

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

+ + + + +

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

JOINT MEETING OF THE GAS PIPELINE (GPAC) AND
LIQUID PIPELINE (LPAC) ADVISORY COMMITTEES

+ + + + +

FRIDAY

AUGUST 9, 2013

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committees met in the
F. Scott Fitzgerald Ballroom, The Westin
Arlington Gateway, 801 N. Glebe Road,
Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m, Colette
Honorable, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT

COLETTE HONORABLE, Chairperson

LANNY ARMSTRONG

MICHAEL BELLMAN

TODD DENTON

ANDREW DRAKE

RICHARD FEIGEL

TIMOTHY FELT

SUSAN FLECK

WAYNE GARDNER

ROBERT HILL

RICHARD KUPREWICZ

CHARLES LESNIAK III

RON McLAIN

CRAIG PIERSON

DONALD STURSMA

CARL WEIMER

RICHARD WORSINGER

JEFF WRIGHT

CHAD ZAMARIN

ALSO PRESENT

JEFF WIESE, Designated Federal Official

TERRY BOSS, Interstate Natural Gas Association

of America (INGAA)

DWAYNE BURTON, Kinder Morgan

LINDA DOUGHERTY, PHMSA

JOHN GALE, PHMSA

BLAINE KEENER, PHMSA

PETER LIDIAK, American Petroleum Institute

ALAN MAYBERRY, PHMSA

CHRISTIE MURRAY, PHMSA

AMY NELSON, PHMSA

CHRISTINA SAMES, American Gas Association

CAMERON SATTERTHWAITE, PHMSA

MARK WARNER, Questar

CHERYL WHETSEL, PHMSA

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Call to Order and Opening Remarks	5
Jeff Wiese	5, 11
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety	
Colette Honorable Chairperson	15
Introductions	7
National Pipeline Mapping System	15
Amy Nelson	15
GIS Manager	
Questions and Comments	29
Jeff Wiese	64
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety	
Integrity Verification Processes (IVP)	67
Jeff Wiese	68, 143
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety	
Steve Nanney	69
PHMSA	
Questions and Comments	83
Gas Transmission 2012 Annual Report	152
Blaine Keener	
PHMSA	
Questions and Comments	169

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (CONTINUED)

Public Awareness Meeting and Update 172

Christie Murray 172

PHMSA

Questions and Comments 184

Open Discussion 189

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:33 a.m.

MR. WIESE: We are going to go ahead to go ahead and get started. So, if everybody could take a seat? Thank you.

So, good morning, everyone. I hope you had a great night last night.

Welcome to our typical Washington weather. Those who are from town know we have had a break recently. It has been in the seventies and eighties and dry, but now we are back to like Houston. So, you guys feel right at home, any of you from Houston, right?

Very good. Well, welcome back to day two of the Joint Session of our Pipeline Advisory Committees.

In just a second, I will be turning the reins over to our esteemed ringmaster, Colette Honorable, Chairman down in the Arkansas Public Service Commission, and I think it is fair to say incoming President of the National Association of Regulatory

1 Utility Commissioners.

2 We are very pleased to have her
3 here today. Always happy to have her next to
4 me running a meeting.

5 So, today, if you can bear with us
6 a little bit, we talked to some of the members
7 who need to catch planes, and we want to try
8 to jostle things a little bit. Since we don't
9 have a vote today, I hope you will bear with
10 us.

11 I thought what I would do is, when
12 Amy cues me and tells me that she is ready, we
13 may do the mapping thing first. Then, we will
14 do IVP.

15 And I wanted, in particular, in
16 the IVP session -- so, heads-up to any of you
17 who want to -- Steve Nanny is going to do
18 about a 15-minute overview for those who
19 weren't at the day-long workshop, just high-
20 level overview.

21 Then, I want the members to each
22 have the time to get on the record.

1 Hopefully, no 15-minute soliloquies, but five
2 minutes to get on the record or something like
3 that. This is an ongoing discussion.

4 So, after that, we will come back
5 and we will have Blaine Keener talk about the
6 data, which those of you who were in the
7 workshop already saw. And then, we will come
8 back and talk about public awareness.

9 And we will run it pretty hard and
10 fast. So, hopefully, everyone will be out of
11 here at lunch break. Does that work for you?
12 Okay. Very good. I am just trying to
13 accommodate, get people home in time for the
14 weekend with their family.

15 So, with that, maybe we will just
16 unofficially do introductions because there
17 are always new people who show up here.

18 So, my name is Jeff Wiese. I am
19 Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety at
20 the U.S. DOT's Pipeline and Hazardous
21 Materials Safety Administration.

22 I think maybe we will introduce

1 the PHMSA crowd, and then, we will walk around
2 the table, starting with Ron.

3 MS. DAUGHERTY: Linda Daugherty,
4 Deputy Associate Administrator for Field
5 Operations, kind of, and Region Director in
6 Kansas City.

7 MR. MAYBERRY: Good morning.

8 Alan Mayberry, Deputy Associate
9 Administrator for Policy and Programs here in
10 D.C.

11 MR. SATTERTHWAITE: Cameron
12 Satterthwaite, Regulations.

13 MR. GALE: John Gale, Regulations.

14 MS. NELSON: Amy Nelson, GIS
15 Manager.

16 MS. WHETSEL: Cheryl Whetsel, also
17 in Regulations.

18 (Other introductions made off-
19 microphone.)

20 MR. WIESE: Ron?

21 MEMBER McLAIN: Ron McLain. I am
22 the President of Product Pipelines for Kinder

1 Morgan Energy Partners.

2 MEMBER FEIGEL: Gene Feigel, Vice
3 President, Risk Analysis, the Hartford Steam
4 Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company. I am
5 on the Gas Committee.

6 MEMBER ZAMARIN: Chad Zamarin,
7 Chief Operating Officer, NiSource, Midstream,
8 on the Gas Committee.

9 MEMBER WRIGHT: Jeff Wright,
10 Director of Office of Energy Projects, Federal
11 Energy Regulatory Commission, Gas Committee.

12 MEMBER DRAKE: Andy Drake, Vice
13 President, Asset Integrity, U.S. Operations,
14 Inspector, Energy, Gas Committee.

15 MEMBER HILL: Robert Hill,
16 Brookings County Development Director, and I
17 am on the Gas Committee.

18 MEMBER FLECK: Sue Fleck. I am
19 Vice President of Engineering Standards and
20 Policy at National Grid, and I am on the Gas
21 Committee.

22 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Colete

1 Honorable. I am with the Arkansas Public
2 Service Commission and NARUC First Vice
3 President.

4 Pleased to be with you all today,
5 and I want to offer my regrets for not being
6 in attendance yesterday. I had a previously-
7 scheduled meeting with one of the participants
8 who is former Secretary Rodney Slater. So, he
9 sends his regards to all of you.

10 And I am on the Gas Committee.

11 MEMBER BELLMAN: Mike Bellman,
12 Deputy Director of Gas and Light for the City
13 of Richmond Municipal Utility, and I am on the
14 Gas Committee.

15 MEMBER DENTON: Todd Denton,
16 President, Phillips 66 Pipeline, Liquids.

17 MEMBER STURSMA: Don Stursma,
18 Manager of Safety and Engineering, Iowa
19 Utilities Board, Gas Committee.

20 MEMBER WORSINGER: Rich Worsinger,
21 Director of Utilities for the City of Rocky
22 Mount, North Carolina. I am on the Gas

1 Committee.

2 MEMBER WEIMER: Carl Weimer,
3 Executive Director of the Pipeline Safety
4 Trust, Liquids Committee.

5 MEMBER FELT: Tim Felt, Colonial
6 Pipeline Company, on the Liquids Committee.

7 MEMBER PIERSON: Craig Pierson,
8 President of Marathon Pipeline, Liquids.

9 MEMBER KUPREWICZ: Rick Kuprewicz,
10 President of Accufacts, Incorporated, on the
11 Liquids.

12 MEMBER ARMSTRONG: Lanny
13 Armstrong, Fire Chief, City of Pasadena,
14 Texas, Liquids Committee.

15 MR. WIESE: Okay. Very good. I
16 think we got everyone.

17 I am not going to go around the
18 audience, although it is small enough today
19 that I could make you all introduce
20 yourselves.

21 But since time is of the essence
22 here, just kind of a couple of quick other

1 things and I will turn it over to Colette.

2 The primary purpose of our meeting
3 today is to really get the advice and counsel
4 from people on this federally-chartered
5 Advisory Committee. So, we will be here to
6 hear from them.

7 Time permitting, we will provide
8 an opportunity, at Colette's discretion, you
9 know, if we have time, for public comment on
10 topics that we are talking about. But we are
11 primarily here to hear from the Committee.

12 If and when we have the
13 opportunity -- we don't have any votes. So,
14 if we had a vote, we would definitely make
15 time. But, since we don't have a vote, we
16 will just play it by ear, depending on timing.
17 But if we do have time, I want to remind
18 people from the audience, as well as people
19 from here -- and we were slipping yesterday,
20 a few people -- please try, since we are
21 transcribing the meeting and everything that
22 is said, to introduce yourself each time and

1 who you are with. It is really helpful to the
2 court reporter. You know, generally speaking,
3 we can guess that.

4 If you are from the audience and
5 it is a public time, I assure you that we will
6 try to, if you feel desperately about getting
7 a point across, we will provide time for you.
8 Just let us know.

9 What I cannot and will not abide
10 by is people interrupting the Advisory
11 Committee. It is a federally-chartered
12 Committee here for a purpose. So, I am just
13 doing that so everybody has common
14 expectations. I do have Security alerted. If
15 people can't abide by those rules, I will have
16 you shown to the door, and I will do it
17 quickly. So, let's be clear. Then, there are
18 no hard feelings, right? I just want
19 everybody to play it by the rule and be
20 respectful, and we will get along just great.

21 The meeting is being recorded. We
22 do remind the members that, when you have

1 something to say, that you take your tent card
2 and put it up, so the Chairwoman can see that
3 you have a question.

4 The meeting record, as I said,
5 will be transcribed, and it will be available
6 through regulations.gov. The docket number is
7 PHSMA-2013-0156.

8 The last couple of things I will
9 mention: thankfully, and by now, most of you
10 know, there is a Starbucks on the first floor;
11 thank you.

12 (Laughter.)

13 There are restrooms out the doors
14 to the right and, then, all the way around to
15 the left as you go out. And the fire exits
16 are in the same location. So, I just want to
17 make sure everyone knows in case there is
18 something that happens, that that is where you
19 need to go.

20 So, I think, with that, I will
21 call the meeting to order and hand it over to
22 the Chairwoman.

1 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
2 Jeff.

3 As always, I look forward to these
4 meetings. I am looking forward to being
5 informed and looking forward to hearing from
6 all of you.

7 And we will begin a little bit out
8 of order this morning. We will hear from Amy
9 Nelson. You heard her introduce herself as
10 the PHMSA GIS Manager, who will visit with us
11 regarding mapping.

12 Amy?

13 MS. NELSON: Good morning,
14 everyone.

15 I'm Amy, and it is great to meet
16 so many people that I have heard of or talked
17 to on the phone over the years.

18 So, today I am going to talk about
19 the National Pipeline Mapping System and some
20 much-needed improvements that we are making to
21 it.

22 But, first, I want to kind of take

1 us back to 1998. Now most of us probably
2 remember 1998, right? Well, this is what some
3 common home pages of popular websites looked
4 like in 1998. This is what was on the news.
5 This is what you paid for a gallon of gas in
6 1998.

7 (Laughter.)

8 This is the latest in cutting-edge
9 technology with the iMac and the big, old cell
10 phone.

11 And this is what people looked
12 like in 1998. Okay?

13 (Laughter.)

14 So, yes, a lot has changed, right?
15 For one thing, the price of gas. But what
16 hasn't changed since 1998? Well, the data the
17 NPMS collects.

18 So, in 1998, the NPMS data
19 standards were written in a Joint Committee
20 with industry and PHMSA. And I heard that
21 there would be kind of a mixed level of
22 knowledge about the NPMS in the room and about

1 knowledge about GIS as well.

2 So, I am just going to briefly say
3 the NPMS is our program of collecting
4 geospatial data from operators, analyzing the
5 data, and disseminating it. Gas transmission
6 and hazardous liquid operators are part of
7 this program, and gas distribution and
8 gathering are not.

9 So, when the standards were
10 drafted in 1998, they kind of reflected the
11 state of GIS and GPSes at that time, GPSes
12 having an evolution somewhat similar to cell
13 phones. So, at the time the accuracy for
14 GPSes was pretty poor, and GIS was not in its
15 infancy. In fact, it kind of began in the
16 seventies or eighties, but it was not as
17 widely used.

18 When the standards were drafted,
19 the optional submissions began circa
20 2000/2001. That is when the first NPMS web-
21 mapping applications were launched, in the
22 spring of 2001. But the attributes collected

1 were minimal because submission was optional,
2 and we wanted to encourage operators to
3 submit, so as not to make it too much of a
4 burden on them.

5 And then, the Pipeline Safety
6 Improvement Act of 2002 made it mandatory to
7 submit the data to the NPMS, but there was
8 only six months between that Act being passed
9 and submissions being due for the first time.
10 So, PHMSA opted not to change our data
11 standards.

12 Now, it being 2013, we are seeing
13 so many deficiencies in the dataset; it is
14 lagging so far behind what we know that
15 operators have and what technology can do.

16 This ties into PHMSA's
17 reauthorization mandate, which had a couple of
18 specific mentions for the NPMS, saying that we
19 must promote greater awareness of it and also
20 saying the Secretary has the power to collect
21 additional geospatial data.

22 So, as a result, we are drafting

1 the information collection to obtain the data
2 that we need to do our mission; specifically,
3 mission goals of safety, environmental
4 stewardship, reliability, and assisting
5 emergency responders, as well as the
6 government officials and other stakeholders
7 that we work with.

8 The information collection is
9 still being drafted. It is not in its final
10 state yet. So, I am going to talk in general
11 terms about what will be in it.

12 We are going to tighten the
13 positional accuracy. Currently, that is plus
14 or minus 500 feet. In fact, I have a diagram
15 coming up which will show you exactly how many
16 pipelines can fall in that 500-foot swathe.
17 It is a lot of pipelines.

18 We are going to collect additional
19 pipeline attributes. One example is pipe
20 grade.

21 We are going to collect additional
22 pipeline-related facility data. So, this is

1 a little different because, first, we are
2 talking about the pipeline itself and
3 attributes of the pipeline. Pipeline-related
4 facility data is something like a pump
5 station. So, that is a point, instead of a
6 line, it is a point that sits on the pipeline.
7 It is a separate feature.

8 We are going to slightly modify
9 the LNG plant attributes, and we are going to
10 make breakout tank submissions mandatory.
11 They are currently optional, and we currently
12 have definitely less than a 50-percent rate
13 for breakout tanks.

14 Here's the timeline that we are
15 operating on. We are just kind of wrapping up
16 our internal comments right now in the
17 information collection. It will be published
18 in fall 2013. There will be a 60-day comment
19 period. We expect the Final Notice sometime
20 in 2014. So that the earliest we would start
21 collecting this data from the operators is
22 2015.

1 A big part of the puzzle here is
2 the security of the new data. We are all
3 concerned about that. We know that some of
4 the things we would like to collect are very
5 security-sensitive. And we are going to be
6 working with TSA on a suitable policy to
7 protect this data. And again, it is very
8 unlikely that most of this will appear to the
9 public.

10 This is how the data is going to
11 help us meet our mission goals. We need to
12 better identify, regulate, and respond to
13 emergencies for our regulatory assets. And to
14 do that, we need to know where they are and
15 exactly what type of asset it is.

16 We have risk-ranking algorithms
17 that could be greatly strengthened by having
18 more information about the pipe and running it
19 through the GIS. Things like coating, SMYS,
20 and MAOP are sample inputs to the risk-ranking
21 algorithms.

22 The improved positional accuracy

1 that we are shooting for will help us more
2 accurately locate the pipe, especially in
3 areas where there is a lot of pipelines in the
4 right-of-way.

5 And we have key internal tabular
6 datasets that refer to features that are not
7 in the GIS. I will give you a few examples of
8 this. And we would like to link more of our
9 tabular data to the GIS, so that we can
10 analyze things geospatially. We can see on a
11 map a pattern that you can't see when you are
12 leafing through pages and pages of tabular
13 data.

14 The color is a little bit faint
15 here, but I think you can see that circle.
16 That is a 500-foot circle. You know, there
17 are many, many areas like this where we have
18 got at least two dozen lines in that 500-foot
19 radius. So, again, the 500-foot accuracy
20 means a line could fall anywhere within that
21 circle, no matter where it actually is on the
22 ground.

1 And here are two examples of
2 referencing data that the NPMS does not have.
3 It is from our Data Mart, which is our kind of
4 big collection of most of the tabular datasets
5 that we collect, things like inspection
6 records.

7 And again, I know you can't read
8 it, the scale. But the first one refers to
9 pump and compressor stations. It says it runs
10 -- let me see if I can laser this here -- it
11 runs from Station 50 through Station 54. What
12 this is is a description of an inspection
13 unit, which is the boundaries that an
14 inspector inspects when they go out on an
15 inspection.

16 So, how do we know where this is
17 if we don't have the pump and compressor
18 stations? Well, today either we can use an
19 auxiliary commercial dataset, which usually,
20 almost always, doesn't line up exactly on our
21 pipelines, or we can pour through aerial
22 imagery to say, "Is that a pump station or is

1 that a 7-11?" And that is kind of what we
2 have been doing to date.

3 The second example, which is even
4 fuzzier, talks about diameter. The unit
5 consists of 153 miles of 20-inch line. Again,
6 this is a way to define that inspection
7 boundary.

8 Now, diameter, you might be
9 wondering why I have this up here, because
10 isn't it mandatory? Well, no, it is actually
11 optional, and we get the records from 75 to 80
12 percent of pipeline operators, but not all of
13 them. And it seems like, whenever you are
14 looking at a line, the one you want doesn't
15 have the diameter entered.

16 This is how we went about writing
17 the information collection draft. We talked
18 to all levels of PHMSA. We talked to the
19 Regional Directors down to Inspectors in the
20 field, you know, all different groups, to talk
21 about our mission needs.

22 We looked at the data we currently

1 collect, and we said, where are the holes?

2 And I would like to extend my
3 sincere thanks to five operators who I visited
4 to interview about their GIS data. That would
5 be NiSource, Marathon, National Grid,
6 Colonial, and Access Midstream. They all
7 spent a day or two with me and Leah and shared
8 the data, and talked about what is in their
9 GIS and what is not in their GIS.

10 And I also spoke with some current
11 and former industry employees about, again,
12 what is in their GIS; what would it take to
13 get things into their GIS, if needed.

14 One of the other benefits that we
15 hope to realize with this information
16 collection is to simplify the annual reports.
17 Now I have been at PHMSA for about seven-and-
18 a-half years now. Over the past at least 10
19 years, we have made a couple of attempts to
20 change the annual report and start collecting
21 that data through the NPMS instead of the ARs.
22 And to date, we have had mixed success, but I

1 think that technology and the industry is
2 reaching a point where this is very feasible.

3 We don't want to collect duplicate
4 data. We don't want you to have to prepare
5 both the NPMS and the annual report. We are
6 actually trying to simplify what you collect
7 and just have this in your NPMS submission.
8 After you do it the first time, it should be
9 easier just to kind of spit out those figures.

10 For example, you pipeline
11 construction, in the annual reports it is by
12 decade. We are considering having it by
13 actual year. So, if it is in your system by
14 the actual year, you don't have to dumb it
15 down anymore for the annual reports. It will
16 just spit out of your system what you have in
17 there.

18 And we hope that eventually, past
19 the initial hump here, it will provide you
20 with easier and faster annual report
21 preparation. But the big benefit is the data
22 will be so much better quality and more

1 precise.

2 A couple of ways in which we will
3 use the new data. There is a lot of text
4 here.

5 But promoting public awareness.
6 This goes back to the reauthorization and
7 improving our public awareness, and helping
8 our emergency responders in a more complete
9 way.

10 The second bullet talks about more
11 powerful analysis. Like I said, you can see
12 patterns in geospatial data that aren't
13 apparent anywhere else. If you want to, for
14 example, trace a pipeline back through
15 different operators, you basically have to
16 rely on institutional knowledge to know who
17 operated this pipeline in the past.

18 Well, we have implemented
19 something we call historical tracking that
20 tracks a pipeline every year. What happened
21 to it? Did it change operators? Did it
22 change commodity? Was there a reroute? Was

1 there a lateral added?

2 So, this provides us with a much
3 higher level of analysis, which, of course,
4 will help our program evaluation and decision
5 support, et cetera.

6 I talked about the risk-ranking
7 algorithm, how it is really going to
8 strengthen that.

9 And assisting our emergency
10 responders in a more complete way by providing
11 them with just better pipeline maps and more
12 comprehensive data about the pipelines that we
13 are all protecting. Certain aspects, like
14 pressure, might come into play when responding
15 to an emergency.

16 And last, helping our in-house
17 inspectors by more accurately identifying the
18 pipelines and giving inspectors more
19 information when they are going out on the
20 inspections.

21 Now we have the possibility to
22 have a link between the tabular data and the

1 geospatial data. Then, we can show that data
2 through our GIS, whether it be internal or
3 external.

4 Okay. That wraps up my
5 presentation. I thank you for your time, and
6 I will take questions.

7 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
8 Amy.

9 Let's begin first with the Joint
10 Committee. If you will turn your placards if
11 you have a question? And then, we will take
12 any from the audience.

13 We will begin with Sue. Please
14 identify yourself for the record.

15 MEMBER FLECK: My name is Sue
16 Fleck, National Grid, and I am on the Gas
17 Committee.

18 I have two questions, Amy. And we
19 enjoyed your visit at National Grid.

20 MS. NELSON: Thank you.

21 MEMBER FLECK: I got some very
22 positive feedback.

1 The first question is about
2 distribution systems. Most of what you talked
3 about today is more information about LNG
4 plants, transmission lines. You are not
5 really looking for geospatial on distribution
6 systems yet. It is more just the how many
7 miles of pipe kind of thing?

8 MS. NELSON: That is correct.

9 MEMBER FLECK: Great.

10 MS. NELSON: It is a no answer; we
11 are not looking for distribution lines.

12 MEMBER FLECK: Perfect, because
13 that would just be an abnormally huge amount
14 of data.

15 The second question is you
16 mentioned that you guys do -- you said
17 something.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: She caught
20 you.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. WIESE: You have just got to

1 reserve your rights there.

2 (Laughter.)

3 Mains maybe; service lines, I
4 doubt.

5 MEMBER FLECK: Not in this round?

6 MR. WIESE: Not in this round.

7 MEMBER FLECK: Okay. Great.

8 The second question, you mentioned
9 that you do a risk-ranking. You have your own
10 algorithm. Do you share the results of that
11 with the companies, where you see our risk
12 versus where we see our risk?

13 MS. NELSON: I might be the wrong
14 person to answer that. There is a specific
15 committee that does the risk-ranking, and we
16 provide inputs to them. Now how exactly they
17 disseminate it, I will have to refer to
18 someone else.

19 MR. WIESE: Yes. I will just say
20 that ranking is done for the purposes of
21 scheduling our next inspections. So, we don't
22 demand a level of precision at decimal-place

1 accuracy because it is really about just
2 scheduling.

3 But I will tell you that, yes, we
4 do use the aggregate data to call in operators
5 that we are concerned with. So, if you
6 haven't had a phone call from us recently,
7 probably you are not at that list, and I doubt
8 many of the members here would be. But we do
9 use it to call operators in and have
10 conversations about their performance.

11 MEMBER FLECK: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Carl?

13 MEMBER WEIMER: Carl Weimer,
14 Liquids Committee.

15 The recent reauthorization from
16 2011 under "public awareness" had a mandate to
17 provide HCA information on NPMS, but it was a
18 little less clear -- and I know it is hard to
19 believe that Congress was not totally clear
20 (laughter) -- whether that information was
21 going to be part of the public dataset or not.
22 I was wondering if you can talk to that.

1 MS. NELSON: I don't believe there
2 was anything released about it being part of
3 the public dataset. When we say "high-
4 consequence areas," there is a couple of
5 different data layers that make that up.
6 There is the population data layers, high-
7 populated and other populated areas. Now that
8 is Census data, and that is releasable to
9 anyone. That is on our website right now.

10 The ones that are more sensitive
11 are the drinking water and the ecological
12 areas. So, we are actively looking to update
13 those. It has been a long time. I think it
14 has been about since 2002, is when we compiled
15 those datasets. So, yes, we are looking to
16 update those. And again, I think TSA would
17 certainly have to be part of the discussion
18 about whether those could be released
19 publicly. And Jeff might have mor to say
20 about that.

21 MR. WIESE: I apologize, I won't
22 jump in on every one. But I would want to say

1 on that one, Carl, the Congress wasn't
2 terribly well-informed on that one. As you
3 may recall, on drinking water, we made over
4 10,000 phone calls to drinking water supply
5 just to get the data. There is no readily-
6 available source of data on sole-source
7 drinking water supplies, right? So, without
8 an adequate alternative backup, that is the
9 long definition.

10 So, we are not in a position to
11 replicate that methodology. So, what Amy and
12 others have been doing is talking to EPA about
13 alternative definitions that might be out
14 there that can be adopted.

15 When it came to eco, which was one
16 of the ones that were in there, we had to
17 strike agreements with every state's heritage
18 conservation society and pay them money in
19 order to get data. So, I would just tell you
20 it is really hard to replicate that
21 methodology.

22 Clearly, on population, we will

1 update that anytime we can, you know, and
2 Census provides us that.

3 The last comment on this, you
4 know, the reason that high-consequence areas
5 were generated to begin with, we should be
6 clear, was so that operators would prioritize
7 their assessments and their repair schedules
8 to areas where the consequences could be worse
9 if there was a failure.

10 We are now through a minimum of
11 one or two baseline periods on there. So, I
12 think the overall concepts, while still having
13 some validity, you know, the urgency has
14 changed markedly.

15 So, I would just say you saw the
16 list of things that we have to work on. You
17 know, to make 10,000 phone calls and strike
18 50-some new agreements is probably not a high
19 priority. And fortunately, here is one of the
20 cases I find myself with my friend Rick
21 agreeing; you know, we have to pick and choose
22 at some point.

1 Yes, that Rick.

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: He wanted
4 that noted for the record.

5 (Laughter.)

6 Don? Is your microphone on?

7 MEMBER STURSMA: I didn't push it
8 hard enough.

9 Don Stursma, Gas Committee.

10 In a conversation the other day --
11 first of all, I don't use NPMS a whole lot, so
12 I am not real familiar with all it can do.
13 But a counterpart in another state was looking
14 for information on a pipeline that kind of
15 went in and out and then back in his state.
16 And the view he gets right now showed the
17 route inside his state, but he could not get
18 an expanded view that showed more of the
19 pipeline, not including the part in the
20 neighboring state. Is that something that
21 could be easily -- how hard would it be to get
22 a little bit of an expanded view maybe in

1 cases like that?

2 MS. NELSON: Okay, Don, what I
3 think you are talking about is that state
4 officials have access to their state
5 jurisdiction on the web tools. So, it would
6 cut him off at a state boundary, and that is
7 why he couldn't see the pipeline going out of
8 his state.

9 He can use the public viewer.
10 That is a tool that lets you see one county at
11 a time. And we crafted that as kind of a
12 balance between the public right to know and
13 security concerns about identifying vulnerable
14 points on pipelines. So, he could see that
15 with his public viewer.

16 And as a matter of course, if
17 state officials are requesting data for county
18 that surround their state, I approve that
19 access. So, if he contacts me, I am happy to
20 work with him, and we can talk about the
21 border of the states.

22 I know that some of your emergency

1 response plans, they don't stop at the
2 boundary. They go beyond the boundary.

3 MEMBER STURSMA: Okay. Thanks. I
4 think he was looking for something a little
5 less granular than the county level, but I may
6 tell him that I know who he should call now.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MS. NELSON: Yes. Please do.

9 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Ron?

10 MEMBER McLAIN: Amy, on your slide
11 that showed the --

12 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I'm so
13 sorry. Will you identify yourself for the
14 record?

15 MEMBER McLAIN: Oh, Ron McLain,
16 Liquids side.

17 On the slide that showed the 500-
18 foot radius and the congested corridor, really
19 to resolve that problem, I mean, everyone
20 would have to go to submeter accuracy or maybe
21 even better than that. I don't think that is
22 what you would propose.

1 But I guess a comment that you are
2 probably never going to resolve that. So,
3 what kind of accuracy do you think is
4 reasonable?

5 And then, kind of a followup is
6 the higher accuracy required, the more likely
7 of non-compliance. For instance, an operator
8 has thousands of miles of pipes. Maybe the
9 majority of it is within 100 feet or 50 feet.
10 Some may be submeter. But there is also the
11 consequence that, even though you try, the
12 tighter the tolerance gets, the more likely it
13 is a violation. So, how would you address
14 that?

15 MS. NELSON: Well, thanks for
16 asking the question I was expecting, first of
17 all.

18 (Laughter.)

19 And, yes, it is true that the
20 problem with all the congested pipelines is
21 always going to be a problem in the sense that
22 we are not looking for submeter accuracy.

1 And, yes, it is possible that a company could
2 misplace lines. Sometimes they run on top of
3 each other, and we don't have an elevation
4 value in our data.

5 What we are looking for is
6 something much, much finer than 500 feet, and
7 it might even be in the single digits. But
8 that is just what we are thinking. You know,
9 this is being refined. There will be a
10 comment period.

11 Did you also ask about how
12 operators would fulfill that?

13 MEMBER McLAIN: No, the second
14 part was on the more granular, the more likely
15 a company, even though they are trying, with
16 large systems is non-compliant. I mean, 500
17 feet --

18 MS. NELSON: All right.

19 MEMBER McLAIN: -- is a fairly low
20 bar, and I don't think that is what industry
21 would argue for, but it still has to be enough
22 tolerance that you can practically do it

1 across a large system and not have non-
2 compliance.

3 MS. NELSON: Right. Well, we
4 certainly know that refining the accuracy to
5 such a great extent poses a burden to
6 operators. We are going to give the operators
7 enough time to re-GPS lines, if needed. But
8 we do feel that, with the state of GPS, they
9 should know where their lines are within a
10 certain tolerance, and it is less than 500
11 feet; it is less than 100 feet. It is much
12 less than 100 feet. So, we expect that
13 operators should know their lines to this
14 extent. For older lines that might need to be
15 re-GPSed, we are building the time into the
16 timeframe of this information collection.

17 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Gene?

18 MEMBER FEIGEL: There are a number
19 of geocoding algorithms out there, commercial
20 and private, and so on and so forth.

21 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: And I'm
22 sorry, Gene, will you identify yourself?

1 MEMBER FEIGEL: Oh, I'm sorry.

2 Gene Feigel, Gas Committee.

3 There are a number of geocoding
4 algorithms out there. I am just interested in
5 how you -- and they are all going to give
6 different results.

7 MS. NELSON: Okay. Are you asking
8 about the whispering thing --

9 MEMBER FEIGEL: No, no, no, no.
10 No, I'm asking about -- "normalizing" isn't
11 quite the right word, but how you normalize
12 this data. If the inputs are based on
13 different geocoding algorithms and you are
14 sitting there with one database, it is not a
15 matter of accuracy or inaccuracy. I mean,
16 these are all algorithms. They are not
17 specific point locations. In fact, some of
18 that data is being accumulated, you are using
19 normal geocoding methods. I am just curious
20 about how that might affect your accuracy.

21 MS. NELSON: Okay. The way I
22 would phrase it is projections. So, operators

1 submit their data in all different
2 projections. An example of a projection is
3 Albers is State Plane. That is probably the
4 most common one.

5 So, a projection is basically just
6 kind of a mathematical model of the earth.
7 The globe is not flat, but we are asking for
8 the data to be flat. So, it has to be
9 transformed.

10 So, we take all the incoming data
11 from about 1200 operators and we run it
12 through another transformation, so it is in
13 the same projection. So, it will all be on
14 the map in the same data layer.

15 And, yes, it is true that that
16 does tend to distort the lines a bit, but we
17 find it is really the mileage that can be
18 distorted, and that is in specific areas of
19 the country or specific hilly areas. When you
20 flatten out a hill, you are not going to have
21 the same mileage as when you were looking at
22 the actual elevation. But we find that, in

1 general, that is less than 2 percent of change
2 in mileage or in positional accuracy.

3 So, those are the tools we have.
4 We use Esri software, and the tools have the
5 mathematical routine they go through. And
6 those are the best tools anyone has.

7 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Chad?

8 MEMBER ZAMARIN: Chad Zamarin, Gas
9 Committee.

10 Just to follow up maybe on Ron's
11 comments, I have got a couple of questions.
12 First, I think it is important just to note
13 that the better the accuracy, the higher the
14 cost for the operator. It sounds simple. GPS
15 technology has come a long way, but it still
16 requires an extensive amount of manpower and
17 expense to go out and survey lines. We
18 typically focus those efforts on the larger-
19 diameter, the higher-risk, the higher-priority
20 areas.

21 But, also, I think my question
22 would be, are we talking, in effect,

1 regulating an accuracy of an operator's
2 pipeline? Because there are many parts of the
3 code in which we account for error in the
4 accuracy of a route. For example, where we do
5 our high-consequence area analysis, we may
6 assess the accuracy of our routes and add a
7 buffer into our analysis.

8 But the reality is there are
9 pipelines that are oftentimes not as accurate
10 as -- I think when you talk about a single-
11 digit kind of standard for NPMS submittal, it
12 sounds like a great target. But if you are
13 talking about, in effect, creating a
14 regulatory requirement to have an accuracy of
15 your pipelines which is in effect, you are
16 getting close to kind of submeter accuracy
17 when you start talking about single-digit
18 accuracy.

19 Are you actually, in effect,
20 saying that there will be a regulation
21 requiring that accuracy for pipelines and
22 potential enforcement if you lines that don't

1 meet that accuracy level?

2 MS. NELSON: Thanks for your
3 question. I guess I will start off by saying
4 that we understand that changing the level of
5 accuracy to such a great extent is a big
6 burden on operators. And I have talked to
7 multiple sources to get estimates as to how
8 much of a burden it is. So, I think we do
9 have a clear view of what that takes.

10 We do, however, feel that it is
11 time for operators to give us a level of
12 accuracy that is current with the times. And,
13 yes, there may be lines that need to be re-
14 GPSed, but they already should have been re-
15 GPSed.

16 I would certainly invite you to
17 make comments on the information collection
18 about this. And ask whether it could be
19 enforced in a regulatory way, I might ask Jeff
20 about that one.

21 MR. WIESE: I have deputized Amy
22 to go out and look for you guys. All right?

1 (Laughter.)

2 An interesting question. I will
3 say the information collection itself would
4 not provide that, right? It would have to be
5 done through some other means.

6 And we understand your points, and
7 they are well-taken. One of the things Amy
8 and I were talking about, though, in this, you
9 get, and all of you, and particularly at your
10 companies because you participated in our
11 pilot, understand that we are dealing with
12 stuff, a model that is over a decade old. We
13 together want to build something that we can
14 use in the future, not just today. So, I
15 think we should be a little aspirational here.
16 We are not saying submeter, you know, but,
17 clearly, 500 feet is not acceptable.

