

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
JOINT MEETINGS

TECHNICAL PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEE
TECHNICAL HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS
COMMITTEE

Thursday,
August 19, 2010

The above captioned matter convened via
conference call, pursuant to notice at 1:00 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON:

Hon. Collette D. Honorable

CONVENTER:

Mr. Jeff Wiese

Executive Court Reporters
(301) 565-0064

TECHNICAL HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS(Present via phone)

Hon. Lula M. Ford
Commissioner
Illinois Commerce Commission
527 East Capitol Ave
Springfield, IL 62701

Larry Davied
Vice President, Technical Services
Magellan Midstream Partners
Mail Drop 27
One Williams Center
Tulsa, OK 74172

Denise Hamsher
Director
Public, Government and Regulatory Affairs
Enbridge (U.S.A.) Pipeline
1409 Hammond Ave.
Superior, WI 54880

Richard B. Kuprewicz
President, Accufacts, Inc.
4643 192nd Drive NE
Redmond, WA 98074

C. Todd Denton
Vice President, Pipeline and Terminal Operations
NuStar Energy, LP
2330 N. Loop 1604 W
San Antonio, TX 78248

Massoud Tahamtani
Director, Division of Utility and Railroad Safety
Virginia State Corporation Commission
1300 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23119

Lisa Parker
 Consultant
 Parker Horn Company
 P.O. Box 1234
 Soldotna, Alaska 99669-1234

Larry M. Shelton
 Manager, Asset Integrity
 Sunoco Logistics
 One Fluor Daniel Drive
 Building A, Level 3
 Sugar Land, TX 77478-5095

Carl M. Weimer
 Executive Director
 Pipeline Safety Trust
 1155 N. State Street, Suite 609
 Bellingham, Washington 98225

Craig Pierson
 Vice President of Operations
 Marathon Ashland Pipe Line LLC
 539 South Main St.
 Findlay, OH 45840-3229

TECHNICAL PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Hon. Collette D. Honorable
 Commissioner
 Arkansas Public Service Commission
 1000 Center
 Little Rock, AR 72203-0400

J. Andrew Drake
 Spectra Energy
 Vice President Transmission Services
 5400 Westheimer Court
 Houston, TX 77056

Jeryl L. Mohn
 Panhandle Energy
 Senior Vice President Operations and Engineering
 5444 Westheimer Road
 Houston, Tx 77056

James F. Wunderlin
Senior Vice President
Engineering and Business Operations
Southwest gas Corporation
5241 Spring Mountain Road
Las Vegas, NV 89105-0002

Donald J. Stursma
Iowa Utilities Board
350 Maple Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0069

Peter G. Terranova
Vice President of Opeations
UGI Utilities, Inc.
225 Morgantown Road
Reading, PA 19611-1949

Dr. Richard (Gene) Feigel
Vice President Engineering
Hartford Steam Boiler
One State Street
Hartford, CT 06102-5024

Theodore C. Lemoff
Senior Engineer
National Fire Protection Association
One Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02269

Paul S. Rothman
The Port Authority of NY and NJ
Engineering Architecture Design Division
2 Gateway Center, 16th floor
Newark, NJ 17102

PHMSA present:

Cynthia Quarterman
Administrator

Jeff Wiese
Acting Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety

John Gale

Cheryl Whetsel
Transportation Specialist

Alan Mayberry

Cameron Satterthwaite

Linda Daugherty

Ben Fred, Attorney

Representative of NTSB

Ravindra Chhatre

Presenter:

Mike Israni

Also present via phone:

Carl Skolnik
Member of the public

Karen Simon
Member of the public

I N D E X

<u>Agenda Item:</u>	<u>Page</u>
WELCOME , Jeff Wiese	8
ROLL CALL , Cheryl Whetzel	8
OPENING REMARKS , Ms. Quarterman	12
OPENING REMARKS , Mr. Wiese	20
OFFICIAL START OF MEETING , Ms. Honorable	23
STATUS OF PHMSA RULEMAKING INITIATIVES	
25 Mr. Gale	
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN PROCESS RELATED TO CONSENSUS STANDARDS , Mr. Wiese	30
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	33
GAP ANALYSIS , Mr. Israni	46
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	49
EXCESS FLOW VALVES , Mr. Israni	56
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	60
ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS OF THE COMMITTEE Mr. Wiese	68
HOW TO BEST CONDUCT BUSINESS , Mr. Weise	71
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, COMMENTS	76
PUBLIC COMMENTS	83
CLOSING REMARKS	86

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 1:08 p.m.

2 OPERATOR: Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you
3 for standing by. Welcome to the Joint Meeting of the
4 Technical Pipeline safety Standards Committee
5 Conference Call. I will like to now turn the
6 conference over to your host, Mr. Jeff Wiese.

7 **OPENING AND WELCOME**

8 MR. WIESE: Ann, thanks for your help, and
9 welcome everyone. Apologize for getting a little bit
10 of a late start. We took the shorthand version of the
11 committees, so I welcome the members of both
12 committees. If you will allow me before we begin, I'd
13 like to thank anyone who's attended in person, as well
14 as the vast majority of people who are attending today
15 by telephone, for taking time out of your schedules to
16 join us to talk about what we think are some fairly
17 important issues.

18 I'd also like to take a quick moment to
19 remind you that this is a recorded public meeting, so
20 it's really helpful during the session, if you're going
21 to ask a question or make a statement, rhetorical or
22 otherwise, that you identify yourself by name and state

1 your affiliation. So without any further ado, maybe
2 I'll ask Cheryl, if you will, to run a roll call.

3 MS. WHETZEL: If you can just say you're
4 here, if you are.

5 **ROLL CALL**

6 MS. WHETZEL: Collette Honorable.

7 MS. HONORABLE: Present.

8 MS. WHETZEL: Don Stursma. Mike Comstock.
9 Andy Drake.

10 MR. DRAKE: Here.

11 MS. WHETZEL: Jeryl Mohn.

12 MR. MOHN: I'll be present, on mute.

13 MS. WHETZEL: Peter Terranova.

14 MR. TERRANOVA. Here.

15 MS. WHETZEL: Jim Wunderlin.

16 MR. WUNDERLIN: I'm here.

17 MS. WHETZEL: Richard Feigel.

18 DR. FEIGEL: Here.

19 MS. WHETZEL: Tedd Lemoff.

20 MR. LEMOFF: Here.

21 MS. WHETZEL: Rick Pevarski. Paul Rothman.

22 MR. ROTHMAN: Here.

1 MS. WHETZEL: Alan Schuman. John Bresland.
2 Lula Ford.
3 MS. FORD: Here.
4 MS. WHETZEL: Massoud.
5 MR. TAHAMTANIN: Here.
6 MS. WHETZEL: You know I never do your last
7 name. Sorry.
8 MR. WIESE: He's been called worse, as he's
9 said.
10 MS. WHETZEL: Larry Davied.
11 MR. DAVIED: Here.
12 MS. WHETZEL: Denise Hamsher.
13 MS. HAMSHER: Here.
14 MS. WHETZEL: Todd Denton.
15 MR. DENTON: Here.
16 MS. WHETZEL: Craig Pierson.
17 MR. PIERSON: Here.
18 MS. WHETZEL: Larry Shelton.
19 MR. SHELTON: Here.
20 MS. WHETZEL: Tim Butlers. Gerry Edens.
21 Richard Kuprewicz.
22 MR. KUPREWICZ: Here.

1 MS. WHETZEL: Lisa Parker.

2 MS. PARKER: Here.

3 MS. WHETZEL: Carl Weimer.

4 MR. WEIMER: Here.

5 MS. WHETZEL: Great. Thank you very much.

6 MS. SIMON: Cheryl? This is Karen Simon. If
7 you called my name, I couldn't hear it. You were kind
8 of fading in and out.

9 MR. WIESE: You know, we've been thinking
10 about nominating you to the committee, Karen, but it
11 hasn't happened yet, so she hadn't gotten around to
12 that.

13 MS. SIMON: I see. I'm standing in for Peter
14 Limniak (ph).

15 MR. WIESE: And he's not on the committee
16 either, but that was just a role call of committee
17 members.

18 MS. SIMON: Oh, okay. Thanks.

19 MR. STURSMA: Don Stursma here too, I didn't
20 hear my name.

21 MS. WHETZEL: Thanks, Don.

22 MR. STURSMA: I'm going to be hanging up and

1 calling back in. I've got so much static on my line I
2 can barely make out what you're saying. MR. WIESE:

3 MR. WIESE: Okay. Great. Maybe taking our
4 cue from Jeryl Mohn, I would recommend that those of
5 you who can, during the presentation part of this, you
6 might consider putting your lines on mute. It would
7 certainly help when shuffling things around in the
8 background. So again, thanks, Cheryl.

9

PURPOSE

10 The purpose of today's meeting, as most of
11 those of you who are members of the Committee know, is
12 we periodically reconvene to tax and solicit their
13 advice in the form of a vote, or just to inform them on
14 a range of initiatives that we have before us.

15 Today's meeting really falls into the latter
16 category. There are no votes that will be taken today.

17 It's really just a discussion of meetings. I would
18 say that we'll formally begin the meeting in just a
19 little bit, and at that time, we've managed to twist
20 the arm of Collette Honorable and ask her to chair this
21 meeting, so I'll turn it over to her when both Cynthia
22 and I are through with some real quick opening remarks,

1 and then we'll begin the meeting in earnest.

2 Just for your information, I've asked Cynthia
3 Quarterman to join us today. Cynthia is the PHMSA
4 Administrator. She has some brief remarks and has
5 agreed to entertain some questions from the committee
6 members. When Cynthia's finished, I've got a few brief
7 remarks and then we'll turn the meeting over to
8 Collette to officially open and conduct it.

9 I know that many of you who are members of
10 the committee had an opportunity to meet Cynthia
11 before, in our December 2009 session, but at that
12 point, Cynthia was brand new to PHMSA, and I'm sure
13 that her perceptions of PHMSA might have been a little
14 different then than they are now, so she's been on a
15 fun ride ever since, and she's just loving every
16 moment. So I'm really happy to have Cynthia here, as
17 I've told most of you before, we've had the pleasure of
18 working for Cynthia before, and I'm really glad to
19 welcome her back. So, before I say anything else, I
20 would like to turn it over to Cynthia.

