

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TECHNICAL HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS
COMMITTEE MEETING

Hyatt Arlington Hotel
1325 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA
Senate Salon C

Tuesday,
March 25, 2003

The above captioned matter convened, pursuant
to notice at 12:30 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON:

Stacey L. Gerard
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety

PANEL MEMBERS:

Sam Bonasso
Deputy Administrator, RSPA

Alex Alvarado

Sam Hall
GIS analyst, Office of Pipeline Safety

Ruth E. Schelhous

Orville B. Harris

Larry Miller

Denise Hamsher
Embridge

Cheryl Wetsel

Lois Epstein, Chair
Public Representative

BRIEFINGS:

Roger Little
Program Manager

Buck Furrow
Regulations Manager

Marvin Fell
Economist, OPS

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rick Flint
NTSB

Barbara Betsock
Deputy Chief Counsel

Marti Mathison
American Petroleum Institute

I N D E X

<u>Agenda Item:</u>	<u>Page</u>
Welcome - Ms. Gerard	4
Briefing - National Pipeline Mapping System Mr. Hall	5
Briefing - Annual Report Mr. Little	52
Briefing - Recommendations to Change Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards Mr. Furrow	82
Briefing: Cost-Benefit Analysis of Proposal Mr. Fell	116
Vote on two previous briefings	118

1 than the first item up today, on the combination of the
2 mapping system and annual report. So please do jump in
3 and make your recommendations, and if you don't hear
4 questions, you might formulate them in your own mind as
5 questions because we are asking for your advice.

6

7 MS. EPSTEIN: Good afternoon everybody. I'm
8 Lois Epstein. I'm an engineer with Cook and Lehkeeper
9 (ph). It's a watershed protection organization and I'm
10 located in Anchorage, Alaska. I'm going to start the
11 meeting with the first item on the agenda, and Sam, do
12 you want to begin?

13 **Briefing - National Pipeline Mapping System**

14 MR. HALL: Good Afternoon. My name is Sam
15 Hall. I'm the GIS analyst for the Office of Pipeline
16 Safety. I work with Steve Fisher. I believe that most
17 of you here on the committee know Steve. He couldn't
18 be with us today because of some personal obligations,
19 so this has fallen to me.

20 Today I'll be talking about the National
21 Pipeline Mapping System and some things that we've been
22 considering for rulemaking for the NPMS. Stacey just
23 mentioned that there are some innovations in terms of
24 the National Pipeline Mapping System that we're pretty
25 excited about. One of them is combining the National

1 Pipeline Mapping System with the Annual Reports, and I
2 will briefly mention that towards the end of my
3 presentation here. And Roger Little, who's in the back
4 of the room, who is also with the Office of Pipeline
5 Safety, will pick up from there and talk a little bit
6 more about the Annual Reports and how we intend to
7 marry the two, the National Pipeline Mapping System --

8 MS. GERARD: Propose.

9 MR. HALL: Propose to marry the two. Thank
10 you, Stacey.

11 When I referred to the NPMS I tend to say it
12 quickly because I've been saying it for five years.
13 I'll say NPMS and what I'm talking about is the
14 National Pipeline Mapping System. What I'm going to
15 talk to you today about is some background on the
16 National Pipeline Mapping System, why we feel the need
17 to propose this rule, what that proposal could mean in
18 terms of changes to the National Pipeline Mapping
19 System, and then a couple words on data security.

20 I'm kind of operating here on the assumption
21 that most of us are familiar with the National Pipeline
22 Mapping System to some degree, and I'm not sure that
23 that's necessarily the case. I can talk some about
24 what the National Pipeline Mapping System is and if I'm
25 going too fast or too slow, just mention it and I'll

1 speed up or slow down for you.

2 The National Pipeline Mapping System is a
3 geographic information system that contains geospatial
4 data and attributes associated with that data. So
5 you're really talking about geographic coordinates,
6 lat/long coordinates in a geographic information
7 system, and then attributes are attached to those
8 coordinates. So you've got a piece of pipeline that
9 has lat/long associated with that piece of pipeline,
10 and then attributes, such as pipeline operator, the
11 commodity that flows through that pipeline, et cetera.
12 We also collect O&G facilities, and we, on a voluntary
13 basis, collect breakout tanks.

14 Now, until December 17, 2002, which is the
15 Pipeline Safety Act of 2002, that was the date it was
16 signed into law, submission to the National Pipeline
17 Mapping System was voluntary. And we have our United
18 Way thermometer here that shows that under that
19 voluntary submission, we had about 99 percent of
20 hazardous liquid mileage under our jurisdiction
21 submitted to us. That's effectively 100 percent, and
22 on the gas side, we had 61 percent of our mileage under
23 our jurisdiction submitted. That's transmission
24 mileage, that doesn't include gathering systems and
25 does not include distribution systems. It does include

1 inter- and intra-state pipelines. The
2 pipeline --

3 (inaudible question from audience)

4 MR. HALL: No, sir. The question was does
5 the Act require submission of distribution lines, and
6 the answer is no, it doesn't.

7 The Pipeline Safety Act of 2002 did require
8 submission of the NPMS -- of data to the NPMS in its
9 current state. Standards were developed. I believe
10 most should be familiar with these -- but standards
11 were developed originally in March of 1999. They've
12 been revised in January 2003 to reflect the Act, and
13 some additional features. Just -- the language has
14 changed in the standards. The content of the data did
15 not change because of the Act.

16 Right now we use the National Pipeline
17 Mapping System and the Office of Pipeline Safety for a
18 lot of different things. Some of the major uses are to
19 generate statistics for hazardous liquid integrity
20 management oversight and inspection planning. We look
21 at things like miles of pipeline in High Consequence
22 Areas. We look at number of crossings with
23 commercially navigable waterways. This gives us some
24 idea of which pipeline operators should be inspected
25 first, depending on their percentage of mileage in

1 these areas.

2 We also have created some mapping
3 applications for OPS personnel. We have a online
4 mapping application that is available to OPS personnel
5 that's much like Yahoo maps where you can zoom and pan
6 around. We've also developed a CD that inspectors can
7 take into the field, and we use the National Pipeline
8 Mapping System to fulfill our Congressional and public
9 inquiries. We can answer questions like how many miles
10 of pipeline rest in any number of states, counties,
11 geographic areas and things of that nature.

12 If there's anything that I really want to
13 make clear today is why we propose a mapping rule, or
14 what we believe to be the drivers behind that. And
15 really, the drivers are regulatory oversight and
16 effective data analysis will require additional
17 attributes and higher geospatial quality to be
18 submitted to the National Pipeline Mapping System. And
19 when I say higher quality, I mean accuracy on the
20 ground, as it were, is depicted in the mapping system,
21 plus or minus how many feet on the ground.

22 MS. GERARD: Just to make it clear, what Sam
23 is talking about is additions beyond what the
24 legislation proposed -- what the legislation not
25 proposed -- what the legislation enacted. We're

1 talking about some additional quality control measures.

2 MR. HALL: Additional attributes and improved
3 quality on geospatial data.

4 MS. GERARD: I think this is the first time
5 that we've raised this issue.

6 MR. HALL: Yes.

7 MS. GERARD: We're using you, as the advisory
8 committee, to be the first place where we're bringing
9 this up for discussion.

10 MR. HALL: I was just asked by Ruth if I'll
11 be identifying what attributes will be collected.
12 Right now, the purpose of what I'm doing here is just
13 try to talk about some of our initiatives in the office
14 in terms of data integration and how we intend to use
15 the National Pipeline Mapping System. I will go into
16 some specifics, but a lot of the attributes that we
17 intend to collect will be -- will rest in other
18 initiatives in our office, and most importantly gas
19 integrity management. So any attributes that we
20 collect will need to reflect gas integrity management,
21 and so I can talk about some specifics, but a lot of it
22 would be premature at this point. What I can do is
23 talk some about what attributes we are considering and
24 what may be useful, but again, this is very much
25 speculative.

1 MR. HARRIS: But I still want to reiterate
2 what Ruth said, if you could point out those attributes
3 that go beyond the law, I'll say, it would be
4 beneficial to us.

5 MR. HALL: Okay.

6 MS. HAMSHER: Even if we -- even if -- this
7 is Denise Hamsher, I'm with Embridge. We appreciate
8 that you're still in the information gathering phase of
9 it, but if you could give us some examples of what
10 you're talking about so at least we can grasp the scope
11 of what you're thinking.

12 MS. GERARD: And the reason behind it.

13 MR. HALL: Yes, and I can do that, and I do
14 make some examples here. I think something that's
15 important to note is that on or around May 30th of this
16 year, we'll have a public meeting to discuss these
17 issues, and that's where we can really start to talk
18 about specifics.

19 MS. GERARD: We're bouncing the idea. We
20 just thought that maybe it would be a good idea to have
21 a public meeting because as the information is
22 gathering, it seems that it's the type of subject area
23 that is evolutionary and dynamic, and we probably ought
24 to have a public meeting on it by itself. And we want
25 to get your reaction as Sam sort of lays this out.

1 MS. HAMSHER: Does that mean that you're
2 opening a docket and that's part of what used to be
3 called advanced notice? I mean, you're actually
4 formally gathering information on this?

5 MS. GERARD: I guess whenever you have a
6 public meeting, yes, I don't think we have a docket
7 open on it yet, do we?

8 MS. BETSOCK: We don't have a docket open on
9 it yet, but we certainly can open one.

10 MS. GERARD: Yes, we will. We will.

11 MS. HAMSHER: I ask that not to constrain the
12 information and dialogue that would be there, I'm just
13 trying to understand the process and how far this is
14 marching and how fast this is marching forward.

15 MS. GERARD: This is evolving so fast, this
16 discussion came up this week. We decided, with what
17 was being understood, that we ought to consider
18 reshaping our proposal for the Annual Report. Maybe
19 Sam, you can continue, but if you hear a note of
20 trepidation, it was a huge investment of time and
21 effort to pull information together. It's a little bit
22 of concerning to believe that there's a lot of rework
23 that would have to be done, particularly as we look at
24 budget and planning cycles to fund these types of
25 efforts.

1 MR. HALL: That's understood. Part of what I
2 will talk about here in terms of what we would
3 potentially propose would be a way for operators to
4 submit this data to us in an easier way, more
5 efficiently and what we believe to be an easier way.
6 At least as we --

7 MS. HAMSHER: (off mike, inaudible)

8 MR. HALL: Alright, I'll leave it at that.

9 MS. GERARD: That's why we're calling this a
10 discussion. Denise wants that last remark purged from
11 our record.

12 MR. HALL: I'll quickly go over some of the
13 drivers for what's driving this potential proposal.
14 Better data means a smarter operator and a smarter
15 regulator. Part of what we are trying to do with the
16 National Pipeline Mapping System is identify where
17 problems exist on pipelines, and we're trying to also
18 measure success. And we need a way to correlate the
19 data that we have in our office and other databases,
20 and most importantly our compliance database and some
21 of our other databases, and look at data integration
22 across a lot of our databases in an effort to figure
23 out what correlations we can find in terms of what's
24 causing accidents and what would be the most effective
25 measures to reduce those accidents.

1 What we can do with this kind of integration
2 is look at more effective regulatory oversight. We can
3 -- will now have the ability to conduct better
4 regulatory oversight through prioritization of
5 inspections and verification of operator data. I'll
6 talk more about that in a second.

7 This is my little equation here. The first
8 part of the equation, at the top, is an enhanced
9 National Pipeline Mapping System. More accurate
10 pipeline data, geospatially, plus or minus less margin
11 of error, High Consequence Areas' attributes along the
12 pipeline explaining where High Consequence Areas are,
13 and attributes such as -- and this is where we can get
14 in more specific -- would be things like diameter,
15 which is now a voluntary data element, and pressure on
16 the line, specifically for gas.

17 We can then marry that information in the
18 National Pipeline Mapping System with performance and
19 compliance information and come up with some proxy for
20 risk. And this proxy for risk can be used to basically
21 rank pipeline operators -- again, this is for
22 regulatory oversight -- so we can now look at pipeline
23 operators and rank them in terms of this equation that
24 we've developed that would give us some proxy for risk,
25 to make better decisions of how we're going to allocate

1 our inspection resources.

2 MS. GERARD: Point of clarification, Sam.
3 This data on performance and compliance that is added -
4 - we're talking about adding to the map -- would be
5 available to operators?

6 MR. HALL: Yes, and the performance and
7 compliance information here is not an additional
8 request from pipeline operators. We're talking about
9 integrating data that we already have in house and
10 making best use of that data.

11 MS. GERARD: So just to -- I can just feel
12 the hairs on certain people's necks --

13 MR. HALL: Sure, I can too.

14 MS. GERARD: We're doing the presentation
15 today while you're here because it relates to the
16 Liquid Annual Report. A lot of the information that we
17 need to be added relates to gas, and will be discussed
18 with the gas committee. But information that we had
19 proposed to be collected with the Annual Report, we're
20 now thinking would be able to be presented in a spatial
21 way, and that by presenting it that way, information we
22 had proposed to request for you, the mapping system
23 will be able to slice and dice for you.

24 MR. HALL: Stacey's -- we can basically take
25 data that is submitted to the National Pipeline Mapping

1 System and dump that data into Annual Reports. So
2 Annual Reports now -- you know, it's a way for
3 operators to submit data to the Office of Pipeline
4 Safety without this duplicative effort. So we can take
5 data from the National Pipeline Mapping System and feed
6 that data directly into Annual Reports, most
7 specifically, things that have to do with bi-state
8 reporting because that's a geographic aspect of this
9 data, and the National Pipeline Mapping System is a
10 perfect platform to take that data and dump it into
11 Annual Reports and Roger will talk more about that in a
12 few minutes.

13 MR. HARRIS: Maybe I should know -- this is
14 O.B. Harris. Can the performance compliance
15 information -- can you talk a little bit more about
16 that?

17 MS. EPSTEIN: And Sam also, when you give
18 your presentation, can you talk about what items, for
19 purposes of discussion, we can hear what you're
20 thinking, what might be available to the public?

21 MR. HALL: I think I'll let Stacey address
22 those kinds of questions in terms of what can be
23 available to the public. Technologically, everything
24 could be made available to the public. Now in terms of
25 policy within the Office, that's not something I can

1 address. I think Stacey would be willing to do that.

2 MS. GERARD: Let's get through your
3 presentation and then this is just the kind of
4 discussion we want to have in this Committee.

5 MR. HALL: Okay. I just showed you this
6 little equation here, sort of how we're looking at
7 using the National Pipeline Mapping System in the
8 future, and an enhanced National Pipeline Mapping
9 System. So an example of the kinds of things that we
10 would like to be able to do -- and this is a very
11 simplified example, and this is really tailored to the
12 gas industry, this particular example.

13 We have two pipeline companies, pipeline
14 company ABC and pipeline company XYZ. Both pipeline
15 companies operate 100 miles of pipeline. Pipeline
16 company ABC at the top has a small diameter pipeline at
17 low pressure, it has ten percent of its mileage in High
18 Consequence Areas, and it is a relatively good
19 performer. Pipeline company XYZ has 100 miles of
20 pipeline as well, only this time their pipeline is a
21 large diameter pipe at high pressure. Fifty percent of
22 their mileage is in High Consequence Areas and they're
23 relatively a poor performer.

24 What we can do is -- this is our proxy for
25 risk. However we decide to use the information that we

1 already have in house with an enhanced National
2 Pipeline Mapping System, we can begin to start to rank
3 operators in terms of what risk they pose to public
4 safety and therefore apply our inspection resources to
5 those risks and be a more effective safety
6 organization.

7 MS. HAMSHER: I guess I just have to ask you,
8 how would you quantify poor versus good performance?
9 Does that mean a leak history, and if it means a leak
10 history on that 100 miles, if they've now, because it's
11 all in High Consequence Area, pigged the entire line,
12 not just 50 miles of it, just because of the nature of
13 pigging, made repairs, does the past predict the future
14 on "their performance"? I'm having a hard time coming
15 up with some new definition of good, bad.

