

PIPELINE & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
SAFETY ADMINISTRATION (PHMSA)

+ + + + +

VOLUNTARY INFORMATION-SHARING
WORKING GROUP

+ + + + +

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BEST PRACTICES

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 27, 2018

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met in the Westin
Arlington Gateway, 801 N. Glebe Road, Arlington,
Virginia, at 1:15 p.m., Eric Amundsen, Chair,
presiding.

PRESENT:

ERIC AMUNDSEN, Chair, Vice President, Panhandle
Energy/Energy Transfer Partners
AHUVA BATTAMS, PHMSA
KATE BLYSTONE, Outreach, Pipeline Safety Trust*
SHERRY BORENER, PHMSA
BRYCE BROWN, Vice President, Group Strategy
Management, The ROSEN Group
DIANE BURMAN, Commissioner, New York
State Public Service Commission
DAN COTE, Vice President of Pipeline Safety &
Compliance, NiSource Gas
MARK HERETH, Principal, Process Performance
Improvement Consultants
WALTER JONES, Associate Director of Occupational
Safety & Health, Laborer's Health & Safety
Fund of North America
MAX KIEBA, PHMSA
MIKE LAMONT, Vice President, Integrity Plus

PRESENT (Cont'd):

CHRIS MCLAREN, PHMSA

CHRISTIE MURRAY, PHMSA

JOE SUBSITS, Chief Pipeline Safety Engineer,
Washington Utilities and Transportation
Commission

CHRISTOPHER WARNER, Senior Vice President, Mears
Group, Inc.

* present via telephone

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

(1:20 p.m.)

1
2
3 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So, I guess we'll go
4 ahead and get started this afternoon. So,
5 welcome to the Best Practices Subcommittee.
6 We'll just follow the agenda that proved
7 successful this morning as we went through a
8 couple of the other subcommittees.

9 So we'll start with introductions. So
10 Eric Amundsen of Energy Transfer. I'll be your
11 chairman for the subcommittee. We'll just go
12 around the table here. So, Max?

13 MR. KIEBA: Max Kieba, PHMSA. I'm the
14 DFO for the subcommittee.

15 MR. HERETH: I'm Mark Hereth with the
16 Blacksmith Group.

17 MR. WARNER: Chris Warner with Mears
18 Group. I'm just sitting in, not officially on
19 this subcommittee.

20 MS. BORENER: Sherry Borener. I'm
21 also not on the subcommittee.

22 MS. BATTAMS: I'm Ahuva Battams, I'm

1 one of the attorneys from PHMSA. And my email
2 address is written, I think, on one of those
3 sheets of paper that's sitting out loose. But so
4 you can all wander over, if you want it, to email
5 Amal or myself if you have any legal questions
6 that come up, if you think of anything. Just
7 reach out to us and we will try to answer it.

8 (Off-microphone introductions.)

9 MR. BROWN: Bryce Brown of the Rosen
10 Group.

11 MR. MCLAREN: Chris McLaren, PHMSA.

12 MR. SUBSITS: Joe Subsits, I'm with
13 the Washington Utilities and Transportation
14 Commission.

15 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: And on the phone we
16 have Kate Blystone with Safety Trust. Anyone
17 else on the phone?

18 (No audible response.)

19 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay, so, welcome.
20 And, again, we appreciate everybody's commitment
21 of their time and efforts to this subcommittee.
22 One of the first steps here is maybe to get a

1 volunteer for the scribe. Unless we don't get
2 one from our subcommittee members, Max has
3 volunteered to do that.

4 Any volunteers? If not, Max, you got
5 it.

6 MR. KIEBA: I do.

7 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay. So today,
8 really, in keeping with kind of how the meetings
9 were progressed this morning, we'll just follow
10 this agenda. I think it did a good job of kind
11 of walking us through her task, which is, you
12 know, a presentation, a report out tomorrow with
13 the main goal to develop a task statement as well
14 as, you know, some considerations around that.

15 I want to speak to how we conduct the
16 subcommittee, you know, follow-up meetings and
17 working sessions that we'll have. Obviously, we
18 want to consider interfacing and collaborating
19 with some of the other subcommittees.

20 I think, through discussions this
21 morning, it became pretty obvious that there is a
22 lot of overlap, in particular between best

1 practices, process sharing, and the technology
2 committee.

