into whether or not the controller(s) or control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION No No No No No No No No No	
ontrol room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the Operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller species - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control results - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operation - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	control room issues were the cause of or a contributing factor to the Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller (s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operation - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation idn NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	Accident? - If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller susues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: - PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified amintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- If No, the Operator did not find that an investigation of the controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no controller on issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control one equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: - PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	tion for why the Operator did not
controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation id NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator of din not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
controller(s) actions or control room issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	controller(s) actions or control from issues was necessary due to: (provide an explanation for why the operator did not investigate) - If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	VAS TOO SMALL TO BE
- If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- If Yes, specify investigation result(s): (select all that apply) - Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified no controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: - Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue - Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: Investigation identified no control room issues Investigation identified no controller issues Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response Investigation identified incorrect procedures Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: Investigation identified no control room issues Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response Investigation identified incorrect procedures Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	Operator), and other factors associated with fatigue Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	Provide an explanation for why not: - Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified no control room issues - Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified no controller issues - Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified incorrect controller action or controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	controller error - Investigation identified that fatigue may have affected the controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	controller(s) involved or impacted the involved controller(s) response - Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified incorrect procedures - Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified incorrect control room equipment operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	operation - Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified maintenance activities that affected control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	control room operations, procedures, and/or controller response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No	
response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	response - Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No	
- Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe:	- Investigation identified areas other than those above: Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No	
Describe:	Describe: PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No	
	PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION 1. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No	
	As a result of this Accident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
PART F - DRUG & ALCOHOL TESTING INFORMATION	under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
1. As a result of this Assident, were any Operator employees tested	under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
	Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
	- II Tes:	
10. Specify how many were tested:	1a. Specify how many were tested:	

1b. Specify how many failed:	
2. As a result of this Accident, were any Operator contractor employees	
tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of	No
DOT's Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations?	
- If Yes:	
2a. Specify how many were tested:	
2b. Specify how many failed:	
zb. Specify flow many falled.	
PART G – APPARENT CAUSE	
Select only one box from PART G in shaded column on left represent the questions on the right. Describe secondary, contributing or root	
Apparent Cause:	G1 - Corrosion Failure
G1 - Corrosion Failure - only one sub-cause can be picked from shad	ded left-hand column
External Corrosion:	Yes
Internal Corrosion:	
- If External Corrosion:	Localized Ditting
Results of visual examination: - If Other, Describe:	Localized Pitting
- If Other, Describe: 2. Type of corrosion: (select all that apply)	
Type of corrosion: (select all that apply) Galvanic	Yes
- Garvanic - Atmospheric	100
- Stray Current	
- Microbiological	
- Selective Seam	
- Other:	
- If Other, Describe:	
3. The type(s) of corrosion selected in Question 2 is based on the following	ng: (select all that apply)
- Field examination	ig. (Goroot an triat appriy)
- Determined by metallurgical analysis	Yes
- Other:	
- If Other, Describe:	
4. Was the failed item buried under the ground?	No
- If Yes :	
☐4a. Was failed item considered to be under cathodic	
protection at the time of the Accident?	
If Yes - Year protection started:	
4b. Was shielding, tenting, or disbonding of coating evident at	
the point of the Accident?	
4c. Has one or more Cathodic Protection Survey been conducted at the point of the Accident?	
If "Yes, CP Annual Survey" – Most recent year conducted:	
If "Yes, Close Interval Survey" – Most recent year conducted:	
If "Yes, Other CP Survey" – Most recent year conducted:	
- If No:	
4d. Was the failed item externally coated or painted?	No
Was the rained from externally coated of painted: Was there observable damage to the coating or paint in the vicinity of	
the corrosion?	No
- If Internal Corrosion:	
6. Results of visual examination:	
- Other:	
7. Type of corrosion (select all that apply): -	
- Corrosive Commodity	
- Water drop-out/Acid	
- Microbiological	
- Erosion	
- Other:	
- If Other, Describe:	
8. The cause(s) of corrosion selected in Question 7 is based on the follow	ring (select all that apply): -
- Field examination	
- Determined by metallurgical analysis	
- Other:	
- If Other, Describe:	
9. Location of corrosion (select all that apply): -	
- Low point in pipe	
- Flhow	