21 **OPENING REMARKS BY MS. QUARTERMAN**

22 MS. QUARTERMAN: Good afternoon everyone.

1 I'm delighted to join you here today, again, and Jeff
2 is right, I knew nothing about the program when I met
3 you, I think in December of last year, and I know just
4 a shade above that now. But I've been having a
5 wonderful time here.

6 I wanted to start by welcoming all of the
7 members of the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards
8 Committee and the Technical Hazards Liquid Pipeline
9 Safety Standards Committee on behalf of the
10 Administration, Transportation Secretary LaHood, and
11 our team here at PHMSA, we really appreciate your
12 commitment to pipeline safety, and your involvement in
13 these two committees.

14 I wanted to start with some housekeeping
15 items, which is to introduce to you several new members
16 of the PHMSA team at headquarters and in the field.
17 Here in headquarters, we have joining us, Biz Scott,
18 who is the PHMSA chief counsel; Julia Piscitelli, who
19 is the PHMSA Associate Administrator for Governmental,
20 International and Public Affairs; Alan Mayberry is now
21 the Pipeline Safety Deputy Associate Administrator for
22 field operations; Linda Dougherty, who many of you may

1 know from her job in the southern region, has joined us
2 as the Deputy Associate Administrator for policy and
3 programs. Dave Barrett is now Pipeline Safety central
4 region Director; and Wayne Lemoi is the southern region
5 Director. So we've had quite a few personnel changes
6 over the past few months. These individuals have
7 really hit the ground running, so much so that the
8 ground is practically on fire from all of their
9 activity here, as you'll hear in the next few moments.
10 We are very fortunate to have such top-notch leaders
11 in place to focus on operational excellence and
12 pipeline safety.

13 My remarks this afternoon will give you a
14 pretty good sense of all that we have going on. I want
15 to start by saying I really appreciate your support of
16 the PHMSA pipeline safety program, and applaud all that
17 you have done. We've made significant progress since
18 the passage of the PIPES Act in December 2006.

19 Since last we met, there have been several
20 hearings related to pipeline safety reauthorization
21 where I had the good fortune to be able to brag about
22 the tremendous effort all of you have made together to

1 address the legislative mandates from the last pipeline
2 reauthorization. And I really, really could appreciate
3 your efforts after going through what was a very large
4 chart of initiatives that had been completed, and we
5 could say were done.

6 Because of your technical advice and peer
7 review of our regulatory proposals, we have also been
8 able to address and close eight National Transportation
9 Safety Board recommendations in the very recent past.
10 Addressing such high profile issues as leak detection,
11 excess flow valves, human fatigue, internal operations
12 in pipeline companies, control rules, and distribution
13 integrity management.

14 All of those actions move us forward on our
15 path to continue to reduce transportation risks to the
16 public and to the environment. Of course, we still
17 have some work to be done to complete the Congressional
18 mandates from the 2006 Reauthorization Act. But we are
19 well on our way. We expect that before the end of this
20 year we will be asking you to consider our proposal to
21 finalize our rulemaking on low stress phase 2. That
22 rule would extend the existing pipeline safety

1 regulation to those rural hazardous liquid pipelines
2 operating at low stress that are currently unregulated.

3 Last, but not least, we also plan to move
4 forward with a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for
5 excavation damage enforcement on third parties. But
6 that's not all that we have planned.

7 We've begun a comprehensive review of the
8 existing pipeline safety regime, and developed initial
9 solutions and proposals through legislation,
10 rulemaking, reorganization, and other actions to ensure
11 that all pipelines are adequately regulated, and
12 operators put safety first. We expect to address our
13 legislative ideas in a reauthorization proposal that we
14 hope to get to the Congress within the next few weeks,
15 to provide stronger enforcement, to close statutory
16 gaps, and to begin discussions on expanding high
17 consequence areas.

18 From a regulatory perspective, we're looking
19 closely at all regulatory gaps in our exercise of
20 jurisdiction to determine if those gaps still make
21 sense. We've also begun to do our own internal
22 analysis of what next steps are appropriate to follow

1 up on what is now the decade-old Integrity Management
2 Program on the hazardous liquid side. We're beginning
3 to consider what initiatives are appropriate, given the
4 experience we've had so far with the program, as well
5 as drawing upon lessons from the Deep Water Horizon
6 incident, and several serious pipeline failure
7 investigations. Included in that review will be a
8 review of the ... middle shelf pipelines, regulatory
9 structure specifically, as well.

10 We're working on an ANPRM, that's an Advanced
11 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, to begin a dialogue
12 about what changes should be made on the hazardous
13 liquid side. We're looking forward to working with you
14 on that initiative. As an adjunct to that initiative,
15 we are taking a close look at the control room
16 management rule to determine which, if any, deadlines
17 might be accelerated, and we welcome your comments on
18 that score.

19 We're also looking closely at our enforcement
20 program to determine how we might speed up both issuing
21 enforcement actions and decisions. I've charged our
22 new Chief Counsel, Biz Scott, with working on that

1 matter with the pipeline safety program. We also
2 welcome your suggestions on how we might improve that.

3 Since we'll be busy with implementation of
4 DIMP on the gas side over the next year, our review of
5 the Natural Gas Integrity Management Program will
6 probably not be for another year, consistent with the
7 initial rollout of the Integrity Management initiative.

8 There will be some select initiatives on the gas side
9 in the interim. For example, we would appreciate your
10 assistance in helping us consider where we are on the
11 installation of EFVs on non-single family residences
12 and whether there's more than can be done for other
13 buildings.

14 In addition, we are going to put more
15 resources in promoting 811, and trying to decrease the
16 number of accidents associated with excavation damage.

17 There was one month this summer when four deaths
18 occurred in three incidents over the course of a few
19 weeks that could have been prevented if all parties had
20 followed the 811 protocols. This is something the
21 Secretary is personally very interested in, and our new
22 Associate Administrator for Public and

1 Intergovernmental Affairs, Julia Piscitelli, will be
2 working hard to promote this.

3 Working together, we can proactively and
4 collaboratively find better ways to address pipeline
5 safety challenges. I hope you all feel free to speak
6 with me personally. I mentioned at the last meeting
7 that I do have an open door and some of you have walked
8 through that door, and I appreciate that, and I would
9 love to have others of you come and talk to me and meet
10 with me. As you can see, we have a very full agenda
11 planned for the next few years here at PHMSA on the
12 pipeline safety program. Thank you so much for your
13 support in the past. Obviously, we'll be asking for a
14 lot of help from you in the not-too-distant-future as
15 well. Thanks.

16 MR. WIESE: Okay. Thank you, Cynthia. I
17 want to thank you for your remarks and also for your
18 support of the pipeline safety program. But I'd like
19 you for dispelling my notion that there is going to be
20 any down time after accomplishing the whole pipes
21 agenda. But we look forward to working with you on
22 that aggressive agenda, and I'm sure that we're all up

1 to it, and I know the committee will play a key role in
2 that. I know that, like me, you look forward to -- we
3 hope to bring the committee together December-ish --
4 we'll talk a little bit about that -- in a face-to-face
5 meeting. These telephone meetings are very difficult,
6 you can't look at the people. It's a bit challenging,
7 so bear with us. So we look forward to meeting with
8 you face-to-face and really having time to talk about
9 some of these important topics in brief.

10

OPENING REMARKS BY MR. WIESE

11

Before, I had just a couple quick remarks and
12 then I'll turn it over to Collette, but first let me
13 welcome our newest members. First on the list is
14 Collette Honorable. Collette's Commissioner for
15 Arkansas, not Alaska as it may say in your agenda,
16 Public Service Commission. She's also -- Collette, if
17 I have this correctly, you're also the vice-chair of
18 the Gas Committee for the National Association of
19 Regulatory Utility Commissioners?

20

MS. HONORABLE: That's correct.

21

MR. WIESE: All right, and we want to welcome
22 you and then immediately throw you into service as the

1 Chair of today's session, sort of what we did to Lula
2 Ford not long ago, so it's a time-honored tradition.

3 I'd also like to welcome Todd Denton. Todd's
4 the vice-president for pipelines and terminal
5 operations for NuStar Energy. So thank you, Todd, for
6 agreeing to serve.

7 MR. DENTON: Okay.

8 MR. WIESE: Secondly, let me say
9 Administrator Quarterman has asked Secretary LaHood to
10 appoint several new members. I'm really not at liberty
11 to talk about that now, but I'm really hopeful that
12 we'll have them on board and we'll be near full-
13 strength by the time we meet face-to-face.

14 So on to today's meetings. The objectives
15 today are really simple. In addition to providing a
16 little contextual backdrop from the Administrator, I
17 want to inform the committee on the status of a couple
18 of rule makings we've had a chance to discuss before,
19 plus to provide some updates on a couple of topics,
20 including -- I believe we've talked about these before
21 -- what we call our regulatory gap overlap and
22 alignment study, being headed up by Mike Israni, with a

1 number of our state partners. Talk to you about that.

2 Also, as Cynthia mentioned, we'll talk to you
3 about the possibilities of expanding application of
4 excess flow valve requirements beyond single family
5 homes.

6 Lastly, but I think importantly to this
7 committee, we want to resolve a few administrative
8 matters that we've put before you, both in terms of
9 discussion and in terms of survey. So I would just
10 say, gratuitously, perhaps, that it's been an extremely
11 busy time in the pipeline safety arena. I know I don't
12 have to point that out to many. There are plenty of
13 other people in the room who have been running flat
14 out. In addition to the number of Congressional
15 hearings that Cynthia has mentioned, that we hope, in
16 addition to conducting appropriate levels of oversight,
17 will lead to reauthorization of the program.

18 Cynthia also mentioned we've had several
19 serious accidents to respond to and investigate. Our
20 colleagues from the NTSB are here and they're equally
21 as busy with some of these things, so we welcome them.

22 Some of the members of the committees have

1 themselves been testifying at these hearings, so I
2 think you've got a really good group of people here who
3 have a broad perspective of what's going on in the
4 contemporaneous program.

5 Let me close by saying that honestly, I
6 remain eternally grateful to all the people on the
7 committee and the members of the public who track these
8 things so closely, and I think it's a testament to
9 people's commitment to pipeline safety, but also really
10 just thanking you for helping us improve upon what I
11 believe is really a very solid foundation for the
12 pipeline safety program. We always have room to
13 improve, but with your help, we've done a lot of work
14 over these past few years

15 And now, at last, I think we can officially
16 begin the meeting, and I can turn the microphone over
17 to Collette. So thank you Collette.