16 MR. HALL: I think these terms are very vague
17 here for a reason, and I don't -- good performance and
18 compliance record, I think, yes, would deal with issues
19 like leaks history and those kinds of things, but this
20 is -- what I'm trying to do here is talk about how we
21 intend to use the National Pipeline Mapping System with
22 our other data, and I can't really comment right now in
23 terms of how specifically these kinds of things would
24 be done, but this is a sort of a brain storming
25 session. It's a discussion session, and so I believe

1 I'll move on.

2 MS. SCHELHOUS: Just before you do, this is
3 Ruth Ellen. I would also -- wouldn't you also be
4 looking more at the performance and compliance in the
5 High Consequence Areas, giving it some weighted value
6 or something versus not that kind of stuff?

7 MR. HALL: Yes, that is what I'm saying.

8 MS. SCHELHOUS: Okay, because by that -- the
9 way you put it up, it doesn't per se -- they could have
10 good compliance in their Non-Consequence Area for 50
11 percent, but if they're really bad in that High
12 Consequence Area, then it would be, I would think,
13 higher in your priority and you'd want to look at them.

14 MR. HALL: Yes, I agree. This is a very
15 simplistic example, I agree. So to move to that, what
16 are the potential -- and I stress the word potential --
17 changes to the National Pipeline Mapping System? What
18 needs to happen in order to achieve this kind of model?

19 We're talking about collecting additional
20 attributes and improving the geospatial accuracy. And
21 to give you some examples in terms of additional
22 attributes, we've discussed collecting diameter on a
23 mandatory basis. The National Pipeline Mapping System
24 as is mandated by the Pipeline Safety Act, by the
25 statute, does not collect diameter on a mandatory

1 basis. It's a voluntary field. So what we have in the
2 National Pipeline Mapping System is basically a line
3 that says who it's operated by, what commodity is
4 running through it and what the company calls that
5 pipeline in terms of a system name.

6 MS. GERARD: About what percent of the
7 operators voluntary submit data on that -- on diameter?

8 MR. HALL: I don't know the answer to that
9 question. I don't have the percentage here, but I can
10 --

11 MS. GERARD: Significant amount?

12 MR. HALL: That does submit that data?

13 MS. GERARD: Yes.

14 MR. HALL: I would say it's -- a guess would
15 be 50 percent.

16 MS. GERARD: I would call that a significant
17 amount.

18 MR. HALL: Okay. Another additional
19 attribute that we could potentially look at would be
20 pressure, maximum allowable operating pressure and
21 maximum operating pressure. And other attributes that
22 would tell us, that would describe that pipeline's
23 proximity and relation to High Consequence Areas, and
24 that would be most especially on the gas side, for gas
25 integrity management. We can attach attributes to the

1 pipeline that explain that it is in a High Consequence
2 Area and why. Now, again, these are all potential
3 attributes that we could collect.

4 In order to do that, and this I think gets to
5 your question about you, the industry has put a great
6 deal of energy, money and time into this -- into the
7 National Pipeline Mapping System -- we would need to
8 change the data model of the National Pipeline Mapping
9 System. And we have discussed a model called dynamic
10 segmentation, and that's a fancy GIS term for basically
11 an addressing scheme along the pipeline. I prefer not
12 to get into the details of how that scheme works. It's
13 actually --

14 MS. GERARD: But what does it do?

15 MR. HALL: What it does is it allows
16 operators to submit attributes along the pipeline in a
17 more efficient way. Instead of operators having to
18 break up the pipeline into more and more minuscule
19 segments along the pipeline as attributes change --
20 obviously if we're collecting more attributes, as
21 attributes change along that line, you have to segment
22 that pipeline, because this segment is some diameter
23 and this segment is some diameter, and this segment is
24 some diameter. Now you have a piece of pipeline that
25 is static and has an addressing scheme on it, similar

1 to mileposts for highways. And you would be able to
2 collect attributes based on those "mileposts". They're
3 not -- they don't have to be actual mileposts.

4 The idea behind this model is that operators
5 would be able to submit data easier. It would be a
6 more efficient way to collect that data and would not
7 need to submit data to us -- a refresh of the data.
8 They would be able to submit attributes along the
9 pipeline and geospatial data would basically stay the
10 same. So now it becomes a game of submitting
11 attributes as opposed to geospatial data.

12 The enhance data model, this dynamic
13 segmentation, makes submission easier. It would allow
14 us to store these additional attributes and it would be
15 a more efficient way of storing information. It would
16 also allow the Office of Pipeline Safety to maintain
17 historical data on pipelines. Right now the National
18 Pipeline Mapping System, and at any given time, is a
19 snapshot of what's in the ground right now, and it does
20 not describe what's happened over time, who was the
21 operator of this line at any given period of time, and
22 so that represents a major problem for us in terms of
23 answering questions from Congress. At any given time
24 we only have information about what's happening now and
25 if we're going to look at performance and compliance

1 for a particular operator --

2 MS. GERARD: For a piece of pipe.

3 MR. HALL: For a piece of pipe -- it's
4 difficult to get that information, that historical
5 information.

6 MS. HAMSHER: This is Denise Hamsher from
7 Embridge. I just, as a discussion, I would caution you
8 to not draw a correlation between a compliance history
9 of one operator, because of that piece of pipe
10 changing, to the compliance history of another brand
11 new operator. There would be no direct correlation.

12 MR. HALL: Okay, that's --

13 MS. HAMSHER: History of the pipe is history
14 of the pipe, but practices would not follow the pipe,
15 they would stay with an operator.

16 MR. HALL: Correct, that's noted.

17 MS. EPSTEIN: And as a related note, I found
18 that compliance can be uneven, depending on where a
19 pipeline is operated, so those kinds of information,
20 rate of inspection, are important as well when
21 determining an overall record. So I urge you to look
22 internally as well as externally in the process of
23 doing this.

24 MR. HALL: And that is something that this
25 model will allow us to do. This model, this dynamic

1 segmentation model will mean a major change in the
2 National Pipeline Mapping System, at least internally,
3 but it will allow us -- the design of this really
4 allows us to marry up our other databases in the Office
5 of Pipeline Safety with the National Pipeline Mapping
6 System. The current model is very difficult,
7 especially as it states that the National Pipeline
8 Mapping System as it exists now does not really allow
9 us to marry up the National Pipeline Mapping System
10 with our compliance databases and those kinds of
11 things, so this model would move us towards
12 integration, which will allow us -- you suggested
13 looking internally, and that's what we're talking about
14 doing.

15 Additionally, one of the things that we
16 discuss in this proposal would be requiring breakout
17 tanks to be submitted to the National Pipeline Mapping
18 System. The Act does not require that. Right now it's
19 a voluntary feature than can be submitted to the NPMS.

20 We've been working in close coordination with API to
21 determine how to collect that data, what attributes to
22 collect for the tanks, and we feel we have good support
23 from API in terms of how to collect this data.

24 And then lastly is this Annual Reports issue,
25 and as I said earlier, we can use information from the

1 National Pipeline Mapping System to populate the Annual
2 Reports. And I'll let Roger Little discuss that
3 further. And I think all of this information, the fact
4 that we're collecting this information, certainly has
5 some security implications, so I think that it's
6 appropriate to address security at least briefly.

7 September 11, 2001 was obviously the big
8 change in our security protocols. Up until that date
9 all of the information in the National Pipeline Mapping
10 System was available to the public to download. Anyone
11 around the world could get on the internet and look at
12 pipeline in relation to High Consequence Areas in an
13 internet mapping application that is similar to Yahoo
14 or something like that where you can zoom and pan
15 around. September 12th, that came down and
16 Administrator -- former Administrator Engleman had a
17 vested interest in us not being the source for pipeline
18 data that could get into the hands of terrorists and
19 used against us in an attack.

20 So what we did in the next few months after
21 September 11th, was worked closely with our -- with
22 security elements within the Department of
23 Transportation to figure out how best to protect this
24 information while still giving the information out to
25 those who needed it. Right now our security scheme

1 allows us to give data to federal, state, and local
2 government officials and their contractors, provided
3 that there's a confidentiality agreement in place. We
4 also provide data to pipeline operators, and we only
5 give pipeline operators the data that they've
6 submitted. So pipeline operators cannot see each
7 other's pipeline data, they only see the data that
8 they've submitted. And we also restrict the geographic
9 extent of the data that we provide to requesters, based
10 on the need.

11 So, if Fairfax County, Virginia, for
12 instance, wanted to look at all the National Pipeline
13 Mapping System data in Fairfax County, we would supply
14 them, given that they meet these other requirements for
15 security. We would give them that data for Fairfax
16 County only and we would not give them the entire
17 dataset for the nation. And we're very selective about
18 who we do give that entire data set to the nation.

19 MS. SCHELHOUS: Hi, this is Ruth Ellen.
20 Question, just because it's been so long since I've
21 seen it and accessed it, if you are giving it to like,
22 Fairfax County, the issue for a local emergency
23 planning committee was different pipeline companies
24 were giving them -- the LEPC -- acronym for local
25 emergency planning committee -- copies of or

1 information on individual lines. Are you giving them
2 information that integrates to show they were looking
3 more for junctions and things like that? So are you
4 giving them that or are you giving them separate? This
5 is what this pipeline company does. This is what this
6 one does. Or are you aggregating to show okay, these
7 two pipelines actually cross at this basic location and
8 that kind of stuff?

9 MR. HALL: What we provide to government
10 agencies and local officials is what exists in the
11 National Pipeline Mapping System right now. We don't
12 enhance that data in any way, and how these government
13 officials use that data --

14 MS. GERARD: They see it the way we see it.

15 MR. HALL: They see it the way we see it.

16 MS. SCHELHOUS: Which is?

17 MS. GERARD: It does show.

18 MR. HALL: Aggregated. We give them what we
19 have. Now, it does show where pipelines actually do
20 connect physically and it shows --

21 MS. SCHELHOUS: I was just looking -- they
22 were looking for certain information as opposed to
23 having to aggregate it themselves, so just as long as
24 you're doing that. It's been so long, I just --

25 MS. GERARD: Again, Sam, you might want to

1 caution that the degree of accuracy -- location
2 accuracy you have to use that information such that
3 it's an overall feel of the infrastructure in a
4 jurisdiction, and not specific junctions.

5 MS. SCHELHOUS: Right, they do do that. They
6 just -- that allows them, then, to go back and look
7 more specifically or talk to the different companies,
8 but that gives them the basic. I just wasn't sure from
9 not seeing it these days.

10 MR. HALL: It's important to note that the
11 National Pipeline Mapping System does not contain
12 pumping stations, valves, and those kinds of things.
13 It's very simplistic data you're talking about. It
14 basically shows right of way. I mean that's what
15 you're looking at. You're not actually looking at
16 features on the pipeline that --

17 So just to leave you with what I've said.
18 I've said it, now I'm going to say it again. The --
19 basically what I want you to walk away with is that
20 effective regulatory oversight and data analysis within
21 the Office of Pipeline Safety is going to require some
22 enhancements to the National Pipeline Mapping System.
23 That those -- and I've discussed what some of those
24 potential enhancements might be in terms of the data
25 model and what additional attributes we may want to

1 collect, and I've talked a bit about data security.

2 MS. GERARD: Sam, I was aware that we had
3 developed an application for a citizen, not affiliated
4 with the government, to be able to say, I reside at 232
5 Edwards Ferry Road, Leesburg, Virginia. What pipelines
6 are in my immediate vicinity and who can I contact to
7 find out more information about them?

8 MR. HALL: That's something that I did fail
9 to mention here. Something that we're developing now
10 and it is not live, but it would be publicly
11 accessible, it will be publicly accessible, will give
12 anyone on the internet the ability to go out to our
13 website and punch in a zip code, for instance and
14 return, not geographic features, not maps of the
15 pipeline, but return contact information for pipeline
16 operators.

17 MS. GERARD: In that area.

18 MR. HALL: In that area. In that geographic
19 area.

20 MS. GERARD: And have you successfully got
21 the right contacts with companies, not the GIS person
22 behind a screen -- no offense, it's just they're not
23 the ones to receive public inquiries, typically.

24 MR. HALL: Right, that's a good point, and
25 the Pipeline Safety Act requires us to collect contact

1 information for pipeline operators that are submitting
2 data to the NPMS, and that contact is a general public
3 contact. So the contact that a user of this geographic
4 system would see would be a general, public contact.

5 MS. GERARD: You said it's not live, this
6 application is not live, but it's ready to be live?

7 MR. HALL: It is not ready to be live because
8 the Pipeline Safety Act was just signed in on December
9 17th, and we don't have all the contact information
10 yet. So once we have the contact information we can
11 start to make it live. It's a fairly simple --
12 technologically it's fairly simple.

13 MS. GERARD: So we're just "populating" the
14 database on the emergency contacts, and when that's
15 done --

16 MR. HALL: We can go live. And compliance
17 date for submitting all of this information to the
18 National Pipeline Mapping System, the contact
19 information and the data, as it stands now is June
20 17th. Six months from the date of the signing of the
21 Pipeline Safety Act.

22 MS. GERARD: Sam, did you mention what all of
23 the additional attributes were that we were considering
24 asking of liquid pipeline operators?

25 MR. HALL: I didn't mention those.

1 Additional attributes would include mandating the
2 diameter --

3 MS. GERARD: Could include. This is subject
4 to discussion.

5 MR. HALL: Very subject to discussion,
6 obviously, and I think that needs to be a caveat here
7 so it just generally presides over all this. Diameter
8 could be required, pressure on the line could be
9 required, maximum operating pressure -- and this is for
10 the liquid side, MAOP -- maximum allowable operating
11 pressure for gas.

12 MS. HAMSHER: In other words, some type of
13 stable, static type of information rather than
14 something that would be --

15 MR. HALL: Right, nothing that would change.
16 Correct. We've also considered material of
17 construction, date of installation, and I believe
18 Roger, back there, can talk a bit more about what needs
19 to be collected for dumping data from the National
20 Pipeline Mapping System into Annual Reports. But
21 material of construction, certainly, and date of
22 installation are two of those.

23 MS. GERARD: So, Committee.

24 MS. SCHELHOUS: A question I would have is
25 then once you start getting into date of installation,

1 then it gets into any kinds of repairs or changes or
2 modifications to that. You would also kind of start to
3 want those dates too. I mean you do the basic ones --
4 I mean you do want to know whether it's 40, 60, whether
5 they're going to be 100 years old, looking down the
6 future, it still has to be good for 20 years from now,
7 so then you may get in --

8 MS. GERARD: Is that a question?

9 MS. SCHELHOUS: The question would be are you
10 then considering the issues of repairs and changes,
11 since there is an inspection process for High
12 Consequence Areas, so one would expect stuff to be
13 changed? How you would deal with it?

14 MS. HAMSHER: And before you answer, I break
15 that question into two parts -- repair history, which
16 is what you're talking about, going back historically
17 would be one question, and quite challenging. Another
18 one would be from that point forward to update with
19 segments that had been replaced versus repairs. So
20 there's kind of -- actually that's three questions.
21 Historical replacements and repairs are really kind of
22 three issues.

23 MS. GERARD: Mike, when you talk about the
24 parity issues later, you're going to talk about those
25 performance measures, right? Okay. If we could hold

1 the discussion on the integrity measures, I guess I had
2 the concept that I'd like to be able to see on the map
3 the performance measures that we've proposed for gas,
4 to sort of have a progress depiction on the map: line
5 tested or even plan to be tested, tested, repairs
6 identified, repairs completed. Something along the
7 line like that which is sort of consistent with the
8 performance measures for the gas integrity rule. Mike
9 was going to raise that issue as it relates to liquid.

10 I personally think that a lot of these things fit
11 together and the whole issue of raising confidence and
12 making information available to communities about work
13 that's being done on the pipeline to make it safer, I
14 think to -- and if for no other reason, the officials
15 who have to make decisions to grant the permits, one of
16 the things that we've been hearing, especially at the
17 federal level is that in order to plan work, they'd
18 like to know what's coming, to be able to see sort of
19 the progression of testing in an area, repairs in an
20 area, being able to do assessments that they need, to
21 be able to communicate with you. They'd like -- it
22 seems that one aspect of getting the permitting
23 agencies to be able to do the work more efficiently, is
24 to be able to anticipate what's coming in a particular
25 time frame, like work plan for the year. Which way?

1 MS. SCHELHOUS: Well, my dealing with septic
2 and wells and buildings and permits and that kind of
3 stuff for different things, a contractor may have an
4 idea of this is what I want to work on, but other
5 stuff, emergencies, come up and different things, so
6 schedules get shifted.