18 Carl, you are going to come to my
19 aid, I assume at some point.

20 (Laughter.)

21 You know, Carl has been working me
22 for years about this 500-foot. You know, it

1 is a pretty embarrassing position to be in
2 when I am standing in front of the public, to
3 tell them we can tell them where pipelines are
4 plus or minus 500 feet, and that puts them
5 well beyond where they need to worry about it.

6 So, I think those are the types of
7 things we will work through in the Committee.
8 If you will allow me, since I have the
9 microphone, I would say we are open to
10 alternatives, too. I mean, we can't close our
11 minds on alternatives.

12 I spoke with a gentleman the other
13 day about a project that they have started
14 with Google, which makes a lot of this
15 information available and constantly updated
16 by an operator, where you can tunnel-in, you
17 know, as a regulator to get it. The public
18 could tunnel into a certain level that is
19 agreed upon and see that stuff, but it
20 maintains an ever-evolving, constantly-fresh
21 database.

22 So, I just think we want to think

1 about a variety of constituents' needs and
2 think about the future, you know, but,
3 clearly, in HCA areas and stuff like that, you
4 know, I have a hard time saying you shouldn't
5 have 5-foot accuracy on that. Sorry, but I
6 just think there are too many lives at stake
7 for us not to have accuracy. And I think you
8 would agree.

9 MEMBER ZAMARIN: Yes, I am not
10 implying that 500 is acceptable, and I do
11 agree. I think we should aspire to have the
12 most accurate routes possible. My comments
13 are only to point out that I don't think it is
14 trivial, and there are areas of our systems
15 where you can't achieve submeter. You know,
16 in mountainous terrain, it is sometimes very
17 difficult to get the same accuracy that you
18 can get in the open plain.

19 And so, I agree; I think setting
20 an aspirational target -- my question is, are
21 we going to box ourselves into something that
22 causes a lot of pain and frustration. And so,

1 I support a much better quality of data, but
2 I think we just need to work through some of
3 the challenges that it may pose.

4 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Andy?

5 MR. FINLEY: It is Andy Drake with
6 Spectra Energy.

7 I echo very much the same point.
8 I think there are a lot of issues to deal
9 here. Certainly, a lot has changed, and 500
10 feet should not be our target at this
11 juncture. And I don't know that anybody is
12 really arguing about 500 feet and needing to
13 get better than that.

14 Most all of us are moving in that
15 direction. I mean, many of us are using GPS
16 and we are down submeter at the point. But I
17 think the question of that regulation does
18 make everybody a little nervous because in
19 between point-to-point, especially when you
20 start dealing with vertical issues, you are
21 not plus or minus 3 feet in between point-to-
22 point on GPS.

1 And so, if we were regulating
2 that, I don't even know how frequently you
3 would have to gather GPS data to stay submeter
4 on the actual route of the pipe the whole way,
5 especially when you start doing vertical
6 changes.

7 I think the other thing that comes
8 into play, and I think how you play this may
9 be the best thing, as you are alluding to
10 Jeff, is rolling it out, trying to get a lot
11 of information to make sense of this. What is
12 the greatest common denominator? Because base
13 maps, you know, the USGS maps that we base
14 this on have tolerances, some of which are
15 pretty high. And when we put our stuff on
16 there, it is really dependent on where they
17 are when we try to lay it on top of that.

18 And I think there are just a lot
19 of issues to work through, but I do think that
20 striding that direction is the right answer,
21 but trying to be careful of what is possible
22 versus what is practical. I mean, if we run

1 a GPS pig and we use GPS data, and we do all
2 this, we can get to these numbers, but even
3 when we lay that down on top of these systems,
4 we are still going to be off by more than
5 submeter. And I think that is the point.
6 Practicably, what are people doing and how
7 does it all work together in aggregate.

8 And I think you will set kind of
9 an aspirational goal for people to work
10 towards and through, but at the end what you
11 would actually regulate is probably a net of
12 a lot of things working together that aren't
13 somebody being reckless or negligent. It is
14 just the reality of the constraints of what
15 they are dealing with.

16 MS. NELSON: Yes, thanks, Andy.
17 And again, I invite you to make comments on
18 the info collection when it is released.

19 You know, we do understand that
20 there is always going to be some distortion
21 with the elevation, with the projection, with
22 the reprojection, with the base maps, although

1 I disagree that -- I believe most operators
2 are not using the USGS-based maps anymore
3 because the vast, vast majority of our
4 operators are collecting GPS points and
5 putting it directly in the GPS.

6 So, you start at a certain point,
7 and it gets a little bit distorted, but we are
8 not going to start at the 500-foot point
9 anymore. Even though the distortion is
10 smaller, you know, percentage overall, or
11 smaller mileage amount as a percentage
12 compared to if you start really tight, then it
13 could end up being distorted. If you start at
14 5 feet, it could end up being distorted to 10
15 feet through the process.

16 But still, we still need to
17 tighten it, and we do understand that, even
18 with the best efforts, the nature of the round
19 earth and the flat data is that things are
20 going to get a bit distorted.

21 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Is that
22 Ron's card or Gene's?

1 MEMBER McLAIN: Okay. Ron McLain
2 again with the Liquids Committee.

3 And just to clarify, sometimes
4 technology has stuff you can do, but it
5 doesn't mean you should. This is one of those
6 cases that the technology may let a certain
7 accuracy be achieved, as Andy said, but when
8 you set the minimum or the mandatory
9 requirements, you have to consider what can be
10 one in all situations. And that is a much
11 broader number, and that is a lot better than
12 500 feet, I think. But when we mandate a
13 standard, it can't be for what can be done at
14 a point; it is what can be done everywhere.
15 So, anyhow, just a comment.

16 MS. NELSON: Thanks for the
17 comment. If you feel that standard should be
18 different in different areas, please submit
19 comments to the information collection.

20 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Rick?

21 MEMBER KUPREWICZ: Rick Kuprewicz
22 with the Liquids.

1 I guess from what I am hearing
2 from the general discussion here is a general
3 understanding, a little apprehension about the
4 accuracy and the standard that is going to end
5 up. I have got no problem with that. We
6 spent years in Washington State after a city
7 was nearly leveled trying to come up with
8 maps. It is now in our State law. We have
9 certain issues there, not that you necessarily
10 want to emulate that particular process.
11 There are always different ways to do things.
12 So, you can reach some middle ground.

13 I would be real careful about
14 portraying accuracies because the next step is
15 someone is going to think these are actually
16 real, and I don't need anymore death cases.
17 All right?

18 One call is the effective system
19 that works. It doesn't rely on GPS. It takes
20 people out in the field. So, that is a good
21 thing. We don't want to give anybody the
22 impression that should be replaced.

1 As far as the process going
2 forward, either the government can kind of get
3 ahead of this and start working for what their
4 needs are or you are going to see the big
5 heavy-lifters. They are already starting, the
6 Google maps, SkyTruth, those outfits, you
7 know, they are going to other sources. They
8 will get it to the public eventually. It
9 would be nice to be able to say that the
10 government, for their own particular needs,
11 are doing these things.

12 So, it sounds like, from the
13 discussions I am hearing, you can get there.
14 It is just a question of when and how fast and
15 how accurate. And I see a willingness in some
16 of the industry here to move in that
17 direction, and they are absolutely terrified
18 of if you have got to be within plus or minus
19 a couple feet. I think that is a valid
20 concern on the industry side. So, let's just
21 kind of work together and move this thing
22 forward before it is moved for us.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I would
3 now like to invite any members of the public
4 who have a question of Amy. Please identify
5 yourself, and you will know you will have to
6 project because we don't have a -- or we will
7 let them use one (referring to a microphone).
8 Okay.

9 I am going to start here, the
10 gentleman in the back first.

11 Thank you, John.

12 MR. WIESE: I am controlling it.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. BOSS: Terry Boss from
15 Interstate Natural Gas Association of America.

16 I have worked on this thing ever
17 since the inception of it, and we helped work
18 up on the plus or minus 500 feet. That was a
19 compromise at the time, realizing a lot of
20 folks hadn't GPSed their units out there or
21 their pipelines out there. And it was also
22 realizing in some very rural areas there

1 wasn't a lot of good tie-in locations for
2 that.

3 The important thing to recognize
4 is that an accurate GPS location really
5 doesn't do you any good unless you put it in
6 reference with something. The 7.5-minute
7 maps, where we are not using those to actually
8 locate the pipelines, people are using the
9 base maps to reference where you are at. They
10 are plus or minus 160 feet.

11 So, you start put inaccuracies on
12 top of each other, and that is where some of
13 those numbers were coming from. We did a
14 survey in INGAA in 2006 to see where folks
15 were at, and we had gotten down to plus or
16 minus 300 feet on where we are at. We may be
17 a little better now on that sort of thing.
18 But when you are talking about all the
19 pipelines, all the locations, that is a very,
20 very tough target. Can you get it in a
21 particular spot? Yes, you can.

22 Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.

2 And there is a gentleman here.

3 MR. LIDIAC: Peter Lidiak with

4 API.

5 Terry got at the head of the line

6 on me again.

7 (Laughter.)

8 So, I want to support what Terry

9 was just saying. I think, you know, we have

10 done some work recently with locates to

11 basically try to get people to use consistent

12 nomenclature, consistent data, datums for

13 referencing data, and making sure that that

14 leads to better accuracy. I think you need to

15 consider how to write that into your

16 standards.

17 I was very happy to hear that you

18 are considering simplification of the annual

19 report. Back in 2007, we worked with Amy to

20 try to do that, and it was more difficult. I

21 hope we are closer to that now. I think API's

22 members would support simplifying the annual

1 report in lieu of reporting this data.

2 Finally, the other thing I would
3 ask PHSMA to consider is that it has been
4 since 1998 since the system was built, and the
5 user interface is, frankly, very clunky and
6 very difficult to use. So, while you are
7 collecting this information, you ought to
8 consider a complete redesign of the user
9 interface.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. NELSON: Thanks, Peter, and I
12 hear that every day.

13 (Laughter.)

14 And I agree, it is clunky. And,
15 yes, we are considering a redesign. Actually,
16 right now, we are doing a small pilot that has
17 an open GIS interface behind it, which means
18 that it is going to look more like Google
19 maps. If that is successful and we attain
20 funding, we are going to consider rolling that
21 out for the public viewer. So, we do
22 definitely see that need. It really has just

1 been a matter of kind of funding getting
2 started with it.

3 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.
4 Okay.

5 MR. WARNER: Mark Warner with
6 Questar.

7 You talked about spatial accuracy
8 of plus or minus 500 feet. What about linear
9 accuracy? If you are looking at facility
10 data, stations and other things, it goes back
11 to the point that Terry made. You know, you
12 need to reference it to something. Are you
13 looking for station values? Are you looking
14 for still just GPS coordinates of stations?
15 What exactly are you looking for?

16 MS. NELSON: Yes, that is kind of
17 still evolving. We will be looking for GPS
18 coordinates of these stations basically. We
19 understand that they are not always going to
20 fall exactly on your pipeline because the line
21 has an infinitely-small width in the GIS. So,
22 that is still evolving. That does need to be

1 close enough that we can snap it to the line
2 when needed.

3 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.

4 I am going to look behind me now
5 to see if there are any other members. Okay,
6 very good, if you will come forward?

7 And, John, I want to ask if we
8 could move this stand down here. And for
9 those who have comments, they can just come on
10 up, because we have got quite a bit to cover
11 before you have to get on your planes and go
12 home.

13 MR. BURTON: Dwayne Burton with
14 Kinder Morgan.

15 My question is regarding security.
16 I know you briefly touched on security. But
17 one of the concerns is -- I don't call it
18 conflict, but the overlay with the TSA
19 concerns. What is your vision for the levels
20 of identifying of who gets what level of
21 security? I was pleased to see that you did
22 have something in there concerning security

1 and being able to protect the security of the
2 critical facilities.

3 MS. NELSON: I would answer your
4 comment because, yes, security is really
5 paramount in this project.

6 So, right now, we don't really
7 have different levels of security in a sense
8 that, if you are a government official, you
9 can see all the data. It is just that your
10 jurisdiction or your area, your extent is
11 limited. And I think we would be looking at
12 something like that.

13 I am not sure that we are going
14 to, except for the federal level, the PHMSA
15 folks may, probably will be able to see more
16 of the data that we are collecting than other
17 government officials. Again, this is
18 evolving.

19 But we haven't discussed making
20 state officials different from county
21 officials, for example.

22 I hope that answered your

1 question.

2 MR. BURTON: It did. Thank you.

3 MS. NELSON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Any
5 others? I certainly don't want to discourage
6 you. I just thought we will save five-ten
7 minutes in the long-run if you just step over
8 to the microphone, if you have a question.

9 (No response.)

10 Hearing none, thank you, Amy.

11 I am going to turn it over to
12 Jeff.

13 MR. WIESE: Well, thank you very
14 much, Colette.

15 I asked for just a second because
16 I wanted to express our gratitude to several
17 of the members of the Committee. I know that
18 NiSource and National Grid and Colonial and
19 Marathon -- and I don't know if there is
20 anyone here from Access -- but we are all
21 gracious. We don't want to march into
22 something like that and be uninformed, nor do

1 we want to have you uninformed about our
2 capability.

3 So, the point of conducting those
4 many little pilots was so that your people
5 could talk to Amy, and vice versa, and we
6 could really have a more intelligent
7 discussion about it. We know and had asked
8 that they brief-up, so that we could do that
9 here in the Committee.

10 We are sensitive to some of the
11 comments that were made. You know, we
12 understand the challenges.

13 You know, Chad, I hadn't even
14 really thought too much about the
15 enforceability of it. But I think that that
16 is something we should talk about.

17 But, clearly, to get into high-
18 consequence area, I think we are all agreeing
19 that needs to be as accurate as we can make
20 it.

21 So, I think there are discussions
22 yet to come on this. And I will close by

1 saying I really was asking that we get more
2 creative and think ahead. You know, are there
3 other solutions that meet individuals' needs?

4 I will be talking with this fellow
5 who is playing with Google now to see what
6 they are doing. You know, that is sort of an
7 always-ready type of thing.

8 Right now, I don't know, the
9 public probably doesn't understand, but a lot
10 of our data is snapshot. You know, it is a
11 year old at some particular point in time.

12 And we are attributing more and
13 more to the issues of performance. That
14 system has attributes and segments that
15 include historical tracking. So, we don't
16 want to attribute performance negatively or
17 positively to someone long after they have
18 sold a system, right? It has become someone
19 else's.

20 So, it is important to have
21 historical information both about the pipe and
22 who operated it at one point in time, and

1 then, be able to draw that information out.
2 And Amy has done, I think, an excellent job of
3 really kind of bringing the NPMS along within
4 the constraints that government imposes on us.
5 But, you know, we can think ahead. Are there
6 more creative solutions out there?

7 So, at any rate, mostly, I wanted
8 to thank the members of the Committee for
9 helping us with that pilot. Very helpful.
10 Amy always came back really enthused and
11 excited about the people that she got to work
12 with in your companies. So, thank you very
13 much.

14 So, I will turn it back to you,
15 Colette.

16 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
17 Jeff.

18 We will now move to agenda item 2.
19 We will receive a briefing on Integrity
20 Verification Processes, Steve Nanney.

21 MR. WIESE: There he is.

22 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Come on

1 down.

2 MR. WIESE: If you will allow me,
3 for the Committee members, I am just going to
4 set this up very quickly by saying many of the
5 Committee members, and those who were keenly
6 interested in this, sat through a day's worth
7 of this stuff the other day, and they have
8 probably had all they can take of it.

9 Steve has blessedly boiled it down
10 for about 15 minutes, kind of high-level
11 overview of what is going on. The rest of
12 that time, I wanted to allocate to the
13 members, not the public, the members to get on
14 the record with what their views are. There
15 will be plenty of time for the public and
16 others to weigh-in on the process, but I think
17 it is important to hear from you. And then,
18 we will move into doing sort of the data view.

19
20 But, again, knowing that many of
21 you already sat through that, and it is a tad
22 painful, there is a lot of data out there, we

1 didn't want to make you go through that twice.
2 Blaine does the best job I have seen of
3 telling it, but it is painful data.

4 MR. NANNEY: Again, my name is
5 Steve Nanney with PHMSA. And I will be going
6 over the Integrity Verification Process.

7 One thing before we get started is
8 what I found out is you don't go on vacation
9 because you can get the short straw as far as
10 given some of this when you go on vacation.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. WIESE: At least you got to
13 take one.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. NANNEY: Anyway, before we get
16 started, if you will look over to the left
17 side of the room, I am going to get up and
18 just show you one minute.

19 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Grab that
20 microphone, Steve, on your way.

21 MR. NANNEY: Just so everyone
22 knows -- and at the break or anything, if you

1 want to look -- we did put some posters
2 together that show the process in a big size
3 where folks like me that don't see very well
4 can see what we are proposing and why.

5 The one thing, when you look at
6 the chart -- and you will see this as I go
7 through the overview -- is one thing you might
8 look at is Step No. 9. It could easily be the
9 first step, but it is the step where you break
10 out whether it is in a high-consequence area
11 or what we call a moderate-consequence area,
12 which is the main driver as far as having to
13 do mitigation, whether that is hydro test or
14 ILI or some type of engineering-critical
15 assessment.

16 With that, in our meeting on
17 Wednesday, it was here at the Westin, and we
18 had about 240 people there at the
19 presentation, and we also webcast it. We
20 don't know how many people were on the webcast
21 yet.

22 MR. WIESE: Two fifty to 300.

1 MR. NANNEY: Two fifty to 300 is
2 what Jeff said.

3 Also, we have a link to the
4 workshop and the presentations have already
5 been downloaded for anyone that missed it that
6 would like to see any of the presentations.

7 The speakers, of course, were from
8 the NTSB, Vice Chairman Hart. PHMSA had
9 several speakers, Jeff, myself, Alan Mayberry.
10 The Pipeline Safety Trust was there and had a
11 presentation. NAPSRS had a presentation, and
12 several operators from the gas and liquids
13 side.

14 Why we started the Integrity
15 Verification Process was based upon, No. 1,
16 the Pipeline Safety Act of 2011, which
17 mandated some testing regulations. In other
18 words, pressure testing or an alternate
19 equivalent means, such as an ILI program, for
20 all gas transmission pipe in a Class III, IV,
21 and all HCAs. It has not been previously
22 tested. Also, it said that you had to have

1 records to document the MAOP.

2 And then, from the San Bruno
3 incident, we had three recommendations from
4 the NTSB. One was to delete the grandfather
5 clause and include a spike test for a pipe
6 that was operating under the grandfather
7 clause.

8 And the grandfather clause, if you
9 go to the regulation and look at Part
10 192.619(c), this is pipe that probably has not
11 had a hydro test or it has had a hydro test
12 below 1.1 times the MAOP of the pipe. It also
13 could be pipe that is operating above 72
14 percent SMYS.

15 The next NTSB recommendation was
16 stability, and the NTSB from the San Bruno
17 incident recommended a pressure test to 1.25
18 times MAOP to treat manufacturing and
19 construction defects as stable. Yes, this is
20 addressing seam issues in pipe.

21 And then, the last NTSB
22 recommendation was piggable lines. They were

1 recommending that you configure all lines to
2 accommodate smart pigs, with the priority
3 given to the older ones.

4 With that, PHMSA put together the
5 Integrity Verification Process. Our goal
6 there was to establish a comprehensive program
7 to address the congressional mandates and the
8 NTSB recommendations. We put together, in our
9 viewpoint, an engineering approach to go
10 through the mandates and the recommendations
11 and to address them, either by pressure
12 testing, ILI, or new technology, including
13 engineering-critical assessment.

14 The basic principles of the chart
15 that you see over on the lefthand side of the
16 room is this: one applied to higher-risk
17 areas, in other words, the high-consequence
18 areas, and a new term, "moderate-consequence
19 areas," which I will define on the next slide.

20 No. 2 is the screen segments for
21 categories of concern, in other words, the
22 grandfathered segments, to assure that there

1 is adequate material and documentation of
2 records and to perform assessments to
3 establish the MAOP.

4 And to give you an idea -- and you
5 will see this in Blaine Keener's presentation
6 on the 2012 annual data -- if you look, the
7 HCA mileage is 19,678 miles to date is what we
8 have gotten in from the 2012 annual reports.
9 And the moderate-consequence areas, we
10 estimate to be about 71,000 miles.

11 And from that, when we went
12 through a screening, we estimate that right
13 now, based upon the data we have got, that
14 about 33,000 miles of gas transmission pipe,
15 or 11 percent of the gas transmission mileage,
16 would be applicable to the IVP process.

17 Principle No. 2, screen for
18 categories of concern. And those categories
19 would be grandfathered pipe, pipe that lacked
20 records to document the MAOP, lack of an
21 adequate pressure test, operating pressures
22 above 72 percent SMYS, and pipelines that have

1 a history of manufacturing and construction
2 defects.

3 Principle No. 3 was to know and
4 document the pipe material. In other words,
5 if you do have missing or inadequate
6 documentation, what needs to be the process to
7 approve it?

8 And again, the bullets you see
9 here are some that we put out for discussion.
10 Should we cut out and test pipe samples? If
11 we do that, how many do we cut out? In situ,
12 non-destructive testing, can we validate a
13 process where, when you go and you dig up the
14 pipeline, that you can actually in the ditch
15 test it and get a close, accurate measurement
16 of what the strength of the material is. And
17 also, to document the seam type. You know, if
18 you look at what happened at San Bruno, one of
19 the issues was inadequate documentation of the
20 seam type.

21 And then, field verification of
22 valves, flanges, and fabrications, is to have

1 a process to look to make sure of the
2 appropriate ANSI rating, pressure rating of
3 materials such as that.

4 And then, other verifications. In
5 other words, is there some new technology that
6 we should be developing or that is developing
7 that we should be considering in this process?
8 And that was part of what the workshop was, is
9 to present the chart and the process, and
10 then, to ask for comments, not only from
11 industry, but from the public and from
12 researchers, of what should we be considering
13 here for this process.

14 Principle No. 4 was assessments to
15 establish the MAOP. As you go through and you
16 look at our process, you will see that our
17 goal is to allow the operator to select the
18 best option to establish the MAOP. And some
19 of the candidate options that we are looking
20 at, of course, are based upon the NTSB and the
21 congressional mandate, is a Subpart J test
22 with a spike test, derating pressure. In

1 other words, if you can't pressure test, if
2 you can't run an ILI, what would be a better
3 way of doing it? Maybe an operator would want
4 to lower the pressure some percentage instead
5 of pressure testing.

6 The next option was an
7 engineering-critical assessment. You can
8 always replace your pipeline with new pipe.
9 And then, what other options should PHMSA
10 consider?

11 And again, the sheet I have got
12 here is the IVP chart, which is again over on
13 the lefthand side of the room. The graph
14 process steps, this is the main steps that we
15 categorized it on the flowchart. It is a
16 grandfather and an MAOP review. And the
17 grandfather clause and the sections that we
18 are looking at here is Part 192.619 in the
19 code.

20 And then, an integrity review.
21 Have you had seam issues? Have you had
22 failure issues or leak issues with that

1 segment of the pipeline?

2 And then, the low-stress reviews
3 are the MCA/HCA review, would be to see if it
4 is applicable.

5 And then, we have got Steps 13
6 through 15 as a material documentation review.
7 Process Steps 16 through 20 is an assessment
8 and analysis review. And then, Process Step
9 21 is an implementation.

10 Again, looking at Draft Process
11 Step 9, is the HCA and MCA screen. And again,
12 this is the major screening criteria of what
13 you would have to do work on. And again, if
14 you look, we estimated at about 91,000 miles
15 fall into an HCA/MCA-type category.

16 The Steps 15 through 21 are where
17 you would actually, once you have gone through
18 the chart, where you have to go and do
19 something. If you look at Steps 16, 17, and
20 18, 18 is the engineering-critical assessment
21 category and, also, where you could also have
22 an inline tool inspection-type program to

1 actually qualify your pipeline.

2 If that does not work and after
3 you have run your ILI you see issues, that it
4 would not meet an engineering-critical
5 assessment, you would go to 19, evaluate those
6 results. And you still might need to do a
7 hydro test, depending upon the issues that you
8 run into.

9 But, again, 16 and 17, 16 is to do
10 a pressure test with a spike; 17 is the
11 derating of your pipeline or the replacement
12 section.

13 And then, once you would do that,
14 you would go to box 21 to continue operating
15 and maintaining your pipeline in accordance
16 with Part 192.

17 The specific guidelines and
18 criteria is, again, the IVP chart is a high-
19 level concept. The details and specifications
20 are under development, and we plan to use the
21 knowledge we gained from the workshop and the
22 comments we get in the docket. The docket

1 right now is open until September the 9th.
2 And we will, after it closes, go through and
3 review comments and see what the input we get
4 there.

5 But, for example, again, as I said
6 earlier, the things we are looking at is spike
7 test specs. I mean, what should be the
8 pressure for a spike test? What should be the
9 hold time?

10 If we do have derating criteria,
11 what should be the amount of the reduction?
12 If you have an ILI program, what should be the
13 requirement and specifications there? And if
14 there are a material verification specs, in
15 other words, if you do lack on an MAOP
16 documentation and material documentation, what
17 should be the criteria there that an operator
18 goes out and verifies that information?

19 The target completion timeframes.
20 In other words, if we put this into code
21 through a rulemaking, we would expect this to
22 be a multi-year effort. We would not expect

1 an operator in one, two, or three years to
2 have this done, of course.

3 And we do, if you look on the
4 chart over there, we do have a table with the
5 dates to be determined or the timeframes to be
6 determined. And it is graduated on that table
7 based upon if you have what we call legacy
8 pipe, which if you go through and look at the
9 full presentation, that would be pipe like
10 ERW, low-frequency ERW pipe that has had seam
11 issues, cracking-type issues in the seam.

12 If it is in an HCA, that would
13 have a different timeframe than if it is in
14 what we would call a moderate-consequence
15 area, which would be pipe in a Class II, III,
16 or IV location that is not in an HCA or pipe
17 in Class I areas where you have one dwelling
18 or one identified site within the PIR of the
19 pipeline. So, it would be based upon
20 consequence areas there, is how that would be
21 ranked.

22 And again, the proposed deadlines

1 are under development.

2 And that is all for the review. I
3 will turn it back to Jeff.

4 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
5 Steve.

6 I want to look at Jeff and see if
7 he has any comments before we open it up to
8 the Q&A.

9 (Laughter.)

10 He may also have comments
11 throughout.

12 MR. WIESE: I'm going to leave the
13 room now.

14 (Laughter.)

15 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: He is
16 disciplined. All right.

17 MR. WIESE: I've got my flack
18 jacket on.

19 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I see lots
20 of cards up, and I am going to --

21 MR. WIESE: Whoops, look at the
22 line of cards.

1 (Laughter.)

2 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I know. I
3 am going to start with Gene and come down.
4 And then, we will come down.

5 Well, this is interesting; there
6 are none on this side of the room.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. WIESE: Liquid. Gas.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: We'll see.

11 Gene, get us kicked off here.

12 And, remember, please identify yourself for
13 the record.

14 MEMBER FEIGEL: Gene Feigel, Gas
15 Committee.

16 This isn't a technical question or
17 a comment. It is kind of a high-level comment
18 about your terminology.

19 It is an Integrity Verification
20 Program. It always bothers me every time a
21 regulatory agency or a trade association or a
22 standards developer invents a new term for

1 something that has been around quite a while.

2 What you are talking about here is
3 fitness for service.

4 (Laughter.)

5 And there is a reason for that. I
6 mean, that term has been used and well
7 understood for 25 years or so. There is a
8 tremendous body of literature. There are
9 standards in place, albeit directed towards
10 some other equipment, but much of the
11 technology is applicable. There is a
12 community of engineers and scientists and
13 quality assurance folks that are familiar with
14 that term.

15 Every time you come up with a new
16 term, you create confusion in the larger
17 community.

18 (Laughter.)

19 I admit that IVP is a little
20 sexier-sounding than fitness for service.

21 (Laughter.)

22 But that is not a good and

1 sufficient reason --

2 MR. WIESE: That was our primary
3 goal, Gene.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MEMBER FEIGEL: That is not a good
6 and sufficient reason to fly in the face of 25
7 years of worldwide experience with that term
8 in that field. So, I object to your
9 terminology.

10 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
11 Gene. It is so noted for the record.

12 Chad?

13 MEMBER ZAMARIN: Chad Zamarin,
14 NiSource, Gas Committee.

15 I have got a few comments, and
16 maybe I will just go through them, and then,
17 see if there is any response.

18 The first is that grandfathering
19 on its own is a pretty big issue for our
20 industry. I think that my initial reaction is
21 we are trying to solve maybe too many things
22 with one solution here.

1 Grandfathering on its own is not
2 about verifying the integrity of older
3 pipelines. It is about how we originally
4 established the maximum allowable operating
5 pressure of those pipelines.

6 And so, the process seems to me to
7 kind of confuse a couple of different issues.
8 It is taking on the grandfathering issue and
9 it is taking on the integrity of vintage
10 pipes. I think both need to happen, but it
11 just seems like it gets very challenging to
12 try to do both in one process.

13 For example, I look at the chart
14 and I would say, if you have a properly-
15 qualified pressure test, you have established
16 the MAOP. You should be done. That should be
17 one of the first questions you ask. You
18 shouldn't worry, for the purpose of
19 establishing MAOP, about whether you have
20 other types of information, records. You
21 know, you may need that information for the
22 purpose of verifying the integrity of a

1 vintage pipeline, but I would just encourage
2 that we address the grandfathering issue on
3 its own first or at least "in addition to,"
4 because it is a big issue. It is fraught with
5 lots of challenges. So, that is my first kind
6 of an observation.

7 The second is that I am little
8 concerned with the use of classification as a
9 fundamental function of the process. You
10 know, it was in the legislation; I think it is
11 widely believed that classification is an
12 antiquated process for establishing risk and
13 high consequence.

14 We support at NiSource, and I know
15 at INGAA, the use of the PIR. And if a home
16 or a person could be within the PIR, then it
17 should be considered someone that we are going
18 to cover with advanced integrity management.

19 The reality is a Class II location
20 could have no one possibly within the PIR. It
21 is a waste of resources, a waste of focus. It
22 is an antiquated process that I think even the

1 legislation recognizes needs to be looked at,
2 as to whether or not it is still valid within
3 the code.

4 And so, I would just encourage
5 that we take at another look at whether or not
6 class location is really the right technical
7 means for establishing potential consequence.

8 And then, my last question has
9 more to do with I saw the reference of the
10 spike test, and I recognize NTSB used that.
11 Again, when I think of MAOP establishment, I
12 think of a spike test not as the proven
13 methodology for establishing a factor of
14 safety, which in effect establishes an MAOP.
15 It is something that is applied in various
16 ways to verify integrity and in very unique
17 situations.

18 And so, I don't know that it has
19 been defined what the spike test means, but I
20 am just curious to know if that makes sense
21 for the establishment of MAOP, because it is
22 not something that is in the code for the

1 establishment of MAOP on any other pipeline.

2 There are kind of my comments.

3 Thanks.

4 MR. NANNEY: Just to respond on
5 the spike test, we understand your comment
6 there. We haven't drafted regulation language
7 yet. But, when we do, we would take the
8 consideration just like what you said. We
9 would not expect a spike test to be if you had
10 pipe that -- by our definition, legacy pipe or
11 pipe that has seam-type issues, we would
12 probably look at an out, that you did not have
13 to do a spike.

14 But we have not defined a spike
15 yet. I know normally you would expect a spike
16 test to be above 100-percent SMYS. You would
17 expect it to be probably between 100 percent
18 and 110 percent of SMYS, is what a lot of
19 folks determine it to be.

20 And the timing, whether it is one
21 hour or 15 minutes to one hour, you know, that
22 type duration would probably be, after we get

1 everyone's comments, we would look at.

2 But if you do have a pipe
3 manufacturing type in a segment that has not
4 had those type manufacturing and construction
5 defects, a spike test would probably not be
6 needed.

7 MEMBER ZAMARIN: And I would just
8 wonder what NTSB's intent really was. If we
9 have a pipeline operating at 25 percent of
10 SMYS, and it is grandfathered and we need to
11 reestablish the MAOP, I would submit that we
12 follow Subpart J. It is an established MAOP,
13 establishment methodology. Taking it to some
14 arbitrary, you know, taking it to 100-percent
15 SMYS doesn't make sense and is unnecessary.

16 So, I think I just get a little
17 concerned that we are almost changing 40 years
18 of proven MAOP establishment because of a
19 single term used in an NTSB recommendation.
20 I think we could probably respond to the NTSB
21 recommendation, meet the intent, and
22 demonstrate that the code has a pretty good

1 way of establishing a safe MAOP.

2 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Jeff?

3 MEMBER WRIGHT: Jeff Wright, Gas
4 Committee.

5 As I sit between my industry
6 colleagues, I am feeling a palpable amount of
7 nervous energy here.

8 (Laughter.)

9 As the regulator down the line, so
10 to speak, I have some observations and so much
11 questions. Multi-year is an understatement.
12 These people in the gas industry, in
13 transmission, will be coming to the FERC for
14 this. I am not saying safety is not a
15 priority. What I am saying is it goes into
16 the mix with everything else.

17 What I would counsel, also, is
18 what probably my industry colleagues are
19 saying, is finding a way, whether it is a form
20 of triage, if you will, to take the worst case
21 first, figure you where things can go, a
22 priority of sorts.

1 We will do our best, when we get
2 these kinds of applications, to work on them
3 as efficiently and as quickly as possible.

4 There will also be -- and I don't
5 know if either of the industry guys here to my
6 left and right will take this up -- there will
7 be a major cost impact as well, which will
8 require not only filings to replace the pipe.
9 There will be filings for cost recovery.

10 And in the end, like I have
11 alluded to, there is going to be a heavy
12 workload problem with the resources at our
13 disposal and whether the somewhat Draconian
14 budget restraints that we are facing continue
15 in the future.

16 So, just a few observations from
17 another regulator here.

18 MR. WIESE: Just I had asked
19 Colette if I could jump in real quickly, in
20 particular, because I didn't have benefit of
21 the time to say to you what I have said to
22 her.

1 But, for the others, you know that
2 the mandate that is in the Act requires us to
3 work with FERC and NARUC members to negotiate
4 out the timelines, not the technical details,
5 the timelines.

6 But, that said, you know, what we
7 are doing in the first round is trying to work
8 out some of the bumps on the technical
9 proposal. But we would certainly commit both
10 to you, as I have to Colette, with NARUC, to
11 have substantive discussions long before we
12 get to establishing the timelines. So, I want
13 to make sure that you understand.

14 But I will say you have to walk a
15 mile in our shoes. There is a fair amount of
16 loss of confidence in the system's ability to
17 protect people.

18 This and, Gene, you know, while we
19 like to be called sexy anytime we can, and did
20 start out with fitness for service, there are
21 a lot of reasons we ended up with another name
22 that I won't go into. Suffice it to say that

1 this provides, it is meant to provide
2 assurance and to stay within the integrity
3 process that we have been working, which is
4 very solid. We have been working it for well
5 over a decade. So, I am not disagreeing with
6 you, but I am just saying there are reasons
7 for calling it that.

8 MEMBER WRIGHT: No, I agree we
9 have to talk timeline and I will definitely
10 look at my retirement plans and see how they
11 work out.

12 (Laughter.)