18 **OFFICIAL START OF MEETING**

19 MS. HONORABLE: Thank you, Jeff, and I
20 especially wanted to extend thanks to Secretary LaHood
21 for this appointment in January, and to Administrator
22 Quarterman, and last but not least, to Jeff. I've

1 enjoyed working with him, very important work, and I
2 appreciate all that you all have done.

3 Before we get started with the agenda, Jeff,
4 I wanted to open it up for Q&A and take time if members
5 have any questions and either Administrator Quarterman
6 remarks or yours.

7 MR. WIESE: That was a nice recovery
8 Collette. I was supposed to say that earlier.

9 MS. HONORABLE: Well, that's why we make a
10 good team. And you know what, I'm following
11 Commissioner Ford and I know that I have large shoes to
12 fill, so I'll try to stay on my toes.

13 Does anyone have questions? If you would
14 please identify yourself. We have person at the
15 Department of Transportation. We also have those on
16 the call, so I think we should defer first to those on
17 the call, and then any others. If there are no
18 questions, we will continue.

19 Next, as you'll note on your agenda, we will
20 have a status of PHMSA rulemaking initiatives by John
21 Gale.

22

1 **STATUS OF PHMSA RULEMAKING INITIATIVES**

2 MR. GALE: Thank you, Collette. Good
3 afternoon everyone. Again, this is John Gale. I am
4 the Director for the Office of Regulations in the
5 Office of Pipeline Safety, and what I'm going to do is
6 just give you a quick update on some of the rulemakings
7 we've been working on over the last several months, and
8 some of the things we have planned for the future.

9 The first rule I was going to mention, as was
10 mentioned by Ms. Quarterman was Low Stress 2. Low
11 Stress 2 is a rulemaking published just last June 24th,
12 which is proposing to regulate those low stress lines
13 that were not covered under the phase 1 rulemaking. We
14 are estimating that this rulemaking will bring under
15 the pipeline safety regs an additional 1300 miles of
16 hazardous liquid lines under the pipeline safety
17 regulations.

18 In addition, in that proposal, we are
19 proposing to maintain the half-mile buffer zone to
20 determine the applicability of integrity management
21 regulations to both the lines covered under Low Stress
22 2 and the lines that were previously covered under Low

1 Stress 1.

2 The comment period for that rulemaking
3 actually ends on Monday, the 23rd, and as Jeff
4 mentioned, we're hoping to have a vote on that
5 rulemaking as a final rule later this fall, possibly
6 December-ish, if not earlier. So that's the goal and
7 that's the plan we have for Low Stress 2 final
8 rulemaking.

9 Another rule we're currently working on is
10 the One Rule. The One Rule is a rule that you all
11 voted on last December. It deals with several
12 miscellaneous reporting requirements. It deals with
13 the definition of an incident, for gas incidents. It
14 deals with the issue of bringing the requirements for
15 operator identification numbers into the pipeline
16 safety regulations, and creating forms for those
17 numbers. It deals with the issue of LNG incident and
18 accident forms, or incident forms and annual report
19 forms, excuse me. It deals with the annual report for
20 gas transmission and the hazardous liquid lines.

21 We're currently in the process of working on
22 that final rule and we're getting close to having it

1 ready for publication. Right now we're anticipating
2 being able to publish that final rule by the end of
3 September.

4 We're also in the throws, as Ms. Quarterman
5 mentioned, in the throws of developing an NPRM on the
6 requirements of the Pipes Act, dealing with the
7 excavation damage. This rulemaking will develop
8 procedures for determining if a state's enforcement of
9 penalties related to third party damage is adequate.
10 It will also present the methods in which PHMSA will
11 impose penalties on third party excavators who damage
12 pipelines when it's state is deemed to be inadequate.

13 We published an Advanced Notice of Proposed
14 Rulemaking on this topic back on October 29, 2009. We
15 received almost 200 comments on that Advanced Notice.
16 We're hoping to develop and be able to publish the NPRM
17 on this topic by November of this year.

18 We're also working on a rulemaking that we
19 affectionately call our miscellaneous rulemaking. It
20 is a rulemaking that we're hoping to publish this fall.
21 Some of the areas that the rulemaking will address are
22 areas related to bringing the mapping requirements

1 actually into the pipeline safety regulations, bringing
2 the requirements or the definition -- we're revising
3 the definition of hazardous liquid to deal with the
4 issue of ethanol. It's also going to possibly deal
5 with some recommendations we received from NAPSRS over
6 the last several years. There's a petition from AGA on
7 the outside storage of plastic pipe that we're hoping
8 to deal with in that rulemaking. And so it's a
9 rulemaking that we're going to try to kind of capture
10 the smaller, miscellaneous issues we haven't been able
11 to get to in the last couple of years, and hopefully put
12 some of those things to rest. And again, that rule is
13 hopefully going to be published by this fall.

14 Also we're working on some issues, more
15 information collection-related than rulemaking related,
16 on mechanical fittings. After the final rule was
17 published, we had to create and revise the distribution
18 annual report form to address the things brought into
19 the regulations under DIMP and also to deal with the
20 issue of reporting requirements or create a reporting
21 requirement or mechanism for mechanical fitting
22 failures.

1 We published a form just recently in the
2 Federal Register back on July 28th, to get comments and
3 to have comments submitted to the Office of Management
4 and Budget on this new form that would include both the
5 changes related to DIMP and to mechanical fitting
6 failures. We're currently in the process of reviewing
7 those comments, and we hope to be able to provide
8 something back to OMB for their approval within the
9 next month, if not shorter.

10 The last rulemaking that I was going to
11 mention is our stairs update rule, and our stairs
12 update rule was a rule that you all also approved just
13 last December. We published it as a final rule back on
14 August 11th, and it addressed the incorporation by
15 reference of approximately 40 consensus standards and
16 some pipeline safety regs.

17 Since the creation of the program in the late
18 60s and early 70s, the use of these standards has been
19 an integral part of the pipeline safety regs. And we
20 are currently reviewing ways to ensure that the public
21 has proper participation in this process and they have
22 access to these documents, while we're at least in the

1 Rulemaking process. And so with that I was going to
2 try to turn over to Jeff, if Jeff would like to say a
3 few words real quick on the public process, or the
4 public involvement in the process related to consensus
5 standards.

6 **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN PROCESS RELATED TO CONSENSUS**
7 **STANDARDS**

8 MR. WIESE: Thank you, John, and Collette,
9 maybe when I'm done, if it's okay with you, we might
10 turn it over to the committee just for any reactions
11 from the committee members at this point, because this
12 topic, I think, is important to have a public
13 discussion of. It's been very front and center on many
14 of our hearings, and I think legitimate questions have
15 been raised about the incorporation by reference of
16 National Consensus Standards, and the transparency of
17 those standards for people.

18 I just quickly want to say that we intend to
19 spend significantly more time on this subject when we
20 meet face-to-face, but there'll be a few things
21 happening in the interim.

22 One, as many of you know, there is a group

1 called the Pipeline Standards Developing Organization
2 Coordinating Committee. I think I got that right.
3 PSDOCC -- have to spell it out in my head every time.
4 And really all the standard-setting bodies that are
5 represented within our code. That group gets together
6 and meets from time to time for a lot of purposes. We
7 help galvanize that group because we wanted to try to
8 drive some of the knowledge that was coming out of our
9 R&D program into the standards faster, and we wanted to
10 have an active, ongoing discussion with them about
11 issues that we had with various standards and the whole
12 process.

13 So just to highlight for people's attention
14 very quickly, there are standard setting bodies. All
15 of the ones that we -- all of the standards that we
16 incorporate by reference are developed under the
17 auspices of the American National Standards Institute.
18 For those of you, you can go to, I think it's ANSI.org
19 and you can see their process for development. I would
20 certainly invite comments from any of the members on
21 that subject, but I believe that anyone is entitled,
22 under the ANSI principles, to join one of these

1 standard-setting committees and by doing that you can
2 look at all the drafts that are going on.

3 Second point, under the broader transparency
4 agenda on consensus standards, I'd like to point out
5 that one of the real issues is that under the
6 Administrative Procedures Act, as you know, and many of
7 you have voted on these for us, we incorporate quite a
8 few standards by reference. During the notice and
9 comment period, however, we're not allowed to put those
10 open freely for anyone to look at, so we've asked the
11 PSDOCC to debate that and try to come up with some
12 creative solutions for giving the public more rapid
13 access, at least during the notice and comment period
14 so that they can understand what it is that they would
15 be commenting on. I think it's a fair point that's
16 made. I will say that I equally understand the fact
17 that the actual work of the consensus standards body is
18 supported in large part by the subscriptions to the
19 standards which are published. So it's not an easy nut
20 to crack, and it's something that, as I think
21 Administrator Quarterman said in her testimony, is a
22 larger issue than just PHMSA. I mean virtually every

1 standards -- I mean, every safety agency that I'm
2 familiar with, or any technical agency I'm familiar
3 with incorporates National Consensus Standards in their
4 regulations. So it's a fairly big question, but it's
5 one, I think, that merits our attention, and we'll talk
6 a lot more when we're face-to-face and hopefully we'll
7 have some creative solutions by then.

8 Collette, I turn it over to you, but I
9 certainly would invite any questions or comments from
10 the committee members.

11 MS. HONORABLE: Thank you, Jeff, please do.
12 If anyone has a question, please identify yourself for
13 the record and make your comment.

14 **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

15 MR. STURSMAN: This is Don Stursma. Are they
16 looking for copies of standards to review? For a lot
17 of the standards, the common ones that are adopted now,
18 the state pipeline safety will more often have copies
19 of those. So that's a possible reference for people
20 who would want to get their hands on a copy to look at,
21 other than buying one.

22 MR. LEMOFF: This is Ted Lemoff. Hello.

1 MR. WIESE: Hi, Ted.

2 MR. LEMOFF: Ted Lemoff, National Fire
3 Protection Association. Jeff, I'd like to correct one
4 point you made, a minor point. You said that anyone
5 can join National Standards Committee. Anyone can
6 apply, but the individual organizations do have size
7 and balance criteria, and applications are inspected.
8 However, anyone can certainly see the review materials
9 that are published.

