

**Public Meeting: Integrity Management in High Consequence Areas  
for Gas Transmission Pipelines**

**Friday, April 25, 2003  
8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST**

Marriot at Washington Dulles Airport  
45020 Aviation Drive, Dulles, VA 20166, [room #]  
Phone: (703) 471 - 9500

**Meeting Agenda**

08:00 a.m. **Welcome** ..... Stacey L. Gerard, Associate  
Administrator for Pipeline Safety

08:10 a.m. **Assessment:**  
Low Stress Pipeline ..... Bill Gute (OPS)  
..... Jim Wunderlin/George Mosinskis (Industry)  
..... Jim Anderson (State), Lois Epstein (Public)

*(1) Should assessment requirements for low-stress pipeline (i.e., operating at less than 30 percent SMYS) allow use of confirmatory direct assessment (CDA) for all assessments (baseline and reassessments)?  
Should Preventive and Mitigative requirements in Class 3 & 4 locations outside of impact circles be enhanced to provide added assurance?*

09:10 a.m. **Pressure Testing** ..... Linda Daugherty (OPS)  
Steve Rapp (Industry), Phil Sherr (State), Ted Lemoff (Public)

*(2) Should the requirement to pressure test pipeline to verify integrity against material and construction defects be limited to pipeline segments for which information suggests a potential vulnerability to such defects? If so, what information should be relied upon?*

09:30 a.m. **Direct Assessment** ..... Fred Joyner/Jim Merritt (OPS)  
..... Alan Eastman/Debbi DiMeo (Industry)  
..... (Don Sturmsma (State), Ted Wilke (Public)

*(3) Should the assessment intervals required for direct assessment be revised to be the same as those applicable to in-line inspection or pressure testing? Are there opportunities to quickly schedule and assess research demonstrations to provide additional data on which to base judgments about validity?*

10:30 a.m. **Plastic Pipe** ..... Lane Miller (TSI)  
.....Jim Wunderlin/Ben Andrews (Industry)  
.....Jim Anderson (State), Ted Lemoff (public)

*(4) What assessment requirements should be applicable to plastic transmission pipelines?*

10:45 a.m. **Break**

11:00 a.m. **Performance Measures:**

Realtime or periodic electronic reporting. . . . . Mike Israni/Stacey Gerard (OPS)  
Terry Boss/George Mosinskis (Industry)  
Don Stursma (State)  
Lois Epstein (Public)

*(5) - "Real time" reporting: Should we require monthly electronic reporting of performance measures?*

11:20 a.m. **Prevention and Mitigation:**

Third Party Damage ..... Zach Barrett (OPS)  
..... Andy Drake/ Mike Comstock (Industry)  
..... Bob Kipp(Public), Don Stursma (State)

*(6) Should additional third-party damage prevention methods be utilized instead of explicit assessments for third-party damage ? What methods should be used in conjunction with other assessment methods to detect delayed third party damage?*

Segments Outside HCAs ..... Stacey Gerard/Mike Israni (OPS)  
..... Andy Drake/ Mike Comstock (Industry)  
..... Don Stursma (State), Ted Wilke (Public)

*(7) How can the requirements be clarified for the situations when an operator should look beyond the segment in a high consequence area, when segments outside the HCA are likely to have similar integrity concerns as those found inside an HCA?*

12:20 p.m. **Lunch (On Own)**

01:20 p.m. **Repairs:**

Dents and Gouges ..... Zach Barrett (OPS)  
..... Dave Johnson (Industry)  
..... Don Stursma (State), Ted Wilke (Public)

*(8) Should a repair criteria for dents located on the bottom of the pipeline be different from that allowed for dents located on the top? Should the presence of stress risers or metal loss affect this decision?*

01:40 p.m. **Definitions:**  
High Consequence Areas (Bifurcation) . . . . . Mike Israni (OPS)  
Darren Moore/George Mosinskis (Industry)  
Phil Sherr (State), Ted Wilke (Public)

*(9) Should a rule allow two options: following the definition of high consequence areas defined by final rule on August 6, 2002;(67 FR 50824) or using potential impact circles along the entire length of the pipeline?*

02:00 p.m. **Break**

02:15 p.m. **HCA - Population Threshold** . . . . .Mike Israni (OPS)  
. . . .Darren Moore/George Mosinskis (Industry)  
. . . . .Phil Sherr (State), Ted Lemoff (Public)

*(10) Should the criterion for determining the population density component of a high consequence area be based on 10 or 20 buildings intended for human occupancy within the impact circle?*

02:45 p.m. **Impact Radius (C-FER)** .....Mike Israni (OPS)

*(11) Should additional safety margin be applied to the potential impact circle radius calculated using the C-FER equation?*

03:45 p.m. **Extrapolation (HCAs)**..... Mike Israni/Stacey Gerard (OPS)  
. . . . .Darren Moore/George Mosinskis (Industry)  
. . . . .Phil Sherr (State), Ted Lemoff (Public)

*(12) Should a rule allow an operator to use data regarding the number of buildings within 660 feet of the pipeline (available now to operators because of the existing definition of class locations) to infer (extrapolate) the building density in potential impact circles larger than 660 feet? Should this be limited to an interim period of five years to allow operators to collect additional data on buildings beyond 660 feet?*

04:00 p.m. **Adjourn:** Stacey Gerard