13 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: At the
14 Arkansas Commission, we are undertaking a
15 comprehensive rewrite of our rules as practice
16 and procedure after 30 years of no updates.
17 And now, I understand why, and my Chief of
18 Staff is threatening to retire at any day now.

19 (Laughter.)

20 Andy?

21 MEMBER DRAKE: This is Andy Drake
22 with Spectra Energy, with the Gas Committee.

1 There is a lot of information that
2 is sort of a little bit of a carpet bombing,
3 a process in thinking, and I appreciate that.
4 And I appreciate the opportunity to get
5 together before rulemaking, so that we can
6 provide comments and thoughts to help dial-in
7 a better solution.

8 I think one thing that I want to
9 come very clear on here is we are absolutely
10 committed to getting to zero, not just in
11 words, but in action. We are committed to
12 come up with a good plan, and I think that is
13 key, because the undertaking is quite
14 significant that we are faced with.

15 I mean, the grandfather clause
16 accounts for about 59 percent of the pipe in
17 the United States right now. That is a lot of
18 pipe to push through that flowchart, and there
19 are a lot of people on the other end that are
20 depending on the gas that goes through that
21 pipe. So, you know, we have got to make sure
22 it is safe, but we have got to do it in a way

1 that meets a lot of needs, I think as Jeff
2 said.

3 I think we have to address the
4 technical issues. We have got to address all
5 of the recommendations that are in front of
6 us. We share that goal. Our credibility is
7 at stake here, too.

8 And very much, we have made a
9 commitment to the public that we will rebuild
10 their confidence in our ability to deal with
11 this. And I think those are the tenets of a
12 plan.

13 I think, you know, when I look at
14 the NTSB recommendations, I see a lot of
15 things focusing on the grandfather clause
16 about testing, testing to 125 percent. And I
17 think, to Chad's point, when I look at the
18 flowchart, my concern is that we are taking a
19 huge amount of the infrastructure very deep
20 through this chart. And you have got a lot of
21 pipes that aren't going to clear a lot of
22 those questions.

1 And what is going to happen is you
2 are going to end up with a lot of the U.S.
3 infrastructure in this "to be discussed" on a
4 case-by-case basis discussion. One, you don't
5 have the time for that. Two, we don't have
6 the time for that. Three, the public is going
7 to freak out because those discussions are
8 going to happen on a case-by-case discussion
9 where the interactive variables are going to
10 decide criteria that is different for every
11 single operator.

12 Have we been there before? That
13 didn't usually yield good results. Because
14 when somebody has a problem, the immediate
15 thing that comes out in the press is, hey,
16 everybody seems to be doing different stuff.
17 And that is not credible.

18 I understand the technical
19 perfection of what we are trying to accomplish
20 here. But I think when we back away from the
21 tree, I think we can accomplish very quickly
22 a huge confidence build by asking two or three

1 key questions.

2 And I loved your chart, Carl. I
3 really did. I liked the one where he was
4 pulling his hair out because that was a
5 picture of me when I first looked at it.

6 (Laughter.)

7 But I think, when you get through
8 it, there are some beautiful, simplistic
9 questions that I think the NTSB has given us
10 recommendations and guidance on, and Congress,
11 too. And that is, is it in a high-consequence
12 area or an MCA, which I actually like the term
13 MCA. I think that is a growth opportunity for
14 all of us.

15 The next question is, was it
16 tested to 125 percent, yes/no? If it is yes,
17 it is clearly in a different place. And I
18 think we all agree to that. Why are we asking
19 those questions way, way down in that box? I
20 think those should be the first and second
21 questions we ask. And if you clear those
22 questions, get them out of the mix at least

1 for a while and put them into the IM box,
2 because now they have got to manage the pipe.

3 The only other box I would put in
4 there, which I do think is a value-add, and I
5 may get some pressure from my peers here about
6 fatigue, but I think it is appropriate for us
7 at this juncture to answer credibly the issue
8 of fatigue. What you are really answering at
9 that question is, is the test still valid? If
10 the test was done yesterday, the question is
11 yes, unless it is in an incredibly-hostile
12 environment, yes, it is probably valid.

13 If it was done 40 years ago, the
14 question is, what is the environment that pipe
15 operates in, and is that pipe seeing cyclic
16 fatigue or an environment that would be
17 conducive to growing problems in the pipe over
18 time that would erode the confidence in that
19 test?

20 But if you can show -- and I think
21 most pipes are going to show -- cyclic fatigue
22 life studies that are well beyond 40-50 years.

1 But that is a public confidence issue. Okay.

2 We have cleared that hurdle.

3 Now take the pipes into an IM
4 discussion box. And I think that is where you
5 start to get to issues about the importance of
6 records, to make good choices about safe
7 pressure calculations of remaining strength on
8 anomalies; to make good choices about what you
9 are dealing with to try to manage threats.

10 You know, I think extending into
11 integrity management is a lot of what is up
12 here, but there is a lot of stuff that is not
13 up here that is about extending integrity
14 management also. And I think, once you clear
15 those boxes, you are coming down into IM. And
16 then, start asking IM questions.

17 I think the question, I guess, one
18 of the questions I have about a box up here is
19 the records box. And I feel curious, anyway,
20 about what happened. I feel like we were told
21 to get on the TVC train, and then, we showed
22 up at the station, and all of a sudden, we are

1 told to comply with today's regulatory records
2 requirements. It is like, well, why did we do
3 TVC for the last two years if that is not what
4 we are going to use to try to make decisions
5 about our pipe?

6 And I think the industry has
7 geared up around trying to provide reasonable
8 records. I have probably as good of records
9 as anybody I know on pipe from 1960 and 1970
10 and 1950. I can show you chemical analysis.
11 I can show you mill test records. But I will
12 be honest with you, I don't know that I can
13 comply with today's record requirements. That
14 puts me immediately down in a box where I have
15 got to start worrying about cutting out pipe
16 samples to prove something that I have got a
17 mill test for. That is not where we want to
18 be.

19 It just seems like we kind of
20 mixed apples and pears up a little bit. I
21 would get us back to TVC, where you are trying
22 to make a reasonable determination about what

1 a pipe that was built a while ago, certainly
2 before the new regulations, could come forward
3 with that is credible, that you could show to
4 the public and say, "This makes sense. We
5 know enough about this."

6 And on the spike test, I am with
7 Chad. I mean, that is kind of our background.
8 So, we will try to avoid getting into too much
9 metallurgical discussion. But the spike test
10 is a good test. It was designed to deal with
11 a very specific kind of problem, sharp-edged
12 defects and crack-like defects. What we are
13 trying to do is avoid extending those defects
14 during the hold period. Okay. But that is a
15 marginal improvement. It is good. It is
16 better, but it is this much better. It is not
17 this much better than the tests we have been
18 doing for decades.

19 We do it. We have been doing it
20 for 10 years. Hell, we were involved in the
21 research that went to developing it with
22 Battelle and others for managing FCC. And

1 Steve knows that. We have used it very
2 successfully.

3 But, when you start applying it to
4 all of this other stuff, I think you are
5 starting to, one, compromise. Is the other
6 test really that good? The answer to that is
7 absolutely yes. You can actually calculate
8 the difference, and it is small, between
9 defect extension under the hold period and
10 that. And those are the kinds of things I
11 think we have got to get back to.

12 I mean, yes, if we all had our
13 better choices, we would all buy a car built
14 yesterday. But there are things here that are
15 just marginally different, and it is hard for
16 people to understand that. It is not the only
17 way to certify the MAOP.

18 I don't want to take up any more
19 of the time, but I really think it is
20 important that it is understood we come to
21 this table committed to getting to zero. I
22 think the best way to get to zero is to

1 prioritize this stuff.

2 I really like the MCA
3 prioritization that you have on the lower
4 righthand because it starts; let's get going.
5 Let's get to HCAs. Let's get to MCAs. Let's
6 work our way down through the places where
7 there aren't as many people. And I think that
8 we are absolutely committed to getting to
9 traction on that.

10 And I sympathize with the
11 frustration of the one fellow that stood up
12 yesterday, "I've been testing for the last two
13 years. Please tell me, please, God, that is
14 not wasted energy." Because that was an
15 effort made in good faith, and now, he is
16 standing here wondering: I can't get through
17 those first four boxes. Am I screwed or what?
18 And I think that is a really good question.

19 So, those are my comments.

20 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
21 Andy.

22 MR. NANNEY: I don't think you

1 wanted an answer, but I would --

2 (Laughter.)

3 But I would like to say this, and
4 it is a very good point. And Blaine will talk
5 about this on the data, but we really request
6 that you get back with your fellow operators
7 and, based upon the meeting on Wednesday, and
8 if they did give us bad data, they need to be
9 getting with Blaine and resubmitting the data,
10 because we have got about, just to give a
11 quick overview to put it in context, on the
12 grandfather clause, which is 192.619(c), which
13 means that you don't have pressure test
14 records, material records; you are based upon
15 the five-year operating history before July
16 1st, 1970. We have got about 20,000 miles
17 identified as 619(c).

18 And then, if you go look in the
19 part where you look at the lowest of about
20 four items, we have got about 32,000 miles
21 identified as that, which I know from talking
22 with probably eight to ten of the operators,

1 that some of them put that in the incorrect
2 box.

3 So, if you go back to your fellow
4 operators, please suggest to them that they
5 take a look at how they submitted data to us
6 and updated. It would really help in what we
7 are looking at.

8 MEMBER ZAMARIN: Just on that
9 point, Steve -- this is Chad.

10 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I'm sorry,
11 Chad.

12 MEMBER ZAMARIN: I'm sorry.

13 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: We are
14 going to let Sue go, but I think Andy first
15 wants to say something. We will come back to
16 you, Chad.

17 MEMBER DRAKE: I just want to
18 absolutely resound what you said, Steve. We
19 can see there's breakdowns in the data. It is
20 clear. When you see that 619(c), the
21 grandfather clause, there's 22,000 miles in
22 there, and then, you see that collectively

1 there's almost 90,000 miles of pipe with less
2 than 1.1 tests done, you can't be in that box
3 and not be in 619(c). You can't.

4 So, there is obviously some
5 misunderstandings about where to be. And that
6 is why we are so concerned about some of this.
7 There is a lot more pipe going to go through
8 that than what people checked that box on
9 619(c).

10 And I wanted to say one other
11 thing that I think is really important, just
12 for the record. I know when people talk about
13 (c), sometimes we get very polar about how
14 619(c) works. You don't have all these
15 records and you don't have all this other
16 stuff. So, you just the five-year operating
17 pressure. That is not true.

18 What it says is that you use
19 619(c) if you don't use the lowest of those.
20 Many pipes, many pipes in 619(c) have great
21 records. They have hydro tests. They just
22 may be operating at 74 percent of SMYS rather

1 than 72. It is not all or none, and I think
2 that is really important because that is how
3 they can get through, did we have a hydro test
4 discussion, and everything kind of washes out.
5 That pipe is okay.

6 So, I just want to make sure that
7 it is not this Grand Canyon, all-or-none sort
8 of scenario.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. NANNEY: And we definitely
11 realize that, and I agree. In fact, we picked
12 out eight to ten of the operators that
13 submitted in data that we thought was
14 incorrect, and they did get a phone call and
15 an email from myself and everything. But we
16 have looked at that.

17 MR. WIESE: And we will add that,
18 you know, it was obvious to us, and we jumped
19 in ourselves to try to correct data through
20 talking to the operators.

21 I remind the operators that we
22 also have other recommendations, which, of

1 course, we were following before anyway about
2 verifying the accuracy of the data that you
3 submit. Okay?

4 So, we will, through integrity
5 management, be looking to validate. Don't
6 just go back and say, "We don't like the way
7 those" -- I know you don't anyway. But I am
8 just saying it is a cautionary note. Make
9 sure that you can prove your records and what
10 you submit. Okay? Good.

11 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Sue?

12 MEMBER FLECK: Thank you.

13 Sue Fleck, National Grid, Gas
14 Committee.

15 It is nice to follow up people who
16 can explain things so well, so I can kind of
17 skip over. But I just want to get on the
18 record that I agree with Andy's comments
19 around the commitment to safety and the
20 commitment to compliance. Certainly, that
21 underpins everything that we are talking about
22 today and all the questions and concerns that

1 we are bringing to you.

2 I also agree with what Chad said
3 about the spike testing. He said it a lot
4 better than I can, but I share his concerns.

5 I believe that we should separate
6 the MAOP verification from the expansion of
7 the integrity management issues. I am
8 uncomfortable with changing the definition of
9 high-stress from greater than 30-percent SMYS
10 to greater than 20-percent SMYS. I haven't
11 really felt comfort that that is the right
12 thing to do.

13 I have a lot of concern about the
14 dates. When I see "TBD," it makes me very
15 uncomfortable because, you know, you can
16 switch that. You can put anything in there
17 later. So, I just want to be on the record
18 saying I am concerned about how long it is
19 going to take us to comply.

20 I don't understand what you mean
21 be derating and how much, and how that is
22 going to be determined. So, the whole

1 deration option makes me as uncomfortable as
2 "TBD," because in my mind it is a "TBD".

3 And I also agree with the comments
4 about there is a significant underestimation
5 of the amount of pipe that is going to get
6 pulled into this process.

7 And I think there is also a great
8 underestimation of the amount of money it is
9 going to cost to deal with it. When you look,
10 on distribution company sides, a lot of us
11 have these transmission mains running through
12 extremely-crowded urban areas. I can't even
13 imagine the difficulty of trying to hydro test
14 a transmission line in downtown Brooklyn or
15 Manhattan or Detroit or Chicago that has
16 already been hydro tested at 1.5 times twice.

17 But I wouldn't pass through this,
18 and I would go back and cut coupons out of it
19 and retest it a third time. So, I just don't
20 understand how the existing mains in those
21 kinds of areas are going to be dealt with, and
22 if there is a real understanding of the

1 consequences of trying to rehydro something
2 like that, or rebuild it. Where would I put
3 it? Where would I put a pipe?

4 So, just some of our concerns.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Chad?

7 MEMBER ZAMARIN: Thanks.

8 Chad Zamarin, NiSource, Gas
9 Committee.

10 Just a kind of final thought on
11 Steve's point the records. One thing I would
12 mention, we have focused most of our energy on
13 Class III and IV and HCAs because the
14 legislation kind of put us in that direction.
15 And this does open up beyond that. So, I
16 think we will learn more and most of us are
17 continuing to go through that process beyond
18 Class III/IV and HCAs. And so, I think we are
19 going to get better data over time on the
20 broader dataset.

21 The last thing that I would
22 mention is, you know, I spoke yesterday about

1 the 42 mandates. You showed 42 mandates. And
2 I know we want to accomplish everything.

3 But if, in 2030 -- you know, we
4 talked about Outlook 2030 -- we looked back
5 and said that you addressed the grandfather.
6 All pipe that could impact a person has a
7 pressure qualified by a method equivalent to
8 or better than a pressure test, I think you
9 would have made the biggest impact of anything
10 we have been talking about, you know,
11 following San Bruno.

12 And so, I just worry, again, that
13 we get caught up -- and Andy's right; I rarely
14 disagree with him; he is my first boss ever,
15 so I have to be careful.

16 (Laughter.)

17 I think fatigue is a big issue,
18 but it is not an issue associated with how you
19 establish a pressure for the original design
20 of a facility. And so, I guess I just get
21 down to, at the end of the day, I think the
22 most important issue that came out of

1 legislation, that came out of NTSB, is let's
2 make sure that every pipeline has a pressure
3 that has been established by testing. And
4 then, let's continue to work on improving how
5 we operate and maintain pipelines. But, if we
6 did nothing else, if we got yelled at by
7 Congress, and for all the other things that we
8 may or may not have gotten done, if we
9 achieve, I think we will have made the biggest
10 impact possible.

11 So, that is why, when I look at
12 that, I go back to, and I think maybe even
13 Carl's point, was it tested, yes or no? If it
14 wasn't, let's get it tested or do something
15 else that provides that equivalent level of
16 safety. And I think we will have hit the
17 mark.

18 Thanks.

19 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Steve?

20 And then, Alan.

21 MR. NANNEY: Just one thing, back
22 on what Chad was saying. When we did go back

1 to the operators on the 1.1 MAOP test, a lot
2 of them put mileage in there because they had
3 not completed looking at their records. And
4 so, it was a data dump. So, we know that the
5 91,000 is too high, based upon I had three or
6 four operators, large operators, to tell me
7 they had not finished looking at their data.
8 So, they just put it in that box.

9 So, you know, again, if you are
10 talking to any of the other operators that
11 have done that, it would be good that they
12 come back and tell us that, and give us a date
13 when they are going to get that information
14 updated. So, I do know that.

15 And again, Chad, we agree on what
16 you are saying on the fatigue, but we also
17 know that, if you do have seam problems or
18 cracking problems -- let me put it that way --
19 the "one and done," it is not the methodology
20 that needs to be here. That is why we are
21 probably seeing a lot of the failure and leak
22 issues that we have had in the past five or

1 six years. It is because maybe the
2 methodology was the "one and done". So, that
3 is the issues that we will be looking at as we
4 go through the rulemaking process. But your
5 point is well-taken.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Alan?

8 MR. MAYBERRY: Just a couple of
9 thoughts. You know, there is no easy button
10 on what we are trying to do here. I wish
11 there were a button on that chart there.

12 In the words of the NTSB Chairman,
13 she recognized that this would be a heavy lift
14 for us and for industry. So, we are not
15 taking this lightly, obviously. We appreciate
16 your comments.

17 You know, a lot of the concerns
18 are related to some areas of the chart that we
19 really need your input on, because there is a
20 tendency to think of the worst case. And
21 certainly, we all realize what we are trying
22 to solve. We are trying to prevent another

1 San Bruno.

2 You know, you had a worst-case
3 situation there. When you deal with the
4 issue, you have the worst case; you also have
5 a wide range in between.

6 So, we are trying to solve, as we
7 have pointed out, with our numerous briefings
8 on this topic, a number of things besides
9 confirming the MAOP, confirming the material
10 strength. We are also dealing with records.

11 We are also dealing with an area
12 where we have seen weaknesses in some of our
13 inspections regarding engineering-critical
14 assessment.

15 We can appreciate that people have
16 done due diligence. They have pressure-
17 tested, and they are concerned about how we
18 will consider that pressure test. But I think
19 that would be some of the stuff, some of the
20 input, that will go into how, say, someone
21 performs an ECA on the pipeline.

22 We still need to fill out how we

1 are going to handle that. We need to fill out
2 how we are going to handle the spike test.
3 Because there are a lot of scenarios out
4 there, a lot of situations out there, with
5 Class III and IV pipe, that maybe they do have
6 a pressure test already, at least 1.5 times
7 the operating pressure. Do you need to go
8 all the way to yield if it is not operating at
9 the upper limit of the stress level of the
10 line as well? Maybe not.

11 So, we are aware of that. But,
12 again, your input on the areas we need to fill
13 out is very important to us.

14 So, thanks. That's all.

15 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Ron?

16 MEMBER McLAIN: Ron McLain,
17 Liquids Committee.

18 You know, this discussion is
19 really about gas, but I can tell you liquid
20 operators know it is coming to a theater near
21 us soon.

22 (Laughter.)

1 And as a operator, you know, we
2 operate about 70,000 miles of natural gas
3 transmission. So, the cost is incredible.

4 I keep hearing about San Bruno as
5 a driver. And certainly, that was a tragedy.
6 But as I read the NTSB reports, a lot of what
7 happened at San Bruno appeared to be non-
8 compliant with existing rules.

9 So, we can come back and do a lot
10 of things when -- and I am not being critical
11 of that company; I think they are making
12 tremendous progress right now.

13 But sometimes we go from no
14 records to perfect records, and I just want to
15 caution against that. That is what seems to
16 happen downstream of the hydro test here.

17 I do agree with Chad and some of
18 the other speakers that there is a subset of
19 records or tests you have to have, but they
20 are certainly not perfect. And I appreciate
21 your openness to feedback on the box. I think
22 it can be made better.

1 But, at some point, this box
2 addresses normal integrity management. So,
3 there ought to be a hurdle that it was
4 designed, and it is adequate design, to
5 support your MOP or MAOP on the gas side.
6 But, at some point, you go back into normal
7 integrity management for ongoing after that
8 point in time.

9 So, that is my comment.

10 MR. WIESE: I'm stepping in as
11 Acting Chairperson for just a moment.

12 Thank you, Ron.

13 The order I was given, and I
14 follow orders here, was, Rick, I believe that
15 you were next, then Rich, and then, Mike.
16 Okay. That was the order I was given.

17 MEMBER KUPREWICZ: Thank you,
18 Jeff.

19 I guess I would say, from standing
20 back and spending more time on reviewing the
21 San Bruno than many people in this room,
22 probably even Nick earlier this week in his

1 comments, some of it I supplied testimony and
2 other things. I read most of the records and
3 all that. It doesn't make me an expert in all
4 these issues.

5 But some general issues: extreme
6 anxiety here. I understand and appreciate the
7 effort you guys are doing, putting here. You
8 have an obligation to meet a congressional
9 requirement, and this is a great starting
10 point. And I think you can get there.

11 A couple of general observations:
12 yes, the integrity management versus the MAOP,
13 this is a conversation that happened in
14 California and people were under oath. Not
15 all of them told the truth. Not my call. Go
16 get them, if you wish. All right? I mean
17 that was, basically, in the State of
18 California. That is a California process.
19 They have to decide how they are going to deal
20 with that.

21 The cost in there is come anywhere
22 between \$2 to \$10 billion. The question is,

1 who pays and does it fix the problem?

2 I think Nick, from what I heard
3 earlier this week, he is trying to change the
4 company culture. I wish him the best of luck.
5 It is a tough task. None of you should be in
6 that situation.

7 Let's not all forget here, the San
8 Bruno rupture occurred on a relatively-low-
9 pressure, large-diameter transmission system,
10 a 30-inch, 400-pound MAOP, actually operating
11 lower than that, and failed below MAOP.

12 One thing that hasn't come up here
13 is, well, related to it, the issue of the
14 cracking threats. We still haven't got a
15 really good assessment process, except hydro
16 testing, and that is not where people want to
17 go. All right?

18 I have even seen people testify
19 under oath lately the hydro test damages pipe.
20 Well, gentlemen, you are in conflict with a
21 lot of industry research, and you need to
22 explain that. All right? That is where some

1 players are going to be.

2 The reason I bring this up is it
3 is about to hit FERC in some serious ways,
4 because, normally, when FERC approves
5 pipelines, they assume you are building to run
6 MAOP. I think that is a fair call.

7 What is happening here, and maybe
8 not necessarily just in California, is some
9 pipeline operators, while they are complying
10 with the MAOP test, are cross-threading them,
11 MAOP and integrity management, but they are
12 just focused on MAOP, and they have crack
13 risk.

14 And the last thing you want to be
15 doing is dropping operating pressures because
16 you have got a crack threat, because your
17 pressure-cycling spectrum goes way off the
18 chart. Okay?

19 So, if you have a crack risk and
20 you are dropping operating pressures, you
21 could be changing seriously your pressure
22 spectrum, to the point where your fitness for

1 service is off by decades. And so, that is
2 just something to think about.

3 Normally, when I build and design
4 pipelines, we were building them to run higher
5 than MAOP, and not to drop the pressures
6 because we have faults. So, you want to be
7 careful about pressure reductions in terms of
8 gas service especially.

9 So, I think you can get there. I
10 heard some really good comments this week. I
11 think Carl has given us a lot of thought. No,
12 Rick Kuprewicz didn't put Carl up to that.
13 That is the Pipeline Safety Trust thinking on
14 their own. They are getting really smart.
15 You ought to listen to them.

16 So, I think you can get there.
17 This is a very important step. It has got a
18 lot of work to go. I would just be real
19 careful about, if you have got crack risk and
20 you think you needed to solve this by pressure
21 reduction, you could be really setting
22 yourself up for a terrible surprise.

1 Anyway, my comment.

2 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thanks,
3 Rick.

4 I think we are ready for Rich.

5 MEMBER WORSINGER: Rich Worsinger,
6 Rocky Mount, Gas Committee.

7 A lot of discussion, good
8 discussion. I just want to point out a couple
9 of things in here.

10 We talk about cost. Our concern
11 is that these costs ultimately are going to be
12 passed on to the LDCs and our customers. So,
13 I urge PHMSA to make sure that we obviously
14 can't take this all on at one time. We don't
15 want another San Bruno, but we don't want all
16 the pipelines replacing every line they have
17 that they don't have modern records. So, I
18 urge you to work with them, to work on what
19 they determine are the most hazardous
20 pipelines. Good comments, Andy.

21 The second thing, just to point
22 out, 90 percent of the American Public Gas

1 Association's members are captive to one
2 pipeline. So, I am concerned if any of these
3 pipelines have to be taken out of service for
4 this testing, or whatever, how our members are
5 going to continue to be supplied gas.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.

8 Mike?

9 MEMBER BELLMAN: Mike Bellman,
10 City or Richmond Municipal Gas Company; also,
11 along with Rich, on the Gas Committee.

12 Kind of echoing some of what Rich
13 said on the cost. And this was in the
14 Pipeline Safety Act. The timeframes for
15 testing takes into account potential
16 consequences to public safety and the
17 environment, and it minimizes cost and service
18 disruptions.

19 American Gas Association submitted
20 some comments on this before the workshop, I
21 think, and it included an engineering study
22 that placed the cost of testing the high-

1 consequence area, the Class III and IV
2 locations, and at the 30-percent SMYS level at
3 about \$23 billion. If we extrapolate that
4 down to the 71 million customers that this
5 cost is going to roll down to, we are talking
6 \$325 a customer. You may say, "Well, that's
7 not that much."

8 In the City of Richmond, we have
9 100,000 customers. There is a \$32 million
10 revenue requirement right there.

11 And there is a little
12 misunderstanding on rate-setting because I
13 know the Congress said you are going to talk
14 to FERC and you are going to talk to NARUC.
15 Well, on the municipal side, our rates are set
16 by elected officials.

17 In the City of Richmond, you know,
18 45 percent of our population is below the
19 poverty level. So, if I had to go to them and
20 say that, "By the way, we are going to up your
21 rates by \$325 over some period of time," those
22 Council Members are not going to be reelected,

1 and we are not going to get that as a revenue
2 requirement addition to what we already have.

3 So, now I have to step back and
4 say, "Well, where is that money coming from?"
5 In our organization, I don't think Massoud --
6 and he is not here today -- is going to say
7 that I can stop doing my critical valve
8 inspections for a year or I could postpone
9 some leak surveys.

10 So, it has to come from somewhere
11 else. And right now, the only place I can
12 take that from is cast iron renewal.

13 So, all of this rolls downhill
14 from an integrity management issue on
15 transmission that is going to affect the
16 integrity of the distribution system. So,
17 again, keeping that in mind.

18 The aspect of the service
19 disruptions and the public safety, I know we
20 had a good presentation from PG&E on their
21 efforts of bringing in mobile LNG and mobile
22 CNG.

1 One of the points that he made is
2 he would have liked to have had more time to
3 do better planning around that effort. And
4 that just sends shivers down my back because,
5 like Rich, we are relying on just one or two
6 pipelines for our entire supply. And if they
7 are saying they would have rather had more
8 time to plan this, then I would be kind of
9 concerned about that.

10 And then, the whole aspect of
11 siting a mobile LNG station somewhere in the
12 near vicinity to the City of Richmond, I can't
13 see where that would happen and what the
14 aspects of public safety would be there.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. WIESE: Well, first of all, I
17 appreciate all the comments, and we still have
18 more to come.

19 But I do want to illustrate for
20 the public. Okay? So, I would listen-up.
21 This is the discussion that we get put into
22 all the time. If we were in right after San

1 Bruno, no one would be talking.

2 What happens in America is
3 people's memories fade. Really, eight people
4 died in that. A number of other people lost
5 their homes. So, I am not denying any of the
6 points that you are making, but I want the
7 public, not you because you understand this,
8 to realize that these tasks are monumental.

9 You know, the country depends on
10 the supply. The rate model -- forgive me; I
11 have a couple of Commissioners and FERC with
12 me -- is broken. It is disconnected from the
13 safety model in some ways that it shouldn't
14 be, in my view. But these are huge problems.
15 They are not minor.

16 And again, we put a model out to
17 provoke the discussion. We did it in a very
18 public way, transparent, brought people in to
19 talk about it.

20 It is not a minor undertaking.
21 So, we are not unsympathetic to the points you
22 make. And actually, that is why we had "TBD"

1 in the chart, because we started out with some
2 actual numbers in that chart, and it became a
3 real argument even in-house.

4 (Laughter.)

5 So, we decided that that is really
6 where we need to have FERC and NARUC involved
7 in that. The municipal angle is another one
8 altogether.

9 So, I just wanted to point out, as
10 we get into the commenting, we are cognizant
11 of it. We are not unsympathetic in any way,
12 shape, or form because we understand it. But
13 it is a bit of a Gordian knot here, you know.
14 How the hell do we provide the public the
15 assurance that they deserve when they live and
16 depend on these pipelines, and yet, pay for
17 work that probably -- we shouldn't be paying
18 for work that doesn't need to be done, but we
19 really do have to focus more resources, move
20 faster. I think we are all agreeing on that
21 in general.

22 So, forgive the soliloquy.

1 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: All right.
2 We are going to move on to -- but I think Jeff
3 has now pushed a button with me.

4 (Laughter.)

5 I am keeping a list.

6 MR. WIESE: She has Chairman's
7 rights.

8 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: But I
9 wanted to mention there are a number of
10 examples across the country where the
11 regulatory framework works very well. But I
12 do agree with you that we do need to focus on
13 how we make safety a priority, even in the
14 ratemaking context.

15 But I think Arkansas is a great
16 example of where, if I might say so myself --
17 and it happened long before I arrived -- but
18 where we are very responsive to the needs of
19 the LDCs, to not only get the pipe out of the
20 ground, but get it out more quickly, and even
21 where it costs a bit more to do it, because
22 safety is a priority.

1 And now, since I have the
2 microphone, I won't let you respond to that.

3 (Laughter.)

4 And we will go to Gene. And then,
5 we will go to Carl.

6 MEMBER FEIGEL: Gene Feigel, Gas
7 Committee.

8 If I were to take your chart and
9 just ask you the following question, what
10 failure modes are we most concerned with? I
11 mean, they are sort of implicit, but not
12 explicit in what you are doing here, in my
13 estimation.

14 MR. NANNEY: Well, one of the main
15 modes would be pipe manufacturing and
16 construction issues, whether that is a seam-
17 type issue or --

18 MEMBER FEIGEL: No, that is not my
19 question. What failure modes are you
20 concerned with?

21 MR. NANNEY: What failure? Do you
22 mean rupture or leak? Or what are you --

1 MEMBER FEIGEL: That is exactly
2 what I mean. I you worried about fast
3 fracture? Are you worried about --

4 MR. NANNEY: Well, we would be
5 looking for ruptures, of course. Ruptures
6 would be the main issue that we would be
7 looking for, yes.

8 MEMBER FEIGEL: More specifically,
9 let me turn it around. What failure
10 mechanisms, then, are you most concerned with?

11 MR. NANNEY: You mean like
12 selective seam corrosion, stress corrosion
13 cracking?

14 MEMBER FEIGEL: Yes.

15 MR. NANNEY: Is that what you are
16 asking?

17 MEMBER FEIGEL: Yes.

18 MR. NANNEY: Those would be the
19 type issues we would be looking at.

20 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Okay. Are
21 you done, Gene?

22 MEMBER FEIGEL: Well, I have got

1 another question, if I may.

2 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Well, go
3 right ahead.

4 MEMBER FEIGEL: It is sort of
5 related.

6 Have you explicitly, what I will
7 call, stress-tested this approach based on a
8 selection of historical failures?

9 MR. NANNEY: You mean, have we put
10 this into place on a pipeline? Is that what
11 you are asking?

12 MEMBER FEIGEL: Yes. Have you run
13 -- I will pick San Bruno -- through this
14 process?

15 MR. NANNEY: Well, just to answer
16 your question, yes, we have. In the process,
17 we worked with one operator, Magellan, on the
18 Longhorn pipeline, and we have gone through a
19 public environmental assessment where we did
20 put it out last year for public comment. And
21 it is in the process of being inputted and
22 implemented, and that pipeline is operating

1 today.

2 MEMBER FEIGEL: Well, I'm sorry,
3 that is not -- maybe I will try to put it
4 another way. If you took the San Bruno
5 pipeline and ran it through this process, and
6 you can pick different time periods, for
7 example, where you might have gone through
8 this prior to that failure, I guess what I am
9 after is some gross estimation of the
10 probability of having detected, and therefore,
11 prevented that failure by applying this
12 process. But have you gone through that kind
13 of process?

14 MR. NANNEY: Well, first of all,
15 the answer would be yes and no. We haven't
16 got the process developed fully. We haven't
17 said and written it into rulemaking of how it
18 would be implemented. That is why we had the
19 workshop on Wednesday. That is why we are
20 having the meeting today. And we have got the
21 docket open until September the 9th.

22 We do not plan to sit down and do

1 that until we get everyone's comments. Then,
2 we will look at them. We will look at San
3 Bruno, and we will do our best to get measures
4 in place and what will come out in the
5 proposed rulemaking that addresses those type
6 issues.

7 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.

8 All right, Carl?

9 MEMBER WEIMER: Carl Weimer,
10 Pipeline Safety Trust, Liquids Committee.

11 Just a couple of questions, or not
12 questions so much as comments, because people
13 have used my name and mentioned my chart. So,
14 I thought I had better go on record.

15 (Laughter.)

16 That makes me somewhat
17 uncomfortable because I am probably not in the
18 upper 50 percent of the smartest people in the
19 room. So, if you are starting to use my
20 chart, that might cause some concerns.

21 (Laughter.)

22 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Carl,

1 while you are doing that, will you also tell
2 us where we can find it? I bet it is on your
3 website.

4 MEMBER WEIMER: It is actually in
5 one of the presentations from the IVP that
6 PHMSA has already posted online.

7 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Very good.
8 Thank you.

9 MEMBER WEIMER: You know, I have
10 looked at this and in the last couple of days
11 have gotten more clarity on this. And I
12 really appreciate all the comments on the IVP
13 process.

14 Clearly, we are trying to do a
15 number of different things and roll them all
16 into one process, and I appreciate that
17 because I think there is a whole number of
18 things that need to be done. So, I really
19 appreciate PHMSA trying to do that in one
20 thing.

21 I have no problem separating those
22 out, if it leads to greater clarity, and doing

1 them in separate processes, as long as those
2 separate processes are done in parallel and in
3 parallel timeframes. I don't want to see this
4 become a serial process where I am dead and
5 buried for 20 years before we get to some of
6 the things that are trying to be addressed in
7 this one attempt.

8 So, if we can separate those out
9 for clarity and run those in parallel
10 timeframes and parallel processes, I don't
11 have a problem with that.

12 A number of things that I really
13 like in it -- and I mentioned this the other
14 day -- I like the expansion into MCAs. I
15 think that is a good idea. I like a lot of th
16 stuff in here.