10 MR. WIESE: Very good. Thank you for that.

11 MR. LEMOFF: And NFPA is somewhat unique. We
12 make all of our standards available on the web for
13 anyone to read, that is read but not print. Thank you.

14 MR. MOHN: This is Jeryl Mohn from Panhandle.
15 Jeff, could you add just a little more background
16 around this oversight committee? What is the
17 membership and what's their charter and how do they
18 function?

19 MR. WIESE: Are you talking about -- which
20 one? Oh, the PSDOCC?

21 MR. MOHN: Yes.

22 MR. WIESE: I think there are several INGAA

1 members that are probably on that, but it's groups like
2 NACE, ASME, I believe -- and Mike do you want to add?

3 MR. ISRANI: Yes, there's API -- this is Mike
4 Israni. We have ASME, NACE, API. We also have members
5 from the NIST, PHMSA, of course, and we do get
6 participation sometimes from Department of Energy, and
7 NFPA. That's about it.

8 MR. WIESE: I don't know, does that help at
9 all, Jeryl? It's not an oversight committee, it's a
10 committee of standards developing organizations who we
11 have worked with for a few years now, and again, as we
12 say, they meet a couple times a year?

13 MR. ISRANI: They meet a couple times a year.
14 They not only look at R&D issues, that Jeff mentioned,
15 but they also look at if there are any new standards to
16 be developed for incorporation. So those subjects are
17 also brought up during this meeting.

18 MR. MOHN: Okay. That helps. Thanks.

19 MR. WUNDERLIN: This is Jim Wunderlin,
20 industry representative on the Gap Committee. I'd like
21 to make comments on three different points if I may,
22 regarding the update of standards.

1 First point. We currently believe that NFPA
2 59 should take precedent. Conflict exists between NFPA
3 59 and Part 192. In many cases, allowing Part 192 to
4 take precedence could jeopardize safety and let me
5 explain what I mean by jeopardizing safety. There may
6 be times when NFPA 59 includes design engineering
7 installation, testing, and even maintenance
8 requirements, which would be less stringent and maybe
9 even jeopardize safety if Part 192 were to take
10 precedence. NGA is nearing completion of 192 versus
11 NFPA 59 comparison effort, and we would like -- we look
12 forward to sharing our findings on that with PHMSA.

13 Point number two. We urge PHMSA to view NFPA
14 59 and 58 as separate standards. Their scopes are not
15 the same. We would like to also clarify a mistake in
16 the final rule. NFPA 59 has not adopted the NFPA 58
17 standard in its entirety, indicated in the final rule.
18 It also did not include NFPA 58 Chapter 14.4 on small
19 LP gas systems which PHMSA has stated as being a
20 regulatory concern.

21 And my final point. We urge PHMSA to
22 consider adoption of the latest version of NFPA 59(a)

1 in the 2009 edition. It provides greater clarity and
2 in organized such that the utility owners can more
3 easily recognize and follow the requirements. The
4 version was not available, the 2009, was not available
5 when the proposed rule was issued. It recognizes
6 continued progress must be made within the facilities ...
7 chapter concerning vapor and thermal exclusions ...
8 Until NFPA 59 improvements are achieved, PHMSA should
9 reference the specific requirements in 2006 and 2001
10 admissions appropriately.

11 PGA and our supplemental GAP committee
12 members serving on the NFPA 59(a) technical committee
13 and those on the AGA-NFPA 59(a) standards task force
14 are focus on protecting the public and our member
15 employees from injury in the ... facility from damage,
16 and we look forward for the opportunity to work closely
17 with PHMSA in meeting our common objectives.

18 MR. ISRANI: This is Mike Israni. On this
19 issue about NFPA 58, 59, and 59(a), all I want to
20 mention is that we are --we have a team which is
21 working on it. We are working as independently on
22 this. As you may all know, in the last periodic

1 upgrade rulemaking, we had not referenced these
2 standards, the newer additions, because we had a lot of
3 conflicts. But our team is working on these standards,
4 doing the comparison of 58, 59, and with 192 and we are
5 also looking at LNG issues NFPA 59(a). So we'll
6 address those separately.

7 MR. WIESE: This is Jeff. I'd just like to
8 say that that topic, as Mike said, we temporarily took
9 a pass on in the last incorporation, but certainly by
10 the time we meet again face-to-face, we'll have an
11 opportunity to discuss it in depth, so we welcome you
12 making your comments again for the record, appreciate
13 it. So thank you, Jim.

14 Anyone else have any questions?

15 MR. DRAKE: Jeff, this is Andy Drake, Spectra
16 Energy. I have a question I think to the comment here
17 about PHMSA -- the conflict that we have, and an action
18 item coming up in the December meeting, that we're
19 going to spend some time figuring out how the public
20 gets access to the standards and what role standards
21 play. If there's some specific action items that we,
22 as committee members, have to have and take home and

1 dwell on and maybe try to ferret out a little bit in
2 preparation for that meeting, other than just the issue
3 about access to public standards, or standards by the
4 public members or non-committee members, which I think
5 is a very specific and valid issue that we can come to
6 some amiable alternatives or recommendations. Are
7 there other things that we need to be dealing with in
8 preparation for this meeting?

9 MR. WIESE: I think it's important for us --
10 it's a good question, Andy, and again, we'll try to
11 have a well-rounded conversation on National Consensus
12 Standards when we meet in December, November, whenever
13 we pull it off. I think we all, most of us who have
14 worked in the area, understand the critical role that
15 Consensus Standards can play in providing guidance to
16 operators on how to achieve the broader objectives set
17 out in the regulatory framework.

18 You know, there are legitimate questions that
19 are asked regarding participation in the standards,
20 regarding access to those standards, and cost of them.

21 And so I would urge you, that many of you are members
22 -- I know, for example, Andy, you are in the ASME

1 committee, so I would urge you who are members of those
2 committees to go back and try to incentivize your
3 committees to be a little more creative about how to
4 come up with providing a public access to the
5 standards.

6 I know API, for example, makes 1162, the
7 Public Awareness Standard, available to everyone on its
8 website. It's a non-printable PDF. I want to have a
9 fair moment for the standards bodies to talk to people
10 and the public about why we have this existing
11 environment. So there's the access issue.

12 But the participation is important too.
13 PHMSA and many of our state partners participate in
14 these standard-setting bodies and I'm at least proud to
15 say that I'm a public representative. My job is to
16 represent the public, and I personally sat on some of
17 these committees. I think the regulators play a
18 crucial role in technical standards consensus setting.

19 So I think that's -- we can talk about
20 participation, access, cost. As Don said, the states
21 can provide you access there. Of course, anyone can
22 come to OPS, you can go to the Office of the Federal

1 Register, but those are not terribly convenient for
2 people who live a long ways from the city locations.
3 So basically we have to be creative about how we make
4 that available to them, and talk to people about how we
5 drive new technology and knowledge into the consensus
6 standards in the roles that they play.

7 MR. LEMOFF: This is Tedd Lemoff, NFPA. I'd
8 like to just make a comment. Certainly I appreciate
9 Jim Wunderlin's comments. While NFPA is disappointed t
10 the latest round of not adopting some of our documents,
11 we have a long history of cooperatively working with
12 DOT and looking forward to resolving this, which I
13 think we can. Thanks.

14 MR. WIESE: Thank you, Tedd.

15 MR. FEIGEL: Jeff?

16 MR. WIESE: Yes.

17 DR. FEIGEL: Yes, this is Gene Feigel. I was
18 the senior vice president of ... and Standards for ASME
19 for a time and was involved in standards development
20 for ASME for 20 or 25 years. I think that within the
21 bounds of propriety and your regulatory charge has a
22 responsibility to correct some of the fairly wide-

1 spread misconceptions held by some members of the
2 public as to how consensus standards bodies work, and
3 the fact that in the main, and I'll speak specifically,
4 but not ... are to establish effective standards
5 committees and those include members of the public, as
6 you alluded to. And I'm concerned that particularly, I
7 think we should be pretty open and honest about this,
8 after a few recent disasters there always seems to be a
9 human cry about standard developers being preached ...
10 industry, whatever that might mean, and while no one is
11 claiming to be perfect in this regard, that there are
12 misconceptions, misperceptions that seem to repeat
13 themselves, and I think we all have an obligation to
14 correct them insofar as ... present standards really
15 works.

16 MR. WIESE: And I'm hoping, Gene, that the
17 conversation that we have in December, November,
18 whenever, we can pull that together. We'll have the
19 standards setting bodies there to present the process,
20 and talking to people about how it works, and others,
21 so that we can do just what you say. And as I tried to
22 say, I understand the critical role that they play and

1 I think many people do. But there are some legitimate
2 questions that are being asked, and I think it's in our
3 interest to advance our discussion of that. So we'll
4 do that come December.

5 DR. FEIGEL: Jeff, I think there may be some
6 issues, but quite frankly, at least in my estimation,
7 most of the issues that have been raised are somewhat
8 peripheral in importance to these bodies, and could be
9 handled, and I think they should not be allowed to
10 become the tack lead to the formal structure and
11 importance of these organizations.

12 MR. WIESE: Okay. Thanks, Gene.

13 MR. KUPREWICZ: Rick Kuprewicz with the
14 liquid gas committee. I want to add a public comment
15 here. I really want to reinforce where you're going
16 with this. I don't know what the answer is, but I
17 assume a room full of very smart people should be able
18 to reach some -- we're asking for compromise on this
19 issue than the current status quo. I can give you an
20 example where an investigatory agency could not get a
21 copy of the standard that I had paid for, because when
22 I buy them they say copyright all over them, so I

1 couldn't give them -- give them that particular
2 reference. And if we're going to incorporate these
3 many standards by reference, I think you're on the
4 right queue here, and I think we have to be able to
5 reach some rational compromise without cutting
6 somebody's revenue stream. And I think we should be
7 able to get there fairly quickly. Keep it simple.

8 And I think you kind of addressed a couple of
9 issues here this afternoon -- the issue of transparency
10 to the public, and the issue of timing. I don't think
11 the public wants to necessarily -- they don't want to
12 get into the super technical stuff that the committees
13 usually tend to do, but they want to understand, if
14 you're going to incorporate things by reference, what
15 do they cover and what do they not cover.

