



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Pipeline and
Hazardous Materials Safety
Administration**

8701 South Gessner, Suite 1110
Houston, TX 77074

WARNING LETTER

CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

January 28, 2011

Mr. Michael McGarry
Senior Vice President
PPG Industries, Inc.
440 College Park Drive
Monroeville, PA 15146

CPF 4-2011-1002W

Dear Mr. McGarry:

On April 26-30, 2010, a representative of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) pursuant to Chapter 601 of 49 United States Code inspected your PPG Industries, Inc.'s LA-TX Ethylene Pipeline in Lake Charles, LA.

As a result of the inspection, it appears that you have committed a probable violation of the Pipeline Safety Regulations, Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations. The items inspected and the probable violation is:

1. §192.803

Abnormal operating condition means a condition identified by the operator that may indicate a malfunction of a component or deviation from normal operations that may:

- (a) Indicate a condition exceeding design limits; or**
- (b) Result in a hazard(s) to persons, property, or the environment.**

Evaluation means a process, established and documented by the operator, to determine an individual's ability to perform a covered task by any of the following:

- (a) Written examination;**
- (b) Oral examination;**
- (c) Work performance history review;**
- (d) Observation during:**
 - (1) Performance on the job,**
 - (2) On the job training, or**
 - (3) Simulations; or**
- (e) Other forms of assessment.**

Qualified means that an individual has been evaluated and can:

- (a) Perform assigned covered tasks; and**
- (b) Recognize and react to abnormal operating conditions.**

Operator personnel were unable to readily identify Abnormal Operating procedures associate with the tasks they were performing. Operator personnel did not perform a covered task as allowed/specified in the company's procedures.

During the inspection, an individual was asked to perform a covered task (Operate a Mainline Valve) which the operator's "qualified" individual performed according to procedure. When asked by this inspector, "what were some of the Abnormal Operating Conditions?" The individual was unable to do so without leading from the inspector. A senior technician was also present at the time and acknowledged the deficiency in response by the technician performing the task concerning the recognition of AOCs associated with the task.

A second individual was then asked to perform a different qualified task (Inspect Rectifier). The individual incorrectly performed the task by not performing the task as denoted in the operator's written procedures. When the technician was asked if his actions were done according to the operator's written procedures, he responded in the affirmative. The technician was asked to confirm his understanding of the procedure and responded that the actions he had performed was an "alternative" method, as "performed in the plant." The written procedures did not contain any "alternative" methods of the type performed or witnessed to obtain a rectifier reading. The aforementioned senior technician accompanying the inspection also witnessed the performance of covered tasked (rectifier reading) by the technician commented afterwards that the task had not been performed per PPG's written procedure and acknowledged the deficiency and inspector's concerns.

Both individuals observed performing the covered tasks either insufficiently or incorrectly performed them. The personnel selected to perform the covered tasks were experienced

operators. PPG was allowed ample notice that the inspection was to be performed and what the inspection would consist of. PPG was told by the inspector that any reference materials, manuals, etc. were permissible to the technicians in order to perform the selected covered tasks. None of the technicians chose to utilize any of these items in performing their tasks.

In both cases, PPG's personnel failed to demonstrate properly executing the covered task (per the company's written procedure) or were unable to readily identify the Abnormal Operating Conditions associate with the covered tasks.

Under 49 United States Code, § 60122, you are subject to a civil penalty not to exceed \$100,000 for each violation for each day the violation persists up to a maximum of \$1,000,000 for any related series of violations. We have reviewed the circumstances and supporting documents involved in this case, and have decided not to conduct additional enforcement action or penalty assessment proceedings at this time. We advise you to correct the item(s) identified in this letter. Failure to do so will result in PPG Industries, Inc. being subject to additional enforcement action.

No reply to this letter is required. If you choose to reply, in your correspondence please refer to **CPF 4-2011-1002W**. Be advised that all material you submit in response to this enforcement action is subject to being made publicly available. If you believe that any portion of your responsive material qualifies for confidential treatment under 5 U.S.C. 552(b), along with the complete original document you must provide a second copy of the document with the portions you believe qualify for confidential treatment redacted and an explanation of why you believe the redacted information qualifies for confidential treatment under 5 U.S.C. 552(b).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. M. Seeley".

R. M. Seeley
Director, Southwest Region
Pipeline and Hazardous
Materials Safety Administration