17 One of the things that is clear --
18 well, it is lack of clarity, in my mind, and
19 I think the chart needs to be changed -- is
20 the whole issue of people that have done valid
21 pressure tests. But because of the way the
22 diamonds are arranged on the chart, those kind

1 of don't meet. And we are looking at people
2 that -- well, yes, there is the wonderful
3 chart (laughter) -- don't meet the intent of,
4 that they have done a valid pressure test, but
5 they can't get through the chart without doing
6 another one. So, I think that is something
7 that, clearly, I have heard operators ask,
8 "Will we be covered or not?" And they haven't
9 gotten a straight answer to that question.
10 So, I would love to see that move forward.

11 And like I said before, when we
12 get into kind of the integrity management
13 section of the charts, the whole engineering-
14 critical assessment, we have some concerns of
15 whether that is as valid a way to determine
16 MAOP as a pressure test.

17 So, those were my comments. Thank
18 you.

19 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.
20 Very good.

21 Commissioner Gardner?

22 MEMBER GARDNER: Wayne Gardner

1 with the Gas Committee.

2 I have been sitting almost, let's
3 say, somewhat patiently because I didn't
4 really think that I had a lot to add to the
5 discussion.

6 But I did want to commend PHMSA
7 for its effort here. I think that this is a
8 very important topic on top of the fact that
9 you actually have a legal mandate to get it
10 done. And as a result, you should be moving
11 in that direction.

12 And I guess I also have some
13 pushback on industry. I hear their concerns.
14 I think their concerns are legitimate. But
15 this is not a fait accompli. It is a work-in-
16 progress that you are asking for comments on.
17 And please give them the comments, unless you
18 have given them to them already and they
19 aren't listening to you, in which case, then,
20 I think you have real grounds for raising
21 issues.

22 But the big piece that I wanted to

1 speak to was comments from across the table
2 around cost recovery and the concern.

3 In Pennsylvania, where I am a
4 Commissioner, we have estimated that we have
5 our at-risk pipe, cost to replace it is going
6 somewhere between \$14 and \$20 billion. And we
7 have very large gas distribution companies and
8 some really, really small companies, on the
9 order of a few hundred customers.

10 But the big piece of that was that
11 the companies were using that cost of
12 replacement as a legitimate excuse for, in my
13 opinion, for doing nothing. And as a result,
14 pipe that had already been identified as at-
15 risk could take as long as 80 to 100 years for
16 the companies to get around to replacing it.
17 In my opinion, that is not good enough. And
18 in fact, I will say, beyond my opinion, the
19 Commission's opinion, because all of our
20 companies now have been ordered to come up
21 with accelerated replacement programs.

22 And we also got the support of the

1 Legislature, which passed a law for a
2 distribution service improvement charge, which
3 is a way to help companies accelerate
4 recovery.

5 So, cost is legitimate. I do have
6 sympathies for Commissions that are elected,
7 but I also think that, as Chairman Honorable
8 stated, safety is a priority and we really,
9 really have to bring safety up to the level
10 and start to push back a little bit on cost
11 and get this job done.

12 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Amen.

13 With that, I will turn it back
14 over to Jeff.

15 MR. WIESE: Thank you.

16 So, just retaining my prerogative
17 as whatever they call me, Designated Federal
18 Officer -- (laughter) -- or whatever it is,
19 just a couple of comments, if I can.

20 I think in many ways you hear a
21 lot of agreement, right? In the higher-level
22 principles, something needs to be done. You

1 know, things need to be accelerated. People
2 need to be protected.

3 You know, there are legitimate
4 costs that need to be recovered. There are
5 lots of discussions that need to happen about
6 the balance between shareholders and
7 ratepayers and all of that. And I get it. We
8 will be having a lot of discussions with FERC
9 and NARUC.

10 But we felt you couldn't have a
11 productive conversation until you had a model
12 to discuss. So, we have presented our model
13 and in public, and the public has a right to
14 see this, just as the companies do and other
15 regulators. So, we have invited your
16 comments.

17 As you all know, actually, we have
18 done a lot of webinars outside to try to
19 explain this model to people and give them
20 plenty of opportunity to understand what we
21 have said. I don't think we have ever claimed
22 perfection, but we think we have a good model.

1 It is complex.

2 What I hear more is people feel
3 that it is too much or it would be too costly,
4 or whatever. And I think we are sympathetic
5 to that, and I think Andy, in particular, said
6 you can move one block up here and really
7 discount a lot of that.

8 So, we have heard some really good
9 comments, and I appreciate that going forward.
10 I would like to rename the grandfather clause
11 "the great grandfather clause".

12 (Laughter.)

13 I think at the time that was
14 created, it was created for the right reasons.
15 But how many years have passed since then? I
16 think we all recognize it shouldn't be there
17 anymore. But, as Chairman Hersman said, it is
18 a heck of a heavy lift, as you have heard
19 today.

20 But we are talking about this
21 because I think we have agreed on all those
22 principles I just mentioned. And I will just

1 highlight the last couple of things and be
2 done.

3 During our workshop, you know, we
4 tried to emphasizes the connections between
5 these things. I know people want to separate
6 them, and it is probably the way it will go.
7 You know, we should talk about it.

8 But knowing your system is key to
9 integrity management, and openly admitting you
10 don't know your system, what the pipe is, what
11 its materials and chemical properties are, you
12 know, but it just passed the pressure test, we
13 have to debate whether or not the Weimer Chart
14 gets us everywhere we want to go. Or do we
15 just lean into the integrity side?

16 The legacy pipe challenges are
17 real. We see this in many of your states.
18 You know, Pennsylvania and Arkansas are two of
19 the ones represented here; the great State of
20 Iowa, not aware of, although there was a lot
21 of mechanical damage up there done that we are
22 going to have to work on.

1 In integrity management, I think
2 we see operators taking advantage of the
3 latitude that is inherent in integrity
4 management. So, I am not pointing fingers at
5 you as individuals. I am saying the industry
6 as a whole.

7 So, I think this was an attempt to
8 tighten up some of the latitude that we have
9 seen abused within the system. Once you do
10 know your system, you need to know your
11 environment. And the MCA, by the way, while
12 it is new in this setting, you will see it
13 again. It is a concept that I think makes
14 great sense for us all as we get into risk
15 management, to deal with things where
16 consequences could be worse. So, I think that
17 will all come out to play.

18 I will close on saying let us not
19 rest our entire laurels on PIR. We have seen
20 PIR burn patterns well exceed the boundaries
21 of that. So, maybe it is PIR plus a buffer,
22 you know, to whatever it is. You know, let's

1 feel good about what we are going to propose.

2 Class location, we do have a
3 Federal Register notice that went out. As we
4 had told you the other day, ironically, it was
5 not us, but it was The Federal Register who
6 made it into a Proposed Rulemaking. All we
7 sent forward was a Request for Comments on it.
8 And honestly, we could show you the document.
9 We screw up enough, but that one wasn't ours.

10 So, the last thing -- and I will
11 just leave on this one -- is we tried to
12 allow, there will be time in there for
13 technology to play a role. We believe in
14 technology and its ability to help us solve
15 some of the problems in this Gordian knot.

16 That said, R&D remains a huge
17 challenge for the industry, the states, and
18 the federal side to get together and figure
19 out how are we going to do what needs to be
20 done. If we don't want to undo this knot the
21 old way, which is what we are sort of talking
22 about, how do we deliver technology into this

1 fast enough to solve some of these problems on
2 cracking?

3 I know a failure, in particular,
4 where I felt like the operator was doing spike
5 tests. They were, then, running corrosion
6 tools. They had, then, run a TIF tool in
7 there. They still had a failure, and it was
8 still a hook crack in the low-frequency ERW
9 pipe. I felt like the operator was looking.
10 So, the technology has failed us in that case,
11 but I am pretty sure that it can help us, if
12 we can figure out how to get together on that
13 notion.

14 I have written to the Commissions
15 asking them to be sensitive to letting
16 companies recover investments. And to the
17 industry, I will say we have got to find a way
18 to pool those funds and maximize our impact
19 and deliver stuff into the market.

20 So, with that, I will stop and
21 turn it back to the Commissioner.

22 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.

1 And I think these are certainly
2 challenging issues, obviously, but I am
3 hopeful that, through this continued dialog,
4 and I certainly trust that PHMSA, all of the
5 subject matter expertise are heeding your
6 concerns.

7 We appreciate you, first, for
8 being present, but also for caring enough
9 about the work that you do to be here to
10 improve the process.

11 So, with that, are we going to
12 trudge forward or are we going to take a
13 break?

14 MR. WIESE: With your permission,
15 I think what we will do is -- you know, I have
16 tried to be sensitive; some people have
17 flights coming up soon. And forgive me, if
18 you are going to leave now, I will just say
19 thank you for your service and for taking time
20 out of your schedules.

21 We do have a couple of things.
22 So, I plan to stick around. I hope anybody

1 else who has the time will, particularly if
2 you need updates on public awareness or on the
3 amount of pipe that we are talking about that
4 will be subjected to IVP, because those are
5 the two next topics we will cover.

6 May I suggest that we just take
7 like a 10-minute quick break --

8 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Sure.

9 MR. WIESE: -- reconvene. People
10 can check out if they need to.

11 All right. Thanks.

12 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: We will
13 begin at 11:00.

14 MR. WIESE: Eleven.

15 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter
16 went off the record at 10:49 a.m. and went
17 back on the record at 11:06 a.m.)

18 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: We are
19 back on the record in the joint meeting of the
20 Gas and Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Advisory
21 Committees.

22 And for your information, we have

1 now returned to agenda item 1, with a briefing
2 by Blaine Keener on the Gas Transmission 2012
3 Annual Report.

4 Blaine?

5 MR. KEENER: Thank you.

6 This thing works? This thing
7 doesn't work?

8 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: It was
9 working, yes.

10 MR. KEENER: Okay. The things I
11 am going to cover are up on the screen now.
12 So, I won't read them to you.

13 But, sort of as a prelude, we made
14 some significant changes to the Gas
15 Transmission Annual Report after the
16 congressional mandate came out and the NTSB
17 recommendations were received. So, 2012 is
18 the first year that we have collected some of
19 the data that is contained in the annual
20 report.

21 The 2012 reports were due June
22 15th. It is three months later than our usual

1 due date for the Gas Transmission Annual.
2 That was to allow operators more time to
3 review their records and, also, allow us time
4 to get the IT system in place to collect it.

5 As of July 1st, we had 903
6 operators that submitted reports. This is 32
7 less operators than 2011. And we also have
8 less miles total in 2012 than we had in 2011.
9 So, we have been in contact with those
10 operators that were with us in 2011 and not in
11 2012, trying to make sure that we have a
12 complete dataset.

13 We have 115 reports that have been
14 supplemented to either update or correct data.
15 And we are expecting more, for some of the
16 reasons that I will cover in my presentation.

17 There are two links that allow you
18 to access the form itself and the instructions
19 on our website.

20 We collected a lot of different
21 ways, a lot of different slices and views of
22 the data in the various parts of the form.

1 And again, Part Q and Part R are brand-new for
2 2012, dealing with, how did you establish your
3 maximum allowable operating pressure and do
4 you have complete records? And then, Part R,
5 the pressure test range and internal
6 inspection capability. And you know, that
7 goes by a lot of different monikers, ILI,
8 pigability. So, it is basically just the
9 concept of can you internally inspect your
10 pipe.

11 The HCA mileage is included in
12 three parts of the form, Parts L, Q, and R.
13 So, we get total mileage in all the parts, and
14 we get the HCA miles in three of the parts.

15 We realized that this data was
16 going to be of interest to a lot of people.
17 So, we had the July 1st dataset added to the
18 IVP docket and our public meeting web page in
19 early July. And we found that some of those
20 reports are missing parts. So, in other
21 words, we don't have the same number of
22 records in every part, like we would expect

1 to. I will talk about that a little at the
2 end here, too.

3 In mid-July, we put out some key
4 data points related to the mandates and
5 recommendations. The data in here is solid.
6 That summary that we put out in mid-July, we
7 were off on the Part Q. What we actually did
8 was we added the total miles and the
9 incomplete record miles, which was not the
10 right logic. But, as I said, today's
11 presentation does not repeat that error that
12 we made in mid-July.

13 There is a link for the OPS
14 website, where you can go to get the current
15 dataset as of July 31st. Data was added
16 earlier this week.

17 And some of our reports are still
18 missing parts. Our IT group is still digging
19 into it. We think most of them are empty.
20 For some reason, the data collection algorithm
21 created more parts than were needed. And
22 actually, the user couldn't even see the

1 parts, if they wanted to add data in the user
2 interface. So, we are still trying to iron
3 that out.

4 But I guess the good news is those
5 extra parts are empty. So, they are annoying,
6 they shouldn't be there and we are trying to
7 get rid of them, but we think the mileage data
8 that we have is accurate. And we are going to
9 continue to update that dataset monthly, as we
10 do with all of our web downloads for annual
11 report and incident data.

12 And again, since different
13 attributes come on different parts, you are
14 going to find that the total gas transmission
15 miles and the gas transmission HCA miles are
16 not identical in each part. If you have got
17 an operator with 15,000 miles of pipe, we
18 would have to go many, many decimal places out
19 and cause extreme angst to require them to be
20 equal.

21 So, what we targeted was a half of
22 a percent on the total gas transmission miles

1 and .3 percent agreement among parts for the
2 HCA miles. We also missed that a little bit,
3 and we will be in touch with operators soon
4 who went over that threshold and asked them to
5 resubmit their report to get the mileage by
6 part tightened up a little more.

7 Traditionally, we use Part J, by
8 decade installed, for our total gas
9 transmission miles. There is a page on our
10 website that shows the mileage over years, and
11 Part J is what we traditionally use. So, our
12 official number is almost 302, well, it is
13 302,427. That is our total gas transmission
14 mileage.

15 For our official HCA mile number,
16 we use the data in Part L. So, we have almost
17 20,000 miles, 6.5 percent of the total that is
18 in HCAs.

19 And this chart just gives you a
20 look at the HCA and Class location data. So,
21 if you look in the upper right, the Class I
22 and Class II non-HCA miles, that is 88 percent

1 of the total gas transmission miles. And as
2 you might expect, if you look at the percent
3 in the HCA column, that goes up as your Class
4 location goes up, which is what we would
5 expect. And so, there's the total numbers,
6 and you can see the non-HCA greatly outweighs
7 the HCA. That is part of the motivation for
8 coming up with an MCA concept, so that we have
9 more miles under the integrity management
10 paradigm.

11 Okay. I am going to have a whole
12 series of slides here that runs through the
13 various parts of the form. So, Part H is th
14 nominal pipe size. You can see most of it is
15 clumped in that 10-to-36-inch. We have a lot
16 more on the low end than we do on the high
17 end. And then, the other is just if people
18 wanted to pick a 4.5-inch, instead of the 4-
19 inch nominal pipe size. So, that is basically
20 noise in the data. All that should be
21 allocated into a nominal pipe size range.
22 Luckily, it is not many miles because it is

1 going to be a pain to clean up. But,
2 essentially, most of it is in that 10-to-36
3 range.

4 If you look at it by the decade
5 that it is installed, 59 percent of it is
6 installed before the seventies. That is our
7 pre-code pipe. And you see the big lump in
8 the fifties and sixties. And then, except for
9 the 2000s, it has been fairly steady
10 afterwards.

11 When you look at it from specified
12 minimum yield strength in Part K, particularly
13 troubling is the "unknown" category. There is
14 almost 7,000 miles where the operators have
15 steel pipe and don't know what percent SMYS
16 they are operating at.

17 You get a fair chunk that is on
18 the other end at less than 20 percent. So,
19 that is your transmission-by-definition, not
20 by SMYS, category. And you see the bulk of it
21 there is in the 61-to-72-percent range, which
22 is your Class I and Class II areas. So, that

1 is a recurring theme. Most of it is Class I
2 and Class II outside HCAs.

3 Then, we have the grandfather
4 interlude, which we talked about a lot on
5 Wednesday at the public meeting; 619.83 is not
6 the grandfather clause. We caused some
7 confusion by making that statement in an
8 Advisory Bulletin. But if you look under
9 619(a), you have to consider four different
10 factors. You have to consider your design,
11 your pressure test, and then, your operating
12 pressure in the five years preceding 1970, and
13 your pipeline history. And then, you pick the
14 lowest of those.

15 We had a good number of miles
16 reported under 619(a)(3), which is basically
17 telling us that, yes, we had design records;
18 we had pressure test records; we have pipeline
19 history information. Yet, we chose to go at
20 a lower operating pressure based on what the
21 pipeline actually operated at between '65 and
22 '70. So, you can't pick 619(a)(3) unless you

1 know your design and your pressure test
2 information.

3 And then, 619(c) is the
4 grandfather clause where design/pressure test
5 goes out the window, and you say, okay, what
6 was my highest operating pressure between '65
7 and '70? Bang, that is my MAOP.

8 So, looking at Part Q, this is the
9 total miles. And again, (a)(1) and (a)(2)
10 your design and pressure test is the
11 predominant method that was used. That big
12 chunk of miles in (a)(3), we are kind of
13 scratching our heads over.

14 And then, Part D is the alternative
15 AOP where you are allowed to exceed the Class
16 location ranges if you comply with the
17 alternative AOP regulations.

18 If you look at the HCA miles, and
19 how the MAOPs were established there, you see,
20 again, it is a real similar distribution for
21 the HCA miles as what we had for the total
22 miles, except for the Part D. And a lot of

1 that is shown as being in HCAs.

2 And then, when we look at the
3 incomplete records, again, record status was
4 not collected for Class locations I and II
5 outside of HCAs. Eighty-eight percent of the
6 gas transmission pipelines, we did not collect
7 data on whether your records were adequate.

8 I guess another way to look at it
9 is that the most mileage that could have
10 incomplete records would be the remaining 12
11 percent, about 36,000 miles. So, again, it is
12 a real similar distribution to what we saw for
13 how MAOP was established on the other charts.
14 Most of it is pressure tests and design
15 pressure.

16 This is the last part of the form,
17 Part R. Essentially, it has three pieces.
18 The three bars on the left show all the
19 pipeline miles and what their pressure test
20 range is. So, the majority of the pipelines
21 were pressure tested to more than 1.25 MAOP,
22 just a little bit in that mid-range, and then,

1 a significant chunk that is less than a 1.1
2 times MAOP pressure test.

3 The chart in the middle shows you,
4 for lines that can be internally inspected,
5 what their pressure test is. So, obviously,
6 again, the pressure test less than 1.1 is what
7 we are concerned with the most.

8 And then, when internal inspection
9 is not able is the right three columns. And
10 you can see we have still got a significant
11 amount of mileage where the pressure test was
12 less than 1.1 MAOP and internal inspection is
13 not able.

14 All right. And then, the last
15 couple of slides here are going to, again,
16 pull out some key data points that relate to
17 the congressional mandate and the NTSB
18 recommendations.

19 So, the first is Section 23 of the
20 Act, where they had to verify records for HCAs
21 in Class location III and IV. We got just
22 over 5400 miles that were reported with

1 incomplete records, with a little less than
2 half in HCAs and a little over half outside
3 HCAs.

4 And then, the other portion of
5 that mandate was the strength test, pipe and
6 HCAs, well, that was not tested. That is
7 operating over 30 percent SMYS. We have just
8 over 3200 HCA miles that have that pressure
9 test less than 1.1 MAOP. And we assume that
10 about 77 percent of that is over 30 percent
11 SMYS. The 30 percent SMYS question is sort of
12 diluted by another NTSB recommendation that
13 doesn't necessarily care what this SMYS level
14 is, but talks about testing pipe in general,
15 regardless of the SMYS level.

16 So, here is where we see generally
17 77 percent of the total mileage is operating
18 over 30 percent SMYS. So, that is where we
19 came up with that estimate that 77 percent of
20 the pipe is going to be over 30 percent SMYS.

21 And then, NTSB Recommendation
22 P-11-14, that is the eliminating the

1 grandfather clause and require the hydro tests
2 for pre-'70 pipe. So, here what we did, when
3 we said, okay, how much is really
4 grandfathered, we included the miles that were
5 reported under 619(c) and the miles that were
6 reported under 619(a)(3). And that brings us
7 to just over 55,000. We got almost 94,000
8 where the pressure test is less than 1.1 MAOP.

9 And then, the other factor that we
10 were concerned with here is the miles where
11 the stress level is over 72 percent SMYS are
12 unknown. Happily, that number is less than
13 the grandfathered because, except for special
14 permits in the MAOP pipelines, we can't think
15 of a reason why a pipe would be allowed to
16 operate over 72 percent SMYS except for the
17 grandfather clause.

18 So, I guess the punchline is that
19 we expect that the grandfather miles and the
20 pressure test less than 1.1 MAOP are actually
21 pretty close to the same number, and we think
22 that number is somewhere between 55 and 94

1 thousand miles.

2 This just gives you an idea of
3 where the grandfathered miles are located.
4 So, you can see on the right we have got a
5 little bit in the HCAs. Most of it in the
6 Class I areas outside of HCAs. And this chart
7 stacks the 619(a)(3) miles on top of the
8 619(c) to come up with our best guess of the
9 actual grandfathered models.

10 And this just shows you that
11 pressure test less than 1.1 of MAOP
12 constitutes 31 percent of our mileage, and you
13 have got 6 percent that is in that mid-range
14 somewhere, with the majority being greater
15 than 1.25 MAOP test.

16 And where there was 1.1, less than
17 1.1 miles that are located, as shown here a
18 little bit in the HCAs, and again, most is in
19 Class I, not in HCA.

20 And here is a look at the
21 operating stress levels, over 72 percent SMYS
22 and the unknowns. Possibly the most

1 disturbing is that 6,000 miles of intrastate
2 gas transmission where operators don't know
3 the SMYS level, an indication that you really
4 don't have much, if any, information about the
5 material properties of your pipe.

6 So, again, we expect that if it is
7 between 72 and 80 percent SMYS, that that is
8 either grandfathered, special permit, or
9 alternate MAOP.

10 Recommendation P-11-15 dealt with
11 the manufacturing and construction defects,
12 considered stable only if the pipe is pressure
13 tested to more than 1.25. Since the
14 manufacturing and construction defects are an
15 integrity management issue, we just looked at
16 the number of miles that are in HCAs where
17 that pressure test is less than 1.25. So,
18 again, just over 3200 miles and about fairly-
19 evenly-divided between able to be internally
20 inspected and not able.

21 And this graph shows where those
22 pressure tests less than 1.25 MAOP miles are.

1 And again, this shows the whole gamut. Those
2 3200 miles I talked about are all the way on
3 the right in the HCA. So, again, most of the
4 miles that haven't been pressure tested, 1.25,
5 are in your Class I and not in HCA.

6 And then, the final NTSB
7 recommendation we will talk about here is
8 configuring lines to accommodate smart pigs.
9 We have got 40 percent of the total gas
10 transmission where internal inspection is not
11 able. And diameter, we gave some numbers for
12 the miles of pipe that are less than 8-inch
13 and the miles of pipe that are less than 6-
14 inch. With current technology, it is kind of
15 "iffy" if you can really internally inspect 8-
16 inch-and-below lines.

17 So, some of that ILI, not able, is
18 just based on the diameter of the line. You
19 can't get a pig in it. And then, we don't
20 really know how many miles might be not able
21 to do system configuration, metering and
22 measurement devices that would obstruct the

1 passage of the pig through the pipeline.

2 And this chart, again, breaks down
3 that internal in-line inspection, able and not
4 able, by Class location and by HCA. So, you
5 can see, from the bottom line, again, internal
6 inspection, not able, on the righthand side,
7 is about 40 percent of the pipelines. And
8 again, most of them are Class I, not an HCA,
9 and Class II, not an HCA.

10 And there will be a quiz after.

11 I'm sorry.

12 (Laughter.)

13 No, we will give you the slides
14 because we realize it is much more than the
15 human brain can absorb in the 15 minutes I
16 have been talking. So, the slides will be
17 available. And as I said, the data update, we
18 are going to continue to update that monthly
19 and have it available for the website.

20 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
21 Blaine.

22 We will begin now with questions

1 for Blaine from the Joint Committee members,
2 and we will begin first with Gene.

3 MEMBER FEIGEL: Gene Feigel, Gas
4 Committee.

5 Is the data on your website
6 granular enough that we could get in and link
7 sizes and pressures and all sorts of different
8 things or is it largely aggregated much along
9 the lines that we saw --

10 MR. KEENER: It is not aggregated,
11 but it is segregated. We know how many miles
12 operate over 72 percent SMYS. We can't tell
13 you how big they are.

14 MEMBER FEIGEL: Okay.

15 MR. KEENER: We can't tell you
16 their diameter. Can't tell you which portion
17 can be inspected internally and which portion
18 can't. So, they are discrete sets of data by
19 particular attributes.

20 The proposal that we heard from
21 Amy Nelson this morning, that would allow us
22 to do that kind of crunching and combining

1 things if it was in a GIS where we had the
2 attributes for each segment. Right now, with
3 the tabular annual report, it is like eight
4 separate slices of the data.

5 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Any other
6 questions from the Committee members?

7 (No response.)

8 Very good. We will now turn to
9 the audience. If you are a member of the
10 public and you have a question or a comment on
11 this current topic, if you will come to the
12 microphone now?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. WIESE: We might have worn
15 them out already.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Very good.
18 Seeing none, thank you, Blaine,
19 very much for that presentation.

20 And we will return to our agenda
21 for agenda item 3. It is a briefing on the
22 public awareness meeting and an update.

1 Christie Murray?

2 MS. MURRAY: Good morning.

3 I am Christie Murray with the
4 Office of Program Development within Pipeline
5 Safety.

6 I kind of see my presentation this
7 morning as a preview in a movie theater.
8 Really, I wanted to provide a brief update on
9 what we are doing with our public awareness
10 efforts and to talk about some upcoming
11 activities that we are going to partake in.

12 So, where I wanted to start, PHMSA
13 and our state partners have spent the past
14 two, two-and-a-half years conducting public
15 awareness inspections. Many have been
16 targeted inspections, and some have been
17 combined with other inspection initiatives.

18 PHMSA, we completed all of ours
19 and our interstate agents at the end of 2012,
20 and states are still conducting public
21 awareness inspections. Their efforts are
22 ongoing throughout the end of this year. And

1 many are combining them with other inspection
2 activities.

3 Pretty much what we went out and
4 did is we took a look at public awareness
5 programs, visited with operators, to really
6 assess their compliance with public awareness
7 regulations 192.216 and 195.440, and, also,
8 the first edition of the American Petroleum
9 Institute's RP 1162.

10 Currently, this is a little
11 outdated. It is probably about a month old,
12 but we have conducted, roughly, about 350
13 total inspections. We have a database that we
14 are actually collecting a lot of the results
15 of our inspections within PHMSA.

16 PHMSA, we completed about 135
17 total, and the states, roughly, around 180 so
18 far. And more are still being input into the
19 database. Our PHMSA inspectors are still
20 wrapping up some of their results. So, are
21 the states. So, it is still a work-in-
22 progress put into that system.

1 And we are also taking some looks
2 at what we are seeing so far. We have a
3 pretty good data size. So, we are looking at
4 some of the results that we are seeing by each
5 inspection question, just to say, what are
6 some of the leading indicators and what areas
7 that we may want to look at strengthening
8 awareness? Where are operators doing really
9 well, and what areas may they be struggling
10 in?

11 And I just wanted to just point
12 out a couple of general areas. I know there
13 is a lot of interest in getting a hold of the
14 data that we have in this database, and
15 operators are anxious to find out what they
16 can to improve their programs. That is really
17 the essence of my conversation today, is to
18 start the dialog around what is next with
19 public awareness.

20 But there are a couple of key
21 areas that, if operators were to look and
22 focus their efforts without having the full

1 results of what we are seeing from the
2 inspections -- Harold Winnie at our public
3 awareness workshop, I thought he did a great
4 job of providing the general overview of some
5 of the areas where we are seeing some areas of
6 concern with the inspections by question.

7 So, I just wanted to point out
8 just a few areas that, if we could take back
9 or to just put into perspective that here are
10 some of the things that we are going to be
11 talking more about in the future, the first
12 would be stakeholder identification. I
13 actually participated on some of the public
14 awareness inspections, not as many as some of
15 our inspectors, but I did participate on a
16 few.

17 But I think this area is an area
18 where there is a lot of opportunity to really
19 look fundamentally at how operators are
20 identifying their stakeholders and looking
21 back over time, multiple years, into their
22 program to do some basic analysis, to make

1 sure they are reaching the intended
2 stakeholders that they should be reaching.

3 And by stakeholders, there are
4 four key stakeholder audience groups: the
5 affected public, public/local officials,
6 emergency officials, and the excavation or
7 excavator community.

8 Also, with the written programs,
9 the whole essence of these inspections was
10 also to, four years after implementing the
11 public awareness program, operators were
12 required in June of 2010 to conduct an
13 effectiveness evaluation. How well is our
14 program working? Are our messages reaching
15 their intended audiences? What are we
16 learning from this process, so that we can
17 continuously improve?

18 And one of the takeaways from what
19 we saw with the inspections is there was a lot
20 of struggle around the effectiveness
21 evaluation, and for different reasons, just
22 due to the nature and flexibility and

1 variability, and how those effectiveness
2 evaluations were conducted and could be
3 conducted. There was really no one
4 standardized methodology or approach taken to
5 conduct those. So, we saw a lot of variation
6 there.

7 But one of the key messages that I
8 wanted to point out is, if you don't define
9 what your intended goal, your metrics, how you
10 will know when you have gotten to where you
11 need to be with your program, it will be very
12 difficult for years into implementation to
13 determine whether or not it was effective.

14 So, my second area that I think we
15 probably need to spend more time discussing
16 ways to improve is the written program itself
17 and making sure that upfront, when you are
18 developing out the public awareness programs,
19 that there are metrics and defined goals input
20 into it that will give you a great baseline
21 for assessing your program when you are trying
22 to assess it for effectiveness years later.

1 Also, another key area was
2 maintaining liaison with emergency officials.
3 There is a lot of different efforts with the
4 public safety community with regards to
5 maintaining liaison. Are we providing the
6 right information that emergency officials and
7 first responders need in a timely manner?
8 What do you do within those first 10 to 15
9 minutes of an incident?

10 And so, we are seeing a lot of
11 variation again in this area. I think there
12 are some operators that are doing a really
13 great job with reaching out to their emergency
14 officials, but I think there are still some
15 opportunities and overall with this area where
16 we can focus our efforts more on what do they
17 really need to know and when do they really
18 need to know it.

19 So, some of the activities since
20 we have conducted inspections and we are
21 starting to look at the results that we are
22 undergoing, back in June, we had a great

1 public awareness workshop in Dallas, where we
2 brought various stakeholders together and
3 individuals from our four stakeholder audience
4 groups and had a two-day workshop to talk
5 about some of the challenges and successes we
6 have had with public awareness and, also, what
7 are some of the opportunities we have for
8 improvement moving forward?

9 And we actually on the second day
10 we had breakout sessions where we broke out
11 into three smaller groups with diverse
12 stakeholders in each group, so that we could
13 have rich conversation around some of the
14 needs and some of the challenges from
15 different stakeholder perspectives.

16 We have a lot of that information,
17 the presentations from the workshop, and we
18 will be putting the actual breakout group
19 comments on our public awareness website. I
20 didn't provide the link, but I can make sure
21 I provide it back to the Committee.

22 Now the next step, and one of the

1 things we did talk about at that workshop that
2 we wanted to do next, is to formulate a small
3 working group to primarily look at the
4 different input items that we have, whether it
5 is reviewing our inspection summaries and
6 findings, identifying some of the gaps in our
7 public awareness requirements, whether it is
8 in our regulatory requirements or recommended
9 practices; also, taking into consideration the
10 feedback from the working group -- excuse me
11 -- from the breakout groups that we had at the
12 workshop. And pretty much our end goal is to
13 talk about ways to improve public awareness
14 moving forward in the form of a report or
15 issuing findings.

16 And a key point to that -- and I
17 will talk about that small working group on
18 the next slide a bit more -- but the intent of
19 the group is not to recommend we should make
20 "X" changes to the regulations specifically or
21 to recommend that we are going to make
22 exchanges to RP 1162. It is to really

1 generally look at practical and reasonable
2 areas where we have seen challenges
3 collectively, and we want to really be
4 practical about what makes sense moving
5 forward on ways we can address it. How we
6 address it will be outside of the scope of
7 this actual working group.

8 And that feeds into the next
9 point, RP 1162. Even though our current
10 regulations, the first edition of RP 1162 is
11 what is incorporated in our current
12 regulations, we know that the second edition
13 of RP 1162 is published and available and has
14 been for a few years. But we have not adopted
15 any additional additions because we wanted to
16 get through the inspection process and make
17 sure we had a good feel for what is working
18 and what some of the areas that we need to
19 strengthen before making that next step,
20 because we may want to propose some changes or
21 look at things differently.

22 So, if there is any concern over

1 what is next with the 1162 incorporation, we
2 are really waiting until after we make
3 recommendations and we decide if any
4 requirements to public awareness need to
5 change before making a decision on whether to
6 incorporate any further additions.

7 And just one last point here. The
8 working group we are looking to create, I know
9 in the slides and the binder I think I said
10 that we would work tentatively until the end
11 of 2013, the end of this year. But it could
12 spill over into early 2014. So, I wanted to
13 make that clarification.

14 Generally, this is just an
15 overview over public awareness is more of an
16 iterative process. Things change. Technology
17 changes. The needs of stakeholders change.
18 The climate in which we all operate changes.
19 So, continuous improvement is a focus for our
20 operators. We know it is a focus for all the
21 regulators, and all the stakeholders have
22 expectations and perspectives about how we go

1 about doing those things. So, this is just
2 kind of a snapshot on all the pieces that
3 really fit into the puzzle for public
4 awareness. And the overall goal is to keep
5 finding ways to get the right information to
6 the right stakeholders at the right time.

7 And this chart is just a brief
8 representation of what we would like to put
9 together for the working group for public
10 awareness. I have already started reaching
11 out to some of the stakeholders you see listed
12 here, personally inviting them to participate
13 on this working group because they have
14 specialized knowledge, experience,
15 perspectives that we believe will be very
16 valuable in advancing our discussion on public
17 awareness.

18 And that is really all I have to
19 share. The reason why I say it is more of a
20 movie clip is because there is more to come,
21 and this is just kind of the preview of some
22 of the work we have ahead.

1 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
2 Christie. Thank you for the trailer. We
3 appreciate it.

4 And we will acknowledge Linda,
5 although she technically doesn't have the tent
6 card up. She tried; it fell.

7 Linda?

8 MS. DAUGHERTY: Linda Daugherty.
9 I'm with PHMSA.

10 And I just wanted to make a really
11 quick note and say thank you to Christie.
12 Christie is a brand-new Director for us in
13 Program Development. And she handled quite
14 adroitly a very difficult public awareness
15 meeting in Dallas. She handled some
16 disruptive behavior. And I just wanted to
17 acknowledge to the group for the record she
18 did really well.

19 And I think you might also see a
20 repeating theme in some of Jeff's introductory
21 marks, that in the current environment, we
22 sometimes have to set expectations and the

1 whole idea about not being disruptive or rude
2 to commenters. So, we want everybody to have
3 an opportunity to make a point and make a
4 statement, but sometimes you have to be
5 limited in order to get your main objective
6 achieved on a mission.

7 So, thank you again, Christie.

8 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
9 Linda.

10 Don?

11 MEMBER STURSMA: You gave some
12 numbers for the number of inspections
13 performed. I think you said 313 total and 178
14 by states. What is the date of those numbers?
15 Because I know the states have been conducting
16 these inspections and uploading their reports,
17 and those numbers seem awfully low.