7 MS. GERARD: I'm just talking about as part
8 of the integrity plan, a company knows in what year
9 what segments of pipe are scheduled to be tested. So,
10 as segments are scheduled for testing --

11 MS. SCHELHOUS: I could believe that they
12 could propose them, but I could believe that each year
13 they'd have to revise them relative to, okay, these
14 things changed, so this is what our new -- the next
15 year, while we had planned this, because of certain
16 factors, this is now our new plan for this next year.
17 And I think they'd have to do it on a yearly basis
18 update.

19 MR. HARRIS: Let me just give you a general
20 sense. This is O.B. Harris. When we talked about the
21 attributes, I was kind of marching down a path and
22 we're talking about diameter -- that's a one time
23 event, pressure, that's pretty much a one time event.
24 And you know, kind of -- so we were kind of marching
25 down that path, but then all of a sudden we move up to

1 date of installation, and with date of installation you
2 get all of these replacements that are going to be
3 taking place, and so now it's -- we're going to a big,
4 much bigger Annual Reporting that kind of thing, so I
5 had this one concept that had one manageable --

6 MS. GERARD: That's why we're having this
7 discussion, O.B.

8 MR. HARRIS: Now it jumps to something that's

9 MS. GERARD: More burdensome.

10 MR. HARRIS: Oh, it's highly -- I see it as
11 being highly -- I won't say highly complex, but much
12 more burdensome.

13 MS. GERARD: Well, where would you draw the
14 line between -- you know, what is manageable? This is
15 why we're having this discussion with you, the Advisory
16 Committee, is to get some early input on concept.

17 MS. HAMSHER: Well, I guess I would ask -- I
18 think the question needs to be asked in another way.
19 Because what's manageable, if it contributes to safety,
20 is -- you would, even if it's burdensome, if there was
21 a contribution to safety, you would answer one way. If
22 it's very burdensome and does not contribute to safety,
23 you have to ask yourself what is the value added. I'm
24 having a hard time figuring out what the value added
25 here. If you look --

1 MS. GERARD: How about age? Certainly
2 looking at the question of age, that's obviously a
3 question that comes up in terms of managing risk.

4 MS. SCHELHOUS: And I think as we have an
5 incident on that, and the incident report, including
6 age, of that segment affected is a manageable relevant
7 thing to do. What you would be doing would be
8 collecting information on age of replaced segments that
9 may never have an incident.

10 MS. GERARD: Yes, I didn't hear replaced
11 segments. I heard original age.

12 MS. SCHELHOUS: And that's a static.

13 MR. HALL: Right, and that's as far as we've
14 gone in our discussions, that's as far as we've gotten
15 is just the static original date of installation.

16 MS. HAMSHER: And even on looping replacement
17 many mile segment you can manage and see those -- those
18 are "replacements" not repair -- joint of pipe repair.

19 MS. GERARD: Sort of like date of birth.

20 MR. HARRIS: Yes, date of birth would be
21 marching down the original path where it's a one time
22 submittal, that kind of thing and that's most
23 definitely manageable. Would probably add some value,
24 but -- and looking at the incremental effort as far as
25 tracking all the repairs and that kind of thing -- I'm

1 questioning the incremental value.

2 MS. GERARD: I guess what I was looking at
3 was -- and Mike's going to talk about the parity issue
4 later -- but just the issue of -- like the image of the
5 United Way thermometer. You know, we have a goal of
6 testing -- every operator has a plan that says I have a
7 goal of having this much pipe tested in this time
8 frame. I think what we were looking at was -- and this
9 is just me, I can't blame it on Sam -- is there a
10 way of depicting on the map when the testing and repair
11 has been completed in compliance with the regulation?
12 So segments of pipe that are planned to be tested have
13 been tested and repaired. It's done.

14 MS. SCHELHOUS: If you're dealing with that
15 on a segment basis, yes, no, toggle on off -- that's
16 manageable. If you're talking about doing something
17 that would report repairs on a specific dig by dig, I
18 fail to see how that contributes at all to our
19 knowledge of overall safety. You have to presume that
20 if it's an injurious defect that meets the criteria,
21 it's repaired. So the perception is it isn't there,
22 knowing that it was repaired, it isn't there, doesn't
23 add any more information.

24 MS. GERARD: So what you're saying is that a
25 data flag that would say yes, repaired, or no repair,

1 or yes replaced, no replaced?

2 MS. SCHELHOUS: As in a wide geographic
3 segment.

4 MS. GERARD: This is a question. Is there a
5 way to do this so that at the end of the year, you
6 know, one time in the year, you would say this much has
7 been completed? Yes, it's completed. It's been tested
8 and repaired in accordance with the requirement?

9 MS. HAMSHER: Yes, just be careful, you can
10 be -- and I'll use an example -- we have a pipeline
11 segment that was inspected in October. The results of
12 that inspection are not in our hands yet. Therefore,
13 the digs have not been completed, and therefore on
14 December 31st when we do the Annual Report, we'll say
15 inspected but no repairs. Let's be careful how we use
16 or misuse that information. Because just because it
17 straddles over a calendar year for the Annual Report,
18 doesn't mean that we're not managing safety equally
19 well on that segment. So I would just caution you on
20 how you collect and draw conclusions from that
21 information.

22 MS. GERARD: Well do you see a value in the
23 audience for the mapping system being able to look at
24 the map for the area that they live in, and being able
25 to say, oh, well the pipelines have been tested and

1 repairs are underway. Or the pipelines have been
2 tested and repaired. Is it of value to you in that
3 being available to state and local officials or to the
4 public?

5 MS. HAMSHER: Before I answer that, let's be
6 careful. We are drawing the assumption that under the
7 integrity management plan, testing means internal
8 inspection. That's the language we're all using. It's
9 the language I fall into because our system -- on our
10 liquid systems are internally inspectable. Don't
11 forget inspected could be hydrostatically tested or
12 direct assessment. I'm not quite sure how you're going
13 to have a segment that is on or off for direct
14 assessment. So I think --

15 MS. GERARD: These are questions we are
16 posing to you as the Committee ahead of everybody else,
17 and obviously it's a meaty subject. We'd appreciate it
18 if you'd give it some thought and discuss it with your
19 colleagues so that we can prepare for -- I mean it
20 looks to me like this is the subject of a more public
21 discussion with a larger group of people. We're using
22 you as the Advisory Committee to weigh in at the
23 concept stage here.

24 MS. EPSTEIN: I have a different issue that
25 I'd like to weigh in on at this point. In the

1 beginning of your presentation, Sam, you talked about
2 uses of the data by OPS in terms of setting priorities,
3 et cetera. One of the things you didn't mention, and I
4 don't know if you're thinking about it, is looking at
5 consistency of High Consequence Area determination,
6 because I think this -- you could potentially use some
7 of the information you have, which is related to
8 enforcement and priority setting, and that's a real
9 example. In the Cook Inlet watershed there are some
10 offshore pipelines interpreting High Consequence Area
11 more broadly as in the whole waterway -- it's similar
12 to the Chesapeake Bay. Others are saying, well, we're
13 only going to consider the segments that are directly
14 in the commercially navigable portion, that there's
15 actual navigation above those segments. And OPS, the
16 Regional Office knows about this being an issue and
17 there would be -- these kinds of things might be able
18 to jump out to an inspector who's looking at the data,
19 and areas being interpreted one way or the other way by
20 different operators. And there needs to be some
21 consistency in that, particularly for those operators
22 that are essentially expending more effort and doing
23 more testing, whereas their neighboring pipeline is
24 doing a lot less.

25 MR. HALL: A lot of that information is now

1 collected in the integrity management databases, and I
2 think that there is strong effort within the
3 inspections to make sure that there is consistency
4 among how High Consequence Areas are defined. We don't
5 penalize, certainly, for more conservative definitions
6 of what could affect a High Consequence Area, but I do
7 know that a lot of that information is collected in the
8 integrity management database as we perform our
9 integrity management inspections.

10 MS. EPSTEIN: Is that a separate database
11 from this?

12 MR. HALL: Yes.

13 MS. EPSTEIN: And is that information the
14 kind of thing that might eventually be integrated?
15 Because I think that's important stuff and has a
16 geographic focus.

17 MR. HALL: I agree, and it is something that
18 we have considered with this rulemaking. It's
19 something that we would like to build into the
20 rulemaking, not explicitly in the rulemaking, but in
21 terms of how we design our database so that we can move
22 toward integration of our databases in house. So the
23 answer is yes.

24 MS. GERARD: Does your question go to is
25 there information available to the public on how the

1 operator made that determination in a database?

2 MS. EPSTEIN: I'm not raising the bigger
3 question today of what is going to be available,
4 because I think this is -- that's sort of a separate
5 discussion because I think we have to look at
6 individual elements and see whether there are security
7 issues or not, and this is a more general discussion.
8 To answer your question, Stacey, I think there is a
9 concern among the public that perhaps they know about
10 some areas that should be identified as High
11 Consequence and either the operator or the OPS
12 regulators may be missing something, or if nothing
13 else, they want the increased comfort of knowing that
14 everything has been identified that should be
15 identified, and right now, since that information isn't
16 available, that's a concern.

17 MS. GERARD: Tomorrow there'll be a
18 discussion on the whole range of communication
19 initiatives and certainly there are several. One of
20 them which has not really begun yet is the initiative
21 on integrity management communications and what
22 information should be exchanged, and that sort of
23 focuses on the whole need for communities and states to
24 be able to give information to operators and vice-
25 versa. We're working on kind of the first initiative

1 which is the public education standard right now, but
2 that issue of going beyond that is certainly on the
3 table and goes to Denise's point about providing risk
4 information to operators from communities, where there
5 may be a change or something that the operator's not
6 aware of. There's a real safety purpose for that.

7 I wanted to go back to your original question
8 just so that -- you know, we're having these
9 discussions about what information could be shared with
10 the public. For those of you who don't know, we had a
11 public meeting in Bellevue, Washington several weeks
12 ago. Communications initiatives in general. There was
13 an awful lot of discussion at that meeting about
14 security and the extent to which information about
15 pipelines could be shared without being a security
16 risk.

17 We've been thinking about it and there's
18 certainly aspects of the legislation which indicate
19 Congress' support for certain information being able to
20 be shared -- public information grants to communities,
21 provisions like that. We've been talking about whether
22 or not we should expand the exchange of information
23 beyond state and local officials to a broader category
24 of people who may be working under the auspices in
25 some way -- in a voluntary capacity or a governor's

1 task force or some sort of a citizen's committee, where
2 we would ask the local government or the state
3 government to take the responsibility for passwording
4 the larger group of people. We're very concerned about
5 the appearance of hiding information that should be
6 shared under the big cloak of security, and that we are
7 concerned about some sort of a screening process.

8 The people that we exchange information with
9 identify themselves. We verify in some way they are
10 who they say they are, and that perhaps that
11 responsibility could be delegated by us to state and
12 local officials who are aware of activities that
13 volunteers or other organizations might undertake on
14 behalf of pipeline safety in some sort of affiliation
15 with some kind of government auspices. And so we're
16 beginning to talk about that and that will be a subject
17 for discussion maybe in the same timeframe. And we
18 have our Council definitely thinking about how to do
19 that.

20 So, again, thoughts from the Advisory
21 Committee about that question about, you know, once we
22 go beyond the government -- state and local government
23 officials -- and we're all aware of the environment of
24 shrinking government resources and there isn't enough
25 money in government to do everything, and there's a lot

1 of voluntary efforts that are very bona fide. How do
2 we recognize that? You don't have to answer now, but
3 asking you, as the Committee, to think about it.

4 MS. HAMSHER: Well, just one reaction,
5 Stacey. One might look at the general right of way
6 piece of pipe and that grid work is not particularly
7 security sensitive, however, when you start adding
8 break out tanks, hubs, pressure, pipe diameter, you're
9 now starting to get enough information to find what I
10 would suggest might be critical hubs, delivery hubs
11 that could have an impact to the energy, and thus now,
12 security type of information. So it may be that your
13 answer isn't all yes or all no, but is there a layer of
14 information that does not get into security,
15 particularly as you expand the attributes or
16 contemplate expanding the attributes?

17 MR. HALL: That's something that we have
18 certainly considered, especially the diameter and the
19 pressure aspect, and it is something that we'll
20 consider in any future activities.

21 MS. SCHELHOUS: As I commented to Sam
22 earlier, you are going to have to have an independent
23 body, other than you, will want to evaluate how the
24 High Consequence regulations have evolved and whether
25 there has been safety -- and it's going to have to be

1 different from you, just OPS telling the public that
2 oh, we analyzed everything and its fine -- it's going
3 to have to be a more independent body that does that, I
4 assume, like five years from now or something. But I
5 mean in the future, you're going to have to have
6 somebody else, independent of you evaluating the data
7 and the information, and was it successful, not
8 successful? Did it increase safety? How did it do?

9 MS. EPSTEIN: I'm going to try to shut down
10 this discussion unless there are any final thoughts
11 and do we -- Marti?

12 MS. MATHISON: Are we going to have the
13 opportunity to ask questions?

14 MS. GERARD: Yes, go ahead, since it's a
15 brain storming, yes.

16 MS. EPSTEIN: Sure, go ahead.

17 MS. MATHISON: I'm Marti Mathison with the
18 American Petroleum Institute. Just a couple of
19 questions. You said that this mapping initiative was
20 across the entire pipeline industry, yet I don't see it
21 on the natural gas agenda, either on the joint agenda,
22 or on natural gas agenda for Thursday. Is that an
23 oversight?

24 MS. GERARD: We did modify the agenda. I
25 think the operator qualification topic was down for an

1 hour and we decided we didn't need an hour for that,
2 and I think that you were going to come back for the
3 joint session to talk with the gas folks, because the
4 gas folks don't have time on their agenda.

5 MS. WETSEL: I will be speaking tomorrow on
6 the same issue.

7 MS. MATHISON: Because the reason I ask is
8 because there's an existing Annual Report for the
9 natural gas industry, and it certainly would make a
10 good test to turn the natural gas report first into a
11 system like you've described here, when the Annual
12 Report for the liquids has not even been created yet,
13 or the data fields determined. So you would have a way
14 to test the system without -- with letting the natural
15 gas industry go first. That's a comment, really.

16 MS. GERARD: Is that in the category of
17 turnabout's fair play?

18 MS. MATHISON: Since 99 percent of liquid
19 knowledge is in place, I think it would be very fair to
20 ask the natural gas industry to step up in this
21 particular context.

22 MS. HAMSHER: I think, if I might, what you
23 might be saying is that it's not really stepping up.
24 They already submit an Annual Report. You can take
25 existing information, pilot test it within the agency,

1 rather than adding requirements, and it might help you
2 visualize how you might then propose rulemaking either
3 to modify the gas rule and/or initially propose or
4 repropose the Annual Report for liquid.

5 MS. GERARD: Well, Roger is going to speak to
6 it next up, so --

7 MS. MATHISON: I have a couple of other
8 things. Right now OPS has inspection databases in
9 place for the numbers of inspections it completes and
10 where it is doing. It seems to me it would be a great
11 step forward to tie that to the National Pipeline
12 Mapping System first, even ignoring all the other
13 information, you could take the existing data and tell
14 people what you inspect year to year to year. I think
15 this has been a big hole for a very long time with the
16 Office of Pipeline Safety in not being able to
17 demonstrate where their inspectors have been out and
18 worked, what they have found, how many violations --
19 and that certainly could be map-tied and that seems
20 like the easier task than some of the other tasks
21 you've described today, as a first step. And not to
22 delay that so far in the future to go through two or
23 three years of kind of negotiating over new data fields
24 rather than maximizing the value of data fields today.

25 MR. HALL: Thanks for that comment. Right

1 now we have an initiative in place. We have brought on
2 a contractor who's looking at our business operations
3 and we're trying to look at ways -- right now the
4 biggest problem with marrying our internal databases,
5 the National Pipeline Mapping System, our compliance
6 databases and those kinds of things, is a key field
7 that we can link to marry the databases. I know that
8 that sounds odd. You would think that it would be the
9 operator I.D., but when you get to geographic areas
10 that are covered by an operator I.D. as submitted to
11 the National Pipeline Mapping System, those geographic
12 areas in the National Pipeline Mapping System are
13 different from what is being reported in the Annual
14 Reports, what is being reported in compliance databases
15 and those kinds of things. So we have a contractor in
16 place to look at some of our business rules, how we
17 assign operator I.D.s and how we collect information
18 from operators for the National Pipeline Mapping System
19 in terms of if you operate this piece of pipe, you
20 submit for this piece of pipe. If you don't, you don't
21 submit for that piece of pipe, so that we can begin to
22 move in that direction. So that's a very good comment
23 and it is something that we are looking at.