- Other:	
- If Other, Describe:	
10. Was the commodity treated with corrosion inhibitors or biocides?	
Was the interior coated or lined with protective coating? Were cleaning/dewatering pigs (or other operations) routinely	
utilized?	
13. Were corrosion coupons routinely utilized?	
Complete the following if any Corrosion Failure sub-cause is selected AND	the "Item Involved in Accident" (from PART C,
Question 3) is Tank/Vessel.	·
14. List the year of the most recent inspections:	,
14a. API Std 653 Out-of-Service Inspection	Yes
- No Out-of-Service Inspection completed 14b. API Std 653 In-Service Inspection	1997 Yes
- No In-Service Inspection	2008
Complete the following if any Corrosion Failure sub-cause is selected AND	
Question 3) is Pipe or Weld.	the Remainded in Addition (nomit Art 6,
15. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the	
Accident?	
15a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool and	indicate most recent year run: -
- Magnetic Flux Leakage Tool	
Most recent year: - Ultrasonic	
- Ottasonic Most recent year:	
- Geometry	
Most recent year:	
- Caliper	
Most recent year:	
- Crack	
Most recent year: - Hard Spot	
Most recent year:	
- Combination Tool	
Most recent year:	
- Transverse Field/Triaxial	
Most recent year:	
- Other	
Most recent year: Describe:	
16. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since	
original construction at the point of the Accident?	
If Yes -	
Most recent year tested:	
Test pressure: 17. Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted on this segment?	
- If Yes, and an investigative dig was conducted at the point of the Accident::	<u> </u>
Most recent year conducted:	
- If Yes, but the point of the Accident was not identified as a dig site:	
Most recent year conducted:	
18. Has one or more non-destructive examination been conducted at the	
point of the Accident since January 1, 2002? 18a. If Yes, for each examination conducted since January 1, 2002, select typ	e of non-destructive examination and indicate most
recent year the examination was conducted:	e of non destructive examination and indicate most
- Radiography	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Guided Wave Ultrasonic	
Most recent year conducted: - Handheld Ultrasonic Tool	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Wet Magnetic Particle Test	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Dry Magnetic Particle Test	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Other	
Most recent year conducted: Describe:	
Describe.	
G2 - Natural Force Damage - only one sub-cause can be picked from sha	aded left-handed column
Natural Force Damage – Sub-Cause:	
- If Earth Movement, NOT due to Heavy Rains/Floods:	

	T
1. Specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Heavy Rains/Floods:	
2. Specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Lightning:	
3. Specify:	
- If Temperature:	
4. Specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If High Winds:	
If Other Natural Force Demogra	
- If Other Natural Force Damage: 5. Describe:	
Complete the following if any Natural Force Damage sub-cause is sele	cted.
6. Were the natural forces causing the Accident generated in	
conjunction with an extreme weather event?	
6a. If Yes, specify: (select all that apply)	,
- Hurricane	
- Tropical Storm	
- Tornado	
- Other	
- If Other, Describe:	
G3 - Excavation Damage - only one sub-cause can be picked from s	haded left-hand column
Excavation Damage – Sub-Cause:	
- If Excavation Damage by Operator (First Party):	
- If Excavation Damage by Operator's Contractor (Second Party):	
- If Excavation Damage by Operator's Contractor (Second Party):	
- If Excavation Damage by Third Party:	
- II Excavation Damage by Tillio Faity.	
- If Previous Damage due to Excavation Activity:	
Opening to Opening a F ONLY IF the little or bounded the Application (III (forms	DADT O Consider Olds Blos on World
Complete Questions 1-5 ONLY IF the "Item Involved in Accident" (from	PART C, Question 3) is Pipe or Weld.
Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident?	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool as	
Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted:	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool are in Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted:	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool at a magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool are in Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted:	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool are in Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted:	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool are in Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other Most recent year conducted:	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool are internal inspection tool	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool at a most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other Most recent year conducted: - Describe: 2. Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was completed BEFORE the damage was sustained?	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool are a Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other Most recent year conducted: - Describe: 2. Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was completed BEFORE the damage was sustained? 3. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Accident? - If Yes: Most recent year tested: Test pressure (psig):	
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other Most recent year conducted: - Describe: 2. Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was completed BEFORE the damage was sustained? 3. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Accident? - If Yes: Most recent year tested: Test pressure (psig): 4. Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted on the pipeline segment?	nd indicate most recent year run: -
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other Most recent year conducted: - Describe: 2. Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was completed BEFORE the damage was sustained? 3. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Accident? - If Yes: Most recent year tested: Test pressure (psig): 4. Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted at the point of the Accident? - If Yes, and an investigative dig was conducted at the point of the Accident?	nd indicate most recent year run: -
1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident? 1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a - Magnetic Flux Leakage Most recent year conducted: - Ultrasonic Most recent year conducted: - Geometry Most recent year conducted: - Caliper Most recent year conducted: - Crack Most recent year conducted: - Hard Spot Most recent year conducted: - Combination Tool Most recent year conducted: - Transverse Field/Triaxial Most recent year conducted: - Other Most recent year conducted: - Describe: 2. Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was completed BEFORE the damage was sustained? 3. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Accident? - If Yes: Most recent year tested: Test pressure (psig): 4. Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted on the pipeline segment?	nd indicate most recent year run: -