3 So we'll want to be pretty deliberate
4 about how we do that going forward. And Mark and
5 Bryce and I have already kind of talked and we've
6 got some ideas about how we will do that.

7 So we also want to consider our
8 external member request for the subcommittee
9 which I think I've already identified. You know,
10 Cliff Johnson is one that important for him to be
11 a part of this subcommittee.

12 One of the things that we talked about
13 this morning, and I might just throw this up just
14 for quick reference here --

15 PARTICIPANT: Okay, it might disappear
16 for a little bit.

17 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: It's a context for
18 information sharing. So I thought I might just
19 run through this. I shared this with Mark. And
20 within the technology committee this morning, so
21 again, it just may be an attempt to kind of level
22 us out and get us all kind of our head wrapped

1 around this in a consistent way.

2 And what we talked about this morning
3 was kind of five different contexts for sharing
4 information, again, why are they with us, what's
5 the desired outcome or outcomes that we seek as a
6 working group.

7 And the first one, you know, is to
8 improve from an industry perspective, you know,
9 consistent/best in class application and
10 deployment of an existing technology.

11 So I'm talking about whether it be ILI
12 tools, direct assessment, hydrostatic testing, or
13 other methodology, you know, are all operators
14 within the industry at AA, at the same level.
15 You know, are they all getting the most out of
16 them, those assessment technologies.

17 How do we assure that, or is that
18 something that the Committee thinks we should
19 attempt to ensure, right? So again, really the
20 outcome there would be to put forth some
21 recommendations that would help, that process
22 help enable that floating all operator boats to

1 the same level.

2 And so again, the applicant is an
3 operator, operators deploy a comprehensive,
4 systematic, and integrated process and assure a
5 consistent level of performance from their
6 integrity assessments.

7 You know, we kind of had some
8 discussion this morning amongst, you know, Bryce
9 and Mike Bellamy with GE Baker, you know, they
10 identified best in class performance in the
11 industry. And I think the answer to that
12 question is yes. You know, and I think they can
13 probably articulate who and why and how those
14 operators get to that level of performance.

15 The notion is we want to get everybody
16 to that level of performance. So again, best
17 practices, process sharing, and technology. We
18 want to get the most out of what we do on a day-
19 in and day-out basis in each one of these kind of
20 sub-bullets.

21 So one, you know, we need to make sure
22 we're deploying the right technology for the

1 threat, understudy. We want to make sure that
2 the operator is specifying the data and
3 analytical approach to the ILI service provider,
4 as an example. So we want to make sure that
5 their specification is asking for the right
6 things in the right way.

7 We want to make sure that the service
8 provider, you know, is deploying the right sensor
9 technology, delivering in a consistent and
10 reliable way to the pipe, and then doing the
11 daily analytics and the reporting that
12 accomplishes this.

13 We want to make sure that the
14 operator, you know, when they receive that data
15 and those reports that they're integrating it
16 with their own in-house data in an optimal way.

17 And when they actually make decisions
18 about doing a direct assessment, we're going out
19 and actually doing excavations, an inspection of
20 the pipe that's done in a best way.

21 In the ditch measurement, again, very
22 important that we spend all this money to

1 characterize the pipe, make decisions about what
2 we go dig, and then we'll make sure that they're
3 doing the in the ditch measurements in the best
4 way possible and reporting that information back
5 to us as operators, and then in turn to our
6 service providers.

7 And then integrating all of that data,
8 you know, in the best way possible so again we
9 can get the most out of the tools that we deploy.
10 So yes, I think one of the things we need to
11 decide, this is important to this committee, so I
12 want to make sure that this is part of our
13 overall best practice recommendation. Any
14 discussion about that? Any comments?

15 MR. HERETH: These are really
16 overarching, these contexts that we have are
17 really overarching and sit above all the
18 subcommittees. They really belong at the
19 committee level. But I think they're really
20 helpful in creating the context or what the
21 subcommittees will do. Yes, I like it.

22 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So there's the notion

1 of how does this plug into what the subcommittees
2 do, you know, for the process sharing. Your
3 focus was on the data, you know, what data, what
4 information needs to be shared.

5 And so I think this kind of tells you
6 what information, you know, should be shared and
7 by who. So this is primarily operators and
8 service providers interaction or operator to
9 operator, potentially operator to regulator.