24 MS. MATHISON: And you have that problem
25 regardless of whether it's your data you're tying or

1 it's new operator data that comes in that's created in
2 a different format or is divided up differently. So
3 the problem exists either way, correct?

4 MR. HALL: Yes.

5 MS. MATHISON: Just one last comment and then
6 I'll get off the soap box. I think there's a big
7 distinction between company-wide or industry-wide
8 information and pipe-specific information, and I would
9 hate to see OPS sacrifice the company-wide and the
10 industry-wide data in preference for pipe-specific
11 data. I think it's very important for OPS to get very
12 quickly in front of the public how many miles have
13 baseline assessments have been completed, even if you
14 can't tie it to the geographic location. It says
15 you're out there. It says you're monitoring the
16 information. So I think it's very important to know
17 when these assessments are completed, know that you've
18 met the three and a half year deadline, regardless of
19 the geographical implications. And if you're going to
20 spend two or three years coming up to decide on data
21 fields and improve the NPMS, you'll miss the boat on
22 the public messages.

23 MS. GERARD: I promise we'll go a little
24 faster than that.

25 MS. MATHISON: I'll believe it when I see it.

1 I've been doing data with you for a long time, Stacey.

2 MS. GERARD: Don't have to mention all the
3 years.

4 MS. EPSTEIN: One more comment.

5 MR. FLINT: Rick Flint, NTSB. I was
6 wondering regarding the mapping and security how in the
7 past, or how in the future you plan to work with TSA?

8 MR. HALL: We have supplied information to
9 TSA and are willing to work with TSA to give them what
10 we have for homeland security. Of course TSA would be
11 under the same requirements in terms of not
12 disseminating that data to the public, the map
13 information or maps derived from that data. But we are
14 working in conjunction with the TSA and other security
15 agencies across the federal government, and in state
16 governments, in providing information to them.

17 MS. SCHELHOUS: Question. Do you now fall
18 under -- did you do an MOU or is it under the total DOT
19 TSA MOU? Or is it a separate, or like RSPA, more
20 specific to OPS?

21 MS. GERARD: Jim O'Steen is going to do a
22 briefing on security tomorrow and that's a very much,
23 kind of up to the minute type of question. MOUs have
24 been drafted as RSPA.

25 MS. SCHELHOUS: Okay.

1 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, I think we're ready to
2 move on, and Roger Little is going to do a presentation
3 and he's moving in our direction.

4 **Briefing - Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Operator**
5 **Annual Report**

6 MR. LITTLE: I'm Roger Little, data analyst
7 with the Office of Pipeline Safety, and I'm going to
8 pass around the Annual Report that we published last
9 year in the Federal Register as a Notice of Proposed
10 Rulemaking for our topic that I'm going to cover.

11 I would like to start by thanking Marti
12 Mathison and API for the extensive comments that they
13 made, and also Denise Hamsher with Embridge. I think
14 you folks did a good job of looking at the pros and
15 cons of what we had proposed, and I'm going to quickly
16 go over, I think, the highlights of the comments,
17 without going into great detail over every single
18 comment you made. I believe I can sum up those
19 comments fairly quickly.

20 API started off by pointing out that there
21 had been a lot of positive action over the last couple
22 of years in several areas of data. We've improved the
23 hazardous liquid accident report form to lower the
24 threshold down to five gallons, and also we've gotten
25 better detail on calls information and API also has a

1 separate and ever going-on, looking at pipeline
2 information through the pipeline performance tracking
3 initiative.

4 They had made some comments about comparing
5 their effort with what we proposed and we have taken a
6 look at that. There were also some comments about the
7 nature of the form in that the layout in collecting
8 information by state, which is not currently something
9 that the industry does or has as a business practice.
10 So it's a way that the information isn't currently
11 aggregated. That was seen as especially troublesome,
12 and also Embridge had made the same comment. So we've
13 studied very carefully some of the options for that
14 particular aspect. That seemed to be, I think, the
15 core of the comments, that the reporting information,
16 the level of the information itself is very extensive,
17 and then to drill down and report that by state
18 presented cost burdens. The information isn't readily
19 available. It was never reported before that way.

20 The mapping system was seen early on as the
21 perpetual tool for breaking the information out by
22 state, but because the mapping information is submitted
23 on a voluntary basis, and we didn't also have the
24 aggregate information on the different attributes that
25 we proposed in the Annual Report, not easy to get

1 there. And we also had not planned on doing the
2 rulemaking and changing the data submission at the time
3 that we created the NPRM last year.

4 But now that we're pursuing a change to the
5 National Pipeline Mapping System, we've seen some
6 opportunities to simplify the by state information and we
7 believe the dynamic segmentation aspect, in particular,
8 that Sam had mentioned in his presentation, gives us an
9 opportunity to soften the impact of that, that
10 information, by having the mapping system tally that
11 data for us by state.

12 We seek today to get some advice from you
13 folks in terms of the extent of the information and
14 your agreement on how we might move forward in that
15 area. We're considering possibly a public meeting to
16 get down into the details. We didn't come today --
17 it's, I think, too extensive in terms of the time
18 required to get down into the weeds, to sort out all
19 those issues, and we believe that a public meeting in
20 the late May timeframe might serve us very well, help
21 us sort out some of those issues.

22 MS. GERARD: I should say we haven't said yet
23 that we think that we should have another meeting of
24 the Advisory Committee in late May. If we could have a
25 more populated liquid committee, but certainly on the

1 gas side, we need to have a gas committee meeting in
2 late May and we thought a lot of these mapping issues
3 are more gas than liquid, that we might piggyback a gas
4 Advisory Committee meeting with a public meeting on
5 mapping. So we have a hotel in Washington available
6 the last week in May, after Memorial Day. Memorial Day
7 is like the 25th or 6th, and so we have 27, 28, 29, 30
8 -- those days are all available. I know that's just a
9 very popular time to come to Washington.

10 MS. HAMSHER: I just want to clarify
11 something, and I'll just speak for Embridge. When we
12 offered our comments, it really wasn't focused on the
13 burden. It was focused on the impracticality of
14 separating the information by state, and I'll give just
15 a very short example, just so that there's not a
16 misperception that we're just whining because of work
17 load.

18 Volume through a state is just not something
19 that we would collect. We have pipeline systems --
20 three coming from one state to another. We receive, we
21 deliver within the state. Two of those pipelines leave
22 the state. What we transported in that state is not a
23 number that can just be made up. It's in what segment.
24 So then you'd end up having to break down that Annual
25 Report to its n-th degree. We would have one system

1 that's a third of our 12,000 miles, and just reporting
2 on that system to try to capture the data in a
3 reasonable -- came up with something -- I don't have
4 the number -- 26 reports, just to break it down segment
5 by segment to be rational. So it really wasn't a
6 burdensome, it was just the way that the data was
7 structured is just not achievable in the way pipelines
8 are really run.

9 MR. LITTLE: I thank you for that comment,
10 and there were several different aspects of the by
11 state issue and you did a good job in your comments of
12 articulating the particular impact to Embridge, but
13 from the API comments, there were some comments that
14 there is no business reason that companies had to
15 report by state, and they haven't done it that way.
16 And since they haven't done it that way, it's a brand
17 new initiative for them, so the data would have to be
18 obtained from scratch. And then plus the fact that we
19 have a very complicated matrix here, a little bit more
20 complicated than for the natural gas, and that was
21 acknowledged as well. It presents some burden to
22 industry.

23 Also there was a good observation from API
24 that by having the information reported by state, when
25 you aggregate the by state information to get then your

1 national tallies, because the information is reported
2 by state, you're injecting some guess level into that
3 reporting by state which again leads to some increased
4 error level at the national level. And we recognize
5 that as well.

6 But again, we think that the solution is the
7 mapping system submission, and whether we actually do
8 that, again, we need a public meeting, we need to look
9 at dynamic segmentation, the cost impact of doing this
10 data collection through that system. So we haven't
11 totally determined that that is our only option, and
12 there was a suggestion that we get the by state
13 information as a separate rule, as another possible of
14 getting that. And so certainly we're focusing on
15 getting correct information at a national level. We do
16 need the information by state. We believe that the
17 mapping system will prove to be the best way to do that
18 and we want to work with the group to kick the tires
19 and take a look at what the impacts of that would be.

20 MS. GERARD: Roger, was there information
21 that -- you mentioned yesterday, I thought, that there
22 was some information that would not be spatially
23 related, that if we wanted to go ahead and propose the
24 report and then identify that information which we
25 thought could be provided in a spatial way at a later

1 date. What information would be not spatially
2 provided?

3 MR. LITTLE: If we take a look at the form,
4 in particular the information by decade installed
5 would, we believe, be problematic to report out by
6 segment. And we think that that would be probably the
7 only information that is on this that really needs to
8 be obtained through a separate filing. The diameter
9 information, Sam mentioned is one of the attributes
10 that we were looking at in the mapping which would
11 basically subsume the Part C information, other than
12 the by decade part.

13 One of the differences we have in what we
14 proposed in this form versus the annual report for gas
15 is that in the annual report for gas, we separated into
16 a separate matrix the information by decade installed.
17 We combine it by decade installed information for what
18 we proposed for hazardous liquid and that, I think, is
19 part of the reason that we got some of the extensive
20 comments in terms of the complexity. It adds a layer
21 of complexity in breaking out information by diameter
22 and by decade installed. And we could see that. We
23 would -- in order to help make parity with what we get
24 from gas, propose to collect that separately.

25 But again, through a workshop, we might

1 determine some better way of even getting some of this
2 information through the mapping system, and we don't
3 want to totally forego that possibility. But the
4 diameter I mentioned, also in Part B, the information
5 on bicathodic protection, we believe, could readily be
6 obtained through the mapping submission.

7 On the second page, the information on high
8 frequency and low frequency PRW pipe. Again, fairly
9 easily to get through the mapping system. If we can
10 get that information -- and again, in the public
11 workshop we could discuss the comments made that that
12 information is very difficult, costly, not available,
13 and determine a little bit more what the impact and the
14 cost burden of getting that information would be. And
15 again, we had had here the by decade installed and the
16 -- another layer of complexity, in that as well.

17 The Part E, miles of pipe by specific minimum
18 yield strength. Sam mentioned earlier that that would
19 be one of the things that could be obtained in the
20 mapping system. We believe fairly readily.

21 Part F, miles of gathering lines. There was
22 fairly strong objections to us getting information on
23 unregulated -- we have that separated into proposed
24 data by regulated and unregulated pipelines. And we
25 concede that. We are not going to pursue that at this

1 time. We wanted to get that information for
2 determining our needs to do further rulemaking in that
3 area.

4 MS. GERARD: I think Lois wanted to make a
5 comment there. I heard an exclamation.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: I'll wait until you're done.

7 MR. LITTLE: Well, basically we would pursue
8 that through a different mechanism, and we might do a
9 separate targeted data collection. We're doing a study
10 now with the state of Texas, looking at unregulated
11 lines in the state of Texas, so we're --

12 MS. GERARD: It's not that we wouldn't do it.
13 We wouldn't do it through this.

14 MR. LITTLE: Right. There's one piece of
15 information that we need and sort of a one purpose, one
16 time need, and so maybe from that perspective it's not
17 something we need on an annual basis. Once we have the
18 information through a separate mechanism, we could then
19 determine the need for having it on an annual basis.
20 So we basically had agreed with that comment.

21 The break out tank information under Part G,
22 we believe, would fit in the National Pipeline Mapping
23 System. And there were some comments on the volume
24 transported. Denise mentioned the complexity of
25 reporting that by state. We concede that as well.

1 Part I, we had comments that the internal
2 inspection information as we proposed to collect over a
3 two year period is very difficult and that the progress
4 made is what we really need, and there was also a
5 separate comment or suggestion that we pursue that
6 information through the integrity management database
7 collection. We're going out now in integrity
8 management inspections and getting the total miles
9 pigged by device and this sort of thing, and we believe
10 that does meet our needs, so we're looking at that
11 again, that that will be part of what we talk about at
12 the public meeting.

13 That essentially covers all the different
14 sections in the form and it's, I think, fairly easy to
15 see how some of these attributes can be moved into
16 mapping and then pushed out by state and so forth. So
17 we believe that that is an option we want to consider.

18 We would entertain having an optional submission by
19 this, maybe possibly as an incentive in lieu of, if we
20 don't have all the attributes information decided to be
21 obtained through the mapping system. So those
22 decisions --

23 MS. GERARD: Could you clarify that, Roger?
24 I'm not sure it's clear.

25 MR. LITTLE: Yes. We have a need for the

1 Annual Report information, and as Marti pointed out, we
2 don't want to wait too long to basically be able to
3 have the information we need to --

4 MS. GERARD: While we're waiting for the
5 mapping concept to be finalized.

6 MR. LITTLE: Right, and also the mapping
7 information may take several years once we have a model
8 proposed to collect. And some of the information here
9 may be more burdensome than other information to push
10 into mapping. So when we have a public meeting we
11 would hope to obtain information about the viability by
12 particular attribute here, pushing this information
13 into mapping and seeing if it made sense to collect
14 some of this information earlier, through this annual
15 submission.

16 However, if a company readily had this
17 information and already did dynamic segmentation as
18 their method of collection, and they wanted to submit
19 it to the mapping system, we could click the button and
20 have it spit this out and the company then wouldn't
21 have to file the Annual Report. It might be a check
22 box on the form that they would check, submit, already
23 in the NPMS.

24 MS. GERARD: Roger, couldn't we proceed with
25 our plan for the Annual Report with the modifications

1 that you mentioned, considering the comments, and then
2 identify on that from those portions of the form which
3 might be suitable for submitting spatially --
4 geospatially. So go ahead and finalize the Annual
5 Report and then indicate that we're probably going to
6 be in a transition period where some operators might
7 choose to move into geospatial prior to our making it a
8 regulatory structure?

9 MR. LITTLE: Yes, and we actually have been
10 discussing that, you know especially considering the
11 length of time that would be required to get the
12 information through the National Pipeline Mapping
13 System.

14 MS. GERARD: I would like to say to the
15 Committee that that would be what I would like to do,
16 is to proceed with the Annual Report, with the
17 modifications that Roger talked about and in
18 consideration of the comments so that an Annual Report
19 would be born and we would shade on the report in some
20 way those areas of information which could also be
21 transmitted geospatially. And then work on the mapping
22 thing as we can, and then make the conversion at a
23 later date. But I think it's very much in our interest
24 to complete this project with the recognition it's
25 likely to go geospatial to a large extent soon, and

1 give people the opportunity to plan -- operators the
2 opportunity to plan at their best pace.

3 MR. LITTLE: Timing-wise, we were hoping to
4 get a final rule out this year, have a public meeting
5 in May, and move forward with what we believe we need
6 for the short term. As for working simultaneously on
7 the mapping rule to iron out the details of how we
8 could improve the information submission later.

9 MS. GERARD: But we're ready -- we could
10 finalize the Annual Report now.

11 MR. LITTLE: Yes.

12 MS. GERARD: And technically this would be
13 the last time that you heard about it, because as a
14 reporting rule it doesn't require a vote. So I guess I
15 would like the Committee to be aware of the fact that -
16 - you know, Roger just reported to you a number of
17 areas where he was responding to comments, and that we
18 could go ahead and complete the Annual Report and just
19 have that indication on the report that it has numerous
20 areas which may soon be able to be transmitted
21 geospatially.

22 MR. LITTLE: We also propose that we get the
23 final rule out this year, and then we would give a year
24 to tally the information, with submission in the spring
25 of 2005. So we wouldn't expect this to be coughed up

1 next year. Yes, Marti.

2 MS. MATHISON: I'm not sitting on the
3 Committee but I have a couple of comments --

4 MS. GERARD: Well, Robert's Rules is anybody
5 on the Committee.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: Well, I'd like to make a few
7 comments and then we'll open it up. Recognizing that I
8 did not submit comments on this when it was proposed, I
9 still would hope, given that this is our last
10 opportunity to discuss this, that I can raise a few
11 points that OPS can think about and consider.