18 MS. MURRAY: The date of those
19 were about the end of June. So, I have seen
20 an influx of more inspection reports come in.

21 And also, keep in mind that that
22 was based on who led the inspection, and there

1 could be a little bit of a variance between
2 those numbers, based on how it was actually
3 sorted.

4 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thanks,
5 Don.

6 Andy?

7 MEMBER DRAKE: Andy Drake with the
8 Gas Committee.

9 I appreciate what you are working
10 on here. I think that one of the things that
11 when we were trying to do integrity management
12 and contingency improvement, we really figured
13 out that engineers don't really understand how
14 to communicate well.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. MURRAY: Hey, I'm an engineer.

17 MEMBER DRAKE: That is probably
18 shocking -- Christie is the exception -- that
19 is probably shocking to many of the people
20 around the table here, but we came to that
21 amazing self-awareness, and we actually went
22 outside ourselves and brought in a group that

1 was designed specifically for public outreach.
2 And it really helped fuel us with a lot more
3 information than we had been getting
4 previously to make better choices.

5 And I think when you are looking
6 at this public awareness working group -- I
7 was going to say "PAWG" (laughter) -- but when
8 you are looking at that working group, I think
9 it might be helpful to visit back with folks
10 like Cathy Landry and Susan Waller, in
11 particular. They were very instrumental in
12 setting that group up and have been very
13 active in outreach to the emergency responders
14 and other folks.

15 And I think what we learned was
16 amazing. But I think, as much as anything, to
17 offer that to this group as you start up might
18 help kind of jump-start it a little bit, those
19 two folks, in particular.

20 MS. MURRAY: Thank you. Will do.

21 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
22 Andy.

1 Any other questions, comments from
2 the Committee members?

3 (No response.)

4 Seeing none, I will turn to the
5 public now. If you have a question or
6 comment, you may step to the microphone and
7 identify yourself, please. You can go on
8 over.

9 MR. LIDIAC: I am not an engineer.
10 I play one on TV.

11 (Laughter.)

12 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Will you
13 tell us who you are for the record?

14 MR. LIDIAC: This is Peter Lidiak
15 with API.

16 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you.

17 MR. LIDIAC: I just wanted to let
18 everyone know that probably pretty much in
19 alignment with the schedule that Christie just
20 talked about is we will be looking to form a
21 revised work group to update for the third
22 edition of 1162 in early 2014. So, this is a

1 little bit of a pre-announcement. We will
2 also be publishing the intent for this in the
3 NIST publication that comes out early in the
4 year on standards activities.

5 So, think about whether you have
6 people that can contribute to that revision.
7 We will be working with PHMSA on what they
8 found from the inspections as well.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Any other
11 members of the public? Now is your time.

12 (No response.)

13 Seeing none, thank you, Christie,
14 and congrats on your promotion.

15 MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I look
17 forward to working with you.

18 All right. I think that now we
19 have concluded our listed agenda items, and we
20 are now into the period for open discussion,
21 and I will yield to Jeff.

22 MR. WIESE: Well, I just wanted to

1 point out for Andy's benefit there were a
2 couple of other people in the room who
3 actually worked with Susan on that. Christina
4 is in the back of the room. I was on there.
5 There might be others, too, and I don't mean
6 to leave anyone out on that.

7 So, yes, we have been working this
8 one for a long time. We created the CATS
9 program in which Christie used to be the
10 National Coordinator for the CATS, for the
11 same reasons that you had said.

12 We had put engineers in really
13 untenable positions before public meetings
14 that were really rough, and it hadn't gone so
15 well. So, we figured we had better bring on
16 a corps of people that we could train to
17 communicate better. I mean, they knew their
18 stuff, but they would get flummoxed, you know,
19 in a really tough public meeting and just go
20 south on them.

21 So, at any rate, I think we have
22 all learned a lot. We have come a long ways

1 with public awareness and appreciate Peter's
2 comments as well, because we have worked well
3 to get everybody into agreement, including
4 Carl and everyone else's points of view on
5 that.

6 So, that is really all I had to
7 add to that, short of my own congratulations
8 to Christie.

9 And then, I think Ken Lee is here,
10 too. Ken, could you just stand up for a
11 second and wave at people?

12 Ken is the new Engineering
13 Director. We will work on communication
14 skills then.

15 (Laughter.)

16 We will put him into a CATS job
17 for a little while and test him.

18 But Ken is the new Engineering
19 Director for us. We are really thrilled to
20 have him. Those of you who know Ken know he
21 has national-level expertise on a lot of
22 issues, including welding. So, any issues

1 relating to welding, you can count on him.

2 We are happy to have both of them
3 onboard.

4 So, that is really all I have.
5 So, I guess I will turn it back to you, and we
6 can open it up to the Committee, if there is
7 anything you want to say.

8 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thank you,
9 Jeff.

10 Are there any matters for open
11 discussion from the members of the Joint
12 Committee?

13 (No response.)

14 We have worn you out.

15 (Laughter.)

16 Okay. I will ask one more time.

17 Someone may be a little nervous.

18 (Laughter.)

19 All right. Here we go.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. WIESE: You gave them enough
22 time.

1 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: I just
2 wanted to say we really mean it; now is your
3 time.

4 Craig?

5 MEMBER PIERSON: Craig Pierson,
6 Liquids.

7 Just curious about the plans for
8 the next meeting.

9 MR. WIESE: We might as well do
10 that now. That was actually in my closing,
11 but I will make it early.

12 So, I have to be sensitive to a
13 lot of moving parts here and working with
14 Cheryl, who will be notifying you. But one of
15 the moving parts which I really want to make
16 sure that I keep onboard is my Chairwoman, who
17 is also going to be the President of NARUC and
18 whose life will be heavily committed in there.

19 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Even more
20 so.

21 MR. WIESE: Even more so.

22 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: How can it

1 possibly be?

2 MR. WIESE: I know. I feel that
3 pain.

4 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: We all do.

5 MR. WIESE: But we are shooting
6 for December. So, we will ask Cheryl to put
7 out a -- we don't want to get too close to the
8 holidays, but I will ask Cheryl to put out a
9 request to you for calendar availability in
10 very late November into mid-December. So, if
11 you could help us with that, it would be
12 great.

13 We do want to continue to have the
14 meetings regardless of whether we manage to
15 get any rules passed to anyone else outside of
16 PHMSA, so that we have things to vote on.

17 But, also on that, you know, we
18 sit and cram trying to figure out what do we
19 want to bring to you when we don't have those
20 rules. So, we are wide open to that. Who
21 knows? We might even have a liquid IVP by
22 then.

1 (Laughter.)

2 I know you guys are looking
3 forward to that.

4 (Laughter.)

5 Hey, now fair trade here. The
6 liquid guys took the heat on integrity
7 management first before we got to gas. So,
8 IVP goes to gas first and, then, liquids.

9 MEMBER PIERSON: So, I presume we
10 are talking 2015 then.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. WIESE: For the next meeting
13 or?

14 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Who wants
15 to clarify the record? Andy?

16 MEMBER DRAKE: Just one comment,
17 and I know I heard this from other Committee
18 members. But I appreciate why we couldn't get
19 an agenda before the night before, but it
20 really puts us at a disadvantage when we come
21 into a meeting and we can't read ahead or
22 think ahead even. I know why it was done.

1 But if there is some way we can like create
2 some -- what did Stacy used to call it? -- a
3 knot in the tree or something, where we could
4 post it up, and I can go get it, and no one
5 else can see it, or something. But I think it
6 would help us to get --

7 MR. WIESE: Not "hole in a tree".
8 It was a literary reference to "To Kill a
9 Mockingbird".

10 MEMBER DRAKE: Yes.

11 MR. WIESE: But, yes, that would
12 have been Stacy's style, not hole in a tree.

13 But, yes, we hear you. So, I
14 apologize for that.

15 MEMBER DRAKE: I know why it was
16 done, and it is not a criticism.

17 MR. WIESE: I understood.

18 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Thanks,
19 Andy.

20 Go ahead, Jeff.

21 MR. WIESE: Sorry. And I just
22 mentioned to Colette most of you were here

1 yesterday when we said thoughts about a
2 digital briefing book. You know, we just
3 noticed that some of the bios are out-of-date.
4 So, I have asked John and Cheryl to send you
5 an alert when we have a meeting, "Here's
6 things we could use from you. You know, check
7 your bio. Is it current?" Understood that in
8 a few cases probably it is not.

9 So, we would welcome your input on
10 that. You know, we are trying to make sure we
11 have things for you and others to look at. We
12 want it to be current.

13 But any thoughts on the digital
14 briefing book? You don't have to do it now
15 because I know a lot of you have got flights.
16 But feel free to send them in to his. You
17 know, Cheryl, John, myself, people can
18 forward.

19 Can we have just kind of a general
20 view of who is in favor of digital briefing?

21 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: You can
22 open it in Docs to Go or something like that.

1 MR. WIESE: Yes, you have to a
2 computer or iPad.

3 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Well, a
4 lot of people have tablets.

5 MR. WIESE: Okay. I saw a general
6 support for that notion. So, we will consider
7 the December meeting a pilot of a digital
8 briefing book.

9 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: But save
10 the trees.

11 MR. WIESE: Yes, that's right;
12 save the trees.

13 No colored printing. That is a
14 PHMSA joke. Apparently, we are restricted on
15 color printing now. Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: All right.
17 Carl? And then, Sue.

18 MEMBER WEIMER: Just a question.
19 This is Carl from the Liquids Committee.

20 I notice there's a lot of openings
21 on the Committees. I was wondering if you
22 could just comment on where the filling of

1 those openings is. I think there are some of
2 us that are approaching retirement from the
3 Committees, which I am hopeful for.

4 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: No, no.

5 MEMBER WEIMER: So, I was
6 wondering if you can comment on that, too.

7 MR. WIESE: If you ask that
8 question one more time, Carl, we will just put
9 you on the other Committee. Okay?

10 (Laughter.)

11 And that solve the appointment
12 and the term problem.

13 There are a number of nominations
14 in the process. As you can imagine with the
15 change in Secretary, it is going to complicate
16 it. You know, he has got to get his feet
17 underneath him.

18 This is we nominate people. Let's
19 be clear, the Secretary selects and appoints.
20 So, it is like a rule. There are a lot of
21 things past us.

22 The one I am having the most

1 difficulty with, honestly, are government.
2 Honestly, I wanted to get Jim Watson from
3 Besse to come over. Watson just announced he
4 is leaving. We actually tried to appoint
5 Watson when he was in the Coast Guard. Then,
6 he left to get to Besse. Then, we were going
7 to move to appoint him while he was at Besse,
8 and he is leaving to, I think it is the
9 American Bureau of Shipping. So, offshores,
10 in kind of an awkward spot.

11 But, yes, we are sensitive to
12 that, and we are making nominations, but it is
13 taking a while. Sorry.

14 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Sue?

15 MEMBER FLECK: I withdrew my
16 question.

17 CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: Very good.
18 Are there any others?

19 (No response.)

20 I will ask a third time.

21 (Laughter.)

22 All right. I will close it down.

1 Thank you so much for the
2 opportunity to chair the meeting again. I am
3 always enlightened. I don't have the luxury
4 to work as closely with the issues. You guys
5 are the subject matter experts. So, thank you
6 again for being committed to this work. It is
7 important and, most of all, it is important to
8 the people that we serve.

9 I will turn it back over to Jeff.

10 MR. WIESE: Okay. And thank you,
11 Colette. I appreciate both you and Wayne
12 making time out of your schedules to come join
13 us, and all of you, for that matter.

14 So, I won't draw it out. You have
15 got planes to catch.

16 Thank you for your service. It is
17 enlightening for us, too, and we work on it on
18 a day-in and day-out basis. So, that is why
19 we have an Advisory Committee. Your help is
20 very important to us. And thank you so much
21 for your service.

22 Safe travels home.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

CHAIRPERSON HONORABLE: We are

adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., the
meeting was adjourned.)

A				
abide 13:9,15	28:17	adopted 34:14	alerted 13:14	170:21
ability 93:16 96:10	achieve 49:15	181:14	algorithm 28:7	analysis 9:3 27:11
148:14	114:9	adroitly 184:14	31:10 155:20	28:3 45:5,7 78:8
able 56:9 63:1,15	achieved 54:7	advanced 87:18	algorithms 21:16	101:10 175:22
67:1 163:9,13	185:6	advancing 183:16	21:21 41:19 42:4	analyze 22:10
167:19,20 168:11	acknowledge 184:4	advantage 147:2	42:13,16	analyzing 17:4
168:17,20 169:3,4	184:17	advice 12:3	alignment 188:19	ANDREW 2:4
169:6	Act 18:6,8 71:16	Advisory 1:6,18	allocate 68:12	Andy 9:12 50:4,5
abnormally 30:13	93:2 126:14	5:16 12:5 13:10	allocated 158:21	52:16 54:7 94:20
absolutely 56:17	163:20	151:20 160:8	allow 48:8 68:2	94:21 104:21
95:9 103:7 104:8	Acting 120:11	201:19	76:17 148:12	106:14 125:20
106:18	action 95:11	aerial 23:21	153:2,3,17 170:21	145:5 186:6,7
absorb 169:15	active 187:13	affect 42:20 128:15	allowable 86:4	187:22 195:15
abused 147:9	actively 33:12	agency 83:21	154:3	196:19
accelerate 143:3	activities 172:11	agenda 67:18 152:1	allowed 161:15	Andy's 109:18
accelerated 142:21	173:2 178:19	171:20,21 189:19	165:15	113:13 190:1
144:1	189:4	195:19	alluded 92:11	angle 131:7
acceptable 47:17	actual 26:13,14	agents 172:19	alluding 51:9	angst 156:19
49:10	43:22 51:4 131:2	aggregate 32:4	all-or-none 108:7	announced 200:3
access 25:6 37:4,19	166:9 179:18	52:7	alterative 161:14	annoying 156:5
64:20 153:18	181:7	aggregated 170:8	alternate 71:18	annual 3:21 25:16
accommodate 7:13	add 45:6 108:17	170:10	167:9	25:20 26:5,11,15
73:2 168:8	141:4 156:1 191:7	ago 99:13 102:1	alternative 34:8,13	26:20 59:18,22
accompli 141:15	added 28:1 154:17	agree 49:8,11,19	161:17	74:6,8 152:3,15
accomplish 97:19	155:8,15	60:14 94:8 98:18	alternatives 48:10	152:19 153:1
97:21 113:2	addition 87:3 128:2	108:11 109:18	48:11	156:10 171:3
account 45:3	additional 18:21	110:2 111:3	altogether 131:8	anomalies 100:8
126:15	19:18,21 181:15	115:15 119:17	always-ready 66:7	ANSI 76:2
accounts 95:16	additions 181:15	132:12	amazing 186:21	answer 30:10 31:14
Accufacts 11:10	182:6	agreed 48:19	187:16	51:20 63:3 99:7
accumulated 42:18	address 39:13 73:7	145:21	Amen 143:12	103:6 105:1
accuracies 55:14	73:11 87:2 96:3,4	agreeing 35:21	America 2:16	135:15 136:15
accuracy 17:13	181:5,6	65:18 131:20	57:15 130:2	140:9
19:13 21:22 22:19	addressed 113:5	agreement 143:21	American 2:19,21	answered 63:22
32:1 38:20 39:3,6	139:6	157:1 191:3	125:22 126:19	answering 99:8
39:22 41:4 42:15	addresses 120:2	agreements 34:17	173:8 200:9	antiquated 87:12
42:20 44:2,13	137:5	35:18	amount 30:13	87:22
45:1,4,6,14,16,18	addressing 72:20	ahead 5:4,4 56:3	44:16 53:11 80:11	anxiety 121:6
45:21 46:1,5,12	adequate 34:8 74:1	66:2 67:5 135:3	91:6 93:15 96:19	anxious 174:15
49:5,7,17 54:7	74:21 120:4 162:7	183:22 195:21,22	111:5,8 151:3	anybody 50:11
55:4 59:14 61:7,9	adjourned 202:2,4	196:20	163:11	55:21 101:9
109:2	Administration 1:4	aid 47:19	Amy 2:21 3:10 6:12	150:22
accurate 45:9	7:21	Alan 2:19 8:8 71:9	8:14 15:8,12,15	anymore 26:15
49:12 56:15 58:4	Administrator 3:4	114:20 116:7	29:8,18 34:11	53:2,9 55:16
65:19 75:15 156:8	3:13,17 7:19 8:4,9	albeit 84:9	38:10 46:21 47:7	145:17
accurately 22:2	admit 84:19	Albers 43:3	57:4 59:19 64:10	anytime 35:1 93:19
	admitting 146:9	alert 197:5	65:5 67:2,10	anyway 69:15

100:19 109:1,7 125:1 AOP 161:15,17 API 59:4 188:15 API's 59:21 apologize 33:21 196:14 apparent 27:13 Apparently 198:14 appear 21:8 appeared 119:7 apples 101:20 applicable 74:16 78:4 84:11 applications 17:21 92:2 applied 73:16 88:15 applying 103:3 136:11 appoint 200:4,7 appointment 199:11 appoints 199:19 appreciate 95:3,4 116:15 117:15 119:20 121:6 129:17 138:12,16 138:19 145:9 150:7 184:3 186:9 191:1 195:18 201:11 apprehension 55:3 approach 73:9 135:7 177:4 approaching 199:2 appropriate 76:2 99:6 approve 37:18 75:7 approves 123:4 arbitrary 90:14 area 45:5 63:10 65:18 70:10,11 81:15 98:12 117:11 127:1 175:17,17 177:14 178:1,11,15	areas 22:3,17 33:4 33:7,12 35:4,8 43:18,19 44:20 49:3,14 54:18 57:22 73:17,18,19 74:9 81:17,20 111:12,21 116:18 118:12 159:22 166:6 174:6,9,12 174:21 175:5,5,8 181:2,18 argue 40:21 arguing 50:12 argument 131:3 Arkansas 5:20 10:1 94:14 132:15 146:18 Arlington 1:20,21 Armstrong 2:2 11:12,13 arranged 139:22 arrived 132:17 ARs 25:21 asked 64:15 65:7 92:18 157:4 197:4 asking 39:16 42:7 42:10 43:7 66:1 97:22 98:18 100:16 134:16 135:11 141:16 149:15 aspect 128:18 129:10 aspects 28:13 129:14 aspirational 47:15 49:20 52:9 aspire 49:11 assess 45:6 173:6 177:22 assessing 177:21 assessment 70:15 73:13 77:7 78:7 78:20 79:5 117:14 122:15 135:19 140:14 assessments 35:7	74:2 76:14 asset 9:13 21:15 assets 21:13 assisting 19:4 28:9 Associate 3:4,13,17 7:19 8:4,8 associated 113:18 association 2:15,21 5:22 57:15 83:21 126:19 Association's 126:1 assume 47:19 123:5 164:9 assurance 84:13 94:2 131:15 assure 13:5 73:22 attain 60:19 attempt 139:7 147:7 attempts 25:19 attendance 10:6 attribute 66:16 attributes 17:22 19:19 20:3,9 66:14 156:13 170:19 171:2 attributing 66:12 at-risk 142:5 audience 11:18 12:18 13:4 29:12 171:9 176:4 179:3 audiences 176:15 AUGUST 1:12 auxiliary 23:19 availability 194:9 available 14:5 34:6 48:15 169:17,19 181:13 avoid 102:8,13 aware 118:11 146:20 awareness 4:9 7:8 18:19 27:5,7 32:16 151:2 171:22 172:9,15 172:21 173:4,6 174:8,19 175:3,14	176:11 177:18 179:1,6,19 180:7 180:13 182:4,15 183:4,10,17 184:14 187:6 191:1 awfully 185:17 awkward 200:10 a-half 25:18 a.m 1:21 5:2 151:16,17 202:3 <hr/> B <hr/> back 5:12,14 7:4,8 16:1 27:6,14 36:15 57:10 59:19 61:10 67:10,14 82:3 97:20 101:21 103:11 105:6 106:3,15 109:6 111:18 113:4 114:12,21,22 115:12 119:9 120:6,20 128:3 129:4 143:10,13 149:21 151:17,19 175:8,21 178:22 179:21 187:9 190:4 192:5 201:9 background 102:7 backup 34:8 bad 105:8 balance 37:12 144:6 Ballroom 1:19 Bang 161:7 bar 40:20 bars 162:18 base 51:12,13 52:22 58:9 based 42:12 71:15 74:13 76:20 81:7 81:19 105:7,14 115:5 135:7 160:20 168:18 185:22 186:2 baseline 35:11	177:20 basic 73:14 175:22 basically 27:15 43:5 59:11 61:18 121:17 154:8 158:19 160:16 basis 97:4 201:18 Battelle 102:22 bear 6:5,9 beautiful 98:8 began 17:15,19 behavior 184:16 believe 32:19 33:1 53:1 110:5 120:14 148:13 183:15 believed 87:11 Bellman 2:3 10:11 10:11 126:9,9 benefit 26:21 92:20 190:1 benefits 25:14 Besse 200:3,6,7 best 44:6 51:9 53:18 69:2 76:18 92:1 103:22 122:4 137:3 166:8 bet 138:2 better 21:12 26:22 28:11 38:21 44:13 50:1,13 54:11 58:17 59:14 77:2 95:7 102:16,16,17 103:13 110:4 112:19 113:8 119:22 129:3 137:14 187:4 190:15,17 beyond 38:2 48:5 99:22 112:15,17 142:18 big 16:9 21:1 23:4 26:21 46:5 56:4 70:2 85:19 87:4 113:17 141:22 142:10 159:7 161:11 170:13 biggest 113:9 114:9
---	--	---	--	---

billion 121:22 127:3 142:6	184:12	bullets 75:8	124:11,12 133:5	115:15 119:17
binder 182:9	break 5:10 7:11 69:22 70:9 150:13	bumps 93:8	137:8,9,22 191:4	Chad's 96:17
bio 197:7	151:7	burden 18:4 41:5 46:6,8	198:17,19 199:8	chair 201:2
bios 197:3	breakdowns 106:19	Bureau 200:9	Carl's 114:13	Chairman 5:19 71:8 116:12 143:7 145:17
bit 6:6,8 15:7 22:14 36:22 43:16 53:7 53:20 62:10 95:2 101:20 131:13 132:21 143:10 157:2 162:22 166:5,18 180:18 186:1 187:18 189:1	breakout 20:10,13 179:10,18 180:11	buried 139:5	Carolina 10:22	Chairman's 132:6
Blaine 2:18 3:22 7:5 69:2 74:5 105:4,9 152:2,4 169:21 170:1 171:18	breaks 169:2	burn 147:20	carpet 95:2	Chairperson 1:22 2:2 3:6 9:22 15:1 29:7 30:19 32:12 36:3 38:9,12 41:17,21 44:7 50:4 53:21 54:20 57:2 59:1 61:3 62:3 64:4 67:16 67:22 69:19 82:4 82:15,19 83:2,10 85:10 91:2 94:13 104:20 106:10,13 109:11 112:6 114:19 116:7 118:15 120:11 125:2 126:7 132:1 132:8 134:20 135:2 137:7,22 138:7 140:19 143:12 149:22 151:8,12,18 152:8 169:20 171:5,17 184:1 185:8 186:4 187:21 188:12,16 189:10,16 192:8 193:1,19,22 194:4 195:14 196:18 197:21 198:3,9,16 199:4 200:14,17 202:1
board 10:19	briefing 172:8 183:7	Burton 2:17 62:13 62:13 64:2	case 14:17 91:20 116:20 117:4 141:19 149:10	cases 35:20 37:1 54:6 55:16 197:8
body 84:8	briefings 67:19 152:1 171:21 197:2,14,20 198:8	button 116:9,11 132:3	case-by-case 97:4,8	cast 128:12
boiled 68:9	briefings 117:7	buy 103:13	cast 128:12	catch 6:7 201:15
Boiler 9:4	briefly 17:2 62:16		catch 6:7 201:15	categories 73:21 74:18,18
bombing 95:2	brief-up 65:8	C	categories 73:21 74:18,18	categorized 77:15
book 197:2,14 198:8	bring 123:2 143:9 190:15 194:19	c 107:13	category 78:15,21 159:13,20	category 78:15,21 159:13,20
border 37:21	bringing 67:3 110:1 128:21	calculate 103:7	Cathy 187:10	CATS 190:8,10 191:16
boss 2:15 57:14,14 113:14	brings 165:6	calculations 100:7	caught 30:19 113:13	cause 137:20 156:19
bothers 83:20	broader 54:11 112:20	calendar 194:9	caused 160:6	causes 49:22
bottom 169:5	broke 179:10	California 121:14 121:18,18 123:8	caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
boundaries 23:13 147:20	broken 130:12	call 3:2 14:21 27:19 32:4,6,9 38:6 55:18 62:17 70:11 81:7,14 108:14 121:15 123:6 135:7 143:17 196:2	cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
boundary 24:7 37:6 38:2,2	Brookings 9:16	called 93:19	Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
box 49:21 79:14 98:19 99:1,3 100:4,18,19 101:14 106:2 107:2,8 115:8 119:21 120:1	Brooklyn 111:14	calling 94:7	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
boxes 100:15 104:17	brought 130:18 179:2 186:22	calls 34:4 35:17	cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
brain 169:15	Bruno 72:2,16 75:18 113:11 117:1 119:4,7 120:21 122:8 125:15 130:1 135:13 136:4 137:3	Cameron 2:22 8:11	Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
brand-new 154:1	budget 92:14	candidate 76:19	caused 160:6	caused 160:6
	buffer 45:7 147:21	Canyon 108:7	causes 49:22	causes 49:22
	build 47:13 97:22 124:3	capability 65:2 154:6	caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
	building 41:15 123:5 124:4	captive 126:1	cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
	built 60:4 102:1 103:13	car 103:13	cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
	bulk 159:20	card 14:1 53:22 184:6	Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
	bullet 27:10	cards 82:20,22	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
	Bulletin 160:8	care 164:13	cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
		careful 51:21 55:13 113:15 124:7,19	Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
		caring 150:8	caused 160:6	caused 160:6
		Carl 2:10 11:2 32:12,13 34:1 47:18,21 98:2	causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9	certain 28:13 41:10 48:18 53:6 54:6 55:9
			cell 16:9 17:12	cell 16:9 17:12
			Census 33:8 35:2	Census 33:8 35:2
			caused 160:6	caused 160:6
			causes 49:22	causes 49:22
			caution 119:15	cautionary 109:8
			cautionary 109:8	cautionary 109:8

122:3 182:5,16,17 199:15 changed 16:14,16 35:14 50:9 139:19 changes 51:6 152:14 180:20 181:20 182:17,18 changing 46:4 90:17 110:8 123:21 charge 143:2 CHARLES 2:8 chart 70:6 73:14 76:9 77:12 78:18 79:18 81:4 86:13 96:20 98:2 116:11 116:18 123:18 131:1,2 133:8 137:13,20 139:19 139:22 140:3,5 146:13 157:19 163:3 166:6 169:2 183:7 charts 140:13 162:13 check 151:10 197:6 checked 107:8 chemical 101:10 146:11 Cheryl 2:23 8:16 193:14 194:6,8 197:4,17 Chicago 111:15 Chief 9:7 11:13 94:17 choices 100:6,8 103:13 187:4 choose 35:21 chose 160:19 Christie 2:20 4:12 172:1,3 184:2,11 184:12 185:7 186:18 188:19 189:13 190:9 191:8 Christina 2:21 190:3	chunk 159:17 161:12 163:1 circa 17:19 circle 22:15,16,21 city 8:6 10:12,21 11:13 55:6 126:10 127:8,17 129:12 claimed 144:21 clarification 182:13 clarify 54:3 195:15 clarity 138:11,22 139:9,18 class 71:20 81:15 81:17 87:19 88:6 112:13,18 118:5 127:1 148:2 157:20,21,22 158:3 159:22,22 160:1,2 161:15 162:4 163:21 166:6,19 168:5 169:4,8,9 classification 87:8 87:11 clause 72:5,7,8 77:17 95:15 96:15 105:12 106:21 145:10,11 160:6 161:4 165:1,17 clean 159:1 clear 13:17 32:18 32:19 35:6 46:9 95:9 96:21 98:21 100:14 106:20 139:17 199:19 cleared 100:2 clearly 34:22 47:17 49:3 65:17 98:17 138:14 140:7 climate 182:18 clip 183:20 close 45:16 48:10 62:1 65:22 75:15 147:18 165:21 194:7 200:22 closely 201:4	closer 59:21 closes 80:2 closing 193:10 clumped 158:15 clunky 60:5,14 CNG 128:22 Coast 200:5 coating 21:19 code 45:3 77:19 80:20 88:3,22 90:22 cognizant 131:10 Colete 9:22 Colette 1:21 2:2 3:6 5:19 12:1 64:14 67:15 92:19 93:10 196:22 201:11 Colette's 12:8 colleagues 91:6,18 collect 18:20 19:18 19:21 21:4 23:5 25:1 26:3,6 153:4 162:6 collected 17:22 152:18 153:20 162:4 collecting 17:3 20:21 25:20 53:4 60:7 63:16 173:14 collection 19:1,8 20:17 23:4 24:17 25:16 41:16 46:17 47:3 52:18 54:19 155:20 collectively 106:22 181:3 collects 16:17 Colonial 11:5 25:6 64:18 color 22:14 198:15 colored 198:13 column 158:3 columns 163:9 combined 172:17 combining 170:22 173:1 come 7:4,7 28:14	44:15 47:18 55:7 62:6,9 65:22 67:22 83:3,4 84:15 95:9,12 102:2 103:20 106:15 115:12 119:9 121:21 122:12 128:10 129:18 137:4 142:20 147:17 156:13 166:8 171:11 183:20 185:20 190:22 195:20 200:3 201:12 comes 51:7 97:15 189:3 comfort 110:11 coming 19:15 58:13 91:13 100:15 118:20 128:4 150:17 158:8 commend 141:6 comment 12:9 20:18 35:3 39:1 40:10 54:15,17 63:4 83:17,17 89:5 120:9 125:1 135:20 171:10 188:6 195:16 198:22 199:6 commenters 185:2 commenting 131:10 comments 3:12,20 3:24 4:15 20:16 44:11 46:17 49:12 52:17 54:19 62:9 65:11 76:10 79:22 80:3 82:7,10 85:15 89:2 90:1 95:6 104:19 109:18 111:3 116:16 121:1 124:10 125:20 126:20 129:17	137:1,12 138:12 140:17 141:16,17 142:1 143:19 144:16 145:9 148:7 179:19 188:1 191:2 commercial 23:19 41:19 Commission 5:20 9:11 10:2 94:14 Commissioner 140:21 142:4 149:21 Commissioners 6:1 130:11 Commissions 143:6 149:14 Commission's 142:19 commit 93:9 commitment 96:9 109:19,20 committed 95:10 95:11 103:21 104:8 193:18 201:6 committee 9:5,8,11 9:14,17,21 10:10 10:14,19 11:1,4,6 11:14 12:5,11 13:11,12 16:19 29:10,17 31:15 32:14 36:9 42:2 44:9 48:7 54:2 64:17 65:9 67:8 68:3,5 83:15 85:14 91:4 94:22 109:14 112:9 118:17 125:6 126:11 133:7 137:10 141:1 170:1,4 171:6 179:21 186:8 188:2 192:6,12 195:17 198:19 199:9 201:19 Committees 1:6,18
---	--	---	---	--

5:16 151:21 198:21 199:3 commodity 27:22 common 13:13 16:3 43:4 51:12 communicate 186:14 190:17 communication 191:13 community 84:12 84:17 176:7 178:4 companies 31:11 47:10 67:12 142:7 142:8,11,16,20 143:3 144:14 149:16 company 9:4 11:6 40:1,15 111:10 119:11 122:4 126:10 compared 53:12 compiled 33:14 complete 27:8 28:10 60:8 153:12 154:4 completed 115:3 172:18 173:16 completion 80:19 complex 145:1 compliance 41:2 109:20 173:6 compliant 119:8 complicate 199:15 comply 101:1,13 110:19 161:16 complying 123:9 comprehensive 28:12 73:6 94:15 compressor 23:9 23:17 compromise 57:19 103:5 computer 198:2 concept 79:19 147:13 154:9 158:8 concepts 35:12	concern 56:20 73:21 74:18 96:18 110:13 125:10 142:2 175:6 181:22 concerned 21:3 32:5 87:8 90:17 107:6 110:18 117:17 126:2 129:9 133:10,20 134:10 163:7 165:10 concerning 62:22 concerns 37:13 62:17,19 109:22 110:4 112:4 116:17 137:20 140:14 141:13,14 150:6 concluded 189:19 conducive 99:17 conduct 176:12 177:5 conducted 173:12 177:2,3 178:20 conducting 65:3 172:14,20 185:15 confidence 93:16 96:10 97:22 99:18 100:1 configuration 168:21 configure 73:1 configuring 168:8 confirming 117:9,9 conflict 62:18 122:20 confuse 86:7 confusion 84:16 160:7 congested 38:18 39:20 congrats 189:14 congratulations 191:7 Congress 32:19 34:1 98:10 114:7	127:13 congressional 73:7 76:21 121:8 152:16 163:17 connections 146:4 consequence 33:4 39:11 65:18 81:20 87:13 88:7 127:1 consequences 35:8 112:1 126:16 147:16 conservation 34:18 consider 54:9 59:15 60:3,8,20 77:10 117:18 160:9,10 198:6 consideration 89:8 180:9 considered 87:17 167:12 considering 26:12 59:18 60:15 76:7 76:12 consistent 59:11,12 consists 24:5 constantly 48:15 constantly-fresh 48:20 constituents 49:1 constitutes 166:12 constraints 52:14 67:4 construction 26:11 72:19 75:1 90:4 133:16 167:11,14 contact 153:9 contacts 37:19 contained 152:19 context 105:11 132:14 contingency 186:12 continue 79:14 92:14 114:4 126:5 156:9 169:18 194:13 continued 4:6 150:3	continuing 112:17 continuous 182:19 continuously 176:17 contribute 189:6 controlling 57:12 conversation 36:10 121:13 144:11 174:17 179:13 conversations 32:10 coordinates 61:14 61:18 Coordinator 190:10 corps 190:16 correct 30:8 108:19 153:14 corridor 38:18 corrosion 134:12 134:12 149:5 cost 44:14 92:7,9 111:9 119:3 121:21 125:10 126:13,17,22 127:5 142:2,5,11 143:5,10 costly 145:3 costs 125:11 132:21 144:4 Council 127:22 counsel 12:3 91:17 count 192:1 counterpart 36:13 country 43:19 130:9 132:10 county 9:16 37:10 37:17 38:5 63:20 couple 11:22 14:8 18:17 25:19 27:2 33:4 44:11 56:19 86:7 116:8 121:11 125:8 130:11 137:11 138:10 143:19 146:1 150:21 163:15 174:12,20 190:2	coupons 111:18 course 28:3 37:16 71:7 76:20 81:2 109:1 134:5 court 13:2 cover 62:10 87:18 151:5 152:11 153:16 covered 140:8 crack 123:12,16,19 124:19 149:8 cracking 115:18 122:14 134:13 149:2 cracking-type 81:11 crack-like 102:12 crafted 37:11 Craig 2:9 11:7 193:4,5 cram 194:18 create 84:16 182:8 196:1 created 145:14,14 155:21 190:8 creating 45:13 creative 66:2 67:6 credibility 96:6 credible 97:17 102:3 credibly 99:7 criteria 78:12 79:18 80:10,17 97:10 critical 63:2 119:10 128:7 140:14 criticism 196:16 cross-threading 123:10 crowd 8:1 crunching 170:22 cues 6:12 culture 122:4 curious 42:19 88:20 100:19 193:7 current 25:10
--	---	--	--	---