16 So I would just recommend that we move
17 forward with this. I think the committees on both
18 sides, gas and liquids, should be able to reach some
19 rational way to get here. I would just recommend keep
20 it simple, don't make it too complicated. That's all I
21 had.

22 MR. WIESE: Well, I think that's our hope for

1 December. I mean we've got a nice balance of public,
2 government, and industry in these committees. It's a
3 perfect forum to talk about this issue, so you know, I
4 might -- certainly anyone else is welcome to comment if
5 you'd like to, but I might just offer Cheryl up,
6 without having asked her, to say if you have questions
7 that you think that this session should address in
8 December, please send them to Cheryl -- all of you who
9 are members, and most of you who are not, know it's
10 just cheryl.whetsel@dot.gov. Notice how I gave her e-
11 mail up and not mine. Go ahead and just frame the
12 question that you want addressed. We'll combine them
13 all together and we'll try to address it. But I think
14 it's an important session, so we'll spend a little bit
15 of time on it. We'll invite people from both sides of
16 the aisle, so to speak, to talk about it. I look
17 forward to it.

18 MS. HONORABLE: Are there any other
19 questions? Thank you all and we're looking forward to
20 learning more about this very important subject at our
21 December meeting.

22 Now, as our agenda calls -- we're a few

1 minutes early, so we'll try to keep up with that --
2 we'll now hear from Mike Israni regarding our GAP
3 analysis and excess flow valves. Mike.

4 **GAP ANALYSIS**

5 MR. ISRANI: Thank you. Good afternoon all.

6 As you all know, regulations for the gas and liquid
7 pipelines, which are covered in Part 192 and 195 have
8 been in place for decades, but many requirements have
9 changed over the years, and it's time for us to take a
10 fresh look at all these regulations. Our goal is to
11 have no gaps, holes, or old regs and revisions that
12 clarify our requirements. But we would like to have
13 regulations to clarify our requirements. And also
14 PHMSA needs to have a clear understanding of statutory
15 requirements for reporting during and after the natural
16 disasters or major accidents. Our main purpose is to
17 have these holes and gaps finally filled in.

18 So with that in mind, we have started this
19 new project regarding 192, 195 Gap Analysis project
20 where our objects are:

- 21 • To evaluate our current regulations
- 22 • To identify holes. By holes we mean something

1 that's missing from both liquid and the gas
2 regulations.

- 3 • Gaps. By gaps we mean it's covered in one part
- 4 but not in the other part;
- 5 • And significant differences in parts 192 and 195
- 6 requirements.

7 There are some subjects that are covered in
8 both but they have different content. So we are
9 looking at those also.

10 There's another thing we are looking at.
11 They are what we call deficiencies, which is in two
12 parts. One is the regulatory language which is not
13 clear enough to support enforcement actions. And also
14 we are looking at deficiencies in the areas where our
15 current requirements are not dealing with it. For
16 example, maintenance of the depth of cover.

17 So overall, we are looking at what are these
18 gaps in the liquid regulations to find most gaps,
19 differences, and deficiencies -- all those terms that I
20 used. We have formed a team which is composed of
21 experienced reporter staff. We have regional and state
22 inspectors also on this team, with some senior people

1 of our training and qualification group at Oklahoma
2 City. We also have attorneys on this team.

3 So our status on this project is that we have
4 collected some information so far. We have had only a
5 couple of meetings. We have collected enough
6 information to evaluate major holes, gaps, and
7 differences in the near future. We are also trying to
8 evaluate -- review -- legislation, particularly with
9 respect to jurisdictional areas where we do not
10 regulate. We're trying to look at where we have
11 jurisdiction where we do not regulate. Some of those
12 areas we are trying to scrutinize.

13 Our team is also reviewing special permit,
14 advisory bulletins, NTSB recommendations, NAPS
15 resolutions, PHMSA interpretations, and also we are
16 looking at high visibility accidents that if those had
17 been answered in some way through regulations. So you
18 can see the scope is pretty big on this project, and we
19 are trying to prioritize on which items we should
20 address first. We also figure annual use between PHMSA
21 and other federal agencies to have a clearer picture of
22 our jurisdictions, our degradations, and overlaps.

1 Going forward on this, once we identify and analyze all
2 these differences, holes, gaps, and deficiencies, then
3 we can come up with some regulations to address these.

4 Now, we also have in our agenda, in our
5 scope, to look at some obsolete regulations, because if
6 you notice in our report of federal regulations
7 49CFR192, 195, we have many dates which have expired,
8 there are many tables which have no use any longer, so
9 we are looking at those. In the future we also intend
10 to look at Parts 193 and 194, the management of
11 systems, life cycle regulations, et cetera. But at the
12 moment, our first priority is to answer all the holes
13 and the gaps in the regulations.

14 And that's the project I just described, and
15 shall we ask questions at this stage?

16 MS. HONORABLE: I think it would be good to
17 take some questions now regarding the GAP analysis, if
18 there are any.

19

20 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

21 MR. WUNDERLIN: Thank you, Mike, for that
22 update. Jim Wunderlin again. Just a question on the -

1 - you talked about the team that was looking at the gap
2 analysis, and I appreciate the work that's going on
3 there, but wanted to know -- you know, in the past
4 we've had industry members participate and get their
5 expertise on the codes and standards. I give a good
6 example of the GMP (ph) and a great ... for putting DIMP
7 into the natural gas distribution. But it sounded like
8 there's no industry members involved in a look at the
9 GAP analysis.

10 MR. ISRANI: Jim, this is Mike Israni. They
11 will come at the later stage, because we are in the
12 initial phase of bringing up all the issues that we
13 have on the table, and once we are in the phase of
14 highlighting those important ones, where we may
15 consider some regulation, before it even begins, we'll
16 have industry involved.

17 MR. WUNDERLIN: That would be my concern is
18 that you started to draft proposed regulations and at
19 that point it becomes more difficult to get the input
20 of the real industry experts, the people who have to
21 operate the pipeline. So I would just keep that in
22 mind.

1 MR. WIESE: This is Jeff. I think what we
2 would do, Jim, is we would open it up for everyone's
3 input. I mean, the public as well as industry, and the
4 other government agencies who haven't been able to
5 participate. But really, rather than go forward with
6 nothing, and just say hey, we're thinking about doing
7 something what do you think, we wanted to take a look,
8 get our ducks in a row, and at least make a logical
9 framework for discussion. You know, you can be assured
10 that we will have a real public discussion on this
11 before we proceed substantively.

12 MR. WUNDERLIN: Okay. Thank you.

13 MR. COMSTOCK: Jeff, this is Mike Comstock
14 with APGA.

15 MR. WIESE: Is it 100 degrees out there,
16 Mike?

17 MR. COMSTOCK: It's 102 today.

18 MR. WIESE: Thank you. Okay, 'cause you
19 invited me to come there Monday and you're inviting me
20 in a heat wave.

21 MR. COMSTOCK: No, we're going to get 110 for
22 you. APGA would just like to make a couple of

1 comments, one that we would support what Mr. Wunderlin
2 just talked about in terms of industry representation
3 on the team. We think that's important also, and
4 should be involved in the process.

5 Second of all, we appreciate the work that
6 Mike and his team have started down this road on this
7 GAP analysis, but just to be mindful of fully vetting
8 the issue is these types of pipelines, distribution,
9 transmission, and liquid are very different in the way
10 that they're operated, and that there may be gaps in
11 the regulations, but justly so in that they probably
12 shouldn't be regulated exactly the same. So as they
13 review that process, to keep that in mind.

14 MR. WIESE: Certainly. Thank you, Mike.

15 MR. STURSMAN: Don Sturmsma. The part of this
16 analysis, this has probably been mentioned before, but
17 this is not a new project. There are teams of the
18 state and industry regulatory review committees and the
19 SIRRC 2 report tried to take the testing regulations,
20 the upgrading regulations, and the MELP (ph)
21 regulations and make them all consistent. Whether you
22 like the result or not, it's certainly something that I

1 think this group should look at and bring that to
2 resolution, either they think it's a good idea, or if
3 the answer's no, say no.

4 MR. ISRANI: Don, this is Mike Israni. Yes,
5 SIRRC-2 is on our agenda for this October meeting when
6 I'm meeting with the team. In fact, this is one of the
7 priority projects we have. We would just try to see if
8 we have some additional differences or gaps that we can
9 join together with SIRRC-2 with our regulations.

10 MR. STURSMAN: Yes, I'm aware that you're ...
11 than pleased with SIRRC-2, but I think that the only
12 remaining member of that team, at least on the state
13 side, I guess is if somebody were to ask what were we
14 thinking, I could tell you, if I can remember.

15 MR. ISRANI: That would be helpful, thank
16 you. And we also have Greg Bordeaux who was on your
17 team, so he's on my team.

18 MR. STURSMAN: Good.

19 MR. WIESE: And certainly, gratuitously, I
20 will add that this is just preliminary work. Anything
21 that we do would run through the whole Administrative
22 Procedures Act. There'd be Notice and Comment, but

1 there is a lot of work that's done in advance of any
2 rulemaking to try to figure out what's worthy of taking
3 on, but that way we can do a little balancing act.

4 MS. HONORABLE: Any other questions?

5 MR. KUPREWICZ: Rick Kuprewicz with liquid
6 group. I'm not trying to drive this or push the time
7 table. When do you think there would be at a point
8 where this could be open to go public in terms of a
9 draft? Or do you even have a time table yet for that?

10 MR. ISRANI: Not yet. We -- there was some
11 things that were being discussed, for example, since
12 all of these are still in the preliminary stages, we
13 have to kind of farm out work before we can make it
14 public. So we will try to analyze -- because we find
15 the holes, in the early study somewhere, much later
16 history and where and how these requirements came about
17 and why they were not put there. So before we come up
18 with any answers, we'd like to really go through them.

19 MR. WIESE: This is Jeff again. But it's
20 probably fair for us to say that by the December
21 meeting, we're going to be a little advanced on this
22 project so we can kind of lay it out. But some of it

1 was what Don was saying. You'd be surprised at the --
2 there's been a large turnover in the community.
3 Understanding the origin of some of these things is the
4 first steps, so you don't create some inadvertent
5 errors. So a lot of the work, Rick, that we've been
6 doing has really been that. Working with our
7 regulatory partners and the states, who are the
8 practitioners of the regulation, and trying to figure
9 out what our issues are and then I'll think we'll open
10 up to concentric rings here and make sure that
11 everybody has a clear say on that.