12 MS. GERARD: Absolutely.

13 MS. EPSTEIN: Three areas I have some
14 questions about and related comments, and maybe you can
15 respond to them. I know that the OPS rules are written
16 in terms of operators as opposed to owners. But it
17 seems to me that it'd be a little bit of a missed
18 opportunity because ownership does change on a
19 potentially annual basis, not always, but there is some
20 value in getting owner and percent ownership, because
21 there may be some patterns there that are worth OPS
22 paying some attention to.

23 Secondly, and there may be a good answer to
24 this question, in terms of reported spills, I know that
25 goes into a different database, but there may be some

1 value in getting it correlated with the types of pipes.

2 I know you don't want to make it more burdensome
3 unnecessarily, but if an operator was to observe that
4 some of their oldest pipe periodically shows the most
5 spills -- just theoretical -- that would be something
6 that this -- the compilation of the report could
7 actually make clear to an operator, whereas if it's
8 someone else reporting the spills and then they're
9 reporting the mileage of pipeline by decade and there's
10 no integration being made by the operator, only by OPS.

11 That may be something that would be valuable to have
12 an operator look at.

13 And then thirdly, I just want to make a
14 comment on the regulated versus unregulated gathering
15 wise. I guess I strongly disagree with removing that
16 from reporting, for a number of reasons. Partly
17 because I think there is a need to get national
18 information on that. I have looked at performance of
19 pipeline operators just in Cook Inlet, and it jumps out
20 at you that the unregulated lines seem to have more
21 problems. And with the administration's current push
22 to do more domestic drilling, this is obviously a
23 number that might change over the next few years. We
24 might have a significant increase in that number and I
25 understand what you're trying to do in terms of keeping

1 it separate right now, and I guess we're not being
2 briefed about what OPS is doing on gathering lines?
3 It's not on the current agenda.

4 MS. WETSEL: We have it planned for May.

5 MS. EPSTEIN: Probably May. Okay. I guess
6 we'll hear more about that. So if that decision is not
7 set in stone, I think there actually would be quite a
8 bit of value of getting that information.

9 MR. LITTLE: I hope we have an agreement
10 today on the prospect of having a public meeting, so
11 today what we want agreement on to move ahead. We
12 certainly hope that we have a forum for further
13 dialogue as well.

14 You know, regarding your comment on the need
15 for operator tracking and the ownership issue. One of
16 the things that we're considering having in the NPMS
17 rule, I think Sam touched on, is operator mergers and
18 acquisitions tracking. As those things change over
19 time, we have the complexity of linking all of our data
20 systems together and we want to be able to tell which
21 operator had which leaks over which period of time,
22 what their compliance records were over a period of
23 time, integrate those layers of data. And we have the
24 problem of different operator submissions at different
25 times. We have an ad hoc way of some sort in finding

1 out when mergers and acquisitions happen, no formal
2 structure. FERG has some submissions in that area, but
3 their jurisdiction doesn't overlap entirely with ours,
4 but we're looking at what they require for lessons
5 learned, and we hope to have some elements in our
6 mapping rule that would verify that information and
7 give us business rules that would allow that kind of
8 correlation that you're talking about. So we strongly
9 are pursuing that.

10 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, anyone else on the
11 Committee like to make some comments?

12 MS. HAMSHER: Just one point on the gathering
13 -- and we made it in our comments. It's not an issue
14 of trying to hide or not provide information. It's an
15 issue of this is not helpful or meaningful to OPS in
16 this mechanism. This report would be filled out by
17 those operators who are now regulated and thus own
18 transmission. It would not be completed by those
19 operators who are not now regulated and yet own lot of
20 gathering lines. So you would have a huge vacuum of
21 information about gathering lines that would never be
22 reported because they're not an operator that also owns
23 transmission lines. So it's just an incomplete
24 mechanism for gathering information about gathering
25 lines.

1 MS. EPSTEIN: That's a fair point.

2 PARTICIPANT: ... some indications of trends?

3 MS. EPSTEIN: No, this would just be
4 reporting the existence of gathering. It's not
5 reporting leaks or other issues. It's just a whole
6 other animal that probably needs to be managed in a
7 more comprehensive way, rather than just slipping in a
8 number of miles of part of the mileage in the United
9 States. It just doesn't get where you need to go.

10 MS. GERARD: Just to sharpen the focus here a
11 little bit, the reason we're not briefing on this today
12 is that we've -- we've decided to put quite a bit of a
13 focus on this and we've asked Fred Joiner, who was a
14 Regional Director for the southern region to take on
15 the responsibility for managing the entire gathering
16 line series of projects, and Fred is here today in the
17 audience. He's sitting in the back, and he's just
18 really started this responsibility in the past week, so
19 he's going to be investigating a number of leads for
20 risk information for a variety of sources that go way
21 beyond our traditional contacts and relationships. And
22 I think that in a couple months we'll have more to
23 report, but we do have a contract with the state of
24 Texas and have -- and are offering contracts with other
25 states who have information collected to be able to

1 provide that information to us. There's a lot of
2 rocks, I think Fred's planning on turning over, to
3 identify information and following up on some leads
4 that you've given us. So we will report on that the
5 next meeting. I think Marti's turn.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, we're going to the
7 audience comments now.

8 MS. MATHISON: Yes, Marti Mathison, American
9 Petroleum Institute. Just a couple of comments. I
10 don't want the Advisory Committee to under-estimate the
11 difficulty of filling out the report that was proposed
12 by the Office of Pipeline Safety. If you're a pipeline
13 operator who has both crude and products lines and you
14 operate in ten states, you have to submit 40 Annual
15 Reports every year the way this was conceived. We have
16 asked, as an industry, and I will state it again, for
17 this Annual Report to be completely repropose because
18 you are in essence changing your focus for how you
19 intend to do this conceptually, in an entirely
20 different way. So I think it would be a mistake for
21 this Committee to say we think that the OPS going with
22 the Annual Report is okay, based on today's discussion,
23 because you don't really know where it's going based on
24 this discussion. What they've offered today is a
25 completely new concept to the industry. It's a

1 completely new concept to the Committee.

2 The second comment I would say is the
3 strength of the National Pipeline Mapping System was
4 the conceptual approach back in the early nineties to
5 set up a voluntary system and set up a series of data
6 requirements that was known to the industry before they
7 began collecting the information and deciding how they
8 were going to organize it. So as an operator, you
9 could see your future and predict it. And the strength
10 -- yes, it takes more time, but the NPMS came into
11 conceptual being in 1995 and here we are eight years
12 later from a liquid perspective, and you have 100
13 percent of your mileage in the system. If you did
14 something similar with the other data fields that
15 you're talking about today, and defined the data fields
16 and made those data fields voluntary initially, you
17 might see seven years from now 100 percent compliance,
18 even with a voluntary approach, compared with a demand
19 today based on very specific pieces of information that
20 may or may not even exist in the pipeline operators
21 today.

22 One of the comments that we made to Roger and
23 to OPS when this report came out is a lot of the
24 subdata elements here are not in operators files,
25 either paper files or electronic files today. So even

1 though you had the demand for the information, you
2 provide the information and OPS ends up with something
3 that is -- that looks like swiss cheese. It doesn't
4 look like it's a data set.

5 So I would urge that you very carefully
6 repropose this and let it have the scrutiny it deserves
7 to make it good quality. Because if it isn't good
8 quality, it hurts all of us. It hurts the competence -
9 - the view of the competence of the regulatory agency,
10 and the view of the competence of the industry. This
11 is really important. This is not something that should
12 be done on a hurry up basis.

13 MS. EPSTEIN: Any other comments, either from
14 the Committee or the audience?

15 MS. HAMSHER: I guess I've asked Stacey to
16 clarify or perhaps, Barbara you can. You mentioned
17 that the Committee would have no formal vote role
18 because this is just a reporting requirement, but
19 again, along with the comments that you received, this
20 isn't a reporting requirement, it is changing the way
21 that information is required to be maintained and
22 reports and collected. It is quite onerous. It isn't
23 just reporting. I guess I'm troubled -- the two
24 questions I have is why -- why the Committee wouldn't
25 vote on a major rule like this, and if not, and you

1 proceeded to final rulemaking on something that's
2 vastly different than what you propose, is that
3 following the administrative rules?

4 MS. GERARD: Let me just say I thought what
5 we were doing was going to continue with those elements
6 that the comments warranted and drop out those elements
7 that the comments didn't warrant so that you would, in
8 fact, be seeing a product that you have commented on.
9 It was my understanding that there were a number of
10 elements that you convinced us didn't make sense, and
11 all we were talking about doing was indicating of what
12 was left, what of that might be able to be reported
13 geospatially, whether it's voluntarily or it's
14 regulatorily.

15 MS. HAMSHER: But I think if you look at the
16 fundamental nature of the comments, it's not like
17 taking off block one, block two and coming up with
18 okay, these survived. The basic structure of the
19 report state by state, and either you're going to
20 continue that despite --

21 MS. GERARD: I think we said we weren't going
22 to do that.

23 MR. HALL: Short term, we would look for the
24 mapping system as a solution or a separate rule, and
25 that we hoped to have a public meeting to maybe

1 determine which of those two methods --

2 MS. GERARD: Roger was conceding that that
3 was one --

4 MS. HAMSHER: Okay, so the rest of that would
5 be macro for the system as a whole?

6 MR. LITTLE: That is correct. Right. What
7 we intended to do was to basically do away with the by
8 state for what we would go forward with the final rule
9 this year, and to drop the gathering line requirement,
10 the cathodic protection, the information under Part B
11 would be virtually identical to what we have from NPMS,
12 should be readily available. The information by
13 diameter in the second part shouldn't be a problem, we
14 would hope, and we would separate out the decades --
15 the mileage by decade installed and not have an
16 aggregated matrix as we proposed here, as we do for
17 natural gas.

18 And there was also a comment that we would
19 add -- that we should add a few extra decades to what
20 we propose here -- we would adopt that. To get
21 information for pre -- for 1930's and 1920's and pre-
22 1920's. There's two extra columns, based on
23 information that the PPTI revealed about risks and pipe
24 in those decades.

25 The information under ERW, we do hope to

1 obtain. I think that is an area that we would need to
2 discuss a little bit further at the public meeting.
3 We've had a lot of controversy over ERW pipe, a lot of
4 scrutiny by Congress, and a lot of questions that we
5 have difficulty answering without normalizing
6 information, so we would hope at the public meeting to
7 look at what the burden for that section would be.

8 I -- the break out tank information, I don't
9 believe was a problematical area, if I recall. The
10 volume transported -- there were objections to by
11 state. We could look at an aggregate throughput by
12 year, and I believe you generally have that information
13 through your filings, and we might look at how we could
14 get that through filings. Through the public meeting
15 there is again, an overlap issue in jurisdiction for --
16 does it deal with the exact same number of operators
17 that we do? But there would be information from volume
18 already existing, we would certainly not duplicate a
19 filing for that.

20 The internal inspection information, I
21 mentioned, there was a recommendation to obtain that
22 information through the integrity management database,
23 and we agreed with that. So I believe that the
24 substantial objections to the form we have found a way
25 to basically solve them by removing the by state.

1 Again, we would have an opportunity for further
2 dialogue to get down into the weeds a bit, and
3 understand what the cost burdens are and the tradeoffs
4 for going by -- for the ERW and some of the remaining
5 information where there might be some problems.

6 MS. GERARD: So we weren't going to proceed
7 with this rulemaking with items that were heavily
8 controversial in the comment.

9 MR. LITTLE: We believe that we essentially
10 found a way to meet the comments with what we propose
11 to go forward with. The ultimate solution being the
12 mapping system, softening the impact on the by state a
13 couple of years later.

14 MS. GERARD: My understanding was that the
15 mapping system would be able to analyze the information
16 geospatially, that it would remove the obligation on
17 the operator to do that type of reporting.

18 MR. LITTLE: Yes, instead of the operators
19 having to provide the tallies, if they provided the
20 information for all their pipelines, then we could have
21 the mapping system produce this report without
22 companies having to --

23 MS. GERARD: Putting that additional burden
24 on the company.

25 MR. LITTLE: Right. It's only if companies

1 already had the information, then for them to have to
2 go out and create some kind of computer program to
3 tally this, we would create some kind of interface in
4 our system if they wanted to go ahead with this kind of
5 submission and have an optional method of supplying the
6 information, again, nation-wide, not by state. Does
7 that help?

8 MS. MATHISON: I think this needs to be
9 repropose because the devil's in the details with
10 data. The devil is in the details. If you recap
11 something, until you understand how you use the
12 information, how you collect it, I think our request to
13 repropose this will stand.

14 MS. EPSTEIN: Will you have a -- sorry, Ruth.

15 MS. SCHELHOUS: Go ahead.

16 MS. EPSTEIN: Will you have a template if you
17 have a public meeting, of a -- what it would look like?

18 MR. LITTLE: Yes, and also we certainly
19 acknowledge the fact that in the proposed rule we
20 undoubtedly underestimated the cost burden, and in
21 particular, information on the cost burden, we would
22 hope to obtain and we would have a dialogue with
23 industry before we had the public meeting to provide
24 you an opportunity to help us have that information at
25 the time we sat down in late May. So we would hope

1 that we could address whatever remaining gaps we have
2 at that meeting, with dialogue, possibly in advance, to
3 help set the stage so that when we set down, we would
4 understand what your concerns were with a little bit
5 better information for us to make our decisions.

6 MS. HAMSHER: I guess I just don't follow the
7 process. If you would have a template -- which would
8 be very helpful so we would all know what you said in
9 words, but now what does it look like -- very helpful,
10 but again, as part of the proposed rulemaking you're
11 floating another Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, but in
12 an informal way in a public meeting. And I think that
13 just gets back to take that same template and repropose
14 it in a proposed rulemaking so that you're following
15 something that people that aren't at the public meeting
16 can actually see and comment on, and they know what
17 they're facing. And it should -- I'm not quite sure
18 you're -- I know it's hard getting stuff out your door
19 and do that, but I'm not sure -- I don't know why you
20 couldn't do that and have it not slow your process
21 down.

22 MS. EPSTEIN: Ruth Ellen.

23 MS. SCHELHOUS: Actually, I disagree with
24 Denise on that because it actually -- for the parts
25 that you're saying it appears that you're basically

1 just responding to comments and taking away certain
2 things and stuff like that. So for one part.

3 The other part I guess I'm trying to take
4 this form, or the ideas and how you're trying to get it
5 through so that the mapping system, if you went to it,
6 would be able to do it by state. So you're basically
7 going, if you've got your data points like this decade
8 or the year it was installed, these discrete data
9 points that are one time things, and the diameter and
10 stuff like that, you could then use the system to
11 query, okay, for this state you could get it to give
12 you a report that would allow you to then give you this
13 kind of information by state. Is that what?

14 MR. HALL: That's right. That's correct. We
15 would -- and geographic information systems -- the
16 software concept that is used to manage the data that
17 is in the National Pipeline Mapping System, that's a
18 very easy thing to do.

19 MS. SCHELHOUS: Okay, it's where -- this
20 segment to this segment is this size and da-a-da, and
21 this size is this year old but it may be this.

22 MR. LITTLE: Actually the information by
23 decade is the one area that we believe might be
24 problematic from a national submission, the records
25 existed a long time ago. They then have been bought

1 and sold and so forth, may exist only in aggregate
2 information, probably difficult to submit on a by
3 segment basis. So that's something that we need a
4 little more feedback from industry in terms of how that
5 information is readily available. That was the one
6 area that we believe that in particular we probably
7 would not push through the mapping system. But again,
8 based on a dialogue with industry to determine whether
9 that information did readily exist, but the diameter
10 information, the cathodic protection information, and
11 all the other attributes generally would be things that
12 we would pursue in mapping, and then once you have them
13 in mapping it becomes readily easy to produce
14 information out totaled by state or nationwide, or any
15 other way you want to slice and dice it.

16 MS. GERARD: I want to ask a point of
17 procedure. If we wanted to, Barbara, could we
18 distribute something to the Committee that showed the
19 reformatted form without doing another proposal?

20 MS. BETSOCK: It would be difficult to do so
21 right now because we are formally in rulemaking on the
22 Annual Reports so we should not be doing that.