Most recent year conducted:		
5. Has one or more non-destructive examination been conducted at the		
point of the Accident since January 1, 2002?		
5a. If Yes, for each examination, conducted since January 1, 2002,	select type of non-destructive examination and indicate most	
recent year the examination was conducted:	T	
- Radiography		
Most recent year conducted: - Guided Wave Ultrasonic		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Handheld Ultrasonic Tool		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Wet Magnetic Particle Test		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Dry Magnetic Particle Test		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Other		
Most recent year conducted:		
Describe:		
Complete the following if Excavation Damage by Third Party is selected	ed as the sub-cause.	
6. Did the operator get prior notification of the excavation activity?		
6a. If Yes, Notification received from: (select all that apply) -		
- One-Call System		
- Excavator		
- Contractor		
- Landowner		
Complete the following mandatory CGA-DIRT Program questions if any	/ Excavation Damage sub-cause is selected	
	Licavation Damage Sub-cause is selected.	
7. Do you want PHMSA to upload the following information to CGA-		
DIRT (www.cga-dirt.com)?		
8. Right-of-Way where event occurred: (select all that apply) -	T	
- Public		
- If "Public", Specify:		
- Private - If "Private", Specify:		
- Pipeline Property/Easement		
- Power/Transmission Line		
- Railroad		
- Dedicated Public Utility Easement		
- Federal Land		
- Data not collected		
- Unknown/Other		
9. Type of excavator:		
10. Type of excavation equipment:		
11. Type of work performed:		
12. Was the One-Call Center notified?		
12a. If Yes, specify ticket number:		
12b. If this is a State where more than a single One-Call Center exists, list the name of the One-Call Center notified:		
13. Type of Locator:		
14. Were facility locate marks visible in the area of excavation?		
15. Were facilities marked correctly?		
16. Did the damage cause an interruption in service?		
16a. If Yes, specify duration of the interruption (hours)		
17. Description of the CGA-DIRT Root Cause (select only the one predon	ninant first level CGA-DIRT Root Cause and then, where	
available as a choice, the one predominant second level CGA-DIRT Root		
Root Cause:		
- If One-Call Notification Practices Not Sufficient, specify:		
- If Locating Practices Not Sufficient, specify:		
- If Excavation Practices Not Sufficient, specify:		
- If Other/None of the Above, explain:		
G4 - Other Outside Force Damage - only one sub-cause can be selected from the shaded left-hand column		
Other Outside Force Damage – Sub-Cause:		
- If Nearby Industrial, Man-made, or Other Fire/Explosion as Primary	Cause of Incident:	
- If Damage by Car, Truck, or Other Motorized Vehicle/Equipment NO	T Engaged in Excavation:	
1. Vehicle/Equipment operated by:	Land and Managara Oct Add 166 - Mills III.	
- If Damage by Boats, Barges, Drilling Rigs, or Other Maritime Equipn	nent or vessels Set Adrift or Which Have Otherwise Lost	