10 And so I think it helps define what
11 the data is, where it's sourced, who's it shared
12 with, how's the process improved, who are the
13 players.

14 So the next four contexts are here.
15 So next one is perfect existing technology.
16 Technological capabilities of the operator,
17 industry gap analysis, and collaboration.

18 So, you know, are there unique
19 situations out there where we can tweak the
20 technology, tweak the capability to address
21 problematic integrity issues such as, you know,
22 certain type of corrosion, morphology,

1 interacting threats.

2 So again, how do we work with service
3 providers and industry members to, you know, want
4 to be aware of how one may solve an issue that
5 the other hasn't solved yet. So I guess getting
6 back to that notion of best practice sharing, but
7 also going back and doing that planning check
8 process with our service providers.

9 Again, not developing new
10 technologies, but making sure that we've
11 perfected in getting the most out of what exists
12 today.

13 The third one is you're really driving
14 new or improved technology. So sensors, analytic
15 techniques. So again, identifying maybe some
16 gaps in existing technology or sensor performance
17 that would fill a gap in determining existing or
18 characterizing the existing threats.

19 Fourth one is identifying unique, you
20 know, albeit potentially low probability, high
21 consequence integrity threats and approaches to
22 assess those. Kind of addresses the, you know,

1 we don't know what we don't know, or could be
2 false negatives that we're trying to address
3 there.

4 So it's operator transparency in this
5 context to, you know, okay, I didn't expect to
6 find this threat or this particular issue on this
7 piece of pipe and sharing that to make others
8 aware, and the industry with similar
9 circumstances, similar vintage pipe, same
10 environments, you know, that they might also
11 expect to find something that they haven't found
12 yet. So just some transparency in that regard.

13 And then the last one, all of this
14 kind of leading ultimately to the improvement in
15 our transparency and ability to communicate, you
16 know, what industry's capabilities are to the
17 stakeholders outside of the industry and service
18 provider communities.

19 And again, with the intent being to
20 bolster confidence that we are deploying this
21 technology and that we don't have a wide range of
22 how that technology is deployed. We're all, you

1 know, deploying it at a very high level, getting
2 the most out of it.

3 And then we're also continually trying
4 to improve. I think those two points are really
5 targeted at this last, this last context is, you
6 know, how do we take all of this and tell a
7 better story than what we're telling today.

8 So it makes sense. So that is kind of
9 our context. I think we dive in then to, you
10 know, what are the best practices, what's the
11 data, you know, what's the technology that we
12 need to deploy, come up with, recommend for each
13 one of these opportunities.

14 Really almost can be part of our
15 ultimate report, you know, the report out of how
16 are we going to do the first one, how do we float
17 all those to the highest level, what are all of
18 the subcommittee's pieces of that. And then same
19 for the next four objectives.

20 Maybe we go to, and kind of work
21 together, kind of the accumulation of --

22 MR. KIEBA: Yeah, and then we'll

1 switch over to the draft statement that was sent
2 out to the subcommittee members. And when Eric
3 and I first talked about this once we, for one we
4 wanted to get a little refresher of some of the
5 discussions from all the previous meetings. So
6 some of that is rolled into this document for the
7 draft start.

8 So one thing we have to do is come up
9 with our overall task statement. Part of this
10 one was research and recommendations of best
11 practices to consider.

12 So certainly we want to come up with
13 our recommendations, but part of the discussion
14 Christy brought up too, but one function of the
15 subcommittee might be helping to do some research
16 for some of the other subcommittees, for instance
17 if they want to know what else is out there for
18 best practices in technology, this subcommittee
19 might help with that.

20 So that's how and why it's written
21 this way, but we're certainly open to any
22 suggestions for additional refinement. And what

1 we could do, we could just walk through this for
2 the general concepts of how we got to where we
3 are, and then we can go back and refine it as we
4 go along.

5 MS. BATTAMS: Can you make it bigger?

6 MR. KIEBA: Sure. Is that good,
7 bigger?

8 MS. BATTAMS: Thank you.

9 MR. KIEBA: Sure. So research
10 recommendations, certainly our primary mandate is
11 one of the key items of (c)(5), but we can
12 certainly potentially be relevant to others. So
13 if others think best practices could fit into one
14 of the others, for instance I saw some of the
15 other subcommittees certainly had more than one,
16 we could certainly pick the other mandate items
17 that might be relevant.