23 MS. GERARD: Even if we posted it publicly?
24 The impression I have is that this is hard to envision.
25 The impression I have is that the -- is that we

1 understood the comments, that we had a way to dispose
2 of the issues, and until -- what was that term you used
3 -- about the --

4 MR. HALL: Dynamic segmentation.

5 MS. GERARD: Until dynamic segmentation came
6 up I thought we were moving to a final rule that was
7 very much considerate of the comments on the docket and
8 it was a non-controversial procedure for us to move to
9 final rule, considering those comments.

10 MS. HAMSHER: And don't get me wrong, I
11 appreciate the fact that you did listen and address
12 many of the comments, and it does sound like you're
13 generally going down the right path. I just see that
14 there's been, even though it's pared down, it still is
15 a much different Annual Report. And to tell you the
16 truth, I'll argue on the other side, there may be some
17 now that would be on the opposite side that would have
18 much stronger comments on a pared down Annual Report
19 than what they ventured to offer in this one. You've
20 just -- I think you've just changed the playing field
21 on what you're expecting to have enough that -- that I
22 think you might have a lot more people weighing in one
23 way or the other.

24 And it may be that you issue it, explain how
25 you're collecting other information and other matters

1 that it remains non-controversial, because it does
2 sound like, at least for now you're headed down the
3 right path.

4 MS. GERARD: Well, we'll ask Barbara the
5 question about what else we could share with the
6 Committee since we're in rule making and get back to
7 you on that through Cheryl.

8 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, if -- I don't see any
9 other hands, I'm thinking that it might make sense to
10 have a short break now and -- since we're going to have
11 a presentation and then a vote on the same issue, that
12 way we can have it all together. So right now it's
13 approximately 2:45, and why don't we break until three
14 and start at three. We're a little bit behind and I
15 wanted to thank both Sam Hall and Roger Little for
16 excellent assistance and presentations. And thank you,
17 everybody, for participating in the discussion. Okay.

18 (Whereupon, a 25 minute recess off the record
19 was taken.)

20 MS. EPSTEIN: Now, we're going to reconvene.
21 And our presentation now is by Buck Furrow, and after
22 we hear about the pencil changes to the Hazardous
23 Liquid Pipeline Safety Standard and have Committee
24 discussion, we'll actually have a vote on those
25 changes. Take it away.

1 **Briefing: Recommendations to Change**
2 **Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards**

3 MR. FURROW: Everybody's here. My name is
4 Buck Furrow. I'm responsible for this rulemaking being
5 published in the Federal Register last September. It
6 deals with the National Association of Pipeline Safety
7 Representatives' recommendations for changes to Part
8 195, which they presented to us in a report a few years
9 ago, based on a rather comprehensive review of Part
10 195.

11 We asked the state agencies -- just for
12 information purposes, for those of you who may not know
13 what the National Association of Pipeline Safety
14 Representatives is, it's an association of our state
15 officials that are involved in enforcing the pipeline
16 safety regulations against intra-state pipelines in the
17 various states in the country. So what they were
18 tasked to do in this review project, was to identify
19 regulations which, in their opinion, were kind of hard
20 to enforce, unclear, or insufficient for safety,
21 meaning that some change would be needed to make the
22 regulation a bit more effective.

23 The report had 30 different recommendations.
24 If anybody would actually like to read all 30, a copy
25 of the report is in the docket for this proceeding.

1 And what we did in response to that, most recently
2 anyway, was to go back and -- the report, by the way,
3 was released back in 1995. So recently we picked it up
4 again and decided we needed to do something with the
5 recommendations that we had not yet done anything with.

6 And so this is just an outline of those
7 recommendations and what happened with them.

8 Eighteen we found had been previously adopted
9 or proposed. A large number of those were in that
10 comprehensive rulemaking we had on new tank standards
11 for break out tanks. Some of the others were in a
12 rulemaking we published a couple of years ago on
13 updating our reference standards or our references to
14 industry standards. And this latest -- that left about
15 12 and we've decided to go to further rulemaking on
16 five of them. We declined rulemaking on seven. And in
17 the NPRM you'll find some explanations of why we
18 declined to adopt the seven, and I'm not going to
19 discuss those today and I think the Committee -- if it
20 wants to discuss them, it can, but what we're looking
21 for today is some discussion on the five that were in
22 the NPRM that we published last September.

23 This is just a summary of the five.
24 Requalification of welders. Currently in Part 195
25 there is no requirement that a welder meet any kind of

1 requalification requirement beyond the initial
2 qualification.

3 Backfilling -- and this has to do with
4 backfilling during construction, since it is a
5 construction regulation in Part 195.

6 Pressure test records. We ask there for a
7 minor addition to the set of records that operators are
8 currently required to keep, and the minor addition is
9 a temperature record. Was it a hot day? Did the
10 temperature change? What happened during the day.

11 Firefighter training. Firefighter training -
12 - this really relates to emergency response. There is
13 an existing regulation dealing with the training of
14 firefighters, and this would modify it to perhaps make
15 it more workable.

16 And the last one deals with what emergency
17 number do operators put on their signs that they post
18 around pump stations and break out tank areas in
19 accordance with an existing rule.

20 Now I don't know how the Committee wants to
21 proceed, but what I have next are slides that depict
22 the individual changes and I can discuss these as you
23 will see them up here. I've given maybe a slide and a
24 before and an after, present and proposed, and if you
25 want to stop and discuss it as we go along, that's

1 fine, otherwise I can just proceed through and we can
2 go back.

3 So the first change that we propose deals
4 with Section 195. 222, which is entitled "Qualification
5 of welders". Consistent with what the NAPS
6 recommended, we propose to establish a requalification
7 requirement for welders that would be very similar, if
8 not identical, to the one that's in place now for gas
9 pipeline welders, and that is, -- I have a note of that
10 -- Section 192.229(b), which already requires
11 requalification if it's been more than six months since
12 a welder engaged in any welding with a particular
13 process. And in addition --

14 MR. HARRIS: The wording is identical?

15 MR. FURROW: I would have to compare. I
16 don't know. I do have the regulations here if you'd
17 like to take a look.

18 In addition, the gas regulations require that
19 the welder must have had at least one weld tested and
20 found acceptable under the non-destructive testing
21 sections of API 1104. The only other thing I could add
22 to that is that the current B31.4 code, which is a
23 generally applicable set of voluntary standards for
24 liquid pipelines, requires requalification for welders
25 on pipelines.

1 So we didn't look at this as something
2 necessarily new to the industry or something that most
3 operators perhaps aren't already doing, particularly if
4 they use the same welders on gas and liquid lines.
5 It's more an effort to bring our regulations in line
6 with the current practice in the industry, and to have
7 the liquid regulations consistent with the gas
8 regulations. So that's all I have to say on that one.

9 Other than, let me add, there weren't any
10 comments on this particular section. As a matter of
11 fact, there were only two comments on this entire
12 rulemaking, and they were both on the same regulation
13 which we'll get to. And here we are.

14 MS. GERARD: That means we're likely to have
15 a very long discussion here.

16 MR. FURROW: Here we are, it's the very next
17 one, and I marked it in red at the top there so I
18 wouldn't forget. Backfilling. There have been some
19 problems that NAPSR representatives were familiar with
20 backfilling causing damage to pipelines, not
21 necessarily at the time of installation, but perhaps
22 later through the shifting of large rocks in the
23 backfill material or also maybe there were some organic
24 material in the backfill and it decayed and created
25 weak spots in the support.

1 So what we have presented before you are the
2 present rule, which is a rather good performance
3 standard. "Backfilling must be performed in a manner
4 that protects and pipe coating and provides firm
5 support." The fault was, from NAPSRS, that that could
6 be improved by tweaking it a little bit and making it a
7 bit more specific, although I think this is identical
8 to what we have for gas pipelines in Section
9 192.319(b). 192.319(b). The Committee liked that, for
10 example, looking at the -- particularly the second
11 bullet there -- the backfilling now must -- for gas
12 pipeline anyway -- prevent damage to the pipe and pipe
13 coating from equipment or the backfill material.

14 I've looked at this whole approach as a way
15 of refining what we have there now, adding a little bit
16 more detail, but not really doing anything, I think,
17 that good operators out there would do anyway.

18 Now there were two comments. One of them --
19 well, I won't characterize them, but just read them and
20 you will have received them --

21 MS. GERARD: Go ahead, characterize them.

22 MR. FURROW: The Florida Department of
23 Transportation pointed out -- now let me add that
24 Florida Department of Transportation is not a member of
25 NAPSRS. I think what they are is an agency that spends

1 highway dollars -

2 MS. GERARD: And that's not a bad thing.

3 MR. FURROW: They have certain monies that
4 they spend on highways, and as a part of the highway
5 construction process, they impose some conditions on
6 utilities. And some of you may be familiar with that
7 if you're in the pipeline business and across highways
8 or new highways are built where you have a pipeline.
9 But, here's what they said. They said they do not
10 allow the abandonment of utilities and also they said
11 that their backfilling requirements are more stringent
12 than what's proposed here or what we have in place.
13 Backfilling requirements are more stringent. So what
14 they wanted us to do was to add to Part 195 a statement
15 that says that Part 195 does not supersede any more
16 stringent state requirements. Any more stringent state
17 requirements would not be superseded.

18 MS. GERARD: Isn't that obvious?

19 MR. FURROW: That was their comment, in
20 essence.

21 MS. SCHELHOUS: It's not obvious that --

22 MS. GERARD: On an intra-state -- I mean on
23 an intra-state it's obvious.

24 MS. SCHELHOUS: Yes, but not on inter-state,
25 and I would believe going under highway and stuff like

1 that, when we did water and sewer lines and different
2 utility lines, when you dealt around roads, or if you
3 dug deeper than what you were supposed to, you had to
4 backfill with stone or something in order to have a
5 firm surface to put your pipe on, as opposed to make
6 sure you do certain stuff. So I'm not sure of the
7 translation relative to pipelines, per se, but --

8 MS. HAMSHER: I think we're mixing apples to
9 oranges. You don't -- why would we need anything in
10 Part 195 that would permit somebody to require specific
11 procedures with their crossing. We get into easements
12 and drain tile and railroad -- those are all specific
13 conditions of crossings that are subject of engineering
14 drawings that go back and forth before such crossing is
15 permitted, and you're opening up a can of worms on -- I
16 mean they already can require certain things as a
17 condition for that crossing -- depth, hopefully we've
18 gotten away from casings, but even casings, and there's
19 never been any reason to prohibit those types of
20 requirements before from a safety -- I don't think they
21 intend on the regulation of the facility themselves, on
22 the condition of depth or other things.

23 MR. HARRIS: No, we're not proposing to adopt
24 this Florida standard. You're not proposing that?

25 MR. FURROW: No, that wasn't part of --

1 MS. GERARD: He's just informing you about
2 the comments.

3 MR. FURROW: This is a comment that the
4 Florida Department of Transportation made.

5 MS. HAMSHER: I guess you're addressing it,
6 are you saying that they can still, on their limited
7 basis, for like if the highway is considered an
8 easement, they would -- if you're going under a highway
9 they would want you to submit drawings and stuff in
10 order to do stuff. I know in Maryland you're actually
11 you're supposed to give them drawings of where exactly
12 you went under their stuff and things like that. They
13 don't follow it real well, but --

14 MR. HARRIS: Well, that's exactly right and
15 almost every state agency is going to have some
16 requirements and you're going to have to have a permit
17 or an easement and that kind of thing, so I heard their
18 comment, and I think it's properly addressed.

19 MS. SCHELHOUS: I'm not sure the state --
20 just so long as you give some kind of response to them
21 in your preamble --

22 MS. GERARD: There's mechanisms already --
23 Buck will explain in the preamble about those types of
24 mechanisms -- those --

25 MS. WETSEL: There's a variety of mechanisms,

1 whether it's through their easement, license agreement
2 --

3 MS. HAMSHER: And they're recognized.

4 MS. WETSEL: Right.

5 MS. GERARD: Just so long --

6 MS. HAMSHER: I think they would want some
7 kind of comment back to them that that kind of thing
8 is, that's all.

9 MS. GERARD: You don't have any problem with
10 that, do you, Buck?

11 MR. FURROW: No, no.

12 MS. GERARD: Okay, moving on.

13 MR. FURROW: Moving right on.

14 MS. GERARD: What's your other comment?

15 MR. FURROW: There was one more comment. And
16 that's from the State of Washington, the Washington
17 Utilities Transportation Commission, which is a member
18 of NAPSRS --

19 MS. GERARD: And on this Committee.

20 MR. FURROW: And it suggested that backfill
21 material not contain either rocks larger than six
22 inches, or organic material such as wood that may decay
23 and cause subsidence or erosion. In other words, they
24 would like to see some regulation of the nature of the
25 backfill material, further than what we proposed.

1 MS. GERARD: Who was the commentor?

2 MR. FURROW: The specific name I don't have.

3 MS. SCHELHOUS: But actually looking at it, I
4 gather they're indicating that they've had trouble
5 where they had seen large rocks, two and three man size
6 and stuff, so --

7 MR. HARRIS: Yes, I believe the proposed
8 language addresses that concern. At least that's what
9 my opinion is.

10 MS. HAMSHER: The language says backfill that
11 prevents damage to the pipe. That would preclude
12 backfill with any rocks, and that's by nature a
13 definition. You would damage the pipes if you
14 backfilled with rocks.

15 MS. SCHELHOUS: At least for my pipelines,
16 there are non-hazardous liquid stuff. No, if you dug
17 rocks out of the hole, the backfill would -- you would
18 put the same material back into the hole in a lot of
19 backfill stuff -- actions that I've seen. It all
20 depends. You actually usually don't truck in unless
21 you have to meet -- like the highway -- certain
22 conditions. You don't truck in specific stuff for your
23 backfill.

24 MR. FURROW: Let me add to that discussion by
25 saying this regulation doesn't go to the backfill

1 material, it goes to the process of backfilling. So as
2 you just mentioned, if you remove a big rock, you can
3 put a big rock back under this regulation, but you
4 can't do it in a way that would be likely to damage the
5 pipe or the coating. At least that's the way I think
6 we looked at it. The commentor wanted to go beyond
7 that to regulate the nature of the backfill material,
8 to talk about the gradation of rocks that could be in
9 the material.

10 MS. EPSTEIN: Yes, on the Federal Register
11 notice, on page 56972 in the third column, it does say
12 that NAPSRS as a whole wanted some sort of regulation of
13 the backfill and OPS decided that wasn't needed. I
14 feel a little -- I'm not exactly in a position to argue
15 either way, but I think we're at a little bit of a
16 disadvantage not having someone from NAPSRS here to
17 discuss where that recommendation came from.

18 MR. HARRIS: Well, in my opinion, if the
19 regulation reads like that, you could backfill with
20 rock with construction techniques to protect the pipe.
21 You know, a rock shield, and that's actually used in
22 the ditch to go on and protect the pipe. So as long as
23 the pipe is protected, then I'm satisfied the backfill
24 could be almost anything. If you protect it now and
25 protect it in the future.

1 MR. FURROW: In the NPRM we gave the example
2 of using a layer of finer material next to the pipe to
3 protect that pipe against the heavier or the rocky
4 material that may be above it.

5 MS. GERARD: Just for my edification, does
6 this -- would this be applicable in a seismic area?
7 What if there was ground movement which shifted the
8 materials around the pipe? Is that possible?

9 MR. FURROW: Be more likely, I think, to
10 shift the entire pipe.

11 PARTICIPANT: But ... now separate standards
12 for pipe reinforcement at installation.

13 MS. HAMSHER: But you're going far beyond the
14 intent of what this is. This is the act of backfilling
15 when you build a pipeline, not ongoing prevention and
16 integrity management actions that might prevent
17 subsidence and other damage to coatings and all that
18 that come from rocks penetrating through the backfill
19 area. So let's not try to fix the universe with a very
20 simple solution that says, protect the pipe from damage
21 when you're -- during the process of backfilling,
22 whether that be with screened soil as is often done.
23 They don't come in with new stuff, they just screen it
24 to get the bigger rocks out, or rock shield. Either
25 way, that's a performance base measure that you protect

1 the pipe.