Their Mooring:	
2. Select one or more of the following IF an extreme weather event was a	factor:
- Hurricane	
- Tropical Storm	
- Tornado	
- Heavy Rains/Flood	
- Other	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Routine or Normal Fishing or Other Maritime Activity NOT Engage	ed in Excavation:
If Floatrical Arriver from Other Family ment on Facility	
- If Electrical Arcing from Other Equipment or Facility:	
- If Previous Mechanical Damage NOT Related to Excavation:	
Complete Questions 3-7 ONLY IF the "Item Involved in Accident" (fro	m PART C, Question 3) is Pipe or Weld.
3. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Accident?	
3a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool and in	dicate most recent year run:
- Magnetic Flux Leakage	·
Most recent year conducted:	
- Ultrasonic	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Geometry	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Caliper	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Crack	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Hard Spot	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Combination Tool	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Transverse Field/Triaxial	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Other	
Most recent year conducted: Describe:	
Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was	
completed BEFORE the damage was sustained?	
Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Accident?	
- If Yes:	
Most recent year tested:	
Test pressure (psig):	
Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted on the pipeline segment?	
- If Yes, and an investigative dig was conducted at the point of the Accident:	
Most recent year conducted:	
- If Yes, but the point of the Accident was not identified as a dig site:	
Most recent year conducted:	
7. Has one or more non-destructive examination been conducted at the point of the Accident since January 1, 2002?	
7a. If Yes, for each examination conducted since January 1, 2002, s	elect type of non-destructive examination and indicate most
recent year the examination was conducted:	
- Radiography Most recent year conducted:	
- Guided Wave Ultrasonic	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Handheld Ultrasonic Tool	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Wet Magnetic Particle Test	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Dry Magnetic Particle Test	
Most recent year conducted:	
- Other	
Most recent year conducted:	
Describe:	
- If Intentional Damage:	
8. Specify:	
- If Other Outside Force Damage:	

9. Describe:	
9. Describe.	
OF Metarial Failure of Dine or Wold	and a stand from the substantial left have developed
G5 - Material Failure of Pipe or Weld - only one sub-cause can be	selected from the shaded left-hand column
Use this section to report material failures ONLY IF the "Item Involve	d in Accident" (from PART C, Question 3) is "Pipe" or
"Weld."	
Material Failure of Pipe or Weld – Sub-Cause:	
The sub-cause selected below is based on the following: (select all that	ot apply)
- Field Examination	α αρριγ)
- Determined by Metallurgical Analysis	
- Other Analysis	
- Other Analysis - If "Other Analysis", Describe:	
- Sub-cause is Tentative or Suspected; Still Under Investigation	
(Supplemental Report required)	
- If Construction, Installation, or Fabrication-related:	
List contributing factors: (select all that apply) Fatigue or Vibration-related	
Specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- Other	
- If Other, Describe:	and the disaction in
- If Original Manufacturing-related (NOT girth weld or other welds for	mea in the fleia):
2. List contributing factors: (select all that apply)	
- Fatigue or Vibration-related:	
Specify:	
- If Other, Describe:	
- Mechanical Stress:	
- Other	
- If Other, Describe:	
- If Environmental Cracking-related:	
3. Specify:	
- Other - Describe:	
Complete the following if any Material Failure of Pipe or Weld sub-cau	se is selected.
4. Additional factors: (select all that apply):	
- Dent	
- Gouge	
- Pipe Bend	
- Arc Burn	
- Crack	
- Lack of Fusion	
- Lamination	
- Buckle	
- Wrinkle	
- Misalignment	
- Burnt Steel	
- Other:	
- If Other, Describe:	
5. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of	
the Accident?	
5a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool a	and indicate most recent year run:
- Magnetic Flux Leakage	
Most recent year run:	
- Ultrasonic	
Most recent year run:	
- Geometry	
Most recent year run:	
- Caliper	
Most recent year run:	
- Crack	
Most recent year run:	
- Hard Spot	
Most recent year run:	
- Combination Tool	
Most recent year run:	
- Transverse Field/Triaxial	
Most recent year run:	
- Other	1