18 SMS alignment, this dropdown only gave
19 you one option, so primarily it's SMS-9 which is
20 incident investigation, evaluations, and lessons
21 learned. But I also underlined here as a pitch
22 for SMS-11 management review and continuous

1 improvement.

2 For the initial task purpose, this was
3 right out of the December 2016 meeting. Again,
4 through this meeting we'll certainly have to
5 refine this further. And I just pulled in some
6 discussion from the various transcripts from the
7 June meeting of what the thoughts were
8 surrounding this subcommittee.

9 I'll give people a chance to read.
10 Kate, you're able to see this on the screen too?

11 MS. BLYSTONE: I am not. It, for some
12 reason it's showing up black. I don't have any
13 actual -- I see that you're there. But there's
14 just black.

15 MR. KIEBA: Why don't you try it
16 again. Yes, it's in a document that was sent to
17 the subcommittee.

18 MS. BLYSTONE: Yes, I'll just take a
19 look there. That's fine. What page are you on?

20 MR. KIEBA: This is going to be Page
21 2. Yes, 2 of 5 under task purpose.

22 MS. BLYSTONE: Cool.

1 MR. KIEBA: And in November, talked
2 about development of innovative ways to share
3 information, lessons learned, and best practices
4 across the industry.

5 So from our perspective, hearing some
6 of the other subcommittees this morning, there
7 was a little bit certainly getting into the weeds
8 of trying to reinvent the wheel in some cases or
9 start from scratch. But then there was other
10 discussions that let's get a sense of what's
11 already out there but how can we improve on
12 what's out there.

13 So as part of that, we certainly want
14 to point to what's working, but also look at
15 areas that we need to improve. And part of that
16 improvement might be having, if there's a huge
17 gap out there, we might need to start from
18 scratch on something.

19 So I think relevant potentially to
20 this subcommittee is another part of what I saw
21 from some of these subcommittees are talking
22 about the different stakeholders group. So

1 certainly have industry regulators and then
2 serving the public.

3 And I think in these previous meetings
4 we talked about potentially it could have
5 different ways of how do you share information
6 within industry and with industry, how do you
7 share information with regulators and within the
8 regulator community, and then how do you share
9 information of what information should be shared
10 with the public. They could be different levels,
11 but I think that's part of some of this as well.

12 And then looking at the second bullet,
13 I think some of that pointed to some -- I think
14 this was from some of our pipeline safety trust
15 stakeholders that brought up this second bullet
16 of some of the discussions of what they would
17 like to see out of the working group. So I'll
18 just give folks a chance to read that.

19 And some of the nuances in the second
20 bullet was some of the subcommittee discussions
21 that even talk about breaking up the public into
22 different groups, for instance the local

1 communities, consumers, some of the
2 decisionmakers, workers, and others.

3 So some of that discussion this
4 morning went back and forth. You just call it
5 the public in general, do you just look at the
6 advocates, or are there different components of
7 who we're trying to -- the best practices of who
8 we're trying to reach out to.

9 So under task descriptions, certainly
10 this first one is pretty much pulled right from
11 the mandate. So if nothing else, what this
12 subcommittee has to do is something related to
13 that mandate item. We can certainly through our
14 discussions drill down further on how we want to
15 break that up even more.

16 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, my comment on
17 that particular statement is I think it's fairly
18 limiting. And you know, because it really speaks
19 to, you know, best practices related to
20 protecting any information or data we might
21 share.

22 It really doesn't speak to the broader

1 notion of, you know, being transparent and coming
2 to the table and voluntarily sharing lessons
3 learned, results of RCAs. Again, it really
4 doesn't speak to that, and I think the context
5 we're talking about it should and I think it
6 will.

7 So I think this statement again is,
8 needs to be, we can't change it, but I think it's
9 a part of what we would provide a recommendation
10 on. But I think our recommendation will go much
11 broader than this statement.

12 MR. COTE: Just an additional comment
13 on that from a mission and objectives standpoint.
14 The mission and objectives subcommittee
15 identified the target audience for the product of
16 the VIS Committee work to be operators,
17 ultimately operators.