46:12 155:14 168:14 171:11 181:9,11 184:21 197:7,12 currently 19:13 20:11,11 24:22 173:10 customer 127:6 customers 125:12 127:4,9 142:9 cut 37:6 75:10,11 111:18 cutting 101:15 cutting-edge 16:8 cyclic 99:15,21 C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 3:1 4:6	157:16,20 158:20 162:7 163:16 169:17 170:5,18 171:4 174:3,14 database 42:14 48:21 173:13,19 174:14 dataset 18:13 23:19 32:21 33:3 112:20 153:12 154:17 155:15 156:9 datasets 22:6 23:4 33:15 date 24:2 25:22 74:7 115:12 153:1 185:14,18 dates 81:5 110:14 datums 59:12 Daugherty 8:3,3 184:8,8 day 5:15 25:7 36:10 48:13 60:12 68:7 94:18 113:21 139:14 148:4 179:9 days 138:10 day's 68:6 day-in 201:18 day-long 6:19 day-out 201:18 dead 139:4 deadlines 81:22 deal 50:8 96:10 102:10 111:9 117:3 121:19 147:15 dealing 47:11 50:20 52:15 100:9 117:10,11 154:2 dealt 111:21 167:10 death 55:16 debate 146:13 decade 26:12 47:12 94:5 157:8 159:4 decades 102:18 124:1	December 194:6 198:7 decide 97:10 121:19 182:3 decided 131:5 decimal 156:18 decimal-place 31:22 decision 28:4 182:5 decisions 101:4 deep 96:19 defect 103:9 defects 72:19 75:2 90:5 102:12,12,13 167:11,14 deficiencies 18:13 define 24:6 73:19 177:8 defined 88:19 89:14 177:19 definitely 12:14 20:12 60:22 94:9 108:10 definition 34:9 89:10 110:8 definitions 34:13 delete 72:4 deliver 148:22 149:19 demand 31:22 demonstrate 90:22 denominator 51:12 Denton 2:4 10:15 10:15 denying 130:5 DEPARTMENT 1:1 depend 131:16 dependent 51:16 depending 12:16 79:7 95:20 depends 130:9 deputized 46:21 Deputy 8:4,8 10:12 derating 76:22 79:11 80:10 110:21	deration 111:1 description 23:12 deserve 131:15 design 113:19 120:4 124:3 160:10,17 161:1 161:10 162:14 Designated 2:15 143:17 designed 102:10 120:4 187:1 design/pressure 161:4 desperately 13:6 details 79:19 93:4 detected 136:10 determination 101:22 determine 89:19 125:19 140:15 177:13 determined 81:5,6 110:22 Detroit 111:15 developed 136:16 developer 83:22 developing 76:6,6 102:21 177:18 development 9:16 79:20 82:1 172:4 184:13 devices 168:22 diagram 19:14 dialog 150:3 174:18 dial-in 95:6 diameter 24:4,8,15 44:19 168:11,18 170:16 diamonds 139:22 died 130:4 difference 103:8 different 20:1 24:20 27:15 33:5 42:6,13 43:1 54:18,18 55:11 63:7,20 81:13	86:7 97:10,16 98:17 103:15 136:6 138:15 153:20,21 154:7 156:12,13 160:9 170:7 176:21 178:3 179:15 180:4 differently 181:21 difficult 49:17 59:20 60:6 177:12 184:14 difficulty 111:13 200:1 dig 75:13 digging 155:18 digit 45:11 digital 197:2,13,20 198:7 digits 40:7 diligence 117:16 diluted 164:12 directed 84:9 direction 50:15 51:20 56:17 112:14 141:11 directly 53:5 Director 8:5 9:10 9:16 10:12,21 11:3 184:12 191:13,19 Directors 24:19 disadvantage 195:20 disagree 53:1 113:14 disagreeing 94:5 disciplined 82:16 disconnected 130:12 discount 145:7 discourage 64:5 discrete 170:18 discretion 12:8 discuss 144:12 discussed 63:19 97:3
D				
D 161:14,22 Dallas 179:1 184:15 damage 146:21 damages 122:19 data 7:6 16:16,18 17:4,5 18:7,10,21 19:1,22 20:4,21 21:2,7,10 22:9,13 23:2,3 24:22 25:4 25:8,21 26:4,21 27:3,12 28:12,22 29:1,1 30:14 32:4 33:5,6,8 34:5,6,19 37:17 40:4 42:12 42:18 43:1,8,10 43:14 50:1 51:3 52:1 53:19 59:12 59:13 60:1 61:10 63:9,16 66:10 68:18,22 69:3 74:6,13 105:5,8,9 106:5,19 108:13 108:19 109:2 112:19 115:4,7 152:19 153:14,22 154:15 155:4,5,15 155:20 156:1,7,11				

discussing 177:15	121:7 123:15	dwelling 81:17	Eleven 151:14	19:3 135:19
discussion 4:18 7:3	128:7 133:12	D.C 8:10	eliminating 164:22	EPA 34:12
33:17 55:2 65:7	138:1,22 140:5		else's 66:19 191:4	equal 156:20
75:9 97:4,8 100:4	142:13 149:4	E	email 108:15	equipment 84:10
102:9 108:4	172:9 174:8	ear 12:16	embarrassing 48:1	equivalent 71:19
118:18 125:7,8	178:12 183:1	earlier 80:6 120:22	emergencies 21:13	113:7 114:15
129:21 130:17	Don 10:17 36:6,9	122:3 155:16	emergency 19:5	erode 99:18
141:5 183:16	37:2 185:10 186:5	earliest 20:20	27:8 28:9,15	error 45:3 155:11
189:20 192:11	DONALD 2:10	early 154:19	37:22 176:6 178:2	ERW 81:10,10
discussions 56:13	door 13:16	182:12 188:22	178:6,13 187:13	149:8
65:21 93:11 97:7	doors 14:13	189:3 193:11	emphasizes 146:4	especially 22:2
144:5,8	DOT's 7:20	earth 43:6 53:19	employees 25:11	50:19 51:5 124:8
disposal 92:13	doubt 31:4 32:7	easier 26:9,20	empty 155:19	Esri 44:4
disruptions 126:18	DOUGHERTY	easily 36:21 70:8	156:5	essence 11:21
128:19	2:17	easy 116:9	emulate 55:10	174:17 176:9
disruptive 184:16	downhill 128:13	ECA 117:21	encourage 18:2	essentially 159:2
185:1	downloaded 71:5	echo 50:7	87:1 88:4	162:17
disseminate 31:17	downloads 156:10	echoing 126:12	ended 93:21	establish 73:6 74:3
disseminating 17:5	downstream	eco 34:15	energy 9:1,10,11	76:15,18 113:19
distort 43:16	119:16	ecological 33:11	9:14 50:6 91:7	154:2
distorted 43:18	downtown 111:14	edition 173:8	94:22 104:14	established 86:4,15
53:7,13,14,20	dozen 22:18	181:10,12 188:22	112:12	90:12 114:3
distortion 52:20	Draconian 92:13	effect 44:22 45:13	enforceability	161:19 162:13
53:9	draft 24:17 78:10	45:15,19 88:14	65:15	establishes 88:14
distribution 17:7	drafted 17:10,18	effective 55:18	enforced 46:19	establishing 86:19
30:2,5,11 111:10	19:9 89:6	177:13	enforcement 45:22	87:12 88:7,13
128:16 142:7	drafting 18:22	effectiveness	engineer 186:16	91:1 93:12
143:2 161:20	Drake 2:4 9:12,12	176:13,20 177:1	188:9	establishment
162:12	50:5 94:21,21	177:22	engineering 9:19	88:11,21 89:1
disturbing 167:1	106:17 186:7,7,17	efficiently 92:3	10:18 73:9 126:21	90:13,18
ditch 75:14	195:16 196:10,15	effort 80:22 104:15	140:13 191:12,18	esteemed 5:18
diverse 179:11	draw 67:1 201:14	121:7 129:3 141:7	engineering-criti...	estimate 74:10,12
docket 14:6 79:22	drinking 33:11	efforts 44:18 53:18	70:14 73:13 77:7	164:19
79:22 136:21	34:3,4,7	128:21 172:10,21	78:20 79:4 117:13	estimated 78:14
154:18	driver 70:12 119:5	174:22 178:3,16	engineers 84:12	142:4
Docs 197:22	drop 124:5	eight 105:22	186:13 190:12	estimates 46:7
document 72:1	dropping 123:15	108:12 130:3	enjoyed 29:19	estimation 133:13
74:20 75:4,17	123:20	171:3	enlightened 201:3	136:9
148:8	dry 5:11	eighties 5:11 17:16	enlightening	et 28:5
documentation	due 18:9 117:16	Eighty-eight 162:5	201:17	evaluate 79:5
74:1 75:6,19 78:6	152:21 153:1	either 23:18 56:2	entered 24:15	evaluation 28:4
80:16,16	176:22	73:11 92:5 153:14	enthused 67:10	176:13,21
doing 13:13 24:2	dumb 26:14	167:8	entire 129:6 147:19	evaluations 177:2
34:12 51:5 52:6	dump 115:4	elected 127:16	environment 99:12	evenly-divided
56:11 60:16 66:6	duplicate 26:3	143:6	99:14,16 126:17	167:19
68:18 77:3 93:7	duration 89:22	elevation 40:3	147:11 184:21	eventually 26:18
97:16 102:18,19	Dwayne 2:17 62:13	43:22 52:21	environmental	56:8

everybody 5:5 13:13,19 50:18 97:16 185:2 191:3	experience 85:7 183:14	failures 135:8	50:10,12,21 53:14	14:10 15:22 17:20
everyone's 90:1 137:1	expert 121:3	faint 22:14	53:15 54:12 56:19	18:9 20:1 23:8
ever-evolving 48:20	expertise 150:5 191:21	fair 5:21 93:15 123:6 159:17 195:5	57:18 58:10,16 61:8 199:16	26:8 29:9 30:1 36:11 39:16 44:12 57:10 70:9 85:18 86:17 87:3,5 91:21 93:7 98:5 98:20 104:17 106:14 113:14 129:16 136:14 150:7 152:18 163:19 170:2 173:8 175:11 178:7,8 181:10 195:7,8
evolution 17:12	experts 201:5	fairly 40:19 159:9 167:18	Feigel 2:5 9:2,2 41:18 42:1,2,9 83:14,14 85:5 133:6,6,18 134:1 134:8,14,17,22 135:4,12 136:2 170:3,3,14	150:7 152:18 163:19 170:2 173:8 175:11 178:7,8 181:10 195:7,8
evolving 61:17,22 63:18	explain 109:16 122:22 144:19	fait 141:15	fell 184:6	fit 183:3
exactly 19:15 21:15 23:20 31:16 61:15 61:20 134:1	explicit 133:12	faith 104:15	fellow 66:4 104:11 105:6 106:3	fitness 84:3,20 93:20 123:22
example 19:19 24:3 26:10 27:14 43:2 45:4 63:21 80:5 86:13 132:16 136:7	explicitly 135:6	fall 19:16 20:18 22:20 61:20 78:15	felt 2:5 11:5,5 110:11 144:10 149:4,9	Fitzgerald 1:19
examples 22:7 23:1 132:10	express 64:16	familiar 36:12 84:13	FERC 91:13 93:3 123:3,4 127:14 130:11 131:6 144:8	five 7:1 25:3 115:22 160:12
excavation 176:6	extend 25:2	family 7:14	field 8:4 24:20 55:20 75:21 85:8	five-ten 64:6
excavator 176:7	extending 100:10 100:13 102:13	far 18:14 56:1 69:9 70:12 173:18 174:2	fifties 159:8	five-year 105:15 107:16
exceed 147:20 161:15	extension 103:9	fast 7:10 56:14 134:2 149:1	fifty 70:22 71:1	fix 122:1
excellent 67:2	extensive 44:16	faster 26:20 131:20	figure 91:21 148:18 149:12 194:18	flack 82:17
exception 186:18	extent 41:5,14 46:5 63:10	fatigue 99:6,8,16 99:21 113:17 115:16	figured 186:12 190:15	flanges 75:22
exchanges 180:22	external 29:3	faults 124:6	figures 26:9	flat 43:7,8 53:19
excited 67:11	extra 156:5	favor 197:20	filings 92:8,9	flatten 43:20
excuse 142:12 180:10	extrapolate 127:3	FCC 102:22	fill 117:22 118:1,12	Fleck 2:6 9:18,18 29:15,16,21 30:9 30:12 31:5,7 32:11 109:12,13 200:15
Executive 11:3	extreme 121:5 156:19	feasible 26:2	filling 198:22	flexibility 176:22
existing 111:20 119:8	extremely-crowd... 111:12	feature 20:7	final 19:9 20:19 112:10 168:6	flights 150:17 197:15
exits 14:15	F	features 22:6	Finally 60:2	floor 14:10
expanded 36:18,22	F 1:19	federal 2:15 9:10 63:14 143:17 148:3,5,18	find 35:20 43:17,22 138:2 149:17 156:14 174:15	flowchart 77:15 95:18 96:18
expansion 110:6 139:14	fabrications 75:22	federally-charter... 12:4 13:11	finding 91:19 183:5	flummoxed 190:18
expect 20:19 41:12 80:21,22 89:9,15 89:17 154:22 158:2,5 165:19 167:6	face 85:6	feedback 29:22 119:21 180:10	finer 40:6	fly 85:6
expectations 13:14 182:22 184:22	faced 95:14	feeds 181:8	fingers 147:4	focus 44:18 87:21 131:19 132:12 174:22 178:16 182:19,20
expecting 39:16 153:15	facilities 63:2	feel 5:12 13:6 41:8 46:10 54:17 100:19,20 145:2 148:1 181:17 194:2 197:16	finished 115:7	focused 112:12
expense 44:17	facility 19:22 20:4 61:9 113:20	feet 19:14 39:9,9 40:6,17 41:11,11 41:12 47:17 48:4	FINLEY 50:5	
	fact 17:15 19:14 42:17 108:11 141:8 142:18		fire 11:13 14:15	
	factor 88:13 165:9		first 6:13 10:2	
	factors 160:10			
	fade 130:3			
	failed 122:11 149:10			
	failure 35:9 77:22 115:21 133:10,19 133:21 134:9 136:8,11 149:3,7			

123:12	104:11	gather 51:3	Glebe 1:20	56:1,4,7 57:9
focusing 96:15	fuel 187:2	gathering 17:8	globe 43:7	60:18,20 61:19
folks 57:20 58:14	fulfill 40:12	geared 101:7	go 5:3,4 11:17	62:4 63:13 64:11
63:15 70:3 84:13	full 81:9 174:22	Gene 9:2 41:17,22	14:15,19 23:14	68:3,11 69:5,17
89:19 187:9,14,19	fully 136:16	42:2 83:3,11,14	38:2,20 44:5,17	82:12,20 83:3
follow 44:10 90:12	function 87:9	85:3,11 93:18	46:22 62:11 69:1	87:17 92:11 96:21
109:15 120:14	fundamental 87:9	133:4,6 134:21	69:8,10 70:6 72:9	97:1,2,6,8,9 99:21
following 109:1	fundamentally	170:2,3	73:9 75:13 76:15	101:4 104:4
113:11 133:9	175:19	general 19:10 44:1	78:18 79:5,14	106:14 107:7
followup 39:5	funding 60:20 61:1	55:2,2 121:5,11	80:2 81:8 85:16	110:19,22 111:5,9
foot 38:18	funds 149:18	131:21 164:14	91:21 93:22	111:21 112:19
foregoing 151:15	further 182:6	174:12 175:4	105:18 106:3,14	115:13 118:1,2
forget 122:7	future 47:14 49:2	197:19 198:5	107:7 109:6	121:19 123:1
forgive 130:10	92:15 175:11	generally 13:2	111:18 112:17	125:11 126:5
131:22 150:17	fuzzier 24:4	164:16 181:1	114:12,22 116:4	127:5,13,14,20,22
form 91:19 131:12		182:14	117:20 118:7	128:1,6,15 132:2
153:18,22 154:12	G	generated 35:5	119:13 120:6	142:5 145:9
158:13 162:16	gained 79:21	Gene's 53:22	121:15 122:17	146:22 148:1,19
180:14 188:20	Gale 2:18 8:13,13	gentleman 48:12	124:18 127:19	150:11,12,18
former 10:8 25:11	gallon 16:5	57:10 59:2	133:4,5 135:2	152:11 154:16
formulate 180:2	gamut 168:1	gentlemen 122:20	137:14 146:6,14	156:8,14 158:11
forth 41:20	gaps 180:6	geocoding 41:19	155:14 156:18	159:1 163:15
fortunately 35:19	Gardner 2:6	42:3,13,19	160:19 182:22	164:20 169:18
forward 15:3,4,5	140:21,22,22	geospatial 17:4	188:7 190:19	172:11 175:10
56:2,22 62:6	gas 1:6 2:15,21	18:21 27:12 29:1	192:19 196:4,20	180:21 187:7
102:2 140:10	3:21 9:5,8,11,14	30:5	197:22	193:17 199:15
145:9 148:7	9:17,20 10:10,12	geospatially 22:10	goal 52:9 73:5	200:6
150:12 179:8	10:14,19,22 16:5	getting 13:6 45:16	76:17 85:3 96:6	good 5:6,14 7:12
180:14 181:5	16:15 17:5,7	61:1 95:10 102:8	177:9 180:12	8:7 11:15 15:13
189:17 195:3	29:16 36:9 42:2	103:21 104:8	183:4	55:20 58:1,5 62:6
197:18	44:8 57:15 71:12	105:9 124:14	goals 19:3 21:11	84:22 85:5 90:22
found 69:8 154:19	71:20 74:14,15	174:13 187:3	177:19	95:12 97:13 100:6
189:8	83:8,14 85:14	GIS 3:10 8:14	God 104:13	100:8 101:8
four 104:17 105:20	91:3,12 94:22	15:10 17:1,11,14	goes 27:6 61:10	102:10,15 103:6
115:6 160:9 176:4	95:20 109:13	21:19 22:7,9 25:4	80:18 91:15 95:20	104:15,18 105:4
176:10 179:3	112:8 118:19	25:9,9,12,13 29:2	123:17 154:7	109:10 115:11
fracture 134:3	119:2 120:5 124:8	60:17 61:21 171:1	158:3,4 161:5	122:15 124:10
framework 132:11	125:6,22 126:5,10	give 22:7 41:6 42:5	195:8	125:7,20 128:20
frankly 60:5	126:11,19 133:6	46:11 55:21 74:4	going 5:3 6:17	138:7 139:15
fraught 87:4	141:1 142:7	105:8,10 115:12	11:17 15:18 17:2	140:20 142:17
freak 97:7	151:20 152:2,14	141:17 144:19	19:10,12,18,21	144:22 145:8
free 197:16	153:1 156:14,15	169:13 177:20	20:8,9 21:5,10	148:1 156:4
frequently 51:2	156:22 157:8,13	given 69:10 73:3	28:7,19 32:21	160:15 171:8,17
FRIDAY 1:11	158:1 162:6 167:2	98:9 120:13,16	37:7 39:2,21 41:6	172:2 174:3
friend 35:20	168:9 170:3 186:8	124:11 141:18	42:5 43:20 47:18	181:17 200:17
front 48:2 96:5	195:7,8	gives 157:19 166:2	49:21 52:4,20	Google 48:14 56:6
frustration 49:22	Gateway 1:20	giving 28:18	53:8,20 55:4,15	60:18 66:5

Gordian 131:13 148:15	194:12	129:13 144:5	hearing 15:5 55:1 56:13 64:10 119:4	historical 27:19 66:15,21 135:8
gotten 58:15 74:8 114:8 138:11 140:9 177:10	greater 18:19 110:9,10 138:22 166:14	happened 27:20 75:18 100:20 119:7 121:13 132:17	heat 195:6	history 75:1 105:15 160:13,19
government 19:6 56:2,10 63:8,17 67:4 200:1	greatest 51:12	happening 123:7	heavily 193:18	hit 114:16 123:3
GPAC 1:6	greatly 21:17 158:6	happens 14:18 130:2	heavy 92:11 116:13 145:18	hold 80:9 102:14 103:9 174:13
GPS 41:8 44:14 50:15,22 51:3 52:1,1 53:4,5 55:19 58:4 61:14 61:17	Grid 9:20 25:5 29:16,19 64:18 109:13	Happily 165:12	heavy-lifters 56:5	hole 196:7,12
GPSed 46:14,15 57:20	gross 136:9	happy 6:3 37:19 59:17 192:2	heck 145:18	holes 25:1
GPSES 17:11,11,14	ground 22:22 55:12 132:20	hard 7:9 13:18 32:18 34:20 36:8 36:21 49:4 103:15	heeding 150:5	holidays 194:8
Grab 69:19	grounds 141:20	Harold 175:2	hell 102:20 131:14	home 5:13 7:13 16:3 62:12 87:15 201:22
gracious 64:21	group 155:18 179:12,18 180:3 180:10,17,19 181:7 182:8 183:9 183:13 184:17 186:22 187:6,8,12 187:17 188:21	Hart 71:8	help 21:11 22:1 28:4 95:6 106:6 143:3 148:14 149:11 187:18 194:11 196:6 201:19	homes 130:5
grade 19:20	groups 24:20 176:4 179:4,11 180:11	Hartford 9:3	helped 57:17 187:2	honest 101:12
graduated 81:6	growing 99:17	hazardous 1:3 7:20 17:6 125:19 151:20	helpful 13:1 67:9 187:9	honestly 148:8 200:1,2
Grand 108:7	Guard 200:5	HCA 32:17 49:3 74:7 78:11 81:12 81:16 154:11,14 156:15 157:2,15 157:20 158:3,7 161:18,21 164:8 166:19 168:3,5 169:4,8,9	helping 27:7 28:16 67:9	Honorable 1:22 2:2 3:6 5:19 9:22 10:1 15:1 29:7 30:19 32:12 36:3 38:9,12 41:17,21 44:7 50:4 53:21 54:20 57:2 59:1 61:3 62:3 64:4 67:16,22 69:19 82:4,15,19 83:2 83:10 85:10 91:2 94:13 104:20 106:10,13 109:11 112:6 114:19 116:7 118:15 125:2 126:7 132:1 132:8 134:20 135:2 137:7,22 138:7 140:19 143:7,12 149:22 151:8,12,18 152:8 169:20 171:5,17 184:1 185:8 186:4 187:21 188:12,16 189:10,16 192:8 193:1,19,22 194:4 195:14 196:18 197:21 198:3,9,16 199:4 200:14,17 202:1
grandfather 72:4,6 72:8 77:16,17 95:15 96:15 105:12 106:21 113:5 145:10,11 160:3,6 161:4 165:1,17,19	guess 13:3 39:1 46:3 55:1 100:17 113:20 120:19 136:8 141:12 156:4 162:8 165:18 166:8 192:5	HCAAs 71:21 104:5 112:13,18 157:18 160:2 162:1,5 163:20 164:2,3,6 166:5,6,18 167:16	heritage 34:17	higher-level 143:21
grandfathered 73:22 74:19 90:10 165:4,13 166:3,9 167:8	guidance 98:10	HCA/MCA-type 78:15	Hersman 145:17	higher-priority 44:19
grandfathering 85:18 86:1,8 87:2	guidelines 79:17	head 59:5	hey 97:15 186:16 195:5	higher-risk 44:19 73:16
granular 38:5 40:14 170:6	guys 5:12 30:16 46:22 92:5 121:7 195:2,6 201:4	heads 161:13	high 6:19 33:3,6 35:18 51:15 65:17 79:18 87:13 115:5 126:22 158:16	highest 161:6
graph 77:13 167:21		heads-up 6:16	high-consequence 35:4 45:5 70:10 73:17 98:11	highlight 146:1
gratitude 64:16	H	hear 12:6,11 15:8 59:17 60:12 68:17 141:13 143:20 145:2 196:13	high-level 68:10 83:17	high-stress 110:9
great 5:7 13:20 15:15 30:9 31:7 41:5 45:12 46:5 107:20 111:7 121:9 132:15 145:11 146:19 147:14 175:3 177:20 178:13,22	H 158:13	heard 15:9,16 16:20 122:2 124:10 140:7 145:8,18 170:20 195:17	hill 2:7 9:15,15 43:20	hilly 43:19

hook 149:8	168:17	inch 158:19 168:14	60:7 66:21 67:1	28:17,18 173:19
hope 5:7 6:9 25:15	illustrate 129:19	inch-and-below	80:18 86:20,21	175:15
26:18 59:21 63:22	IM 99:1 100:3,15	168:16	95:1 115:13	inspects 23:14
150:22	100:16	incident 72:3,17	151:22 160:19	installed 157:8
hopeful 150:3	iMac 16:9	156:11 178:9	161:2 167:4 178:6	159:5,6
199:3	imagery 23:22	include 66:15 72:5	179:16 183:5	instance 39:7
hopefully 7:1,10	imagine 111:13	included 126:21	187:3	Institute 2:19
hour 89:21,21	199:14	154:11 165:4	informed 15:5	Institute's 173:9
Houston 5:12,13	immediate 97:14	including 36:19	infrastructure	institutional 27:16
huge 30:13 96:19	immediately	73:12 191:3,22	96:19 97:3	instructions 153:18
97:22 130:14	101:14	incoming 5:21	INGAA 2:16 58:14	instrumental
148:16	impact 92:7 113:6	43:10	87:15	187:11
human 169:15	113:9 114:10	incomplete 155:9	inherent 147:3	Insurance 9:4
hump 26:19	149:18	162:3,10 164:1	initial 26:19 85:20	integrity 3:15 9:13
hundred 142:9	implementation	incorporate 182:6	initiatives 172:17	67:19 69:6 71:14
hurdle 100:2 120:3	78:9 177:12	incorporated 11:10	inline 78:22	73:5 77:20 83:19
hydro 70:13 72:11	implemented 27:18	181:11	input 80:3 116:19	86:2,9,22 87:18
72:11 79:7 107:21	135:22 136:18	incorporation	117:20 118:12	88:16 94:2 100:11
108:3 111:13,16	implementing	182:1	173:18 177:19	100:13 109:4
119:16 122:15,19	176:10	incorrect 106:1	180:4 197:9	110:7 120:2,7
165:1	implicit 133:11	108:14	inputs 21:20 31:16	121:12 123:11
	implying 49:10	incredible 119:3	42:12	128:14,16 140:12
I	importance 100:5	incredibly-hostile	inputted 135:21	146:9,15 147:1,3
idea 74:4 139:15	important 44:12	99:11	inside 36:17	158:9 167:15
166:2 185:1	58:3 66:20 68:17	indication 167:3	inspect 154:9	186:11 195:6
identical 156:16	103:20 107:11	indicators 174:6	168:15	intelligent 65:6
identification	108:2 113:22	individuals 66:3	inspected 163:4	intended 176:1,15
175:12	118:13 124:17	147:5 179:3	167:20 170:17	177:9
identified 81:18	141:8 201:7,7,20	industry 16:20	inspection 9:4 23:5	intent 90:8,21
105:17,21 142:14	imposes 67:4	25:11 26:1 40:20	23:12,15 24:6	140:3 180:18
identify 21:12	impression 55:22	56:16,20 76:11	154:6 163:8,12	189:2
29:14 38:13 41:22	improve 150:10	85:20 91:5,12,18	168:10 169:3,6	interactive 97:9
57:4 83:12 188:7	174:16 176:17	92:5 101:6 116:14	172:17 173:1	interest 154:16
identifying 28:17	177:16 180:13	122:21 141:13	174:5 180:5	174:13
37:13 62:20	improved 21:22	147:5 148:17	181:16 185:20,22	interested 42:4
175:20 180:6	improvement 18:6	149:17	inspections 28:20	68:6
iffy 168:15	102:15 143:2	infancy 17:15	31:21 117:13	interesting 47:2
II 81:15 87:19	179:8 182:19	infinitely-small	128:8 172:15,16	83:5
157:22 159:22	186:12	61:21	172:21 173:13,15	interface 60:5,9,17
160:2 162:4 169:9	improvements	influx 185:20	175:2,6,14 176:9	156:2
III 2:8 71:20 81:15	15:20	info 52:18	176:19 178:20	interlude 160:4
112:13 118:5	improving 27:7	information 19:1,8	185:12,16 189:8	internal 20:16 22:5
127:1 163:21	114:4	20:17 21:18 24:17	inspection-type	29:2 154:5 163:8
III/IV 112:18	inaccuracies 58:11	25:15 28:19 30:3	78:22	163:12 168:10
ILI 70:14 71:19	inaccuracy 42:15	32:17,20 36:14	inspector 9:14	169:3,5
73:12 77:2 79:3	inadequate 75:5,19	41:16 46:17 47:3	23:14	internally 154:9
80:12 154:7	inception 57:17	48:15 51:11 54:19	inspectors 24:19	163:4 167:19

168:15 170:17 interrupting 13:10 interstate 2:15 57:15 172:19 interview 25:4 intrastate 167:1 introduce 7:22 11:19 12:22 15:9 introductions 3:8 7:16 8:18 introductory 184:20 invents 83:22 investments 149:16 invite 46:16 52:17 57:3 invited 144:15 inviting 183:12 involved 102:20 131:6 in-house 28:16 131:3 in-line 169:3 Iowa 10:18 146:20 iPad 198:2 iron 128:12 156:2 ironically 148:4 issue 85:19 86:8 87:2,4 99:7 100:1 113:17,18,22 117:4 122:13 128:14 133:17 134:6 139:20 167:15 issues 50:8,20 51:19 55:9 66:13 72:20 75:19 77:21 77:22,22 79:3,7 81:11,11 86:7 89:11 96:4 100:5 110:7 115:22 116:3 121:4,5 133:16 134:19 137:6 141:21 150:2 191:22,22 201:4 issuing 180:15	item 67:18 152:1 171:21 items 105:20 180:4 189:19 iterative 182:16 IV 71:20 81:16 112:13 118:5 127:1 163:21 IVP 3:15 6:14,16 74:16 77:12 79:18 84:19 138:5,12 151:4 154:18 194:21 195:8	99:7 June 152:21 176:12 178:22 185:19 jurisdiction 37:5 63:10	62:14 kinds 92:2 103:10 111:21 knew 190:17 knot 131:13 148:15 148:20 196:3 know 5:9 12:9 13:2 13:8 14:10 18:14 21:3,14 22:16 23:7,16 24:20 27:16 32:18 35:1 35:4,13,17,21 37:12,22 38:6 40:8 41:4,9,13 47:16,21,22 48:17 49:2,4,15 50:11 51:2,13 52:19 53:10 56:7 57:5 59:9 61:11 62:16 64:17,19 65:7,11 65:13 66:2,6,8,10 67:5 70:20 75:3 75:17 83:2 86:21 87:10,14 88:18,20 89:15,21 90:14 92:5 93:1,6,18 95:21 96:13 100:10 101:9,12 102:5 105:21 107:12 108:18 109:7 110:15 112:22 113:2,3,10 115:4,9,14,17 116:9,17 117:2 118:18,20 119:1 127:13,17 128:19 130:9 131:13 138:9 144:1,3,17 146:3,5,7,10,12 146:18 147:10,10 147:22,22 149:3 150:15 154:6 159:15 161:1 167:2 168:20 170:11 174:12 177:10 178:17,18 181:12 182:8,20	185:15 188:18 190:18 191:20,20 194:2,17 195:2,17 195:22 196:15 197:2,6,10,15,17 199:16 knowing 68:20 146:8 knowledge 16:22 17:1 27:16 79:21 183:14 knows 14:17 69:22 103:1 194:21 Kuprewicz 2:8 11:9,9 54:21,21 120:17 124:12
J	J	K	L	
J 76:21 90:12 157:7 157:11 jacket 82:18 Jeff 2:12,15 3:4,13 3:16 7:18 9:9 15:2 33:19 46:19 51:10 64:12 67:17 71:2,9 82:3,6 91:2 91:3 96:1 120:18 132:2 143:14 189:21 192:9 196:20 201:9 Jeff's 184:20 Jim 200:2 job 67:2 69:2 143:11 175:4 178:13 191:16 John 2:18 8:13 57:11 62:7 197:4 197:17 join 201:12 joint 1:6 5:15 16:19 29:9 151:19 170:1 192:11 joke 198:14 jostle 6:8 July 105:15 153:5 154:17,19 155:15 jump 33:22 92:19 jumped 108:18 jump-start 187:18 juncture 50:11	Ken 191:9,10,12,18 191:20 key 22:5 95:13 98:1 146:8 155:3 163:16 174:20 176:4 177:7 178:1 180:16 kicked 83:11 Kill 196:8 kind 8:5 11:22 15:22 16:21 17:10 17:15 20:15 23:3 24:1 26:9 30:7 36:14 37:11 39:3 39:5 43:6 45:11 45:16 52:8 56:2 56:21 61:1,16 67:3 68:10 83:17 86:7 87:5 89:2 101:19 102:7,11 108:4 109:16 112:10,14 126:12 129:8 136:12 139:22 140:12 161:12 168:14 170:22 172:6 183:2,21 187:18 197:19 200:10 Kinder 2:17 8:22	keeping 128:17 132:5 Ken 191:9,10,12,18 191:20 key 22:5 95:13 98:1 146:8 155:3 163:16 174:20 176:4 177:7 178:1 180:16 kicked 83:11 Kill 196:8 kind 8:5 11:22 15:22 16:21 17:10 17:15 20:15 23:3 24:1 26:9 30:7 36:14 37:11 39:3 39:5 43:6 45:11 45:16 52:8 56:2 56:21 61:1,16 67:3 68:10 83:17 86:7 87:5 89:2 101:19 102:7,11 108:4 109:16 112:10,14 126:12 129:8 136:12 139:22 140:12 161:12 168:14 170:22 172:6 183:2,21 187:18 197:19 200:10 Kinder 2:17 8:22	L L 154:12 157:16 lack 74:20 80:15 139:18 lacked 74:19 lagging 18:14 Landry 187:10 language 89:6 Lanny 2:2 11:12 large 40:16 41:1 115:6 142:7 largely 170:8 larger 44:18 84:16 large-diameter 122:9 laser 23:10 late 194:10 lately 122:19 lateral 28:1 latest 16:8 latitude 147:3,8 laughter 14:12 16:7,13 30:18,21 31:2 32:20 36:2,5 38:7 39:18 47:1 47:20 57:13 59:7 60:13 69:11,14 82:9,14 83:1,7,9 84:4,18,21 85:4 91:8 94:12,19	

