PART A - KEY REPORT INFORMATION

Report Type: (select all that apply)

Original: Yes
Supplemental: Yes
Final: Yes

Last Revision Date: 07/24/2015

Operator's OPS-issued Operator Identification Number (OPID): 18484

Name of Operator: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO

Address of Operator:
3a. Street Address: 555 WEST FIFTH STREET
3b. City: LOS ANGELES
3c. State: California
3d. Zip Code: 90013

Local time (24-hr clock) and date of the Incident: 07/10/2011 10:31

Latitude: 34.23728
Longitude: -118.90278

National Response Center Report Number (if applicable): 982246

Local time (24-hr clock) and date of initial telephonic report to the National Response Center (if applicable): 07/10/2011 16:30

Incident resulted from: Unintentional release of gas

Gas released: (select only one, based on predominant volume released)
Natural Gas

Estimated volume of commodity released unintentionally - Thousand Cubic Feet (MCF): 3,270.00

Estimated volume of intentional and controlled release/blowdown - Thousand Cubic Feet (MCF): 1,920.00

Estimated volume of accompanying liquid release (Barrels): No

Weren't there fatalities? No

- If Yes, specify the number in each category:

13a. Operator employees
13b. Contractor employees working for the Operator
13c. Non-Operator emergency responders
13d. Workers working on the right-of-way, but NOT associated with this Operator
13e. General public
13f. Total fatalities (sum of above)

Were there injuries requiring inpatient hospitalization? No

- If Yes, specify the number in each category:

14a. Operator employees
14b. Contractor employees working for the Operator
14c. Non-Operator emergency responders
14d. Workers working on the right-of-way, but NOT associated with this Operator
14e. General public
14f. Total injuries (sum of above)

Was the pipeline/facility shut down due to the incident? Yes

- If No, Explain:

Form PHMSA F 7100.2

Reproduction of this form is permitted
- If Yes, complete Questions 15a and 15b: *(use local time, 24-hr clock)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a. Local time and date of shutdown</td>
<td>07/10/2011 12:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b. Local time pipeline/facility restarted</td>
<td>07/19/2011 14:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Still shut down? *(Supplemental Report Required)*

16. Did the gas ignite? No
17. Did the gas explode? No
18. Number of general public evacuated: 0

19. Time sequence *(use local time, 24-hour clock)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19a. Local time operator identified Incident– effective 10-2014, changed from &quot;Incident&quot; to &quot;failure&quot;</td>
<td>07/10/2011 10:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b. Local time operator resources arrived on site</td>
<td>07/10/2011 11:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART B - ADDITIONAL LOCATION INFORMATION

1. Was the origin of the Incident onshore? Yes
   - Yes *(Complete Questions 2-12)*
   - No *(Complete Questions 13-15)*

   **If Onshore:**
   - State: California
   - Zip Code: 93012
   - City: Camarillo
   - County or Parish: Ventura
   - Operator designated location: Survey Station No.
     Specify: 138969.6
   - Pipeline/Facility name: Line 404
   - Segment name/ID: 3949
   - Was Incident on Federal land, other than the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS)? No
   - Location of Incident: Pipeline Right-of-way
   - Area of Incident (as found): Underground
     Specify: Under soil
   - Depth-of-Cover (in): 18

2. Did Incident occur in a crossing? No
   - If Yes, specify type below:
     - If Bridge crossing –
       Cased/ Uncased:
     - If Railroad crossing –
       Cased/ Uncased/ Bored/drilled
     - If Road crossing –
       Cased/ Uncased/ Bored/drilled
     - If Water crossing –
       Cased/ Uncased
       Name of body of water (If commonly known):
       Approx. water depth (ft) at the point of the Incident: Select:

   **If Offshore:**
   - Approx. water depth (ft) at the point of the Incident: Select:

3. Origin of Incident:
   - If "In State waters":
     - State:
     - Area:
     - Block/Tract #:
     - Nearest County/Parish:
   - If "On the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS)"
     - Area:
     - Block #:

4. Area of Incident:

### PART C - ADDITIONAL FACILITY INFORMATION

1. Is the pipeline or facility: - Interstate - Intrastate
   Intrastate

2. Part of system involved in Incident:
   Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites

3. Item involved in Incident:
   Pipe
   - Pipe – Specify:
     Pipe Body
   - Nominal diameter of pipe (in): 18
   - Wall thickness (in): .250
   - SMYS (Specified Minimum Yield Strength) of pipe (psi): 50,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3d. Pipe specification:</td>
<td>x-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Pipe Seam – Specify:</td>
<td>Longitudinal ERW - Unknown Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f. Pipe manufacturer:</td>
<td>A O SMITH COMPANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g. Year of manufacture:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h. Pipeline coating type at point of Incident – Specify:</td>
<td>Coal Tar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i. Mainline valve manufacturer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j. Year of manufacture:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Year item involved in Incident was installed:</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Material involved in Incident:</td>
<td>Carbon Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of Incident involved:</td>
<td>Mechanical Puncture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If Mechanical Puncture – Specify Approx. size:</td>
<td>in. (axial) by 61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If Leak - Select Type:</td>
<td>in. (circumferential) 18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If Rupture - Select Orientation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If valve – Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If Mainline – Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART D - ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE INFORMATION**

1. Class Location of Incident: Class 1 Location
2. Did this Incident occur in a High Consequence Area (HCA)? No
3. What is the PIR (Potential Impact Radius) for the location of this Incident? Feet: 278
4. Were any structures outside the PIR impacted or otherwise damaged due to heat/fire resulting from the Incident? No
5. Were any structures outside the PIR impacted or otherwise damaged NOT by heat/fire resulting from the Incident? No
6. Were any of the fatalities or injuries reported for persons located outside the PIR? No
7. Estimated Property Damage: 
   - 7a. Estimated cost of public and non-Operator private property damage paid/reimbursed by the Operator – effective 6-2011, "paid/reimbursed by the Operator" removed $0
   - 7b. Estimated cost of Operator's property damage & repairs $200,000
   - 7c. Estimated cost of Operator's emergency response $1,000
   - 7d. Estimated other costs $0
   - 7e. Property damage subtotal (sum of above) $201,000

**Cost of Gas Released**

- 7f. Estimated cost of gas released unintentionally $13,000
- 7g. Estimated cost of gas released during intentional and controlled blowdown $7,500
- 7h. Total estimated cost of gas released (sum of 7.f & 7.g above) $20,500
- Total of all costs $221,500
### PART E - ADDITIONAL OPERATING INFORMATION

1. Estimated pressure at the point and time of the Incident (psig): 590.00

2. Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP) at the point and time of the Incident (psig): 650.00

3. MAOP established by 49 CFR section: Other
   - If Other, specify: Not on OMB-approved form when submitted

4. Not including pressure reductions required by PHMSA regulations (such as for repairs and pipe movement), was the system or facility relating to the Incident operating under an established pressure restriction with pressure limits below those normally allowed by the MAOP? No

   - If Yes - (Complete 4a and 4b below)
     4a. Did the pressure exceed this established pressure restriction? No
     4b. Was this pressure restriction mandated by PHMSA or the State? No

5. Was "Onshore Pipeline, Including Valve Sites" OR "Offshore Pipeline, Including Riser and Riser Bend" selected in PART C, Question 2? Yes
   - If Yes - (Complete 5a – 5e below):
     5a. Type of upstream valve used to initially isolate release source: Automatic
     5b. Type of downstream valve used to initially isolate release source: Automatic
     5c. Length of segment isolated between valves (ft): 51,057
     5d. Is the pipeline configured to accommodate internal inspection tools? Yes
     5e. For this pipeline, are there operational factors which significantly complicate the execution of an internal inspection tool run? No
   - If No – Which physical features limit tool accommodation? (select all that apply)
     - 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 tool(s)
     - Other
     - If Other, Describe: No
   - If Yes, which operational factors complicate execution? (select all that apply)
     - Excessive debris or scale, wax, or other wall build-up
     - Low operating pressure(s)
     - Low flow or absence of flow
     - Incompatible commodity
     - Other
     - If Other, Describe: No
   - If No, select an activity: (select all that apply)
     5f. Function of pipeline system: Transmission System