12 MR. KUPREWICZ: I'm not trying to drive it,
13 when you think you're ready, then tell people, but
14 don't -- what it sounds like is you probably won't be
15 ready for the December meeting, but only time will tell
16 you that.

17 MR. WIESE: Yeah, we'll certainly give you a
18 more substantive update at that time. We'll have met
19 again with the committee, the state folks, and we'll
20 give you a more detailed outline, and some handouts at
21 that December meeting.

22 MS. HONORABLE: Anyone else? I think we're

1 ready to go to the next topic.

2 **EXCESS FLOW VALVES**

3 MR. ISRANI: All right, we're ready to go to
4 the next topic, which is excess flow valves, a large
5 application. Now PHMSA issued distribution improve
6 final rule in December 2009, and that rule included
7 requirements for excess flow valves for single family
8 homes, for new and replaced service lines in accordance
9 with the Pipes Act 2006. But it did not include the
10 full NTSB's recommendation B012, which is to require
11 excess flow valves on all new and renewed service lines
12 for all gas service customers, regardless of their
13 classification.

14 So NTSB has this recommendation at the
15 moment, open acceptable response, but in their letter
16 of September 21, 2009, they indicated that if our DIMP
17 rule is not going to address this larger
18 classification, they may change this recommendation to
19 unacceptable. That's -- it wasn't possible for us to
20 include in the final rule all kinds of applications of
21 excess flow valves as all the members of this committee
22 know that excess flow valve issue has been coming up

1 for years. Our initial emphasis was on the single
2 family homes, and that's why even the 2006 Act
3 emphasized only on the single family homes for new and
4 replaced service lines.

5 Because there's quite a lot of work involved,
6 studying larger application of these excess flow
7 valves, we have formed a team of stakeholders, and we
8 have had two meetings. One happened in June 2009, and
9 second one in August 2009, and those stakeholders
10 meetings included NTSB, firechiefs, state fire marshals
11 associations, operators, excess flow valve
12 manufacturers, and quite some state members. The
13 reason we had these meetings also to share
14 understanding, knowledge, experience, capabilities with
15 respect to installation, operation, and maintenance of
16 excess flow valves in service lines for the commercial,
17 industrial, and multiresidential natural gas users.

18 There are a number of issues involved in
19 excess flow valves for large applications, and to
20 understand them, to see the technical feasibility and
21 economic feasibility on this, we had to evaluate these
22 valves before we can put them in the regulations. So

1 what we have learned from those meetings is the -- I'm
2 trying to pull out this excess flow valve summary
3 statement.

4 What we learned from the stakeholders, there
5 are a number of things that we have to consider for
6 this excess flow valves for large applications. For
7 example, the load variations and the -- we also learned
8 that these valves have some limitations on -- as to
9 what size they are available and what capacities they
10 have, and standards also which are currently there,
11 that those are limited to 5500 standard cubic foot
12 valves.

13 We also learned from these meetings that NTSB
14 and the fire marshals and the fire chiefs, they would
15 like to see excess flow valves for large applications
16 installed in all cases, mainly because currently they
17 rely on these operators to come in and shut off the
18 lines and the gas keeps feeding fire. But you know, we
19 were more focusing on the technical feasibility because
20 of load variations.

21 And what we noticed is that there are several
22 categories of these valves that we could go in phases.

1 For example, our team was considering that we should
2 first consider -- when I'm saying team, we are looking
3 at the regulators, state and the PHMSA people, we were
4 considering that we could focus in stages. We could go
5 first to the branch service lines of the single family
6 homes, including town houses and others. Then we can
7 look at commercial applications, like single service,
8 single commercial facilities, and then we look at
9 apartment complexes and office buildings. We go in
10 progressive stages, instead of applying this rule all
11 at once, because of the complications involved,
12 liability issues, and also the -- in certain cases, the
13 liability issues are such a great concern for the
14 operators that they feel that if there is any even
15 slight interruption can cost the operators millions of
16 dollars, if there's a supply -- gas supply cut off.

17 Weighing all of that information, we thought
18 that we will go in stages and first start looking at
19 the branch lines. That will go to all the single
20 family homes, whether they were having a separate
21 service line or branch lines.

22 We have prepared an interim report on this,

1 future rulemaking of excess flow valves, forming the
2 stakeholders team was an important step and getting the
3 input from industry is critical in this. I just want
4 to point out that our industry has installed literally
5 millions of excess flow valves on residential -- on new
6 and replacement service since June 1, 2008, and we
7 certainly supported the Congressional mandate in 2006
8 for EFVs on single family and residential service
9 lines. You pointed out, Mike, some areas where we are
10 very concerned about the expansion of these
11 requirements to certain natural gas customers. They
12 may not be practical as far as where we're going. So
13 we have to be careful we just don't put out a blanket
14 requirement to require excess flow valves to
15 everywhere. So we need to be very deliberate.

16 I think that your approach in steps, a first
17 step for services, maybe branch services and single
18 family residences, we could support, maybe some small
19 multifamily service lines, small commercial customer
20 lines where we have low profiles similar to the single
21 family residence, I think that's all very appropriate.
22 But here again, getting into the larger sizes, the --

1 where we're serving hospitals, manufacturing,
2 industrial, chemical plants, there could be significant
3 consequences and risk if an excess flow valve were shut
4 off to any of those facilities

5 So I appreciate PHMSA's approach on this. We
6 want to make sure that it's practical, that we have a
7 simple way to accomplish this, and maybe that we
8 consider criteria going forward, such as pipe size or
9 the limit on flow to services, et cetera. So we look
10 forward to working with you on this in the future.
11 Thank you, Mike.

12 MR. ISRANI: Thank you.

13 MS. HONORABLE: Are there any other
14 questions?

15 MS. PARKER: This is Lisa Parker.

16 MS. HONORABLE: Speak.

17 MS. PARKER: Mike, can you tell me, it's been
18 about a year since you got additional comments back
19 from NTSB. Is there a time frame that NTSB wants to
20 see PHMSA correct these issues?

21 MR. ISRANI: Well, Lisa, as I mentioned in my
22 briefing paper that I sent to all the members, NTSB was

1 hoping that our final rule on DIMP would include all
2 that, and I also mentioned that that wasn't possible
3 for us. It wasn't proposed. It wasn't in the Pipes
4 Act 2006, and also all of our prior work over the years
5 has been on single family homes. And this larger
6 application, we need a lot more work, and quite a lot
7 of interaction between all the stakeholders. So no,
8 they haven't given us time line on this. They'd like
9 to have this wrapped up soon. One thing they did
10 indicate, they would not like to see stages or steps.
11 They would rather have all done at the same time.

12 MR. KUPREWICZ: Mike, Rick Kuprewicz for the
13 public. I'm confused as all get-out here. I'm not
14 sure -- is the NTSB requiring -- are they insisting on
15 excess flow valves on all -- all lines?

16 MR. ISRANI: No, all new and replaced service
17 lines, but all applications, all classification of
18 consumers.

19 MR. KUPREWICZ: Well, I see here in the
20 report, "When the operating systems are compatible
21 with readily-available valves." Is that part of the
22 NTSB requirement, or is that a PHMSA?

1 MR. ISRANI: What we have quoted here is from
2 the NTSB.

3 MR. KUPREWICZ: So I just can't quite figure
4 out, you know, a service line feeding a power plant, an
5 F, or a big boy, an H, I can't think of a technically
6 available valve that could even come close to that.
7 Now maybe I just don't know, but I -- I can't believe
8 that NTSB would require this on every one of these
9 lines.

10 MR. WIESE: Rick, this is Jeff. I hate to
11 speak for the NTSB, but having spoken to them several
12 times on this, I don't think they're -- it's not a
13 blanket order. I think it's to do what can be done.

14 MR. KUPREWICZ: Okay, with the present
15 technology.

16 MR. WIESE: Yeah, and I think it's a
17 reasonable request. There are some cases where we
18 think it might be feasible. That was the purpose of
19 our study group. We had NTSB there. Certainly I would
20 invite -- happen to have a distinguished member from
21 the NTSB here, and Ravi, if you want to speak to that.

22 MR. CHHATRE: The one comment I have is it's

1 like to a certain extent, first for a shake-up. I mean
2 if the industry doesn't require it, the manufacturers
3 have no incentive to include the technology, and vice
4 versa. So somebody has to start somewhere. I'm not
5 sure that our technology experts are so backward that
6 they wouldn't come up with any challenges you throw at
7 them. The point is to throw challenges at them. And
8 our recommendation does say that where it is available.

9 It does not say that it's a carte blanche that
10 everything should be installed at the same time. I'm
11 not quite sure that the manufacturers are saying they
12 cannot design something. At least I haven't heard it.

13 MR. ISRANI: This is Mike Israni. Then those
14 meetings, when we had the EFV manufacturers, in fact,
15 we had four of them who participated on this committee.

16 They say the largest one they have is about the size
17 of two inches diameter, with a capacity less than 5.5
18 million cubic foot per hour. So that limits to how far
19 it can go. That kind of capacity may not feed part
20 (ph) lines and bigger facilities, but for quite a few
21 commercial entities.

22 MR. WIESE: And Jeff again. It's more than -

1 - I think we all understand, it's more than just the
2 size. It's the load variation, and so I think that was
3 the whole point of that study group was to try to
4 settle this down and get the facts on the table in
5 front of everyone. Anyone else have questions? We
6 have Ravi Chhatre here with us and Mike Israni, they're
7 two of the EFV players, so I'd invite any of the
8 members who wish, feel free to jump in.

9 MR. SKOLNIK: This is Carl from the Pipeline
10 Safety Trust, and following this for the last couple
11 years, it seems like the whole crux of this comes down
12 to the one little clause in the NTSB's recommendation
13 that says, "when the operating conditions are
14 compatible." And I wonder if there's been any more
15 clarity from NTSB on that clause. Because it sounds
16 like what we just heard is maybe they're trying to
17 drive the manufacture of new EFVs, where at this point
18 they may not be compatible because of load variations.