18 That doesn't mean you can't be more,
19 it can't be more inclusive than that, but the key
20 users of this information and data will be
21 operators because they will take the data and
22 obviously assess it against their systems and

1 their particular data and their risks to identify
2 how to make improvements.

3 And that's the way actual pipeline
4 safety gang will be realized. We can't lose
5 sight of that. And of course, there's a lot of
6 people that are interested in that data.

7 Without my passing judgement on who
8 should get it and who shouldn't, the ultimate
9 audience has to be operators or nothing really
10 changes form a pipeline safety perspective.

11 MR. KIEBA: Yes. I agree with you.
12 I'm kind of interested here in Kate's thoughts
13 too because I do think there are some members of
14 the public that they want all the data. But
15 let's be realistic, we just can't for a variety
16 of reasons.

17 It could be security reasons, it could
18 be anti-trust reasons, we can't give everything
19 out. I'm sure there's even some limitations with
20 companies to share some information with each
21 other for anti-trust and other reasons.

22 Then there's something that maybe the

1 public doesn't, certain sectors of the public,
2 they don't want everything because it's just way
3 too much in the weeds or too technical. What I'm
4 interested to figure out through this process not
5 just with our subcommittee but overall is what
6 information does the public find reasonable.

7 MR. COTE: Well, the other concern
8 from a data input standpoint is if you are a
9 company who's basically volunteering to share
10 your data, and the airlines dealt with this by
11 making the carriers confidential or essentially
12 invisible.

13 But, I mean, if you have your name on
14 it, you're going to list your top 50 risks and
15 how you've scored them, obviously that's
16 information that may not be suitable for broad
17 distribution or people will be uncomfortable
18 doing it. And since the entire process is
19 voluntary anyway, that's the way to kill the
20 proverbial goose that lays the golden egg.

21 MR. KIEBA: Good point.

22 MR. HERETH: So why is it you would

1 not include the service providers in that
2 stakeholder group? So, you've listed operators.
3 Why would you not include service providers?
4 They're just as vital to that sharing and having
5 that information as the operators are, aren't
6 they?

7 MR. COTE: I think that varies from
8 industry segment to industry segment. So I
9 think, you know, if you take, I mean, if you look
10 at ILI specifically for example, or even
11 contractors who offer various direct assessments,
12 that's, both of those are pretty specialized.

13 You know, that's probably a fair
14 characterization. I mean, beyond that, that's
15 not nearly as prevalent, those sorts of key
16 technical providers who really bring enormous
17 technical knowledge to the table for the operator
18 don't exist to the same extent on the
19 distribution side.

20 So I think it does vary. I mean, and
21 having said that, you know, and again I don't
22 think we considered that extensively from a

1 mission and objectives perspective. But having
2 said that, that's the sort of thing the operators
3 would share anyway.

4 MR. HERETH: Yes, I think it just,
5 that one warrants more discussion.

6 MR. COTE: Agreed.

7 MR. HERETH: Because I think we're
8 trying to improve as much and have the knowledge
9 be in the service providers as much as it is in
10 the operators.

11 And I think what was brought up in one
12 of the meetings was the importance of it not only
13 improving the ILI process, the tools and the
14 process, but improving the in the ditch
15 measurements because we have error and
16 uncertainty there just as we do with the ILI
17 process.

18 So not to get into the weeds, but I
19 think it needs to be -- and to borrow, Kate, to
20 borrow Carl's thinking, I think there's a three
21 legged stool, and the public is that third leg.
22 But we can discuss more because that's not

1 incredibly pertinent to this, but I think it's
2 important overall.

3 MR. KIEBA: Well, It might get
4 relevant to this one here, someone brought up the
5 idea of a case study that we could learn a lot
6 from it, but certainly as part of that it's
7 probably a legal issue too of do we have to do an
8 NEE or confidentiality agreement to even look at
9 that as the subcommittee, and then can we slice
10 and dice what's reasonable to share or not.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Well, we also go back to
12 the congressional directive too which says that
13 the whole goal is to go back to the members.
14 That was the number one driver. And the charge
15 of the Congress isn't that. So operations are
16 the charge. But then there's feedback as part of
17 that as well.

18 So if you're going to deal exclusively
19 with operators, you have to be careful for the
20 fitness of the charge. Congress wanted feedback
21 to the vendors to enhance their tools.