2 MR. FURROW: And there was no attempt here to
3 get at other issues such as protecting against outside
4 forced damage or earth movement or earthquakes, or --

5 Well, I'm prepared to move to the next one
6 hearing no further discussion. Records, and more
7 specifically, this has to do with pressure test
8 records. At present operators have a list of items
9 under 195.310 that they have to keep in connection with
10 every pressure test that are required to conduct under
11 Part 195. But there is no requirement to keep a record
12 of the temperature of the pipeline segment that's being
13 tested, and NAPSRS thought that that was important
14 because temperature can have a bearing on whether the
15 test has been properly conducted, primarily through,
16 let's say, a temperature increase which could cause a
17 pressure rise in the tested segment which could mask a
18 small leak. So, through mathematics, you can take this
19 into account, how much pressure is attributable to a
20 rise in temperature, or a drop in temperature.

21 So what we proposed was that the operators be
22 required to indicate in their records the temperature
23 of the test media or the pipe during the test period.
24 And there were no comments on this section.

25 MS. GERARD: There don't seem to be any

1 comments here either.

2 MR. FURROW: Waiting for it to digest.

3 MS. GERARD: I think they have.

4 MR. FURROW: I got it. Okay, the next one
5 has to do with emergency response training, and in
6 particular training as it relates to firefighting. At
7 present the regulation requires that operators train
8 their emergency response personnel to learn the proper
9 use of firefighting procedures and equipment, fire
10 suits and breathing apparatus. And I think it's the
11 notion of firefighting that causes a problem, and
12 particularly the use of fire suits and breathing
13 apparatus may be a little unclear as to what they have
14 to use it for, when they have to use it, and what the
15 training should consist of.

16 Given that uncertainty, we propose to fix the
17 problem with some more succinct -- I hope it's clearer,
18 starting out with basics of what would a person need as
19 a basic training in the way of what causes a fire and
20 what's likely to happen if a fire occurs.

21 MS. GERARD: This would be operator
22 personnel?

23 MR. FURROW: This would be operator
24 personnel, it would be people -- this information is
25 provided in the lead-in of the existing regulation

1 which isn't repeated here. But it would be people the
2 operator has assigned to react to emergencies. And
3 they would have some training in, for lack of a better
4 word, firefighting.

5 The second part of it deals with fire
6 extinguisher and other on-site fire control equipment.

7 Now there is another regulation in Part 195 that
8 describes the equipment that operators have to have,
9 and it may be described in a performance way, but
10 there's another regulation that says you have to have
11 these things at pump stations and break out tank areas.

12 So this proposal is merely to require the operator to
13 train the people that they're going to be responding to
14 emergencies and how to use the existing equipment. And
15 to be able to recognize consequences of fire and
16 potential causes of fire.

17 Apparently everyone who read this liked it,
18 because there were no comments. So it's -- and I think
19 that's been kind of a lingering sore spot ever since it
20 was established.

21 MS. SCHELHOUS: I guess they basically pulled
22 it back to where it's supposed to be, because it's
23 hazard awareness is what you're doing and basic
24 prevention relative to on-site fire equipment, or
25 portable -- what you would, in a small situation, for

1 the most part. Other than that, you have to meet OSHA
2 requirements and different other requirements if you
3 want to use SCBA and all this other kind of stuff. So
4 the training requirements are massive, such that -- and
5 wouldn't provide you with that much relative to your
6 locations and all that. So it's better to leave and
7 call 911, recognize that there is a hazard and do it,
8 so that's why you don't have comments on it.

9 MR. FURROW: Okay, last one. This is the
10 last slide. It deals with signs at pump stations and
11 break out tank areas. I think this is the only other
12 sign operators have to install under the regulations,
13 apart from line marking signs. And there is some -- in
14 the proposal there is some effort to be consistent with
15 the line marking signs. The existing regulation
16 requires that the signs show an emergency telephone
17 number to contact, meaning if someone is in the area
18 and they see something that is, in their view, an
19 emergency, they can call and notify the operator.

20 The problem that NAPSRS found was that in
21 their experience, oftentimes no one would answer the
22 phone, or it wasn't a phone that was working at all
23 times. So what they suggested was that we make the
24 regulation specifically state that the telephone number
25 has to be a number where the operator can be reached at

1 all times. And that's the part that's consistent with
2 the line marking signs. Currently line marking signs
3 have to indicate a number where the operator can be
4 reached at all times. So that's the basic change in
5 signs for pump stations and break out tank areas. And
6 there really were no comments on that, not even a
7 comment saying well how long do I have to go out and
8 change the numbers? My guess is that after this rule,
9 assuming that it will go into effect, people will
10 straighten out any -- numbers.

11 MS. GERARD: When do we write rules that
12 don't go into effect?

13 MR. FURROW: When we withdraw them because
14 there's so many adverse comments.

15 MS. HAMSHER: Just a question of curiosity.
16 You drew parallels to many of these -- three, I think,
17 of the five changes, to existing language in the gas
18 rule. On both the training and signs, is there
19 parallel language? If not, should there be?

20 MR. FURROW: I don't mean to --

21 MS. HAMSHER: Because to me, the issue of 24
22 hour contact is equally important to compressor
23 stations as it is pump stations.

24 MR. FURROW: I think this, without --
25 somebody can check me, but I don't think there are any

1 comparable either signing requirement for gas pipelines
2 or training requirements for gas pipelines.

3 MS. HAMSHER: The problematic language on the
4 training, on training -- on requiring an operator to
5 train employees at a level of firefighting that you
6 wouldn't expect them to perform, I would agree with you
7 that that problematic language isn't there, but this
8 performance-based language on the training, knowing
9 what to do and how to recognize it, and on the signing
10 to me would be parallel, whether there was a needed
11 change in Part 192 or not, I don't know. But the need
12 --

13 MS. GERARD: Well, we have a separate
14 rulemaking that Buck is talking about on Thursday that
15 deals with other recommendations for changes. That's
16 beyond the scope of this issue.

17 MS. HAMSHER: It was more curiosity. Thank
18 you.

19 MR. FURROW: If anybody has any more
20 questions I'll be happy to answer them.

21 MS. SCHELHOUS: I guess I wanted more just an
22 explanation or if you could, a briefing, as to --
23 because Florida talked about the abandonment versus out
24 of service, and I guess I would just like to try to
25 understand. You decided not to address their ruling,

1 and I just -- I don't know what you allow and don't
2 allow at this point, so I just would like to understand
3 what you do do.

4 MR. FURROW: Part 195 allows operators to
5 abandon pipelines under procedures that they are
6 required to develop. There is no specific regulation
7 on abandonment, apart from a requirement in the
8 operation and maintenance section that calls for
9 operators to have abandonment procedures. There may be
10 some minor detail there, but it's certainly not
11 significant. I think the issue was -- with Florida
12 Department of Transportation that they don't allow
13 abandonment at all, and they felt the inconsistency
14 where we do allow it under procedures, would override
15 their not allowing it.

16 MS. SCHELHOUS: Well they allow an out of
17 service versus an abandonment, but if you're not going
18 to use it kind of deal, then they have abandonment. I
19 guess I'm used to dealing with wells and septic systems
20 and different things like that, so it's allowing where
21 you have conduits, if they're open or something, you
22 can allow contamination if it's not checked. I think
23 they're looking for, if you're doing it in service,
24 there's certain -- out of service, I mean, they're
25 looking at their certain performance conditions to

1 something you call out of service that have to be met
2 to be sure it isn't causing any problems or leakage or
3 contamination, versus if you are totally not going to
4 use it, then you basically -- sometimes it's concrete,
5 seal it up, do something. I don't know how pipelines,
6 how you --

7 MS. EPSTEIN: I actually think it is a real
8 issue that people don't always address, and I think the
9 problem is that OPS doesn't have a definition of idle
10 or out of service or abandoned. As Buck said, there's
11 just a process for operators to develop something.
12 There is no enforceable rules, and in Alaska, it has
13 been a problem where you have pipelines abandoned off
14 shore with liquids in them, and sometimes an operator
15 does something about it and sometimes they don't. So I
16 think this is an important area of discussion and I am
17 concerned that OPS decided not to address this aspect
18 of NAPSRS petition, because I think it is an important
19 one and there are some state rules, but the state rules
20 don't cover the same universe of pipelines as OPS's
21 rules. Alex, you've got the regs in front of you?

22 MR. FURROW: I can just pull them out and
23 see. We do have a definition of abandoned, by the way.
24 It means "permanently remove from service".

25 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, but what happens is if

1 you have an idle line and someone says, it's not
2 abandoned, it's idle. And you don't have a definition
3 of idle, and that could go on forever because no one's
4 required --

5 MR. HARRIS: You have to protect it, believe
6 me, I know. And there are requirements that are
7 imposed on you if you have an idle line.

8 MR. FURROW: We have always applied the
9 regulation --

10 MR. HARRIS: It's a full regulation.

11 MS. EPSTEIN: But sometimes you have transfer
12 of ownership. There are situations where things fall
13 through the cracks, and that's what I'm raising a
14 concern that there's not enforcement, you don't have
15 specific requirements. You could have something idle
16 for a very long time, and containing liquid fuel and
17 not have anything done about it.

18 MS. HAMSHER: You have to fully protect and
19 operated under all requirements of the code.

20 MS. EPSTEIN: That's not happening. I can
21 say that.

22 MS. HAMSHER: Well, but if you're saying
23 that's not happening, that's not a regulation problem,
24 that may be an enforcement problem. If you're required
25 to fully protect, cathodically protect and operate that

1 line, if it's in a High Consequence Area you have all
2 those requirements. The only time that you go through
3 an abandon is when you go through and you're not using
4 it. I would guess where the problem is -- because we
5 run into it often -- is that they require you to move
6 the steel out of the ground, and if it's clean and
7 purged, and sometimes they do require that, and it is
8 often and can very safely be done to abandon in place
9 and purge and clean pipe and leave it under there.

10 MS. EPSTEIN: There isn't anything -- Buck,
11 could you read what the requirements are for
12 abandonment?

13 MR. FURROW: Yes, I can read that if I can
14 find it. And it's section 195.402(c.10). The manual,
15 requirement of paragraph (a) which refers to the
16 operational maintenance manual, "must include
17 procedures for the following to provide safety during
18 maintenance and normal operation". Item 10, it's not
19 too long, I'll read it fast. "Abandoning pipeline
20 facilities, including safe disconnection from an
21 operating pipeline system, purging of combustibles, and
22 sealing abandoned facilities left in place to minimize
23 safety and environmental hazards." So the procedures
24 must touch all those bases. And there's some more
25 about reporting data on abandoned off shore pipelines.

1 MS. EPSTEIN: So it needs to be in a manual,
2 but in terms of what an operator has to do, this is
3 actually a very important point I'm concerned. It has
4 to be in the manual --

5 MR. FURROW: Procedures.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: What happens if someone is not
7 doing it?

8 MR. FURROW: Well, the manual's a regulation
9 in fact.

10 MS. EPSTEIN: But if the manual -- and maybe
11 it's a question for Barbara -- if the manual says they
12 have to do it, and then there's a pipeline on the
13 ground that's not following the manual --

14 MR. FURROW: They're in violation of the
15 regulations.

16 MS. EPSTEIN: They're in violation, but they
17 say, well, it's not abandoned because it's going to be
18 --

19 MS. HAMSHER: It has to be fully protected
20 under Part 195. It's either or.

21 MS. BETSOCK: We have not had any trouble
22 enforcing this one over the years. It is required to
23 be purged and capped and -- unless it's -- and
24 maintained if it's not. I think it's 195.402 says that
25 you not only have to have those procedures but you have

1 to follow them. There is a blanket requirement to
2 follow them.

3 MS. EPSTEIN: Where is that?

4 MS. BETSOCK: I think it's 195.402. I don't
5 have my regs.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, that's --

7 MS. BETSOCK: So they do have to follow them
8 and we've had no trouble enforcing it.

9 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, just to give people why I
10 am so concerned about this, there was an off shore
11 underwater pipeline in Cook Inlet that this summer BP
12 acquired and never operated it. They got it from Amoco
13 and ARCO before that, and they called to say that they
14 -- the story that they were voluntarily purging it, now
15 no one was forcing them to do it, they were going to do
16 it, it wasn't a requirement that they needed to do it,
17 and they just wanted everybody to know that they were
18 going to create sheens and leaks in the process and
19 they had all the emergency response folks around to
20 make sure that when they knew there were going to be
21 leaks that there would be some way of preventing it.
22 But I find it interesting that for so many years
23 previous owners did not do anything about that pipeline
24 and it was only when a new operator came, and I don't
25 know that there was OPS pressure to do anything about

1 that either. So that's my concern about enforcement.

2 Can I raise another question that OPS had
3 made a decision on? The valves -- location of the
4 valves. This is in the Federal Register notice 56972.

5 Essentially NAPSRS was recommending that OPS establish
6 a ten mile maximum distance between shutoff valves to
7 minimize the size of releases, and OPS said well, we
8 have this integrity management requirement that
9 operators decide whether or not there's a need for
10 shutoff valves, and that covers that particular NAPSRS
11 recommendation.

12 Now, I don't have the regs in front of me but
13 I understand there's a fair amount of operator's
14 discretion on that, am I correct, about the citing of
15 the --

16 MS. WETSEL: The placement of the valves?

17 MS. EPSTEIN: Yes.

18 MS. HAMSHER: Well there are some minimum
19 requirements but then in addition to the integrity
20 management rules then there would be risk-based
21 considerations (off mike) ... I'm sorry.

22 MR. HARRIS: Just setting an arbitrary ten
23 mile standard, I don't believe is a proper thing. It
24 needs to be an analysis of what the pipeline could
25 affect, and you need to do land flow models, that kind

1 of thing, you need to look at maximal probable
2 throughput and those types of things which should
3 govern the spacing of valves. And not just some
4 arbitrary ten mile -- and that would be in, the way I
5 see it, inside of an operator's integrity management
6 program, that they perform these types of risk
7 analysis.

8 MS. GERARD: And there's specific protocols
9 on the website that go to the standards that we're
10 using to evaluate the decisions on that. It's about 30
11 pages.

12 MS. EPSTEIN: I guess I understand the
13 concern about the arbitrary distance. My question is
14 is there a need to look at the integrity management
15 program results to see if it meets the intent of what
16 this recommendation is, and I guess I'm questioning
17 whether there should be some sort of analysis over the
18 next couple of years by OPS that the integrity
19 management program's rules are actually having the
20 intended effect.

21 MS. GERARD: There's already, as I recall,
22 there's a statutory requirement, isn't there, Barb,
23 that after a period of three years that we revisit the
24 extent to which the -- look at the cost and benefits of
25 having implemented it and decide whether or not to

1 consider expanding the protection system-wide? I know
2 that was in the proposal, I'm not sure --

3 MS. BETSOCK: I'm not sure right now.

4 MS. GERARD: In any case, we're committed to
5 doing that.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: But that's an expansion system-
7 wide as opposed to whether it's actually working even
8 within the High Consequence Areas. That's a somewhat
9 separate question is what I'm raising, to see whether
10 the rules are doing what they need to be doing.

11 MS. GERARD: Well, maybe what you should be
12 doing, as a Committee making a recommendation on how we
13 evaluate the effectiveness of the integrity management
14 program in specific areas of concentration. We just
15 started it, but I think it's certainly appropriate for
16 you to talk to us about how we know it's working.

17 MS. HAMSHER: The only question I have is we
18 leapfrogged -- leapt, I'm sorry, correct my grammar, we
19 leapt from the issue of spacing of valves to evaluating
20 the IMP rule, that's a big leap.

21 MS. EPSTEIN: I was saying it with respect to
22 valves.

23 MS. HAMSHER: But what would you be looking
24 for? That more valves were put in place?

25 MS. EPSTEIN: No, I think I would be looking

1 for -- to see if the spacing is protective in a rough
2 sense, equivalent to if it were spaced every ten miles
3 or, you know, what kind of releases, what size releases
4 are being prevented? Are we, as a result of the rule,
5 reducing the potential size of release compared to --

6 MS. HAMSHER: Well, there might be another
7 mechanism under Part 194, because we're talking about
8 liquid, you have to report some of your worst-case
9 scenarios, and it's kind of a proxy for that. Are
10 those being reduced, because your worst-case scenarios
11 now are smaller for a variety of reasons, including
12 valve spacing.