Most recent year run:		
Describe:		
6. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Accident?		
- If Yes:		
Most recent year tested:		
Test pressure (psig):		
7. Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted on the pipeline segment?		
- If Yes, and an investigative dig was conducted at the point of the Accident -		
Most recent year conducted:		
- If Yes, but the point of the Accident was not identified as a dig site -		
Most recent year conducted:		
8. Has one or more non-destructive examination(s) been conducted at the point of the Accident since January 1, 2002?		
8a. If Yes, for each examination conducted since January 1, 2002, s recent year the examination was conducted: Radiography	elect type of non-destructive examination and indicate most	
Most recent year conducted:		
- Guided Wave Ultrasonic		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Handheld Ultrasonic Tool		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Wet Magnetic Particle Test		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Dry Magnetic Particle Test		
Most recent year conducted:		
- Other		
Most recent year conducted:		
Describe:		
G6 – Equipment Failure - only one sub-cause can be selected from the shaded left-hand column		
Equipment Failure – Sub-Cause:		
- If Malfunction of Control/Relief Equipment:		
Specify: (select all that apply) -		
- Control Valve		
- Instrumentation		
- SCADA		
- Communications		
- Block Valve		
- Check Valve		
- Relief Valve		
- Power Failure		
- Stopple/Control Fitting		
- ESD System Failure		
- Other		
- If Other – Describe:		
- If Pump or Pump-related Equipment:		
2. Specify:		
- If Other – Describe:		
- If Threaded Connection/Coupling Failure:		
3. Specify:		
- If Other – Describe:		
- If Non-threaded Connection Failure:		
4. Specify:		
- If Other – Describe:		
- If Defective or Loose Tubing or Fitting:		
ii beleative of Loose rubing of Fitting.		
- If Failure of Equipment Body (except Pump), Tank Plate, or other Material:		
- If Other Equipment Failure:		
5. Describe:		
Complete the following if any Equipment Failure sub-cause is selected.		
6. Additional factors that contributed to the equipment failure: (select all that apply)		
- Excessive vibration		
- Overpressurization		
- No support or loss of support		

- Manufacturing defect		
- Loss of electricity		
- Improper installation		
- Mismatched items (different manufacturer for tubing and tubing		
fittings)		
- Dissimilar metals		
- Breakdown of soft goods due to compatibility issues with		
transported commodity		
- Valve vault or valve can contributed to the release		
- Alarm/status failure		
- Misalignment		
- Thermal stress		
- Other - If Other, Describe:		
- II Other, Describe.		
G7 - Incorrect Operation - only one sub-cause can be selected from	the shaded left-hand column	
Incorrect Operation – Sub-Cause:		
Damage by Operator or Operator's Contractor NOT Related to Excavation and NOT due to Motorized Vehicle/Equipment Damage	No	
Tank, Vessel, or Sump/Separator Allowed or Caused to Overfill or Overflow		
CVEITIOW	No	
1. Specify:		
' '		
- If Other, Describe:		
Valve Left or Placed in Wrong Position, but NOT Resulting in a		
Tank, Vessel, or Sump/Separator Overflow or Facility Overpressure	No	
Overpressure		
Dinalina as Equipment Overseasoured		
Pipeline or Equipment Overpressured	No	
Equipment Not Installed Properly		
	No	
Wrong Equipment Specified or Installed	No	
	INO	
Other Incorrect Operation	No	
2. Describe:		
Complete the following if any Incorrect Operation sub-cause is selected	ed.	
3. Was this Accident related to (select all that apply): -		
- Inadequate procedure		
- No procedure established		
- Failure to follow procedure - Other:		
- Other. Describe:		
What category type was the activity that caused the Accident?		
Was the task(s) that led to the Accident identified as a covered task		
in your Operator Qualification Program?		
5a. If Yes, were the individuals performing the task(s) qualified for the task(s)?		
the task(s)?		
G8 - Other Accident Cause - only one sub-cause can be selected from the shaded left-hand column		
Other Accident Cause – Sub-Cause:		
- If Miscellaneous:		
1. Describe:		
- If Unknown:		
2. Specify:		
PART H - NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCIDENT		