22 MR. COTE: Though, again, that was

1 pretty specialized to ILI test verification. So
2 it was a very specialized area, and relatively
3 small in total industry impact even though it's
4 very important. To your point, and to Congress.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

6 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So who owns that
7 particular C-1, which task team or which
8 subcommittee? Is that process sharing?

9 MR. HERETH: I think it's process
10 sharing. I'm not saying that as a definitive.

11 (Simultaneous speaking.)

12 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: This really brings up
13 a real fundamental consideration here is, you
14 know, is our recommendation going to be an
15 industry way to do that, because right now,
16 today, there's hundreds of different ways that
17 that gets accomplished today.

18 And will it be our recommendation to
19 do it a way, the way, the industry way, you know,
20 and how, what ears will that fall on.

21 MR. JOHNSON: It's like, going back to
22 the question she had this morning in the R&D

1 session, do we now have standardized reporting
2 goals? And you know, that goes back to this
3 makes this much easier.

4 If it's a standard reporting format,
5 especially to the operator and back out, then
6 this is more fluid. If it continues the way it
7 is, operator and vendor, it's a challenge to get
8 to the best point collectively in what we're
9 trying to do.

10 So there's some impediments if you're
11 going to go ahead and do this, we've got to think
12 through the various parts of it. It's not just
13 saying we will make it happen.

14 MR. COTE: Well, and to your point,
15 that incongruity which is described in the
16 language, to the extent consistent with the need
17 for, you know, maintenance of security systems --

18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 MR. COTE: Yes. So I think it's
20 almost contradictory as written. So you're
21 absolutely right.

22 PARTICIPANT: Welcome to DC.

1 MR. KIEBA: Thoughts from you, Kate?

2 MS. BLYSTONE: Hey, guys. I can only
3 hear Eric and Matt. And then I can kind of hear
4 Dan sometimes.

5 MR. KIEBA: Okay, we'll try to move
6 the phone in the middle.

7 MS. BLYSTONE: So I'm trying really
8 hard. I believe at one point someone asked what
9 the public wanted.

10 MR. KIEBA: Yes.

11 MS. BLYSTONE: Or is that what you're
12 asking me now?

13 MR. KIEBA: Yes. Or data or process
14 or how much information.

15 MS. BLYSTONE: Yes. So I think, you
16 know, I can't speak for all of public. But what
17 I can say is that, you know, we certainly did see
18 this in the data that is available. But I do
19 think that's probably uncommon.

20 So some version of that that provides
21 us some access to the data would be great, even
22 if it's aggravated data, that would be fine too.

1 It's just something.

2 And I realize that we're, and I've
3 said this before, I realize we're starting from
4 someplace and that as we learn and grow, we can
5 adjust and add more things when it makes sense,
6 take more things away when it makes sense if it
7 did ever make sense.

8 Also, I think that visualization of
9 the data is a big part of it too, that if we're
10 going to offer this data, I think it was FAA that
11 went with that. And their data visualization was
12 really great. Like, the public side of their
13 data was really great.

14 So something like that would be
15 awesome. But you all in the room are the
16 technical experts on what it is that's available.
17 And so I can go to their process, I'm going to be
18 listening for things that are like, that make
19 sense. But just from my perspective to share
20 with the public a preferred aggregated way or
21 some way that feels safe for you guys and is
22 helpful to the public.

1 MR. COTE: Kate, what would that data
2 look like? I heard what you said, but I mean, as
3 I think about the data that we tend to look at
4 from a risk perspective, I'm having a hard time
5 bringing, and this is Dan, but I'm having a hard
6 time bringing the two together.

7 What would that, what would those data
8 points look like to you?

9 MR. JONES: Can I jump in? When you
10 were at our earlier meeting, you had a five point
11 plan you were talking about. And the fifth point
12 was where you talk about the data that would go
13 to the public because the first four points was
14 not that, the data was probably too sensitive or
15 too complex for the public to understand.

16 But you said, in your fifth point you
17 laid out a pretty, to me what sounded like a
18 pretty good case of what you could supply to the
19 public that would be one, informative and
20 acceptable to your peers. Do you remember, I
21 guess you don't remember that I guess.

22 MR. HERETH: Well, the fifth one --

1 (Simultaneous speaking.)