6. Was a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)-based system in place on the pipeline or facility involved in the Incident? Yes
   - If Yes:
     6a. Was it operating at the time of the Incident? Yes
     6b. Was it fully functional at the time of the Incident? Yes
     6c. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume or pack calculations) assist with the detection of the Incident? No
     6d. Did SCADA-based information (such as alarm(s), alert(s), event(s), and/or volume calculations) assist with the confirmation of the Incident? Yes

7. How was the Incident initially identified for the Operator? Notification from Emergency Responder
   - If Other – Describe: 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)

8. 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 Incident? Yes
   - If Yes:
     7a. If "Controller", "Local Operating Personnel, including contractors", "Air Patrol", or "Ground Patrol by Operator or its contractor" is selected in Question 7, specify: 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 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation result(s) (select all that apply):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Investigation reviewed work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the operator), and other factors associated with fatigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Investigation did NOT review work schedule rotations, continuous hours of service (while working for the Operator) and other factors associated with fatigue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If Yes, Describe investigation result(s): (select all that apply):  
  - 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 Incident, were any Operator employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT’s Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No
   - If Yes:  
     1a. How many were tested:  
     1b. How many failed:  

2. As a result of this Incident, were any Operator contractor employees tested under the post-accident drug and alcohol testing requirements of DOT’s Drug & Alcohol Testing regulations? No
   - If Yes:  
     2a. How many were tested:  
     2b. How many failed:  

PART G - APPARENT CAUSE

Select only one box from PART G in the shaded column on the left representing the APPARENT Cause of the Incident, and answer the questions on the right. Describe secondary, contributing, or root causes of the Incident in the narrative (PART H).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparent Cause:</th>
<th>G3 - Excavation Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

G1 - Corrosion Failure - only one sub-cause can be picked from shaded left-hand column

Corrosion Failure – Sub-cause:

- If External Corrosion:
  1. Results of visual examination:  
     - If Other, Describe:  
  2. Type of corrosion: (select all that apply)  
    - Galvanic  
    - Atmospheric  
    - Stray Current  
    - Microbiological  
    - Selective Seam  
    - Other  
    - If Other – Describe:  
  3. The type(s) of corrosion selected in Question 2 is based on the following: (select all that apply)  
    - Field examination  
    - Determined by metallurgical analysis  
    - Other  
    - If Other – Describe:  
  4. Was the failed item buried under the ground?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>Was failed item considered to be under cathodic protection at the time of the incident?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>Was shielding, tenting, or disbonding of coating evident at the point of the incident?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c.</td>
<td>Has one or more Cathodic Protection Survey been conducted at the point of the incident?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d.</td>
<td>Was the failed item externally coated or painted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Was there observable damage to the coating or paint in the vicinity of the corrosion?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If Internal Corrosion:**

6. Results of visual examination:

7. Cause of corrosion *(select all that apply)*:
   - Corrosive Commodity
   - Water drop-out/Acid
   - Microbiological
   - Erosion
   - Other

8. The cause(s) of corrosion selected in Question 7 is based on the following *(select all that apply)*:
   - Field examination
   - Determined by metallurgical analysis
   - Other

9. Location of corrosion *(select all that apply)*:
   - Low point in pipe
   - Elbow
   - Drop-out
   - Other

10. Was the gas/fluid treated with corrosion inhibitors or biocides? |

11. Was the interior coated or lined with protective coating? |

12. 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 Incident" (from PART C, Question 3) is Pipe or Weld.**

14. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Incident? |

14a. 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 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
     - Most recent year run:

15. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Incident? |

16. If Yes,
16. Has one or more Direct Assessment been conducted on this segment?
   - If Yes, and an investigative dig was conducted at the point of the Incident:
     Most recent year conducted:
   - If Yes, but the point of the Incident was not identified as a dig site:
     Most recent year conducted:
17. Has one or more non-destructive examination been conducted at the point of the Incident since January 1, 2002?
   17a. 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:
     - Radiography
       Most recent year examined:
     - Guided Wave Ultrasonic
       Most recent year examined:
     - Handheld Ultrasonic Tool
       Most recent year examined:
     - Wet Magnetic Particle Test
       Most recent year examined:
     - Dry Magnetic Particle Test
       Most recent year examined:
     - Other
       Most recent year examined:

G2 - Natural Force Damage  *only one sub-cause can be picked from shaded left-hand column*

Natural Force Damage – Sub-Cause:
- If Earth Movement, NOT due to Heavy Rains/Floods:
  1. Specify:
     - If Other, Describe:
- If Heavy Rains/Floods:
  2. Specify:
     - If Other, Describe:
- If Lightning:
  3. Specify:
  4. Specify:
- If Other Natural Force Damage:
  5. Describe:

Complete the following if any Natural Force Damage sub-cause is selected.
6. Were the natural forces causing the Incident 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 shaded left-hand column*

Excavation Damage – Sub-Cause: Excavation Damage by Third Party
- If Previous Damage Due to Excavation Activity: Complete Questions 1-5 ONLY IF the "Item Involved in Incident" (From Part C, Question 3) is Pipe or Weld.
  1. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Incident?
     1a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool and indicate most recent year run:
        - Magnetic Flux Leakage
          Year:
        - Ultrasonic
          Year:
        - Geometry
          Year:
        - Caliper
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 Incident?
   - If Yes:
     Most recent year tested:
     Test pressure (psig):

4. 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 Incident:
     Most recent year conducted:
   - If Yes, but the point of the Incident was not identified as a dig site:
     Most recent year conducted:

5. Has one or more non-destructive examination been conducted at the point of the Incident 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:
     - Radiography Year:
     - Guided Wave Ultrasonic Year:
     - Handheld Ultrasonic Tool Year:
     - Wet Magnetic Particle Test Year:
     - Dry Magnetic Particle Test Year:
     - Other Year:
     Describe:

Complete the following if Excavation Damage by Third Party is selected as the sub-cause.

6. Did the operator get prior notification of the excavation activity? No
   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.

7. Do you want PHMSA to upload the following information to CGA-DIRT (www.cga-dirt.com)? No
   8. Right-of-Way where event occurred (select all that apply):
      - Public
      - Private
      - Pipeline Property/Easement
      - Power/Transmission Line
      - Railroad
      - Dedicated Public Utility Easement
      - Federal Land
      - Data not collected
      - Unknown/Other
      - If Public, Specify:
      - If Private, Specify: Private Easement

9. Type of excavator : Farmer
10. Type of excavation equipment : Farm Equipment
11. Type of work performed : Agriculture
12. Was the One-Call Center notified? - Yes - No No
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: Unknown/Other

14. Were facility locate marks visible in the area of excavation? Unknown/Other

15. Were facilities marked correctly? Unknown/Other

16. Did the damage cause an interruption in service? Unknown/Other

16a. If Yes, specify duration of the interruption: (hours)

17. Description of the CGA-DIRT Root Cause (select only the one predominant first level CGA-DIRT Root Cause and then, where available as a choice, then one predominant second level CGA-DIRT Root Cause as well):

- Predominant first level CGA-DIRT Root Cause: One-Call Notification Practices Not Sufficient
  - If One-Call Notification Practices Not Sufficient, Specify: No notification made to the One-Call Center
  - 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 Damage by Car, Truck, or Other Motorized Vehicle/Equipment NOT Engaged in Excavation:
  1. Vehicle/Equipment operated by:

- If Damage by Boats, Barges, Drilling Rigs, or Other Maritime Equipment 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 Previous Mechanical Damage NOT Related to Excavation: Complete Questions 3-7 ONLY IF the "Item Involved in Incident" (from PART C, Question 3) is Pipe or Weld.

3. Has one or more internal inspection tool collected data at the point of the Incident?

3a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool 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:
  Most recent year run: 

Describe:

4. Do you have reason to believe that the internal inspection was completed BEFORE the damage was sustained?

5. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Incident?