19 MR. CHHATRE: Ravi Chhatre, NTSB. We are not
20 insisting -- if you look at the language of the
21 recommendation, if something is not compatible, we are
22 not asking PHMSA to do anything. I mean we have to be

1 practical, at the same time we have to be safety-
2 conscious.

3 MR. WIESE: Jeff again. I think that the
4 Administrator signaled in her opening remarks that she
5 is planning to advance rulemaking in the area. So
6 we've done the preliminary work on this. I think what
7 the rulemaking process will allow us to do is to define
8 what Ravi was just speaking about. You know, what are
9 the limits? What's practicable and what's not? So I
10 think we have a commitment from the Administrator to
11 move forward on that issue, and appreciate -- you know,
12 the NTSB has continued to participate with us all the
13 way through this, so -- as have the emergency
14 responders, so I think it's been a very useful
15 exercise. But yes, there will be more to come on this
16 one, and lots of opportunity for people to opine.

17 MS. HONORABLE: Any other questions or
18 comments regarding the gas analysis or excess flow
19 valves? If not, I would turn it over now to Jeff to
20 bring administrative matters to the committee. Jeff.

21 MR. WIESE: Great. Thank you, Collette. I
22 would, with your indulgence, we should have had, for

1 the purposes of the people who are on the phone call, I
2 apologize, that right after it says 3:30 to 3:40,
3 obviously we're going to beat that unless I go really
4 long, but between the 3:30 and 3:40 and 3:40 to 4:00
5 session, I'd like to, with your permission, Collette,
6 include a public comment period where members -- we'll
7 finish with the committee, and let the committee have
8 their say and then with your permission, we'll open it
9 up to the other people who are attending, representing
10 different entities than the committee members, and let
11 them certainly have an opportunity to have a voice.

12 MS. HONORABLE: That would be wonderful.

13 MR. WIESE: Great. Thank you, Collette.

14 **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

15 MR. WIESE: With that, I wanted to turn to
16 something that the members of the committee who have
17 been on here for at least the last couple of meetings
18 will be familiar with and are probably tired of hearing
19 about, but I'm hoping to move this to closure.

20 When I say administrative matters, what we've
21 been talking about was the ever-popular notion of term
22 limits in the charter itself. We had asked, and both

1 through discussion with the committee on record, as
2 well as through informal, quote ``survey'' of the
3 committee members, I think we had like a 40 percent
4 turnout. As surveys go, that's pretty good.

5 And lastly, just some comments on the
6 regulatory process, so you've had a chance, and I
7 think, Cheryl, am I correct that in the back of the
8 materials that you sent to them, there's a few papers
9 in here called the Technical Advisory Committee's
10 Summary of Administrative Matters of the Committee. I
11 kind of wanted to cut through that really quickly and
12 just tell you what I'm thinking is the game plan, and
13 get your comments and signs of support here.

14 I don't think we're going to have unanimous
15 opinion on anything here, and that's okay. I mean we
16 have broad representation here, a lot of different
17 viewpoint. We have members who have been here since
18 1995, I'm proud to say. We have some people who this
19 is their first meeting. In many ways, I think that
20 reflects a strength of the committee. There are new
21 members and there are people who have been here for a
22 long time and have a lot of corporate knowledge, as

1 they say.

2 We've been dwelling on this so long that we
3 ran up against our deadline for renewing our current
4 charter. So I'm going to put a proposal out to the
5 committee, and the proposal I'm going to put out is
6 having heard all sides of this, that what we're
7 proposing to do is to more or less maintain the status
8 quo for the next two years. In the next two years,
9 what we intend to do, and actually we'll probably move
10 -- we can move faster than that -- I think what we want
11 to do now it just takes a while to get it processed, is
12 that we will renew and amend the charter as it stands
13 right now, but within two years we'll renew and amend
14 it again. I think it's every two years, is that right,
15 Cheryl?

16 MS. WHETZEL: Yes.

17 MR. WIESE: When we amend it, what I propose
18 to include is a term limit. The term limit would be
19 three consecutive terms, meaning if somebody takes a
20 break they could always be reappointed later. These
21 are terms of three years, that would give any member
22 nine years. In addition to that -- and I'll comment on

1 these in just a second -- but in addition to that, we
2 will work aggressively to rotate terms so that not
3 everyone is appointed all at once and comes off all at
4 once, so we'll stagger appointments. And I think some
5 of that happens naturally anyway.

6 I tell you, I have a lot of angst about
7 imposing term limits. I'm not going to sit here and do
8 the argument I did with myself over this one. It
9 wasn't simple. There are some of you who have been on
10 the committee longer than three consecutive terms and I
11 have great respect for every one of you, so it hurts me
12 to ask people to, in two years, to rotate out. But on
13 the other hand, I've seen some of the strengths that
14 the new players bring, and the new blood and the fresh
15 look that comes with them, so on balance, that's the
16 proposal I have as far as it relates to term limits.

17 **MEETING FORMAT - BEST WAY TO CONDUCT BUSINESS**

18 Really, the rest of this, I've taken a little
19 out of turn. The second point I wanted to talk about
20 was meeting format. I think we got a lot of good input
21 from people and what I've heard is that people, members
22 of the committee, tend to like both separate and joint

1 sessions. And there was pretty strong support for
2 joint sessions. But I think I also heard a pretty
3 strong vote for separate discussions. I know that, for
4 example, in the December meeting, there was some
5 confusion over who was voting on what, and I think we
6 can obviate that. So it would be our intent, when we
7 do face-to-face meetings, and when we do votes, as a
8 general rule, to have both separate and joint session
9 together, as we used to. We would call one committee
10 in first, meet at least a half a day, if not a day,
11 depends on how much business we have to do. We would
12 then meet in joint session, and then the other
13 committee would meet in separate session. The
14 committee's meetings would be stretched out over the
15 course of two to three days, it depends on how much
16 business we have to do and how much voting.

17 I clearly hear the call for scheduling these
18 meetings further in advance. I wish it was as easy as
19 just saying, oh, let's meet on November 15th. But I
20 think most of you by now realize the regulatory process
21 is hard to predict, and when we call you together face-
22 to-face, we don't want to waste your time. We really

1 want to have the business we absolutely need you face-
2 to-face for, which is voting on proposals that we put
3 before you.

4 So, with apologies, I just want to say we've
5 heard that. We will do our level best. I think that's
6 why John says December, because I believe that we'll be
7 ready to vote on low stress phase 2 long before that,
8 but who knows?

9 MR. GALE: It could be soon.

10 MR. WIESE: Yeah, it could be sooner, but
11 we've got to keep an eye on the regulatory process and
12 follow that one through. That's the primary driver
13 there.

14 And the one other thing that I heard in a number
15 of comments that came through here that I'm very
16 receptive to, is the possibility of associated field
17 trips. I know we tend to meet face-to-face in
18 Washington only. The world revolves around Washington,
19 D.C. I think almost all of us would like to meet
20 somewhere else, but there are plenty of places, even in
21 Washington, that we could take field trips and members
22 of the committee who don't get a frequent opportunity

1 to go to the physical facilities would have that. So
2 I'd like, certainly, to take that under advisement and
3 recommend that you bring your boots and your parka to
4 the December meeting, and maybe we'll find a field trip
5 for you here.

6 MR. GALE: Jeff, could I recommend possibly
7 Arizona next week?

8 MR. WIESE: Well, Mike Comstock offered to
9 host and he promises the temperatures will drop from
10 110, but --

11 MR. COMSTOCK: We can go to the zoo.

12 MR. WIESE: The zoo, all right. Instead of
13 having our own. Very good.

14 And then lastly, the meetings and process
15 improvements, the part that's in bold I thought every
16 one of those were legitimate issues. And I don't think
17 anybody felt that strongly. Just

- 18 • Want materials earlier,
- 19 • They'd like them in e-mail,
- 20 • They like their briefing books.

21 We do realize that voting was a little
22 convoluted in December, so we're going to work

1 desperately to avoid that, whether we have to subdivide
2 things and say, here's exactly what we're voting on. I
3 continue to work with our counsel, we have Ben Fred
4 here from counsel, representing us today to help them
5 understand the need for creativity when it comes to
6 voting. It's really important, I think, for the
7 committee members to understand what they're voting on,
8 and oftentimes it's hard to do that unless you can see
9 the language. We do understand that we can't favor an
10 outcome, but we're trying to put something up so the
11 committee can relate to it and vote on it, and
12 understand what it is.

13 So I certainly welcome any other advice from
14 the committee members, but I would say by and large,
15 all the things that were bolded there under process
16 improvements are things that we'll take to heart and
17 try to work on those. So, really Collette, I'm happy
18 to talk about this at some length, but that's largely
19 what I wanted to say as far as the administrative
20 matters, unless, Cheryl, am I leaving anything out that
21 you wanted to comment on? That's it? Okay, Collette.

22 MS. HONORABLE: Thank you, Jack. Any

1 questions or comments?

2 **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, COMMENTS**

3 MR. DRAKE: This is Andy Drake with Spectra
4 Energy. I get to make an observation. It seems like
5 we get -- not that I'm questioning what our role is,
6 it's kind of back away from the trees for a minute and
7 look over the landscape -- we often kind of get tangled
8 up very, very tactically in final stages of rule
9 proposals over language, which is important, and I
10 don't certainly mean to undermine that or trivialize
11 that, but there's a lot of things that are going on,
12 moving parts in the industry.

13 And I think sometimes it helps all of us --
14 I've seen us do this in the past, not that I've been on
15 that many years -- but where we sat down and talked
16 about why are you issuing advisory notices, to what
17 kinds of threats and concerns are you seeing, what are
18 the technical issues that we need to be addressing in
19 closing so that we stay in concert, as a group, the
20 public, the regulator, and the industry, on what needs
21 to be done to address and close gaps.

22 Sometimes we're brought almost a fait

1 accompli. Well, here's the answer, and then it's like,
2 well, how did we get here? And we spend a lot of time
3 kind of backing up. Is there some interest on trying
4 to set a part of our agenda where we look ahead and try
5 to, you know, what are the emerging issues and what do
6 we need to be doing? And kind of learning, as a group,
7 to close those gaps, whether they're standards or
8 technical issues or research or whatever.