2 MR. JONES: No, it was earlier today
3 when you were not in the --

4 MR. HERETH: Oh, it's the same that
5 was on the slide.

6 MR. JONES: Okay.

7 MR. HERETH: Yes, it's the same that
8 was on the screen.

9 MR. JONES: Okay. That seemed good.
10 Was that self-explanatory enough or no?

11 MR. COTE: I don't think is Agile
12 Workforce Initiative it.

13 MR. JOHNSON: You stepped out and made
14 a phone call. So it was while you were out.

15 MR. COTE: But that was the question
16 I asked, so thank you.

17 MR. JONES: It's a fair question, but
18 I don't know that Kate would know or I would know
19 or any of us would know at this point because it
20 would be useless to give us data that isn't
21 useful and doesn't tell us anything. It's just a
22 waste of time.

1 But as Kate mentioned about 15 minutes
2 ago, you guys are the experts. And you would
3 know what would be useful in terms of the public
4 safety requirements that many of the
5 stakeholders, some of the stakeholders sitting at
6 this table are looking for coming out of this
7 information sharing.

8 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, what that bullet
9 said, Walter, was, I'll just read it. "To
10 improve transparency/communication of industry
11 capabilities and confidence level with the
12 existing technology, pursuit of gap filling
13 technology, how you define data information and
14 messaging for the industry in public
15 communications."

16 So in essence, you know, tell our
17 story. What are we doing to float the boats to a
18 high level using existing technology. What are
19 we doing to improve and fill gaps that we know
20 exist today. And so what is the state of the
21 state, not just in terms of what we're capable
22 of, but also how well we actually deploy that

1 capability.

2 So let's be transparent about what we
3 can and we can't do, let's be transparent about
4 how well we're doing what we can do, and let's be
5 transparent about how well we're working to fill
6 gaps that exist today.

7 MR. JOHNSON: One of the ideas that
8 came out earlier today was that JD Power's
9 running the nation on tools with industry, you
10 know, JD Power has that report on cars, you know
11 which car to buy. If we're doing tools for
12 cracks, these tools work well for cracks.

13 If we're doing tools for whatever the
14 defect, have that kind of data one of the
15 suggestions that fit and suggestions that
16 industry think is to have a database that shows
17 these tools work well in these environments,
18 maybe it's 80 percent accurate versus 90 percent.

19 We want to continue to improve and
20 here's how to report as a possible idea. So it's
21 not the raw data, but it's more of an analysis of
22 that data saying here's where we are, here's the

1 current state of knowledge, and here's what we
2 have --

3 MR. COTE: And that's a pretty good
4 plan. So that was, I think that's a fair
5 description and valid, and that provides
6 meaningful information.

7 (Off-microphone comments.)

8 MR. KIEBA: No, that was me trying to
9 call in to see if we could have another speaker
10 phone here. But I'm just getting feedback.
11 Kate, can you hear us any better in the center of
12 the room?

13 (Off-microphone comments.)

14 MR. KIEBA: Just to move along again.
15 And we talked about this one as a possibility
16 for, these are just examples. I think all the
17 subcommittees have looked at the example. We
18 have already learned about the airline industry.

19 One that hasn't been talked about that
20 met with us initially was BESSE has a safe
21 offshore initiative that they may be willing to
22 come in and talk with the subcommittee if you

1 want to learn what BESSE is doing with the
2 offshore folks.

3 I also had this bullet on potentially
4 obstacles for sharing best practices. And I
5 think that also gets back to the limitations of
6 what can and can't be shared.

7 Again, ideally we would like to share
8 it all, but you just can't. So what are the
9 obstacles, is antitrust issues, is it some other
10 barrier? Are there any challenges operators have
11 in the data they get to share both internally or
12 with others.

13 And this one, this bullet here, and
14 Kate, we're on Page 3 of the document.
15 Potentially there's some legal context here as
16 well, so maybe some of those elements go to legal
17 group.

18 MS. BATTAMS: I think it might sort of
19 all go to the legal group. Since I'm not in that
20 group, I can just give that word that way. But I
21 think that this goes back to until the group
22 knows what type of data they think would be

1 helpful to possibly share, there's different
2 legal ramifications based on many different
3 things.