- If Yes:
  Most recent year tested: 
  Test pressure (psig): 

6. 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 Incident:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Has one or more non-destructive examination been conducted at the point of the Incident since January 1, 2002?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Radiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Guided Wave Ultrasonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Handheld Ultrasonic Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wet Magnetic Particle Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dry Magnetic Particle Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>G5 - Pipe, Weld, or Joint Failure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Use this section to report material failures ONLY IF the "Item Involved in Incident" (from PART C, Question 3) is "Pipe" or "Weld."
| | Only one sub-cause can be selected from the shaded left-hand column |
| **Pipe, Weld or Joint Failure – Sub-Cause:** | |
| 1. | The sub-cause shown above is based on the following (select all that apply): |
| | - Field Examination |
| | - Determined by Metallurgical Analysis |
| | - Other Analysis |
| | - If "Other Analysis", Describe |
| | - Sub-cause is Tentative or Suspected; Still Under Investigation (Supplemental Report required) |
| **- If Construction-, Installation- or Fabrication** | |
| 2. | List contributing factors: (select all that apply) |
| | - Fatigue or Vibration related: |
| | - Mechanical Stress |
| | - Other |
| | - If Other, Describe: |
| **- If Environmental Cracking-related:** | |
| 3. | Specify: |
| | - If Other, Describe: |
| Complete the following if any Material Failure of Pipe or Weld sub-cause 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... |
5a. If Yes, for each tool used, select type of internal inspection tool and indicate most recent year run:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Most recent year run</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Flux Leakage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrasonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse Field/Triaxial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe:

6. Has one or more hydrotest or other pressure test been conducted since original construction at the point of the Incident?
   - 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 Incident:
     - Most recent year conducted:
   - If Yes, but the point of the Incident 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 Incident since January 1, 2002?
   8a. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Most recent year conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Wave Ultrasonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handheld Ultrasonic Tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Magnetic Particle Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Magnetic Particle Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:
  1. Specify:
     - Control Valve
     - Instrumentation
     - SCADA
     - Communications
     - Block Valve
     - Check Valve
     - Relief Valve
     - Power Failure
- Stopple/Control Fitting
- Pressure Regulator
- ESD System Failure
- Other  
  - If Other, Describe:

- If Compressor or Compressor-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 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 gas/fluid
   - Valve vault or valve can contributed to the release
   - Alarm/status failure
   - Misalignment
   - Thermal stress
   - Other  
  - If Other, Describe:

**G7 – Incorrect Operation** - only one sub-cause can be selected from the shaded left-hand column

Incorrect Operation – Sub-Cause:

- If Underground Gas Storage, Pressure Vessel, or Cavern Allowed or Caused to Overpressure:
  1. Specify:  
  - If Other, Describe:

- If Other Incorrect Operation:
  2. Describe:  

**Complete the following if any Incorrect Operation sub-cause is selected.**

3. Was this incident related to: *(select all that apply)*
   - Inadequate procedure
   - No procedure established
   - Failure to follow procedure
   - Other:  
  - If Other, Describe:

4. What category type was the activity that caused the Incident:

5. Was the task(s) that led to the Incident 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)?

**G8 - Other Incident Cause** - only one sub-cause can be selected from the shaded left-hand column

Other Incident Cause – Sub-Cause:

- If Miscellaneous:
  1. Describe:  

- If Unknown:
2. Specify:

PART - H NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE INCIDENT

Farmer struck line while working field with a tractor. No request to One Call Center. Utility was not aware that work was in progress.
No ignition or injuries. Two customers temporarily impacted by shutdown.
Line put back into service July 19 after pipe wrap cleanup was completed.
Incident became reportable when potential of damage exceeding $50,000 and/or escaping exceeding 3 million cubic feet was determined.
All repairs complete.

PART I - PREPARER AND AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

Preparer's Name | Troy Bauer
Preparer's Title | Pipeline Safety and Compliance Advisor
Preparer's Telephone Number | 909-376-2708
Preparer's E-mail Address | TBauer@semprautilities.com
Preparer's Facsimile Number
Authorized Signature Title | Pipeline Safety and Compliance Advisor
Authorized Signature Telephone Number | 909-376-2708
Authorized Signature Email | TBauer@semprautilities.com
Date | 07/24/2015