98:6 105:2 113:16 118:22 131:4 132:4 133:3 137:15,21 140:3 143:18 145:12 169:12 171:16 186:15 187:7 188:11 191:15 192:15,18,20 195:1,4,11 199:10 200:21 launched 17:21 laurels 147:19 law 55:8 143:1 lay 51:17 52:3 layer 43:14 layers 33:5,6 LDCs 125:12 132:19 leading 174:6 leads 59:14 138:22 leafing 22:12 Leah 25:7 leak 77:22 115:21 128:9 133:22 lean 146:15 learn 112:16 learned 187:15 190:22 learning 176:16 leave 82:12 148:11 150:18 190:6 leaving 200:4,8 led 185:22 Lee 191:9 left 14:15 69:16 92:6 162:18 200:6 lefthand 73:15 77:13 legacy 81:7 89:10 146:16 legal 141:9 legislation 87:10 88:1 112:14 114:1 Legislature 143:1 legitimate 141:14 142:12 143:5	144:3 LESNIAK 2:8 letting 149:15 let's 13:17 29:9 56:20 104:4,5,5,5 114:1,4,14 122:7 141:2 147:22 199:18 level 6:20 16:21 28:3 31:22 38:5 46:1,4,11 48:18 62:20 63:14 79:19 114:15 118:9 127:2,19 143:9 164:13,15 165:11 167:3 leveled 55:7 levels 24:18 62:19 63:7 166:21 liaison 178:2,5 Lidiak 2:19 59:3,3 188:9,14,14,17 lieu 60:1 life 99:22 193:18 lift 116:13 145:18 Light 10:12 lightly 116:15 liked 98:3 129:2 limit 118:9 limited 63:11 185:5 Linda 2:17 8:3 184:4,7,8 185:9 line 20:6 22:20 23:20 24:5,14 59:5 61:20 62:1 82:22 91:9 111:14 118:10 125:16 168:18 169:5 linear 61:8 lines 22:18 30:4,11 31:3 40:2 41:7,9 41:13,14 43:16 44:17 45:22 46:13 72:22 73:1 163:4 168:8,16 170:9 link 22:8 28:22 71:3 155:13 170:6	179:20 links 153:17 liquid 1:6 17:6 83:8 118:19 151:20 194:21 195:6 liquids 10:16 11:4 11:6,8,11,14 32:14 38:16 54:2 54:22 71:12 118:17 137:10 193:6 195:8 198:19 list 32:7 35:16 132:5 listed 183:11 189:19 listen 124:15 listening 141:19 listen-up 129:20 literary 196:8 literature 84:8 little 6:6,8 15:7 20:1 22:14 32:18 36:22 38:4 47:15 50:18 53:7 55:3 58:17 65:4 84:19 87:7 90:16 95:2 101:20 127:11 143:10 155:1 157:2,6 162:22 164:1,2 166:5,18 173:10 186:1 187:18 189:1 191:17 192:17 live 131:15 lives 49:6 LNG 20:9 30:3 128:21 129:11 locate 22:2 58:8 located 166:3,17 locates 59:10 location 14:16 58:4 81:16 87:19 88:6 148:2 157:20 158:4 161:16 163:21 169:4 locations 42:17	58:1,19 127:2 162:4 logic 155:10 long 33:13 34:9 44:15 66:17 93:11 110:18 132:17 139:1 142:15 190:8,22 Longhorn 135:18 long-run 64:7 look 15:3 46:22 60:18 62:4 69:16 70:1,5,8 72:9 74:6 75:18 76:1,16 78:14,19 81:3,8 82:6,21 86:13 88:5 89:12 90:1 94:10 96:13,17 105:18,19 106:5 111:9 114:11 137:2,2 157:20,21 158:2 159:4,11 160:8 161:18 162:2,8 166:20 173:4 174:7,21 175:19 178:21 180:3 181:1,21 189:16 197:11 looked 16:3,11 24:22 88:1 98:5 108:16 113:4 138:10 167:15 looking 15:4,5 24:14 30:5,11 33:12,15 36:13 38:4 39:22 40:5 43:21 61:9,13,13 61:15,17 63:11 76:19 77:18 78:10 80:6 106:7 109:5 115:3,7 116:3 134:5,7,19 140:1 149:9 161:8 174:3 175:20 182:8 187:5,8 188:20 195:2 looks 174:1	loss 93:16 lost 130:4 lot 16:14 19:17 22:3 27:3 36:11 48:14 49:22 50:8 50:9 51:10,18 52:12 54:11 57:19 58:1 66:9 68:22 89:18 93:21 95:1 95:17,19 96:1,14 96:20,21 97:2 100:11,12 107:7 110:3,13 111:10 115:1,21 116:17 118:3,4 119:6,9 122:21 124:11,18 125:7 139:15 141:4 143:21 144:8,18 145:7 146:20 153:20,21 154:7,16 158:15 160:4 161:22 173:14 174:13 175:18 176:19 177:5 178:3,10 179:16 187:2 190:22 191:21 193:13 197:15 198:4,20 199:20 lots 82:19 87:5 144:5 love 140:10 loved 98:2 low 40:19 158:16 185:17 lower 77:4 104:3 122:11 160:20 lowest 105:19 107:19 160:14 low-frequency 81:10 149:8 low-stress 78:2 LPAC 1:6 luck 122:4 Luckily 158:22 lump 159:7 lunch 7:11
---	--	---	---	---

luxury 201:3	manufacturing 72:18 75:1 90:3,4 133:15 167:11,14	matter 22:21 37:16 42:15 61:1 150:5 151:15 201:5,13	171:22 184:15 190:19 193:8 195:12,21 197:5 198:7 201:2 202:4	196:22
M	MAOP 21:20 72:1 72:12,18 74:3,20 76:15,18 77:16 80:15 86:16,19 88:11,14,21 89:1 90:11,12,18 91:1 103:17 110:6 115:1 117:9 120:5 121:12 122:10,11 123:6,10,11,12 124:5 140:16 161:7 162:13,21 163:2,12 164:9 165:8,14,20 166:11,15 167:9 167:22	matters 192:10	meetings 15:4 190:13 194:14	mentions 18:18
Magellan 135:17	MAOPs 161:19	maximize 149:18	meets 96:1	messages 176:14 177:7
main 70:12 77:14 133:14 134:6 185:5	map 22:11 43:14	maximum 86:4 154:3	member 8:21 9:2,6 9:9,12,15,18 10:11,15,17,20 11:2,5,7,9,12 29:15,21 30:9,12 31:5,7 32:11,13 36:7 38:3,10,15 40:13,19 41:18 42:1,9 44:8 49:9 54:1,21 83:14 85:5,13 90:7 91:3 94:8,21 106:8,12 106:17 109:12 112:7 118:16 120:17 125:5 126:9 133:6,18 134:1,8,14,17,22 135:4,12 136:2 137:9 138:4,9 140:22 170:3,14 171:9 185:11 186:7,17 193:5 195:9,16 196:10 196:15 198:18 199:5 200:15	met 1:18
mains 31:3 111:11 111:20	mapping 3:9 6:13 15:11,19 17:21	Mayberry 2:19 8:7 8:8 71:9 116:8	mentioned 30:16 31:8 137:13 139:13 145:22	metallurgical 102:9
maintain 114:5	maps 28:11 51:13 51:13 52:22 53:2 55:8 56:6 58:7,9 60:19	MCA 78:11 98:12 98:13 104:2 147:11 158:8		metering 168:21
maintaining 79:15 178:2,5	March 11:8 25:5 64:19	MCA/HCA 78:3 139:14		method 113:7 161:11
maintains 48:20	march 64:21	McLAIN 2:9 8:21 8:21 38:10,15,15 40:13,19 54:1,1 118:16,16		methodology 34:11 34:21 88:13 90:13 115:19 116:2 177:4
major 78:12 92:7	marginal 102:15	mean 38:19 40:16 42:15 48:10 50:15 51:22 54:5 80:7 84:6 95:15 102:7 103:12 110:20 121:16 133:11,22 134:2,11 135:9 190:5,17 193:2		metrics 177:9,19
majority 39:9 53:3 162:20 166:14	marginally 103:15	means 22:20 47:5 60:17 71:19 88:7 88:19 105:13		MICHAEL 2:3
making 15:20 59:13 63:19 119:11 130:6 160:7 177:17 181:19 182:5 200:12 201:12	mark 2:22 61:5 114:17	meant 94:1		microphone 8:19 36:6 48:9 57:7 64:8 69:20 133:2 171:12 188:6
manage 99:2 100:9 194:14	markedly 35:14	measurement 75:15 168:22		middle 55:12 163:3
management 87:18 100:11,14 109:5 110:7 120:2,7 121:12 123:11 128:14 140:12 146:9 147:1,4,15 158:9 167:15 186:11 195:7	market 149:19	measures 137:3		Midstream 9:7 25:6
Manager 3:10 8:15 10:18 15:10	marks 184:21	mechanical 146:21		mid-December 194:10
managing 102:22	Mart 23:3	mechanisms 134:10		mid-July 155:3,6 155:12
mandate 18:17 32:16 54:12 76:21 93:2 141:9 152:16 163:17 164:5	Massoud 128:5	meet 15:15 21:11 46:1 66:3 79:4 90:21 121:8 140:1 140:3		mid-range 162:22 166:13
mandated 71:17	material 74:1 75:4 75:16 78:6 80:14 80:16 105:14 117:9 167:5	meeting 1:6 4:9 6:4 10:7 12:2,21 13:21 14:4,21 70:16 105:7 136:20 151:19 154:18 160:5		Mike 10:11 120:15 126:8,9
mandates 73:7,10 113:1,1 155:4	materials 1:3 7:21 76:3 146:11			mile 93:15 157:15
mandatory 18:6 20:10 24:10 54:8	mathematical 43:6 44:5			mileage 43:17,21 44:2 53:11 74:7 74:15 115:2 154:11,13 156:7 157:5,10,14 162:9 163:11 164:17 166:12
Manhattan 111:15				miles 24:5 30:7 39:8 74:7,10,14 78:14 105:16,20 106:21 107:1 119:2 153:8 154:14 155:8,9 156:15,15,17,22
manner 178:7				
manpower 44:16				

157:2,9,17,22	144:11,12,19,22	131:7	138:18 144:1,2,4	noise 158:20
158:1,9,22 159:14	models 166:9	Murray 2:20 4:12	144:5 147:10	nomenclature
160:15 161:9,12	moderate-conseq...	172:1,2,3 185:18	151:2,10 177:11	59:12
161:18,21,22	70:11 73:18 74:9	186:16 187:20	177:15 178:7,17	nominal 158:14,19
162:11,19 163:22	81:14	189:15	178:18 181:18	158:21
164:8 165:4,5,10	modern 125:17		182:4	nominate 199:18
165:19 166:1,3,7	modes 133:10,15	<hr/> N <hr/>	needed 25:13 41:7	nominations
166:17 167:1,16	133:19	N 1:20	62:2 90:6 124:20	199:13 200:12
167:18,22 168:2,4	modify 20:8	name 7:18 29:15	155:21	non 41:1 119:7
168:12,13,20	moment 120:11	69:4 93:21 137:13	needing 50:12	non-compliance
170:11	money 34:18 111:8	Nanney 3:18 67:20	needs 24:21 49:1	39:7
mill 101:11,17	128:4	69:4,5,15,21 71:1	56:4,10 65:19	non-compliant
million 127:4,9	monikers 154:7	89:4 104:22	66:3 75:6 88:1	40:16
mind 111:2 128:17	month 173:11	108:10 114:21	96:1 115:20	non-destructive
139:18 185:21	monthly 156:9	133:14,21 134:4	132:18 139:19	75:12
minds 48:11	169:18	134:11,15,18	143:22 148:19	non-HCA 157:22
minimal 18:1	months 18:8	135:9,15 136:14	179:14 182:17	158:6
minimizes 126:17	152:22	Nanny 6:17	negatively 66:16	normal 42:19
minimum 35:10	monumental 130:8	NAPSR 71:11	negligent 52:13	120:2,6
54:8 159:12	MOP 120:5	NARUC 10:2 93:3	negotiate 93:3	normalize 42:11
minor 130:15,20	mor 33:19	93:10 127:14	neighboring 36:20	normalizing 42:10
minus 19:14 48:4	Morgan 2:17 9:1	131:6 144:9	Nelson 2:21 3:10	normally 89:15
50:21 56:18 57:18	62:14	193:17	8:14,14 15:9,13	123:4 124:3
58:10,16 61:8	morning 5:6 8:7	National 3:9 5:22	29:20 30:8,10	North 10:22
minute 69:18	15:8,13 170:21	9:20 15:19 25:5	31:13 33:1 37:2	note 44:12 109:8
minutes 7:2 64:7	172:2,7	29:16,19 64:18	38:8 39:15 40:18	184:11
68:10 89:21	motivation 158:7	109:13 190:10	41:3 42:7,21 46:2	noted 36:4 85:11
169:15 178:9	Mount 10:22 125:6	national-level	52:16 54:16 60:11	notice 20:19 148:3
misplace 40:2	mountainous 49:16	191:21	61:16 63:3 64:3	198:20
missed 71:5 157:2	move 56:16,21 62:8	natural 2:15 57:15	170:21	noticed 197:3
missing 75:5	67:18 68:18	119:2	nervous 50:18 91:7	notifying 193:14
154:20 155:18	131:19 132:2	nature 53:18	192:17	notion 149:13
mission 19:2,3	140:10 145:6	176:22	net 52:11	198:6
21:11 24:21 185:6	200:7	near 118:20 129:12	never 39:2	November 194:10
misunderstanding	moved 56:22	nearly 55:7	new 7:17 21:2 27:3	NPMS 16:17,18,22
127:12	movie 172:7 183:20	necessarily 55:9	35:18 73:12,18	17:3,20 18:7,18
misunderstandin...	moving 50:14	123:8 164:13	76:5 77:8 83:22	23:2 25:21 26:5,7
107:5	141:10 179:8	need 6:7 14:19 19:2	84:15 102:2	32:17 36:11 45:11
mitigation 70:13	180:14 181:4	21:11,14 41:14	147:12 191:12,18	67:3
mix 91:16 98:22	193:13,15	46:13 48:5 50:2	news 16:4 156:4	NTSB 71:8 72:4,15
mixed 16:21 25:22	much-need 15:20	53:16 55:16 59:14	nice 56:9 109:15	72:16,21 73:8
101:20	multiple 46:7	60:22 61:12,22	Nick 120:22 122:2	76:20 88:10 90:19
mobile 128:21,21	175:21	79:6 86:10,21	night 5:7,7 195:19	90:20 96:14 98:9
129:11	multi-year 80:22	90:10 105:8	NiSource 9:7 25:5	114:1 116:12
Mockingbird 196:9	91:11	116:19 117:22	64:18 85:14 87:14	119:6 152:16
model 43:6 47:12	municipal 10:13	118:1,7,12 122:21	112:8	163:17 164:12,21
130:10,13,16	126:10 127:15	131:6,18 132:12	NIST 189:3	168:6

NTSB's 90:8	108:5 109:3,10	161:6 164:7,17	185:5	161:22 162:16,17
number 14:6 41:18	120:16 123:18	166:21	ordered 142:20	partake 172:11
42:3 54:11 117:8	129:20 134:20	Operations 8:5	orders 120:14	participants 10:7
130:4 132:9	152:10 158:11	9:13	organization 128:5	participate 175:15
138:15,17 139:12	161:5 165:3	operator 39:7	original 113:19	183:12
154:21 157:12,15	170:14 192:16	44:14 48:16 76:17	originally 86:3	participated 47:10
160:15 165:12,21	198:5,15 199:9	77:3 80:17 81:1	ought 60:7 120:3	175:13
165:22 167:16	201:10	97:11 119:1	124:15	particular 6:15
185:12 199:13	old 16:9 47:12	135:17 149:4,9	outdated 173:11	55:10 56:10 58:21
numbers 52:2	66:11 148:21	156:17	outfits 56:6	66:11 92:20 145:5
58:13 131:2 158:5	173:11	operators 17:4,6	Outlook 113:4	149:3 170:19
168:11 185:12,14	older 41:14 73:3	18:2,15 20:21	outreach 187:1,13	187:11,19
185:17 186:2	86:2	24:12 25:3 27:15	outside 144:18	particularly 47:9
numerous 117:7	onboard 192:3	27:21 32:4,9 35:6	160:2 162:5 164:2	151:1 159:12
	193:16	40:12 41:6,6,13	166:6 181:6	partners 9:1
O	once 78:17 79:13	42:22 43:11 46:6	186:22 194:15	172:13
oath 121:14 122:19	100:14 147:9	46:11 53:1,4	outweighs 158:6	parts 45:2 153:22
object 85:8	ones 33:10 34:16	71:12 105:6,22	out-of-date 197:3	154:12,12,13,14
objective 185:5	73:3 146:19	106:4 108:12,20	overall 35:12 53:10	154:20 155:18,21
obligation 121:8	ongoing 7:3 120:7	108:21 115:1,6,6	178:15 183:4	156:1,5,13 157:1
observation 87:6	172:22	115:10 118:20	overlay 62:18	158:13 193:13,15
observations 91:10	online 138:6	123:9 140:7 147:2	overview 6:18,20	Pasadena 11:13
92:16 121:11	open 4:18 48:9	153:2,6,7,10	68:11 70:7 105:11	pass 111:17
obstruct 168:22	49:18 60:17 80:1	157:3 159:14	175:4 182:15	passage 169:1
obtain 19:1	82:7 112:15	167:2 173:5 174:8		passed 18:8 125:12
obvious 108:18	136:21 189:20	174:15,21 175:19	P	143:1 145:15
obviously 107:4	192:6,10 194:20	176:11 178:12	page 154:18 157:9	146:12 194:15
116:15 125:13	197:22	182:20	pages 16:3 22:12	patiently 141:3
150:2 163:5	Opening 3:2	operator's 45:1	22:12	pattern 22:11
occurred 122:8	openings 198:20	opinion 142:13,17	paid 16:5	patterns 27:12
offer 10:5 187:17	199:1	142:18,19	pain 49:22 159:1	147:20
Office 9:10 172:4	openly 146:9	opportunities	194:3	PAWG 187:7
Officer 9:7 143:18	openness 119:21	178:15 179:7	painful 68:22 69:3	pay 34:18 131:16
official 2:15 63:8	operate 114:5	opportunity 12:8	palpable 91:6	paying 131:17
157:12,15	119:2 165:16	12:13 95:4 98:13	paradigm 158:10	pays 122:1
officials 19:6 37:4	170:12 182:18	144:20 175:18	parallel 139:2,3,9	pears 101:20
37:17 63:17,20,21	operated 27:17	185:3 201:2	139:10	peers 99:5
127:16 176:5,6	66:22 160:21	OPS 155:13	paramount 63:5	Pennsylvania
178:2,6,14	operates 99:15	opted 18:10	part 17:6 21:1	142:3 146:18
offshores 200:9	operating 9:7	option 76:18 77:6	32:21 33:2,17	people 7:13,17 12:4
oftentimes 45:9	20:15 72:6,13	111:1	36:19 40:14 72:9	12:18,18,20 13:10
Oh 38:15 42:1	74:21 79:14 86:4	optional 17:19 18:1	76:8 77:18 79:16	13:15 15:16 16:11
okay 7:12 11:15	90:9 105:15	20:11 24:11	105:19 154:1,1,4	52:6,9 55:20 58:8
16:12 29:4 31:7	107:16,22 118:7,8	options 76:19 77:9	154:22 155:7	59:11 65:4 67:11
37:2 38:3 42:7,21	122:10 123:15,20	order 3:2 14:21	156:16 157:6,7,11	70:18,20 91:12
54:1 57:8 61:4	135:22 154:3	15:8 34:19 120:13	157:16 158:7,13	93:17 95:19
62:5 100:1 102:14	159:16 160:11,20	120:16 142:9	159:12 161:8,14	103:16 104:7

107:8,12 109:15 117:15 120:21 121:14 122:16,18 130:3,4,18 137:12 137:18 139:20 140:1 144:1,19 145:2 146:5 150:16 151:9 154:16 158:17 186:19 189:6 190:2,16 191:11 197:17 198:4 199:18 201:8 people's 130:3 percent 24:12 44:1 72:14 74:15,22 89:17,18 90:9 95:16 96:16 98:16 107:22 125:22 127:18 137:18 156:22 157:1,17 157:22 158:2 159:5,15,18 162:5 162:11 164:7,10 164:10,11,17,18 164:19,20 165:11 165:16 166:12,13 166:21 167:7 168:9 169:7 170:12 percentage 53:10 53:11 77:4 perfect 30:12 119:14,20 perfection 97:19 144:22 perform 74:2 performance 32:10 66:13,16 performed 185:13 performs 117:21 period 20:19 40:10 102:14 103:9 127:21 189:20 periods 35:11 136:6 permission 150:14	permit 167:8 permits 165:14 permitting 12:7 person 31:14 87:16 113:6 personally 183:12 perspective 175:9 perspectives 179:15 182:22 183:15 Peter 2:19 59:3 60:11 188:14 Peter's 191:1 Petroleum 2:19 173:8 PG&E 128:20 Phillips 10:16 PHMSA 2:17,18,18 2:19,20,21,23 3:19,22 4:13 8:1 15:10 16:20 18:10 24:18 25:17 63:14 69:5 71:8 73:4 77:9 125:13 138:6 138:19 141:6 150:4 172:12,18 173:15,16,19 184:9 189:7 194:16 198:14 PHMSA's 18:16 phone 15:17 16:10 32:6 34:4 35:17 108:14 phones 17:13 phrase 42:22 PHSMA 2:22 60:3 PHSMA-2013-01... 14:7 pick 35:21 135:13 136:6 158:18 160:13,22 picked 108:11 picture 98:5 piece 141:22 142:10 pieces 162:17 183:2 Pierson 2:9 11:7,7	193:5,5 195:9 pig 52:1 168:19 169:1 piggability 154:8 piggable 72:22 pigs 73:2 168:8 pilot 47:11 60:16 67:9 198:7 pilots 65:4 pipe 19:19 21:18 22:2 30:7 51:4 66:21 71:20 72:5 72:10,12,13,20 74:14,19,19 75:4 75:10 77:8 81:8,9 81:10,15,16 89:10 89:10,11 90:2 92:8 95:16,18,21 99:2,14,15,17 101:5,9,15 102:1 107:1,7 108:5 111:5 112:3 113:6 118:5 122:19 132:19 133:15 142:5,14 146:10 146:16 149:9 151:3 154:10 156:17 158:14,19 158:21 159:7,15 164:5,14,20 165:2 165:15 167:5,12 168:12,13 pipeline 1:3,6,6 3:5 3:9,14,17 5:15 7:19,20 10:16 11:3,6,8 15:19 18:5 19:19 20:2,3 20:6 24:12 26:10 27:14,17,20 28:11 36:14,19 37:7 45:2 61:20 71:10 71:16 75:14 77:8 78:1 79:1,11,15 81:19 87:1 89:1 90:9 114:2 117:21 123:9 124:13 126:2,14 135:10	135:18,22 136:5 137:10 151:20 160:13,18,21 162:19 169:1 172:4 pipelines 8:22 19:16,17 22:3 23:21 28:12,18 37:14 39:20 45:9 45:15,21 48:3 57:21 58:8,19 74:22 86:3,5 114:5 123:5 124:4 125:16,20 126:3 129:6 131:16 162:6,20 165:14 169:7 pipeline-related 19:22 20:3 pipes 39:8 86:10 96:21 99:21 100:3 107:20,20 PIR 81:18 87:15,16 87:20 147:19,20 147:21 placards 29:10 place 84:9 98:17 128:11 135:10 137:4 153:4 placed 126:22 places 104:6 156:18 plain 49:18 plan 79:20 95:12 96:12 129:8 136:22 150:22 Plane 43:3 planes 6:7 62:11 201:15 planning 129:3 plans 38:1 94:10 193:7 plant 20:9 plants 30:4 play 12:16 13:19 28:14 51:8,8 147:17 148:13	188:10 players 123:1 playing 66:5 please 12:20 29:13 38:8 54:18 57:4 83:12 104:13,13 106:4 141:17 188:7 pleased 6:2 10:4 62:21 plenty 68:15 144:20 plus 19:13 48:4 50:21 56:18 57:18 58:10,15 61:8 147:21 point 13:7 20:5,6 26:2 35:22 42:17 47:19 49:13 50:7 50:16,22 52:5 53:6,8 54:14 61:11 65:3 66:11 66:22 96:17 105:4 106:9 112:11 114:13 116:5 120:1,6,8 121:10 123:22 125:8,21 131:9 174:11 175:7 177:8 180:16 181:9 182:7 185:3 190:1 pointed 117:7 pointing 147:4 points 37:14 47:6 53:4 129:1 130:6 130:21 155:4 163:16 191:4 point-to 50:21 point-to-point 50:19 polar 107:13 policy 8:9 9:20 21:6 pool 149:18 poor 17:14 popular 16:3 populated 33:7,7 population 33:6
--	---	---	---	--

34:22 127:18	74:5 81:9 128:20	71:21 187:4	69:6 70:2 71:15	propose 38:22
portion 164:4	153:16 155:11	pre-announcement	73:5 74:16 75:6	148:1 181:20
170:16,17	171:19 172:6	189:1	75:13 76:1,7,9,13	proposed 81:22
portraying 55:14	presentations 71:4	pre-code 159:7	76:16 77:14 78:7	137:5 148:6
pose 50:3	71:6 138:5 179:17	price 16:15	78:8,10 86:6,12	proposing 70:4
poses 41:5	presented 144:12	primarily 12:11	87:9,12,22 94:3	protect 21:7 63:1
position 34:10 48:1	President 5:21 8:22	180:3	95:3 111:6 112:17	93:17
positional 19:13	9:3,13,19 10:3,16	primary 12:2 85:2	116:4 121:18	protected 144:2
21:22 44:2	11:8,10 193:17	Principle 74:17	122:15 135:14,16	protecting 28:13
positions 190:13	presiding 1:22	75:3 76:14	135:21 136:5,12	prove 101:16 109:9
positive 29:22	press 97:15	principles 73:14	136:13,16 138:13	proven 88:12 90:18
positively 66:17	pressure 28:14	143:22 145:22	138:16 139:4	provide 12:7 13:7
possibility 28:21	71:18 72:17 73:11	printing 198:13,15	150:10 176:16	26:19 31:16 32:17
possible 40:1 49:12	74:21 76:2,22	prior 136:8	181:16 182:16	47:4 94:1 95:6
51:21 92:3 114:10	77:1,4,5 79:10	prioritization	199:14	101:7 131:14
possibly 87:20	80:8 86:5,15 99:5	104:3	processes 3:15	172:8 179:20,21
166:22 194:1	100:7 105:13	prioritize 35:6	67:20 139:1,2,10	provides 28:2 35:2
post 196:4	107:17 113:7,8,19	104:1	Product 8:22	94:1 114:15
posted 138:6	114:2 117:16,18	priority 35:19 73:2	productive 144:11	providing 28:10
posters 70:1	118:6,7 122:9	91:15,22 132:13	program 17:3,7	175:4 178:5
postpone 128:8	123:21 124:7,20	132:22 143:8	28:4 71:19 73:6	provoke 130:17
potential 45:22	139:21 140:4,16	private 41:20	78:22 80:12 83:20	public 4:9 5:20 7:8
88:7 126:15	146:12 154:3,5	probability 136:10	172:4 175:22	10:1 12:9 13:5
pour 23:21	160:11,12,18,20	probably 16:1 32:7	176:11,14 177:11	21:9 27:5,7 32:16
poverty 127:19	161:1,6,10 162:14	35:18 39:2 43:3	177:16,21 184:13	32:21 33:3 37:9
power 18:20	162:15,19,21	52:11 63:15 66:9	190:9	37:12,15 48:2,17
powerful 27:11	163:2,5,6,11	68:8 72:10 89:12	programs 8:9	56:8 57:3 60:21
Practicably 52:6	164:8 165:8,20	89:17,22 90:5,20	142:21 173:5	66:9 68:13,15
practical 51:22	166:11 167:12,17	91:18 99:12 101:8	174:16 176:8	76:11 96:9 97:6
181:1,4	167:22 168:4	105:22 115:21	177:18	100:1 102:4
practically 40:22	pressures 74:21	120:22 131:17	progress 119:12	125:22 126:16
practice 94:15	123:15,20 124:5	137:17 146:6	141:16 173:22	128:19 129:14,20
practices 180:9	170:7	173:11 177:15	project 48:13 57:6	130:7,18 131:14
pre 165:2	pressure-cycling	186:17,19 188:18	63:5	135:19,20 144:13
preceding 160:12	123:17	197:8	projection 43:2,5	144:13 151:2
precise 27:1	presume 195:9	problem 38:19	43:13 52:21	154:18 160:5
precision 31:22	pretty 7:9 17:14	39:20,21 55:5	projections 42:22	171:10,22 172:9
predominant	48:1 51:15 85:19	92:12 97:14	43:2	172:14,20 173:4,6
161:11	90:22 149:11	102:11 122:1	Projects 9:10	174:19 175:2,13
prelude 152:13	165:21 173:3	138:21 139:11	promote 18:19	176:5,11 177:18
preparation 26:21	174:3 180:12	199:12	promoting 27:5	178:4 179:1,6,19
prepare 26:4	188:18	problems 99:17	promotion 189:14	180:7,13 182:4,15
prerogative 143:16	prevent 116:22	115:17,18 130:14	properly 86:14	183:3,9,16 184:14
present 2:1,14 76:9	prevented 136:11	148:15 149:1	properties 146:11	187:1,6 188:5
150:8	preview 172:7	procedure 94:16	167:5	189:11 190:13,19
presentation 29:5	183:21	process 53:15	proposal 93:9	191:1
70:19 71:11,11	previously 10:6	55:10 56:1 68:16	170:20	publication 189:3

publicly 33:19	question 14:3	130:10 190:21	168:15,20 172:8	reconvene 151:9
public/local 176:5	29:11 30:1,15	ratemaking 132:14	173:5 174:8,16	record 6:22 7:2
published 20:17	31:8 39:16 44:21	ratepayers 144:7	175:18 177:3	14:4 29:14 36:4
181:13	46:3 47:2 49:20	rates 127:15,21	178:12,17,17	38:14 68:14 83:13
publishing 189:2	50:17 56:14 57:4	rate-setting 127:12	180:22 181:3	85:11 101:13
pull 163:16	62:15 64:1,8	rating 76:2,2	182:2 183:3,18	107:12 109:18
pulled 111:6	83:16 88:8 98:15	reach 55:12	184:10,18 186:12	110:17 137:14
pulling 98:4	99:9,10,14 100:17	reaching 26:2	186:13 187:2	151:16,17,19
pump 20:4 23:9,17	104:18 121:22	176:1,2,14 178:13	190:12,14,19	155:9 162:3
23:22	133:9,19 135:1,16	183:10	191:6,19 192:4	184:17 188:13
punchline 165:18	140:9 164:11	reaction 85:20	193:2,15 195:20	195:15
purpose 12:2 13:12	171:10 174:5	read 23:7 119:6	reason 35:4 84:5	recorded 13:21
86:18,22	175:6 188:5	121:2 152:12	85:1,6 123:2	records 23:6 24:11
purposes 31:20	198:18 199:8	195:21	155:20 165:15	72:1 74:2,20
push 36:7 95:18	200:16	readily 34:5	183:19	86:20 100:6,19
143:10	questions 3:12,20	ready 6:12 125:4	reasonable 39:4	101:1,8,8,11
pushback 141:13	3:24 4:15 29:6,18	real 36:12 55:13,16	101:7,22 181:1	105:14,14 107:15
pushed 132:3	44:11 86:17 91:11	92:19 111:22	reasons 93:21 94:6	107:21 109:9
put 14:2 51:15 58:5	96:22 98:1,9,19	124:18 131:3	145:14 153:16	112:11 115:3
58:11 70:1 73:4,8	98:21,22 100:16	141:20 146:17	176:21 190:11	117:10 119:14,14
75:9 80:20 99:1,3	100:18 109:22	161:20 162:12	reauthorization	119:19 121:2
105:11 106:1	137:11,12 169:22	reality 45:8 52:14	18:17 27:6 32:15	125:17 153:3
110:16 112:2,3,14	171:6 188:1	87:19	rebuild 96:9 112:2	154:4,22 160:17
115:2,8,18 124:12	quick 11:22 105:11	realize 25:15	recall 34:3	160:18 162:3,7,10
129:21 130:16	151:7 184:11	108:11 116:21	receive 67:19	163:20 164:1
135:9,20 136:3	quickly 13:17 68:4	130:8 169:14	received 152:17	recover 149:16
155:3,6 173:22	92:3,19 97:21	realized 154:15	reckless 52:13	recovered 144:4
175:9 183:8	132:20	realizing 57:19,22	recognize 58:3	recovery 92:9
190:12 191:16	quite 42:11 62:10	really 12:3 13:1	88:10 145:16	142:2 143:4
194:6,8 199:8	84:1 95:13 184:13	28:7 30:5 32:1	recognized 116:13	recurring 160:1
puts 48:4 101:14	quiz 169:10	34:20 38:18 43:17	recognizes 88:1	redesign 60:8,15
195:20	Q&A 82:8	50:12 51:16 53:12	recommend 180:19	reduction 80:11
putting 53:5 121:7		58:4 60:22 63:4,6	180:21	124:21
179:18	R	65:6,14 66:1 67:3	recommendation	reductions 124:7
puzzle 21:1 183:3	R 154:1,4,12	67:10 88:6 90:8	72:15,22 90:19,21	reelected 127:22
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-...	162:17	98:3 99:8 103:6	164:12,21 167:10	reestablish 90:11
5:1	radius 22:19 38:18	103:19 104:2,18	168:7	refer 22:6 31:17
P-11-14 164:22	raising 141:20	105:5 106:6	recommendations	reference 58:6,9
P-11-15 167:10	ran 136:5	107:11 108:2	72:3 73:8,10 96:5	61:12 88:9 196:8
	range 117:5 154:5	110:11 116:19	96:14 98:10	referencing 23:2
Q	158:21 159:3,21	118:19 122:15	108:22 152:17	59:13
qualified 86:15	162:20	124:10,14,21	155:5 163:18	referring 57:7
113:7	ranges 161:16	130:3 131:5,19	182:3	refers 23:8
qualify 79:1	ranked 81:21	138:12,18 139:12	recommended	refined 40:9
quality 26:22 50:1	ranking 31:20	141:4 142:8,8	72:17 180:8	refining 41:4
84:13	rarely 113:13	143:8,9 145:6,8	recommending	reflected 17:10
Questar 2:22 61:6	rate 20:12 67:7	165:3 167:3	73:1	regarding 15:11