9 MR. WIESE: Yes. It's pretty all-
10 encompassing. I'd have to break them down almost into
11 those categories, because the research is emerging --
12 we're on the cusp. We'll be announcing later this week
13 or early next week, the most recent awards from Broad
14 Agency Announcement 7. It's pretty significant
15 investment in R&D, and that R&D goes into everything
16 from leak detection to anomaly detection, to
17 characterization, new construction issues. So I think
18 it's a legitimate, and certainly the committee would
19 want to have broad cognizance of the fact that research
20 is underway, that research then feeds the standards,
21 and the standards underpin some of the regulations.
22 So, Andy, I welcome any proposals that you

1 all want to make for having that. If we have too free-
2 form of a discussion, we won't get anywhere. So I
3 welcome that idea. You're a junior member of the
4 committee if I remember right --

5 MR. DRAKE: Yeah.

6 MR. WIESE: Having only been here since '95
7 or '99.

8 MR. DRAKE: I know in the ... days, when we
9 going through developing that rule, this committee was
10 meeting very frequently to try to vet out how things
11 needed to be evolved. So it became kind of an integral
12 part between identification of gaps and development of
13 standards, where we were actually in there, so that
14 when standards came out, so to speak, the committee
15 understood why they did what they did, and were
16 actually a part of that process. We've sort of faded
17 back from that role. I guess I'm just thinking out
18 loud, but maybe a more active use of the committee in
19 that function could kill a lot of birds with one stone.

20 MR. MOHN: This is Jerald Mohn. To add to my
21 senior colleague. I think just to take a real life,
22 current example of those issues, is related to the pipe

1 manufacturing process. Our efforts, and your guys'
2 leadership have shown some gaps in the standards
3 process, maybe gaps in specifications, other issues
4 that I think, working together, we have jointly
5 developed a lot of learning. And what I'm interested
6 in is how we memorialize that learning in such a way so
7 that going forward we have those things in front of us
8 and it may be something so simple as a committee with
9 taking a topic, like pipe quality, and getting some
10 feedback on whether that's a standards gap, whether
11 it's a regulation gap, or whether it's memorialized in
12 some other fashion.

13 Given that all of us working through this
14 committee, that in our day jobs have typically some
15 level of involvement with many of these issues, and it
16 would be helpful to kind of see the path forward.

17 MR. WIESE: This is Jeff. I'll try to
18 respond to say that in the last, in the December
19 session, we intentionally focused on the challenge of
20 new construction, perhaps not in the level of depth
21 that we would like to, and so I'd say there may be a
22 lot more to be done there. We appreciated the

1 leadership that both of you gentlemen showed, not only
2 in making those presentations to the other members of
3 the committee, but in the actual working groups that
4 were addressing these challenges.

5 I will tell you that from PHMSA's standpoint,
6 I thought those were urgent challenges. They needed to
7 be addressed immediately. They weren't the kinds of
8 things that we could enter a two-year rulemaking to
9 solve, and that's why we took a -- we were fairly
10 public about our posture on new construction, on
11 purpose. I know that you guys would agree with me,
12 these were -- there were gaps everywhere. There were
13 gaps in standards. There were gaps in regulations.
14 And there are gaps in company procedures, but we've
15 been able to move, I think, pretty well in a public way
16 to show those and I think drive some important change
17 there.

18 I do welcome the idea -- I mean if you're
19 talking about -- I remember once upon a time there used
20 to be subgroups that would be formed who would study
21 something and they would report back to the rest of
22 that. I certainly welcome that, but maybe not on such

1 an urgent matter. New construction, at the rate it was
2 going on, we really needed to get after that
3 immediately, and I think you'd agree.

4 But we have at least, I would say up to a day
5 of joint session to work with, anywhere from a half day
6 to a day of joint session when we get together, and
7 that won't be voting time. So I'm willing to devote
8 that time to what you'd like. And if you'd like to
9 have a more depth conversation about that or some other
10 topic, I welcome that.

11 This isn't supposed to be just PHMSA's show.
12 Remember when I took over the committee what I said
13 was I didn't want to just have you come together when
14 you had to vote. So there is a policy role for the
15 committee, and I just say I welcome ideas on how we can
16 better use the talents that are assembled here.

17 MR. MOHN: Thanks.

18 MS. HONORABLE: Any other comments or
19 questions?

20 MR. SKOLNIK: Hi. This is John Skolnick at
21 Jack Foss (ph) Associates, and we --

22 MR. WIESE: John, can you hang on one second?

1 We're still in the committee session. We'll have a
2 public --

3 MR. SKOLNIK: The committee? Oh, I just
4 wanted to make a comment --

5 MR. WIESE: We'll open it up to the public in
6 a minute.

7 MS. HONORABLE: I apologize, I wasn't very
8 clear. Right now we're concluding our discussion of
9 administrative matters. Are there any questions or
10 comments from the committee on this topic? All right,
11 Jeff, I'll turn it back over to you.

12 MR. WIESE: Okay, so with apologies, there, I
13 would appreciate -- we have an opportunity to hear from
14 the committee all year long, we all know each other by
15 now, and I welcome messages. I know that John and
16 Cheryl do, and Mike, all of our people are pretty open
17 to working with any of the members of the committee, as
18 well as members of the public. A couple comments in a
19 minute, but maybe it would be appropriate, Collette,
20 with your permission, if we just create an opportunity
21 for public comment, and maybe we'll start with the
22 gentleman from Fosset Associates who I cut off because

1 he was in the committee comment section.

2 MS. HONORABLE: Sure, and Jeff, thank you for
3 recommending this. This is an important part, I
4 believe, of this process. We do value the work of
5 those committee members who have given years in several
6 instances, in effort and all of the many very important
7 issues that we take up. We also would like to make
8 time for the public now. If you would identify
9 yourself, who you're with, and for the record, before
10 you begin your comment, the subject on which you make
11 your comment. Thank you.

12 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

13 MR. SKOLNIK: This is John Skolnik, with Jack
14 Fossett Associates and I thought we had moved on. You
15 asked for other comments, so I thought we had moved on.
16 I just want to thank PHMSA and the panel for asking us
17 to attend, and it's been interesting listening to
18 what's going on and keeping up to date on the current
19 regulations. And we just appreciate the chance to
20 participate.

21 MS. HONORABLE: Thank you. Any other public
22 comment, from the public at this time? Any other

1 public comment? I'm asking again in case someone
2 accidentally had the mute button pushed. If not,
3 again, we appreciate your participation as well, your
4 presence and your interest in these issues. And Jeff,
5 I'll turn it over to you for closing.

6 MR. LEMOFF: This is Tedd Lemoff. I'm a
7 member of the gas committee. Could I make one comment?

8 MS. HONORABLE: Yes, please do.

9 MR. LEMOFF: Thank you. I want to respond to
10 Jeff's suggestions or recommendations that there be
11 term limits, and I did speak to the committee on this
12 at the last meeting as I believe I am the longest-
13 standing member of the gas committee. And while I have
14 been, I certainly appreciate the need to be progressive
15 et cetera, and I have no opposition to Jeff's
16 recommendation. Thank you.

17 MR. WIESE: Thank you, Tedd.

18 MS. HONORABLE: Yes, thank you, and thank you
19 for your service.

20 MR. LEMOFF: Thank you.

21 MR. WIESE: And Tedd is right. Tedd and
22 Denise Hamsher on the liquid, I think, are the two

1 longest, both since 1995.

2 MS. HAMSHER: You did say longest, not
3 oldest?

4 MR. WIESE: You both started fresh out of
5 high school. We like those interns.

6 MS. HONORABLE: Thank you, Denise, that's a
7 very important distinction.

8 MR. WIESE: And both of them are obviously
9 stalwarts of the committee, and have seen us through a
10 lot of change here.

11 First of all, let me thank, if I can,
12 Collette. Collette, you know, proving once again that
13 the Commissioners know how to run meetings. We
14 appreciate your organizational skills and letting us
15 drop you in there sort of at the last minute. I didn't
16 hear Lula, or she would have been clapping that we had
17 done that to you.

18 MS. HONORABLE: I tell everyone I'm Lula's
19 protégée.

20 MS. FORD: Okay.

21 MR. WIESE: Well, she's a good teacher. She
22 does well too, so we like to spread that joy around.

1 presentations today, and also Ben for standing -- Ben
2 Fred, for standing by our pipeline council in case I
3 got in trouble, he could warn me and put up flags.

4 Just special thanks if I can, I hope I'm not
5 premature in this, but announcing Pete Terranova from
6 UGI Utilities in Pennsylvania is moving on, and Pete's
7 been a valued member of the committee, and another
8 gentleman with whom I've had a lot of opportunity to
9 work and I know that PHMSA has, Jim Wunderlin -- Jim,
10 it's my understanding that you'll be moving on as well
11 as part of that changeover in the committee, but both
12 great gentlemen, great technical resources to the
13 committees over the years and we want to thank you for
14 all of your contributions and acknowledge your service.

15 MR. WUNDERLIN: Well, thank you, Jeff. This
16 is Jim, and I've really enjoyed being on the committee
17 over the years and enjoyed working with all of you. I
18 think working together, we've come a long way in
19 improving safety, and I think that's the bottom line.
20 So I really felt honored to be on the committee with
21 you again.

22 MR. WIESE: And we've been honored to have

1 you. I don't think Pete is on. I heard someone
2 speaking for him, and if you would, please relay our
3 thanks to Pete. Hopefully, we'll see Pete and we'll
4 thank him in person after that.

5 So I think that that's it. I'll open it up,
6 any other members of the committee have any concluding
7 remarks?

8 MS. HONORABLE: This is Collette. I also
9 wanted to thank Cheryl for her assistance in prepping
10 me for the call. I think we all owe a debt of credit
11 to her. She helped keep the train on the track.

12 MS. WHETZEL: Thank you, Collette.

13 MR. WIESE: Great. I add my thanks to her as
14 well. Anyone else?

15 (Whereupon, at 2:55 p.m., the meeting in the
16 above captioned matter was adjourned.)
17
18
19
20
21
22

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
before:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

In the Matter of:

**TECHNICAL PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS
COMMITTEE**

**TECHNICAL HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE
SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

Were held as herein appears and that this is the
original transcript thereof for the file of the
Department, Commission, Board, Administrative Law Judge
or the Agency.

Further, I am neither counsel for or related to
any party to the above proceedings.

Debra Derr
Official Reporter

Dated: August 31, 2010