13 MS. EPSTEIN: Is that connected to the High
14 Consequence Areas? The worst case scenarios? I didn't
15 think it was, so you might have a worst-case scenario
16 outside, which means they're not looking at the
17 integrity management effect.

18 MS. GERARD: This to me is sort of beyond the
19 scope of what we propose. What we could do -- I mean
20 this is a pretty significant issue, we could make an
21 agenda item on the next meeting to look at the
22 protocols that we're using in the integrity management
23 program. This is something that we've spent quite a
24 bit of time on, talking about, and we've been updating
25 them. They've been recently updated only a few weeks

1 ago, and we could do a briefing on specifically that
2 subject and the Committee could take a look at the
3 accuracy of those protocols.

4 MR. HARRIS: I think that gets to where Lois
5 is coming from. I believe it does, if we look at that.

6 MS. EPSTEIN: Can you explain that a little
7 bit more?

8 MR. HARRIS: Well, we look at the actual
9 protocols and what they're actually looking for in the
10 field, and then when it gets to the issue of valves,
11 they should have something about valves and protocols
12 and how -- and I think it gets more to the meat of what
13 you're asking.

14 MS. GERARD: The fact that these protocols
15 are public, and the operators see what the instruction
16 is to the inspectors, the operators know essentially
17 what standards they're going to have to meet to get a
18 passing grade in that inspection. And I believe that
19 the section and the protocols is about some 30-
20 something pages. The protocols alone. So I think it
21 would be an illuminating briefing for the Committee to
22 look at that question. So we have a rulemaking in
23 place and oversight approach that we reviewed with the
24 NTSB. I know that they've looked at that question and
25 it's sort of a current discussion item, so why not make

1 it an issue for the next Committee meeting?

2 MS. EPSTEIN: Looking at the protocols more
3 generally? or specifically?

4 MS. GERARD: We can specifically send the
5 protocols to you. I mean, they're available on the
6 web, but to make a specific point of preparing for a
7 discussion with the Committee about what everybody
8 thinks about how they're working from all standpoints,
9 from the operator's standpoint, or the public
10 representatives standpoint. And we can explain what
11 data would be going into our database that Roger was
12 talking about earlier, so you'd know what we know and
13 what we record. Same information would be available to
14 you if that all became part of the mapping system.

15 MS. EPSTEIN: Buck, when NAPSRS submitted
16 their petitions, did they give particular examples or
17 were there particular states? Because I'm just again
18 feeling at a disadvantage because they were in the
19 position to say something more was needed, and I don't
20 know how comfortable they are with OPS' response. So I
21 would think hearing from them, how they feel about the
22 protocols would be pretty important.

23 MR. FURROW: You're speaking of the report
24 now? NAPSRS' report.

25 MS. EPSTEIN: Right.

1 MR. FURROW: I don't recall any examples. A
2 lot of it was rather thin as far as basis and
3 background. There were some places enabled us to take
4 a look at their decision making, but I don't recall any
5 on this one. As a matter of fact, I added the
6 references that came in to it -- the previous DOT
7 studies on the issue and the fact that it really
8 culminated in the integrity management rulemaking.

9 MS. GERARD: The other thing is that the
10 state member on this committee took the action of
11 sending in her support for the rulemaking with a letter
12 to the Committee, so she certainly could have raised
13 the issue for additional consideration.

14 MR. FURROW: The other thing to keep in mind
15 here is that the NAPSRS recommendation only went to
16 valves, and by any simple reasoning, just the spacing
17 of valves isn't going to work, I think, unless you also
18 have some type of remote control capability, some type
19 of rapid leak detection, some type of telecommunication
20 of data back to a central -- you're talking about a
21 rather elaborate system that goes far beyond putting a
22 valve every ten miles.

23 MS. HAMSHER: I just think it's important to
24 note that you propose rulemaking that did not include
25 this issue, and you received no comments on your lack

1 of proposing. There's not a controversy. I think
2 there's some issues. I think how it's being addressed
3 under the IMP plan is well worth exploring, as Lois
4 recommends, but there's no controversy that I've seen
5 that you're not proceeding with the rulemaking on valve
6 spacing.

7 MR. HARRIS: I have a procedural thing. We
8 have five issues on the table that we need to vote on.
9 Can we just go on and vote on those and --

10 MS. GERARD: I think we can vote on all of
11 them, just the rule. You don't need to take them one
12 by one.

13 MR. HARRIS: What I'm recommending is that we
14 do that, and if there's any other discussion on NAPS
15 or whatever, I think if we can have that after we vote.

16 MS. EPSTEIN: Well, I guess I considered this
17 discussion -- I know there was a hand or two in the
18 audience relevant because we can also say we approve
19 this with request for either changes or additional
20 actions. So at this point, anyone else on the
21 Committee have additional comments, and then we can
22 open it up to the audience? Okay, anyone in the
23 audience like to weigh in on this discussion? Marti?

24 MS. MATHISON: Actually what I'd like to
25 weigh in on was the discussion of spill size and the

1 idea that valves reduce spill size. I think we always
2 need to recognize that we have the bigger picture in
3 front of us at all times. If you look at the 30 year
4 performance of the oil pipeline industry, the size of
5 spills has been reduced dramatically over the last 30
6 years. I don't have the numbers with me or I'd quote
7 the numbers. The average size is dramatically less
8 than it was 30 years ago. The volume spilled is some
9 60 to 70 percent less than it was 30 years ago, so
10 regardless of whether or not you're specifically asking
11 for additional valves, you have to see that the
12 combination of the competence of the operators and the
13 quality and utility of the regulations have served to
14 reduce the number and size of spills exponentially. So
15 we have success here, and we're really talking about
16 the details.

17 MS. EPSTEIN: Anyone else like to make a
18 comment before we move to a vote?

19 MS. GERARD: The other option you would have
20 is to have Marvin do his cost benefit and then vote on
21 the both of them.

22 MS. EPSTEIN: Is the Committee comfortable
23 with doing that, having a related presentation first
24 and then voting on both? Okay, go ahead Marvin.

25 **Briefing: Draft Regulatory Evaluation to the NPRM**

1 **Recommendations to Change Hazardous Liquid**
2 **Pipeline Safety Standards**

3 MR. FELL: I'm Marvin Fell, the economist for
4 the Office. This should only take a very few minutes.
5 You all have had a chance to look at the draft
6 regulatory evaluation. I apologize there was some
7 confusion. We put some in the wrong docket. It may
8 have appeared more than one time.

9 Let me briefly go over. There were five
10 changes that were proposed. The first one, the
11 qualification for welders, as Buck pointed out earlier,
12 is identical to American Society of Mechanical
13 Engineers B31.4, and it's also similar to what the gas
14 industry already has, so we believe that there was
15 little cost impact of this. Probably not a lot of
16 benefit either, but for those who are maybe not
17 following it, there may be some improvements.

18 The backfilling requirement was similar to
19 192.319(b) which is already used by the gas industry.
20 It was mostly a clarification, so this would also have
21 very little cost. It might have some minimal benefit
22 if some operators were using improper material.

23 The third option is just the adding of the
24 temperature on hydrostatic testing. We figured
25 operators already had this information, it's just a

1 matter of recording it, so this is a rather minimal
2 requirement. But it would add -- it may add some
3 beneficial information.

4 Item number four on training took out some
5 ambiguous words like "fire suit and breathing
6 apparatus" and mentioned, as was mentioned earlier, it
7 really requires training in portable equipment, the
8 equipment that will be used in a fire before you bring
9 in the fire department.

10 The last item on signs was merely that the
11 phone number should have someone who's answering the
12 phone seemed pretty reasonable and not an expensive
13 proposition.

14 So we concluded this regulation would have
15 very little cost impact and it might provide a small
16 margin of safety improvement. That's the conclusion of
17 my remarks.

18 MS. EPSTEIN: Any discussion on Marvin's
19 presentation either from the Committee or the audience?

20 Okay, hearing no discussion, I think we can have a
21 motion at this point as to first, whether or not we'd
22 like to approve? There is sample language we've been
23 given. Anyone like to make a motion?

24

Vote

25 MR. HARRIS: Yes. I move that the proposed

1 rule as published in the Federal Register and the draft
2 regulatory evaluation are technically feasible,
3 reasonable, cost effective and practical.

4 MS. EPSTEIN: We have a motion. Do we have a
5 second?

6 MS. HAMSHER: I'll second the motion.

7 MS. GERARD: We have one vote in writing.

8 MS. EPSTEIN: From the Washington Utilities
9 and Transportation Commission whose representative is
10 not here today. Everyone in favor please say aye.

11 PARTICIPANTS: Aye.

12 MS. EPSTEIN: Anybody opposed?

13 (no response.)

14 MS. EPSTEIN: Motion approved.

15 MS. HAMSHER: ... five of the members who are
16 here that are present, plus the sixth can count as a
17 majority of the existing members?

18 MS. GERARD: I think even five would be a
19 majority.

20 MS. HAMSHER: Okay.

21 MS. GERARD: Plus you have the unique
22 advantage of having a two, two, and two split. So
23 everybody is equally disadvantaged in their lack of
24 representation, which we apologize for.

25 MS. EPSTEIN: So our joint vote took us to

1 the end of the agenda. Anything else, Stacey?

2 MS. GERARD: Let's see, we're going to pick
3 up the parity issue tomorrow, which we thought if we
4 finished early we might have brought up the parity
5 issue, but I think that -- are there any questions or
6 are there recommendations by the Committee for items we
7 want to take up at the next meeting? We'll take
8 recommendations.

9 MS. HAMSHER: I guess I just can't let this
10 part of the Committee go without making some comment.
11 While we made light of it that it is equally not
12 representative, I have to say that I think that the
13 reappointments following up on nominations has just
14 going to be done if OPS is going to use the Advisory
15 Committees the way they are, they should be, to the
16 extent practical, fully staffed.

17 MS. GERARD: The reappointment package has
18 been moved to the Secretary's office.

19 MS. SCHELHOUS: I was just going to ask for a
20 status or date as to when we were going to get full
21 staffed, and then the other issue was, or whether our
22 three years was up and whether we were reappointed or
23 not, and then your date for the next meeting. I think
24 we wanted a discussion on that because we may not be
25 available.

1 MS. EPSTEIN: During the break a few of us
2 were discussing your proposal to have a meeting later
3 in May. It's unclear whether it's for our Committee or
4 not.

5 MS. GERARD: We were talking about that we
6 really need a meeting in May of the gas Committee. We
7 don't really need a meeting of this Committee, because
8 I don't think we're going to have anything else for you
9 to vote on. We might have reasons to talk about
10 mapping in general with the public and but we did talk
11 about what we could do to resolve the question about
12 the Annual Report is to reopen the docket. We can put
13 on -- reopen the docket for comments.

14 We can reopen the docket on the Annual
15 Reports. We can ask Roger to reprocess the form based
16 on his analysis of the docket comments and the
17 disposition of those comments that he discussed with
18 the Committee, so that we can then share with everyone
19 what the new Annual Report would look like, and
20 indicate those areas that, at a future date, might be
21 suitable for geospatial submission or for voluntary
22 geospatial submission, and then have perhaps a phone
23 meeting with the Committee to see whether or not the
24 Committee feels that seeing the reconfigured form, that
25 we have in fact reasonably addressed the comments and

1 the concern that has been raised about the practical
2 difficulties have been resolved.

3 If after that conversation with the Committee
4 we feel that there is still great controversy, at that
5 point we could consider reproposing. I'm still
6 optimistic that when you see the reconfigured form that
7 you'll feel better about what it looks like. And I,
8 frankly, am anxious to complete this action as it
9 stands as a completed action, because it's a subject of
10 a number of recommendations to us by oversight
11 organizations and I think that some progress would be
12 better than delay. And that we can consider the
13 technological issues separately.

14 So that's what we propose to do, is see how
15 quickly Roger can put the form on the public docket and
16 let you know when it's available and give you some time
17 to review it, and rather than meeting in person just
18 for that in May, I don't know that we'll have a lot of
19 other business for you in May, and I don't know of any
20 reason why we need to have you meet with the gas
21 Committee in the next few months.

22 We obviously have a very pressing statutory
23 deadline on the gas side, which fortunately, you, as
24 the liquid Committee don't have to address. Of course
25 you're welcome to come to the meeting -- meetings, but

1 I don't think we need to see you in May and we can look
2 at our progress of other business and see about a
3 meeting later in the year.

4 So if that's acceptable, we can then contact
5 you when we've got the Annual Report on the docket and
6 set a date for a phone call, probably in a couple of
7 months.

8 MS. SCHELHOUS: I think we all were just kind
9 of also interested in the public meeting and being able
10 to attend that or not.

11 MS. GERARD: Well, are you saying that the
12 end of May would be a bad date for the public meeting
13 on mapping? Is that what you're saying?

14 MS. HAMSHER: I guess I was focused on
15 availability if it was this Advisory Committee meeting.
16 Our lack of availability for a mapping public meeting
17 may not influence the selection of your dates. There
18 are many other people that have to be, and should be at
19 that mapping public meeting. If we're not expecting to
20 have any action right now by the Committee, and there's
21 plenty of time as this plays itself out for the
22 Committees in their formal roles to get up to speed,
23 whether it's scheduled then and we're not available is
24 irrelevant.

25 MS. GERARD: Okay. The only other -- you

1 know, we're going to discuss tomorrow our progress on
2 operator qualification. We're going to discuss
3 tomorrow our progress on communication. There's so
4 many items that have become joint, which I happen to
5 think is a good thing, as liquid members, if you feel
6 tomorrow that there's business that you want to
7 reconvene the Committee on within the next several
8 months, why don't you let us know tomorrow? But we
9 have a lot of joint items tomorrow for discussion, and
10 then you can make a judgement at the end of that day.

11 MS. HAMSHER: And it may be just that we can
12 satisfy that later, but if the decision is made that
13 there does not need to be a joint meeting and you do
14 have a gas meeting and that pushes off the next meeting
15 into fall or later, I do think that that's a problem.
16 There are many joint efforts that are in place and that
17 are going on that will be played out over the summer
18 and fall -- OQ criteria, the initiation of some of the
19 regulatory bill requirements on public awareness
20 standards -- so I think it really just depends on when
21 you're going to have a gas one and then if that delays
22 too long the need to have a liquid one.

23 The only other comment I would have is this
24 is a pretty substantial new people on this Committee
25 and many years ago we had, if you will, awareness or

1 pipeline -- kind of a touch and feel session at
2 pipeline facilities for Committee members. I would
3 recommend that, in consideration of the next meeting,
4 whenever that is, expecting that by that time it is
5 staffed, that you have appointments up, that you
6 consider having that in a location such that both the
7 Committee meeting can be held and a nearby pipeline
8 facility might be available so people can, particularly
9 the new ones, get kind of an overview in more of a
10 hands-on way.

11 MS. GERARD: Duly noted. I think that our
12 work is just -- I just can't think of anything else
13 that's going to be coming up in the near future where
14 we're going to have a proposal out that's going to
15 require a vote. I just think it'll be some months
16 before we have anything of a liquid proposal.

17 MS. HAMSHER: You're going to go, I would
18 guess, on the new role of the Advisory -- you might
19 want to talk about any roles on the research and
20 development standpoint in the pipeline safety bill.

21 MS. GERARD: Well, we'll be doing a briefing
22 on that tomorrow, and we obviously have a planning
23 process where we get into that and Jeff will be talking
24 about that tomorrow. Alright, with that --

25 MS. EPSTEIN: Anything else? Anybody in the

1 room?

2 MR. ALVARADO: Stacey, if you're going to
3 revisit the Annual Reporting form, I don't think it
4 makes much difference, but there's a couple places
5 where off shore is mentioned, and maybe we get to visit
6 on that information to see what we have on that, to see
7 if maybe we could simplify it further on those areas.

8 MS. GERARD: Okay.

9 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay, thanks. Last call.

10 MS. GERARD: And our starting time tomorrow
11 is --

12 MS. EPSTEIN: Tomorrow morning the starting
13 time is, for the Joint Committee meeting, nine a.m.,
14 and the meeting today is adjourned. Thank you
15 everybody.

16 (Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the hearing in the
17 above captioned matter was adjourned, to be reconvened
18 as a Joint Committee meeting tomorrow morning,
19 Wednesday, March 26, 2003, at 9:00 a.m.)