AT 11:30 AM ON JULY 13, 2012, WHILE PERFORMING A MONTHLY TANK INSPECTION ON TANK 230 AT BUCKEYE'S MACUNGIE STATION, A LOCAL OPERATIONS EMPLOYEE NOTICED STAINED SOIL NEXT TO THE TANK. EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROCEDURES WERE INITIATED AND ALL APPROPRIATE NOTIFICATIONS WERE MADE. THE TANK WAS ISOLATED AND EMPTIED. THREE MONITORING WELLS WERE EXCAVATED

IN THE AREA OF THE STAINED SOIL. GASOLINE ODOR WAS DETECTED IN THE WELL CLOSEST TO THE TANK, BUT NO FREE PRODUCT WAS OBSERVED. THE MONITORING WELLS WERE MONITORED DURING THE TANK EMPTYING PROCESS AND NO ADDITIONAL PRODUCT WAS DISCOVERED.

THE TANK HAS BEEN EMPTIED AND CLEANED. AN INDEPENDENT INSPECTION COMPANY IS PERFORMING A SCAN OF THE TANK BOTTOM TO LOCATE THE SOURCE OF THE RELEASE. THE SOURCE HAS NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED AT THE TIME OF THE SUBMISSION OF THIS REPORT AND THE INVESTIGATION IS ONGOING.

UPDATE: THE SOURCE OF THE RELEASE HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO BE A SMALL CRACK IN THE FLOOR PLATE NEAR THE TANK SHELL. THE DAMAGED FLOOR PLATE SECTION AND PART OF THE SHELL WAS REMOVED AND SENT TO AN INDEPENDENT LABORATORY FOR METALLURGICAL ANALYSIS. THE METALLURGICAL ANALYSIS CONFIRMED THAT THE WALL LOSS FROM CORROSION ON THE EXTERIOR SECTION SURFACE OF THE FLOOR PLATE (BOTTOMSIDE) HAD THE EFFECT OF INCREASED STRESS ON THE REMAINING STEEL FROM NORMAL SERVICE LOADS WHICH IN TURN ALLOWED LOW CYCLE FATIGUE CRACKING TO OCCUR. THE TANK REPAIR PROCESS IS UNDERWAY.

UPDATE: THE TANK REPAIR PROCESS HAS BEEN COMPLETED AND COSTS FINALIZED. THE TOTAL VOLUME RELEASED HAS BEEN RECALCULATED AT 8.7 BARRELS. SOIL BORING INVESTIGATION WAS CONDUCTED AND SOIL SAMPLES WERE SENT FOR LABORATORY ANALYSIS. ANALYTICAL SOIL RESULTS INDICATED THAT CONCENTRATIONS OF TARGET CONSTITUENTS OF CONCERN ARE BELOW PADEP APPROVED RISK-BASED SITE SPECIFIC STANDARDS FOR MACUNGIE STATION; THEREFORE, NO ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION OR REMEDIATION WILL BE CONDUCTED. BUCKEYE WILL NOT BE MAKING ANY MORE UPDATES TO THIS RELEASE REPORT.

File Full Name	

PART I - PREPARER AND AUTHORIZED SIGNA	ATURE
Preparer's Name	BRAD YARZEBINSKI
Preparer's Title	COMPLIANCE SPECIALIST
Preparer's Telephone Number	610-904-4958
Preparer's E-mail Address	BYARZEBINSKI@BUCKEYE.COM
Preparer's Facsimile Number	610-904-4545
Authorized Signature's Name	JOHN REINBOLD
Authorized Signature Title	COMPLIANCE MANAGER
Authorized Signature Telephone Number	610-904-4185
Authorized Signature Email	JREINBOLD@BUCKEYE.COM
Date	02/04/2013