62:15 117:13	remember 16:2 83:12	182:4	153:3	rights 31:1 132:7
regardless 164:15 194:14	remind 12:17 13:22 108:21	requires 44:16 93:2	reviewing 120:20 180:5	right-of-way 22:4
regards 10:9 178:4	rename 145:10	requiring 45:21	reviews 78:2	ringmaster 5:19
Region 8:5	renewal 128:12	reroute 27:22	revised 188:21	risk 9:3 31:11,12 87:12 123:13,19 124:19 142:15 147:14
Regional 24:19	repair 35:7	research 102:21 122:21	revision 189:6	risk-ranking 21:16 21:20 28:6 31:9 31:15
Register 148:3,5	repeat 155:11	researchers 76:12	rewrite 94:15	Road 1:20
regrets 10:5	repeating 184:20	reserve 31:1	re-GPS 41:7	Robert 2:7 9:15
regulate 21:12 52:11	replace 77:8 92:8 142:5	resolve 38:19 39:2	re-GPSed 41:15	Rocky 10:21 125:6
regulating 45:1 51:1	replaced 55:22	resound 106:18	rich 10:20 120:15 125:4,5 126:11,12 129:5 179:13	Rodney 10:8
regulation 45:20 50:17 72:9 89:6	replacement 79:11 142:12,21	resources 87:21 92:12 131:19	RICHARD 2:5,8 2:11	role 148:13
regulations 8:12,13 8:17 71:17 102:2 161:17 173:7 180:20 181:10,12	replacing 125:16 142:16	respectful 13:20	Richmond 10:13 126:10 127:8,17 129:12	roll 127:5 138:15
regulations.gov 14:6	replicate 34:11,20	respond 21:12 89:4 90:20 133:2	Rick 11:9 35:20 36:1 54:20,21 120:14 124:12 125:3	rolling 51:10 60:20
regulator 48:17 91:9 92:17	report 3:21 25:20 26:5,20 59:19 60:1 152:3,15,20 156:11 157:5 171:3 180:14	responders 19:5 27:8 28:10 178:7 187:13	responding 28:14	rolls 128:13
regulators 144:15 182:21	reported 160:16 163:22 165:5,6	response 38:1 64:9 85:17 171:7,13 188:3 189:12 192:13 200:19	response 38:1 64:9 85:17 171:7,13 188:3 189:12 192:13 200:19	Ron 2:9 8:2,20,21 38:9,15 54:1 118:15,16 120:12
regulatory 5:22 9:11 21:13 45:14 46:19 83:21 101:1 132:11 180:8	reporter 13:2	responsive 132:18	rid 156:7	Ron's 44:10 53:22
rehydro 112:1	reporting 60:1	rest 68:11 147:19	right 5:12,13 13:18 14:14 16:2,14 20:16 33:9 34:7 36:16 37:12 40:18 41:3 42:11 46:22 47:4 51:20 55:17 60:16 63:6 66:8 66:18 74:12 80:1 82:16 88:6 92:6 95:17 110:11 113:13 119:12 121:16 122:17,22 127:10 128:11 129:22 132:1 135:3 137:8 143:21 144:13 145:14 151:11 155:10 157:21 163:9,14 166:4 168:3 171:2 178:6 183:5,6,6 189:18 192:19 198:11,16 200:22	room 16:22 69:17 73:16 77:13 82:13 83:6 120:21 137:19 190:2,4
reins 5:18	reports 25:16 26:11,15 74:8 119:6 152:21 153:6,13 154:20 155:17 185:16,20	restraints 92:14	rough 190:14	roughly 173:12,17
relate 163:16	representation 183:8	restricted 198:14	round 31:5,6 53:18 93:7	route 36:17 45:4 51:4
related 116:18 122:13 135:5 155:4	represented 146:19	restrooms 14:13	route 36:17 45:4 51:4	routes 45:6 49:12
relating 192:1	reprojection 52:22	resubmit 157:5	roughly 173:12,17	routine 44:5
relatively-low 122:8	request 105:5 148:7 194:9	resubmitting 105:9	round 31:5,6 53:18 93:7	RP 173:9 180:22 181:9,10,13
releasable 33:8	requesting 37:17	result 18:22 141:10 142:13	route 36:17 45:4 51:4	rude 185:1
released 33:2,18 52:18	require 92:8 156:19 165:1	results 31:10 42:6 79:6 97:13 173:14 173:20 174:4 175:1 178:21	rules 13:15 94:15 119:8 194:15,20	rule 13:19 199:20
reliability 19:4	required 39:6 176:12	retaining 143:16	rulemaking 80:21 95:5 116:4 136:17 137:5 148:6	rulemaking 80:21 95:5 116:4 136:17 137:5 148:6
rely 27:16 55:19	requirement 45:14 80:13 121:9 127:10 128:2	retest 111:19	rules 13:15 94:15 119:8 194:15,20	run 7:9 40:2 43:11 51:22 77:2 79:3,8 123:5 124:4 135:12 139:9
relying 129:5	requirements 54:9 101:2,13 180:7,8	retire 94:18	run 7:9 40:2 43:11 51:22 77:2 79:3,8 123:5 124:4 135:12 139:9	
remaining 100:7 162:10		retirement 94:10 199:2		
remains 148:16		return 171:20		
Remarks 3:2		returned 152:1		
		revenue 127:10 128:1		
		review 77:16,20 78:3,6,8 80:3 82:2	righthand 104:4 169:6	

149:6 running 6:4 21:18 111:11 149:5 runs 23:9,11 158:12 rupture 122:8 133:22 ruptures 134:5,5 rural 57:22 R&D 148:16	94:6 109:8 110:18 114:22 115:16 129:7 147:5,18 says 23:9 107:18 scale 23:8 scenario 108:8 scenarios 118:3 schedule 188:19 scheduled 10:7 schedules 35:7 150:20 201:12 scheduling 31:21 32:2 scientists 84:12 scope 181:6 Scott 1:19 scratching 161:13 screen 73:20 74:17 78:11 152:11 screening 74:12 78:12 screw 148:9 screwed 104:17 seam 72:20 75:17 75:20 77:21 81:10 81:11 115:17 133:16 134:12 seam-type 89:11 seat 5:5 second 5:17 24:3 27:10 30:15 31:8 40:13 64:15 87:7 98:20 125:21 177:14 179:9 181:12 191:11 Secretary 10:8 18:20 199:15,19 section 79:12 140:13 163:19 sections 77:17 security 13:14 21:2 37:13 62:15,16,21 62:22 63:1,4,7 security-sensitive 21:5 see 14:2 22:10,11 22:15 23:10 27:11	31:11,12 37:7,10 37:14 48:19 56:4 56:15 58:14 60:22 62:5,21 63:9,15 66:5 70:3,4,6 71:6 73:15 74:5 75:8 76:16 78:3 79:3 80:3 82:6,19 83:10 85:17 94:10 96:14 106:19,20 106:22 110:14 129:13 139:3 140:10 144:14 146:17 147:2,12 155:22 158:6,14 159:7,20 161:19 163:10 164:16 166:4 169:5 172:6 183:11 184:19 196:5 seeing 18:12 99:15 115:21 171:18 174:2,4 175:1,5 178:10 188:4 189:13 seen 69:2 117:12 122:18 147:9,19 181:2 185:19 segment 78:1 90:3 171:2 segments 66:14 73:20,22 segregated 170:11 select 76:17 selection 135:8 selective 134:12 selects 199:19 self-awareness 186:21 send 197:4,16 sends 10:9 129:4 sense 39:21 51:11 63:7 88:20 90:15 102:4 147:14 181:4 sensitive 33:10 65:10 149:15	150:16 193:12 200:11 sent 148:7 separate 20:7 110:5 139:1,2,8 146:5 171:4 separating 138:21 September 80:1 136:21 serial 139:4 series 158:12 serious 123:3 seriously 123:21 serve 201:8 service 5:20 10:2 31:3 84:3,20 93:20 124:1,8 126:3,17 128:18 143:2 150:19 201:16,21 session 5:15 6:16 sessions 179:10 set 52:8 54:8 68:4 127:15 184:22 sets 170:18 setting 49:19 124:21 147:12 187:12 seventies 5:11 17:16 159:6 seven-and 25:17 sexier-sounding 84:20 sexy 93:19 shape 131:12 share 31:10 96:6 110:4 183:19 shared 25:7 shareholders 144:6 sharp-edged 102:11 sheet 77:11 Shipping 200:9 shivers 129:4 shocking 186:18,19 shooting 22:1 194:5	short 69:9 191:7 show 7:17 19:15 29:1 69:18 70:2 99:20,21 101:10 101:11 102:3 148:8 162:18 showed 36:16,18 38:11,17 100:21 113:1 shown 13:16 162:1 166:17 shows 93:15 157:10 163:3 166:10 167:21 168:1 side 38:16 56:20 69:17 71:13 73:15 77:13 83:6 120:5 127:15 146:15 148:18 169:6 sides 111:10 significant 95:14 111:4 152:14 163:1,10 similar 17:12 161:20 162:12 simple 44:14 simplification 59:18 simplify 25:16 26:6 simplifying 59:22 simplistic 98:8 sincere 25:3 single 40:7 45:10 90:19 97:11 single-digit 45:17 sit 91:5 136:22 194:18 site 81:18 siting 129:11 sits 20:6 sitting 42:14 141:2 situ 75:11 situation 117:3 122:6 situations 54:10 88:17 118:4 six 18:8 116:1
--	---	--	---	---

sixties 159:8	148:14 149:1	123:22	103:3 143:10	Steve's 112:11
size 70:2 158:14,19 158:21 174:3	199:11	spend 177:15	172:12 174:18	stewardship 19:4
sizes 170:7	somebody 52:13	spending 120:20	187:17	stick 150:22
skills 191:14	97:14	spent 25:7 55:6	started 5:4 48:13	stood 104:11
skip 109:17	somewhat 17:12	172:13	61:2 69:7,16	stop 38:1 128:7
SkyTruth 56:6	92:13 137:16	spike 72:5 76:22	71:14 131:1	149:20
Slater 10:8	141:3	79:10 80:6,8	183:10	straight 140:9
slices 153:21 171:4	soon 118:21 150:17	88:10,12,19 89:5	starting 8:2 56:5	straw 69:9
slide 38:10,17	157:3	89:9,13,14,15	103:5 121:9	strength 75:16
73:19 180:18	sorry 38:13 41:22	90:5 102:6,9	137:19 178:21	100:7 117:10
slides 158:12	42:1 49:5 106:10	110:3 118:2 149:4	starts 104:4	159:12 164:5
163:15 169:13,16	106:12 136:2	spill 182:12	state 17:11 19:10	strengthen 28:8
182:9	169:11 196:21	spit 26:9,16	36:13,15,17,20	181:19
slightly 20:8	200:13	spoke 25:10 48:12	37:3,4,6,8,17,18	strengthened 21:17
slipping 12:19	sort 58:17 66:6	112:22	41:8 43:3 55:6,8	strengthening
small 11:18 60:16	68:18 95:2 108:7	spot 58:21 200:10	63:20 121:17	174:7
103:8 142:8 180:2	133:11 135:4	spring 17:22	146:19 172:13	stress 118:9 134:12
180:17	148:21 152:13	stability 72:16	stated 143:8	165:11 166:21
smaller 53:10,11	164:11	stable 72:19 167:12	statement 160:7	stress-tested 135:7
179:11	sorted 186:3	stacks 166:7	185:4	striding 51:20
smart 73:2 124:14	sorts 91:22 170:7	Stacy 196:2	states 37:21 95:17	strike 34:17 35:17
168:8	sounds 44:14 45:12	Stacy's 196:12	146:17 148:17	struggle 176:20
smartest 137:18	56:12	Staff 94:18	172:20 173:17,21	struggling 174:9
SMYS 21:19 72:14	source 34:6	stake 49:6 96:7	185:14,15	studies 99:22
74:22 89:16,18	sources 46:7 56:7	stakeholder 175:12	state's 34:17	study 126:21
90:10,15 107:22	south 190:20	176:4 179:3,15	station 20:5 23:11	stuff 47:12 48:19
110:9,10 127:2	spatial 61:7	stakeholders 19:6	23:11,22 61:13	49:3 51:15 54:4
159:15,20 164:7	speak 91:10 142:1	175:20 176:2,3	100:22 129:11	68:7 97:16 100:12
164:11,11,13,15	speakers 71:7,9	179:2,12 182:17	stations 23:9,18	103:4 104:1
164:18,20 165:11	119:18	182:21 183:6,11	61:10,14,18	107:16 117:19
165:16 166:21	speaking 13:2	stand 62:8 191:10	status 162:3	139:16 149:19
167:3,7 170:12	special 165:13	standard 45:11	stay 51:3 94:2	190:18
snap 62:1	167:8	54:13,17 55:4	steady 159:9	Stursma 2:10
snapshot 66:10	specialized 183:14	standardized 177:4	Steam 9:3	10:17,17 36:7,9
183:2	specific 18:18	standards 9:19	steel 159:15	38:3 185:11
society 34:18	31:14 42:17 43:18	16:19 17:9,18	step 55:14 64:7	style 196:12
software 44:4	43:19 79:17	18:11 59:16 83:22	70:8,9,9 78:8,11	subject 150:5 201:5
sold 66:18	102:11	84:9 189:4	124:17 128:3	subjected 151:4
sole-source 34:6	specifically 19:2	standing 48:2	179:22 181:19	submeter 38:20
solid 94:4 155:5	134:8 180:20	104:16 120:19	188:6	39:10,22 45:16
soliloquies 7:1	187:1	Starbucks 14:10	stepping 120:10	47:16 49:15 50:16
soliloquy 131:22	specifications	start 20:20 25:20	steps 77:14,14 78:5	51:3 52:5
solution 85:22 95:7	79:19 80:13	45:17 46:3 50:20	78:7,16,19	submission 18:1
solutions 66:3 67:6	specified 159:11	51:5 53:6,8,12,13	Steve 3:18 6:17	26:7
solve 85:21 116:22	specs 80:7,14	56:3 57:9 58:11	67:20 68:9 69:5	submissions 17:19
117:6 124:20	Spectra 50:6 94:22	83:3 93:20 100:5	69:20 82:5 103:1	18:9 20:10
	spectrum 123:17	100:16 101:15	106:9,18 114:19	submit 18:3,7 43:1

54:18 90:11 109:3 109:10 submittal 45:11 submitted 106:5 108:13 126:19 153:6 Subpart 76:21 90:12 subset 119:18 substantive 93:11 success 25:22 successes 179:5 successful 60:19 successfully 103:2 sudden 100:22 Sue 9:18 29:13,15 106:14 109:11,13 198:17 200:14 Suffice 93:22 sufficient 85:1,6 suggest 106:4 151:6 suitable 21:6 summaries 180:5 summary 155:6 supplemented 153:14 supplied 121:1 126:5 supplies 34:7 supply 34:4 129:6 130:10 support 28:5 50:1 59:8,22 87:14 120:5 142:22 198:6 sure 14:17 59:13 63:13 76:1 93:13 95:21 108:6 109:9 114:2 125:13 149:11 151:8 153:11 176:1 177:17 179:20 181:17 193:16 197:10 surprise 124:22 surround 37:18	survey 44:17 58:14 surveys 128:9 Susan 2:6 187:10 190:3 swathe 19:16 switch 110:16 sympathetic 145:4 sympathies 143:6 sympathize 104:10 system 3:9 15:19 26:13,16 41:1 55:18 60:4 66:14 66:18 122:9 128:16 146:8,10 147:9,10 153:4 168:21 173:22 systems 30:2,6 40:16 49:14 52:3 system's 93:16	127:13,14 130:19 146:7 155:1 168:7 172:10 179:4 180:1,13,17 talked 6:6 15:16 24:17,18 25:8 28:6 30:2 46:6 61:7 113:4 160:4 168:2 188:20 talking 12:10 20:2 34:12 37:3 44:22 45:13,17 47:8 58:18 66:4 84:2 105:21 108:20 109:21 113:10 115:10 127:5 130:1 145:20 148:21 151:3 169:16 175:11 195:10 talks 24:4 27:10 164:14 tank 20:10 tanks 20:13 target 45:12 49:20 50:10 58:20 80:19 targeted 156:21 172:16 task 122:5 tasks 130:8 TBD 110:14 111:2 111:2 130:22 technical 83:16 88:6 93:4,8 96:4 97:18 technically 184:5 technology 16:9 18:15 26:1 44:15 54:4,6 73:12 76:5 84:11 148:13,14 148:22 149:10 168:14 182:16 tell 32:3 34:19 38:6 48:3,3 104:13 115:6,12 118:19 138:1 170:12,15 170:16 188:13	telling 69:3 160:17 tells 6:12 ten 105:22 108:12 tend 43:16 tendency 116:20 tenets 96:11 tent 14:1 184:5 tentatively 182:10 term 73:18 83:22 84:6,14,16 85:7 90:19 98:12 199:12 terminology 83:18 85:9 terms 19:11 124:7 terrain 49:16 terrible 124:22 terribly 34:2 terrified 56:17 Terry 2:15 57:14 59:5,8 61:11 test 70:13 72:5,11 72:11,17 74:21 75:10,15 76:21,22 77:1 79:7,10 80:7 80:8 86:15 88:10 88:12,19 89:5,9 89:16 90:5 99:9 99:10,19 101:11 101:17 102:6,9,10 103:6 105:13 108:3 111:13 113:8 115:1 117:18 118:2,6 119:16 122:19 123:10 140:4,16 146:12 154:5 160:11,18 161:1,4 161:10 162:19 163:2,5,6,11 164:5,9 165:8,20 166:11,15 167:17 191:17 tested 71:22 98:16 111:16 114:13,14 117:17 162:21 164:6 167:13	168:4 testify 122:18 testimony 121:1 testing 71:17,18 73:12 75:12 77:5 96:16,16 104:12 110:3 114:3 122:16 126:4,15 126:22 164:14 tests 102:17 107:2 107:21 119:19 139:21 149:5 162:14 165:1 167:22 Texas 11:14 text 27:3 th 139:15 158:13 thank 5:5 14:11 15:1 29:5,7,20 32:11 57:1,11 58:22 59:1 60:10 61:3 62:3 64:2,3 64:10,13 67:8,12 67:16 82:4 85:10 104:20 108:9 109:12 112:5 116:6 120:12,17 126:6,7 129:15 137:7 138:8 140:17,19 143:15 149:22 150:19 152:5 169:20 171:18 184:1,2,11 185:7,8 187:20,21 188:16 189:9,13 189:15 192:8 201:1,5,10,16,20 thankfully 14:9 thanks 25:3 38:3 39:15 46:2 52:16 54:16 60:11 89:3 112:7 114:18 118:14 125:2 151:11 186:4 196:18 theater 118:20 172:7
--	--	--	--	--

theme 160:1 184:20	67:2,5 68:16 85:20 86:10 87:10 87:22 88:11,12 90:16,20 95:8,12 96:1,3,11,13,17 97:20,21 98:7,9 98:13,18,20 99:4 99:6,20 100:4,10 100:14,17 101:6 103:4,11,19,22 104:7,18,22 106:14 107:11 108:1 111:7 112:16,18 113:8 113:17,21 114:9 114:12,16 116:20 117:18 119:11,21 121:10 122:2 123:6 124:2,9,11 124:16,20 125:4 126:21 128:5 131:20 132:2,15 138:17 139:15,19 140:6 141:4,7,14 141:20 143:7,20 144:21,22 145:4,5 145:13,16,21 147:1,7,13,16 150:1,15 155:19 156:7 165:14,21 175:17 177:14 178:11,14 182:9 184:19 185:13 186:10 187:5,8,15 187:16 189:5,18 190:21 191:9 195:22 196:5 199:1 200:8	116:9 197:1,13 thousand 166:1 thousands 39:8 threat 123:16 threatening 94:18 threats 100:9 122:14 three 72:3 81:1 97:6,22 115:5 152:22 154:12,14 162:17,18 163:9 179:11 threshold 157:4 thrilled 191:19 ties 18:16 tie-in 58:1 TIF 149:6 tight 53:12 tighten 19:12 53:17 147:8 tightened 157:6 tighter 39:12 Tim 11:5 time 6:22 7:13 11:21 12:7,9,15 12:17,22 13:5,7 17:11,13 18:9 26:8 29:5 33:13 37:11 41:7,15 46:11 49:4 57:19 66:11,22 68:12,15 80:9 83:20 84:15 92:21 97:5,6 99:18 103:19 111:19 112:19 120:8,20 125:14 127:21 129:2,8,22 136:6 145:13 148:12 150:19 151:1 153:2,3 175:21 177:15 183:6 189:11 190:8 192:16,22 193:3 199:8 200:20 201:12 timeframe 41:16 81:13	timeframes 80:19 81:5 126:14 139:3 139:10 timeline 20:14 94:9 timelines 93:4,5,12 timely 178:7 times 46:12 72:12 72:18 111:16 118:6 163:2 timing 12:16 89:20 TIMOTHY 2:5 today 6:3,5,9 10:4 11:18 12:3 15:18 23:18 30:3 47:14 109:22 128:6 136:1,20 145:19 174:17 today's 101:1,13 155:10 Todd 2:4 10:15 told 100:20 101:1 121:15 148:4 tolerance 39:12 40:22 41:10 tolerances 51:14 tool 37:10 78:22 149:6 tools 37:5 44:3,4,6 149:6 top 40:2 51:17 52:3 58:12 141:8 166:7 topic 117:8 141:8 171:11 topics 12:10 151:5 total 153:8 154:13 155:8 156:14,22 157:8,13,17 158:1 158:5 161:9,21 164:17 168:9 173:13,17 185:13 totally 32:19 touch 157:3 touched 62:16 tough 58:20 122:5 190:19 town 5:9 trace 27:14	tracking 27:19 66:15 tracks 27:20 traction 104:9 trade 83:21 195:5 traditionally 157:7 157:11 tragedy 119:5 trailer 184:2 train 100:21 190:16 transcribed 14:5 transcribing 12:21 transformation 43:12 transformed 43:9 transmission 3:21 17:5 30:4 71:20 74:14,15 91:13 111:11,14 119:3 122:9 128:15 152:2,15 153:1 156:14,15,22 157:9,13 158:1 162:6 167:2 168:10 transmission-by-... 159:19 transparent 130:18 TRANSPORTA... 1:1 travels 201:22 treat 72:18 tree 97:21 196:3,7 196:12 trees 198:10,12 tremendous 84:8 119:12 triage 91:20 tried 146:4 148:11 150:16 184:6 200:4 trivial 49:14 troubling 159:13 trudge 150:12 true 39:19 43:15 107:17
------------------------------	--	--	--	--

trust 11:4 71:10 124:13 137:10 150:4	type 21:15 66:7 70:14 75:17,20 89:22 90:3,4 133:17 134:19 137:5	165:12	140:4,15	visit 15:10 29:19 187:9
truth 121:15	types 48:6 86:20	unknowns 166:22	validate 75:12 109:5	visited 25:3 173:5
try 6:7 12:20 13:6 39:11 51:17 59:11 59:20 86:12 100:9 101:4 102:8 108:19 136:3 144:18	typical 5:8	unnecessary 90:15	validity 35:13	vote 6:9 12:14,15 194:16
trying 7:12 26:6 40:15 51:10,21 55:7 85:21 93:7 97:19 101:7,21 102:13 111:13 112:1 116:10,21 116:22 117:6 122:3 138:14,19 139:6 153:11 156:2,6 177:21 186:11 194:18 197:10	typically 44:18	unsympathetic 130:21 131:11	valuable 183:16	votes 12:13
TSA 21:6 33:16 62:18	<hr/> U <hr/>	untenable 190:13	value 40:4	vulnerable 37:13
tunnel 48:18	ultimately 125:11	upcoming 172:10	value-add 99:4	<hr/> W <hr/>
tunnel-in 48:16	uncomfortable 110:8,15 111:1 137:17	update 4:9 33:12 33:16 35:1 153:14 156:9 169:17,18 171:22 172:8 188:21	valve 128:7	waiting 182:2
turn 12:1 29:10 64:11 67:14 82:3 134:9 143:13 149:21 171:8 188:4 192:5 201:9	underestimation 111:4,8	updated 48:15 106:6 115:14	valves 75:22	walk 8:1 93:14
turning 5:18	undergoing 178:22	updates 94:16 151:2	variability 177:1	Waller 187:10
TV 188:10	underneath 199:17	upfront 177:17	variables 97:9	want 6:7,17,21 10:5 12:17 13:18 14:16 15:22 24:14 26:3 26:4 27:13 33:22 47:13 48:22 55:10 55:21 59:8 62:7 64:5,21 65:1 66:16 69:1 70:1 77:3 82:6 93:12 95:8 101:17 103:18 106:17 108:6 109:17 110:17 113:2 119:14 122:16 123:14 124:6 125:8,15,15 129:19 130:6 139:3 141:6 146:5 146:14 148:20 174:7 181:3,20 185:2 192:7 193:15 194:7,13 194:19 197:12
TVC 100:21 101:3 101:21	underpins 109:21	uploading 185:16	variance 186:1	wanted 6:15 18:2 36:3 64:16 67:7 68:12 105:1 107:10 131:9 132:9 141:22 156:1 158:18 172:8,12 174:11 175:7 177:8 180:2 181:15 182:12 184:10,16 188:17 189:22 193:2 200:2
twice 69:1 111:16	understand 46:4 47:6,11 52:19 53:17 61:19 65:12 66:9 89:5 93:13 94:17 97:18 103:16 110:20 121:6 130:7 131:12 144:20 186:13	upper 118:9 137:18 157:21	variation 177:5 178:11	
two 5:15 22:18 23:1 25:7 29:18 35:11 70:22 71:1 81:1 97:5,22 101:3 104:12 129:5 146:18 151:5 153:17 172:14 187:19	understanding 55:3 111:22	urban 111:12	variety 49:1	
two-and-a-half 172:14	understands 111:20	urge 125:13,18	various 88:15 153:22 158:13 179:2	
two-day 179:4	understatement 91:11	urgency 35:13	vast 53:3,3	
	understood 84:7 103:20 196:17 197:7	use 23:18 27:3 32:4 32:9 36:11 37:9 44:4 47:14 52:1 57:7 59:11 60:6 79:20 87:8,15 101:4 107:18,19 137:19 157:7,11 157:16 197:6	verification 3:15 67:20 69:6 71:15 73:5 75:21 80:14 83:19 110:6	
	undertaking 94:14 95:13 130:20	USGS 51:13	verifications 76:4	
	undo 148:20	USGS-based 53:2	verifies 80:18	
	uninformed 64:22 65:1	usual 152:22	verify 88:16 163:20 109:2	
	unique 88:16	usually 23:19 97:13	verifying 86:2,22	
	unit 23:13 24:4	Utilities 10:19,21	versa 65:5	
	United 95:17	Utility 6:1 10:13	versus 31:12 51:22 121:12	
	units 57:20	U.S 1:1 7:20 9:13 97:2	vertical 50:20 51:5	
	unknown 159:13	<hr/> V <hr/>	vice 9:2,12,19 10:2 65:5 71:8	
		vacation 69:8,10	vicinity 129:12	
		valid 56:19 88:2 99:9,12 139:20	view 36:16,18,22 46:9 68:18 130:14 191:4 197:20	
			viewer 37:9,15 60:21	
			viewpoint 73:9	
			views 68:14 153:21	
			vintage 86:9 87:1	
			violation 39:13	
			Virginia 1:21	
			vision 62:19	

wants 106:15 195:14	170:5 179:19	151:9,14 171:14	190:7 193:13	years 15:17 25:18
Warner 2:22 61:5 61:5	websites 16:3	189:22 192:21	workload 92:12	25:19 47:22 55:6
washes 108:4	Wednesday 70:17 105:7 136:19	193:9,21 194:2,5	works 55:19	81:1 84:7 85:7
Washington 5:8 55:6	160:5	195:12 196:7,11	107:14 132:11	90:17 94:16 99:13
wasn't 34:1 58:1 114:14 148:9	week 120:22 122:3 124:10 155:16	196:17,21 198:1,5	152:6	99:22 101:3
waste 87:21,21	weekend 7:14	198:11 199:7	workshop 6:19 7:7	102:20 104:13
wasted 104:14	weigh-in 68:16	201:10	71:4 76:8 79:21	116:1 139:5
water 33:11 34:3,4 34:7	Weimer 2:10 11:2 11:2 32:13,13	willingness 56:15	126:20 136:19	142:15 145:15
Watson 200:2,3,5	137:9,9 138:4,9	window 161:5	146:3 175:3 179:1	157:10 160:12
wave 191:11	146:13 198:18	Winnie 175:2	179:4,17 180:1,12	172:14 175:21
way 14:14 24:6 27:9 28:10 42:21	199:5	wish 116:10 121:16 122:4	work-in 141:15 173:21	176:10 177:12,22 181:14
44:15 46:19 51:4	welcome 5:8,14 197:9	withdrew 200:15	worldwide 85:7	yelled 114:6
69:20 77:3 91:1	welding 191:22 192:1	wonder 90:8	worn 171:14 192:14	yesterday 10:6 12:19 99:10
91:19 95:22 98:19	well-informed 34:2	wonderful 140:2	worried 134:2,3	103:14 104:12
98:19 103:17,22	well-taken 47:7 116:5	wondering 24:9 32:22 104:16	worry 48:5 86:18 113:12	112:22 197:1
104:6 109:6	went 24:16 36:15 74:11 102:21	198:21 199:6	worrying 101:15	yes/no 98:16
115:18 118:8	148:3 151:16,16	word 42:11	worse 35:8 147:16	yield 97:13 118:8 159:12 189:21
123:17 127:20	157:4 173:3	words 71:18 73:17 73:21 75:4 76:5	Worsinger 2:11 10:20,20 125:5,5	
130:18 131:11	186:21	77:1 80:15,20	worst 91:20 116:20 117:4	Z
136:4 139:21	weren't 6:19	95:11 116:12	worst-case 117:2	Zamarin 2:12 9:6,6 44:8,8 49:9 85:13
140:15 143:3	Westin 1:19 70:17	154:21	worth 68:6	85:13 90:7 106:8
146:6 147:11	We'll 83:10	work 7:11 19:7 35:16 37:20 48:7	wouldn't 111:17	106:12 112:7,8
148:21 149:17	Whetsel 2:23 8:16 8:16	50:2 51:19 52:7,9	wrapping 20:15 173:20	zero 95:10 103:21 103:22
162:8 168:2 196:1	whispering 42:8	56:21 57:17 59:10	wraps 29:4	\$
Wayne 2:6 140:22 201:11	Whoops 82:21	67:11 78:13 79:2	Wright 2:12 9:9,9 91:3,3 94:8	\$10 121:22
ways 27:2 55:11 88:16 123:3	wide 117:5 194:20	92:2 93:3,7 94:11	write 59:15	\$14 142:6
130:13 143:20	widely 17:17 87:11	104:6 114:4	writing 24:16	\$2 121:22
153:21 177:16	width 61:21	124:18 125:18,18	written 16:19 136:17 149:14	\$20 142:6
180:13 181:5	Wiese 2:15 3:4,13 3:16 5:3 7:18	131:17,18 146:22	176:8 177:16	\$23 127:3
183:5 190:22	8:20 11:15 30:22	150:9 152:7	wrong 31:13	\$32 127:9
weaknesses 117:12	31:6,19 33:21	182:10 183:22		\$325 127:6,21
weather 5:9	46:21 57:12 64:13	188:21 191:13	X	1
web 17:20 37:5 154:18 156:10	67:21 68:2 69:12	201:4,6,17	X 180:20	1 71:15 152:1 161:9
webcast 70:19,20	70:22 82:12,17,21	worked 57:16 59:19 135:17		1st 105:16 153:5 154:17
webinars 144:18	83:8 85:2 92:18	190:3 191:2	Y	1.1 72:12 107:2 115:1 163:1,6,12
website 33:9 138:3 153:19 155:14	108:17 120:10	working 21:6 47:21 52:12 56:3 94:3,4	year 26:13,14 27:20 66:11 128:8	164:9 165:8,20
157:10 169:19	129:16 132:6	152:9 176:14	135:20 152:18	166:11,16,17
	143:15 150:14	180:3,10,17 181:7	172:22 182:11	1.25 72:17 162:21 166:15 167:13,17
		181:17 182:8	189:4	
		183:9,13 186:9		
		187:6,8 189:7,17		

167:22 168:4
1.5 111:16 118:6
10 25:18 53:14
102:20 178:8
10,000 34:4 35:17
10-minute 151:7
10-to-36 159:2
10-to-36-inch
158:15
10:49 151:16
100 39:9 41:11,12
89:17 142:15
100,000 127:9
100-percent 89:16
90:14
11 3:4 74:15
11:00 151:13
11:06 151:17
11:53 202:3
110 89:18
115 153:13
1162 173:9 180:22
181:9,10,13 182:1
188:22
12 162:10
1200 43:11
125 96:16 98:16
13 78:5
135 173:16
143 3:16
15 3:6,9,10 68:10
78:6,16 89:21
169:15 178:8
15th 152:22
15,000 156:17
15-minute 6:18 7:1
152 3:21
153 24:5
16 78:7,19 79:9,9
160 58:10
169 3:24
17 78:19 79:9,10
172 4:9,12
178 185:13
18 78:20,20
180 173:17
184 4:15

189 4:18
19 79:5
19,678 74:7
192 79:16
192.216 173:7
192.619 77:18
192.619(c) 72:10
105:12
195.440 173:7
1950 101:10
1960 101:9
1970 101:9 105:16
160:12
1998 16:1,2,4,6,12
16:16,18 17:10
60:4

2

2 44:1 67:18 73:20
74:17 161:9
20 78:7 139:5
159:18
20,000 105:16
157:17
20-inch 24:5
20-percent 110:10
2000s 159:9
2000/2001 17:20
2001 17:22
2002 18:6 33:14
2006 58:14
2007 59:19
2010 176:12
2011 32:16 71:16
153:7,8,10
2012 3:21 74:6,8
152:2,17,21 153:8
153:11 154:2
172:19
2013 1:12 18:12
20:18 182:11
2014 20:20 182:12
188:22
2015 20:22 195:10
2030 113:3,4
21 78:9,16 79:14
22,000 106:21

23 163:19
240 70:18
25 84:7 85:6 90:9
29 3:12

3

3 50:21 75:3 157:1
161:12 171:21
30 94:16 164:7,10
164:11,18,20
30-inch 122:10
30-percent 110:9
127:2
300 58:16 70:22
71:1
302 157:12
302,427 157:13
31 166:12
31st 155:15
313 185:13
32 153:6
32,000 105:20
3200 164:8 167:18
168:2
33,000 74:14
350 173:12
36,000 162:11

4

4 76:14 158:18
4.5-inch 158:18
40 90:17 99:13
168:9 169:7
40-50 99:22
400-pound 122:10
42 113:1,1
45 127:18

5

5 3:2,4 53:14
5-foot 49:5
50 23:11 39:9
137:18
50-percent 20:12
50-some 35:18
500 19:14 38:17
40:6,16 41:10
47:17 48:4 49:10

50:9,12 54:12
57:18 61:8
500-foot 19:16
22:16,18,19 47:22
53:8
54 23:11
5400 163:22
55 165:22
55,000 165:7
59 95:16 159:5

6

6 166:13 168:13
6,000 167:1
6.5 157:17
60-day 20:18
61-to-72-percent
159:21
619(a) 160:9
619(a)(3) 160:16,22
165:6 166:7
619(c) 105:17
106:20 107:3,9,14
107:19,20 161:3
165:5 166:8
619.83 160:5
64 3:13
65 160:21 161:6
66 10:16
67 3:15
68 3:16
69 3:18

7

7 3:8
7,000 159:14
7-11 24:1
7.5-minute 58:6
70 160:22 161:7
165:2
70,000 119:2
71 127:4
71,000 74:10
72 72:13 74:22
108:1 165:11,16
166:21 167:7
170:12
74 107:22

75 24:11
77 164:10,17,19

8

8 168:15
8-inch 168:12
8:30 1:21
8:33 5:2
80 24:11 142:15
167:7
801 1:20
83 3:20
88 157:22

9

9 1:12 70:8 78:11
9th 80:1 136:21
90 125:22
90,000 107:1
903 153:5
91,000 78:14 115:5
94 165:22
94,000 165:7

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Gas Pipeline and Liquid Pipeline
Advisory Committees

Before: US DOT

Date: 08-09-13

Place: Arlington, VA

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under
my direction; further, that said transcript is a
true and accurate record of the proceedings.



Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701