4 What is the data itself, who is
5 accessing it, who owns it, where is the database
6 housed, you know, private versus the government,
7 what's the end product, is there a public report,
8 is there just data that people can search, is
9 there some kind of analysis.

10 And all of that has different, there's
11 different legal paths that can change depending
12 on many different factors at this point.

13 MS. BORENER: So the other part of
14 this that can affect the desire to share
15 information is that the kind of data you're
16 sharing in here affects the value of the
17 pipeline.

18 So if it's in a bad state of repair or
19 if there's things, you know, if there was things
20 about it that are found due to the inspection
21 process that affect its potential value and
22 acquisition and those things, that might not be

1 something that a company wants to share.

2 And that's different than legal
3 restrictions. So it's something to think about
4 because it's part of the value of the positions
5 of the company.

6 As a person who lives in that area,
7 some of the information that is found from the
8 inspection process that's relevant to me is
9 exactly the same data.

10 Do I have a potential hazard, is this
11 going to affect my value of my property. You
12 know, there are other things about the state of
13 the repair of the pipeline that affects everyone
14 in the environment.

15 So why would you share that
16 information, or how would you share that
17 information, and what would the -- how would that
18 change or affect the decisionmaking of people in
19 the vicinity.

20 I think that's one question, you know,
21 from the size example, sharing the information
22 that a particular operator's airplanes seem to

1 have more accidents than others, that's going to
2 affect the value of that company a whole lot.

3 So you have to think about how you are
4 sharing information that's relevant for improving
5 safety without having a negative effect on the
6 commerce, the company. If that makes sense.

7 MS. BATTAMS: And the other thing to
8 keep in mind it is voluntary. And so, you know,
9 you guys all know this.

10 It's finding that balance between
11 sharing information that can lead to improved
12 safety but also, you know, it's not meant to be
13 holding operators' feet to the fire and there's,
14 you know, to point out who's a bad actor, or not
15 a bad actor but has some problems, or who's
16 really fantastic and they're sharing all their
17 data because there's never been an accident or a
18 leak.

19 And so you know, those are all just
20 sort of things to be considered.

21 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Sherry brings up a
22 really valid point here that certain is going to

1 be off limits. You know, when we go to value an
2 asset, obviously its condition is paramount to
3 that.

4 So that goes without saying. That's
5 going to be data and information that would be
6 off limits. I think the focus really needs to be
7 on the operator's processes and practices to deal
8 with integrity issues --

9 MS. BORENER: It might be helpful --

10 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: -- and less about
11 condition of. You know, the condition is what it
12 is, but what am I doing about it. You know, how
13 confident am I in what I'm doing about it.

14 MS. BORENER: It could be a good way
15 to look at a performance based rule, I don't know
16 if we have one, but imagine, you know, is this
17 dent actionable. So out of context when you get
18 a piece of information, you have to make a
19 decision relevant only to your own pipeline.

20 What if you knew around the industry
21 what the consequences were of finding that thing
22 you found. Then you would have much more

1 information to use to make a decision about
2 whether something's actionable. That's kind of
3 the idea of this.

4 And that likewise informs the public
5 of where they are on the spectrum. So it's more
6 of a safety in numbers kind of thing of saying
7 that, you know, an asset specific.

8 MR. JONES: This raises tons of
9 questions I don't even know if I want to get
10 into. But if an airline is demonstratively poor
11 compared to its peers, so it's the information is
12 supposed to remain anonymous to the public. But
13 the industry is supposed to know, well, yes, they
14 have crashes all the time. And that's cool
15 because --

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 MS. BORENER: Nobody has crashes all
18 the time. You know, so no, so you're halfway --
19 so once the industry has entered into this
20 process, right, they're in an S&S process, the
21 thing is they can share with the FAA that they
22 found these problems without getting shut down.

1 So they have to come up with a remedy
2 plan. So they discover this immediately. The
3 purpose of this is to get the information to them
4 immediately that they are in some kind of, that
5 there is an anomaly they need to respond to.

6 And it could be a training issue. It
7 could be that I have two of an airplane that
8 somebody else has 100 of, and I would never have
9 seen this defect but they found it. So they
10 alert me to it.

11 So it's more of an early warning
12 system. Once you get to the law, you know, then
13 you're in the law. So once you get to a point
14 where you're, if you were really in violation of
15 some rule, that some safety rule, some threshold,
16 you don't get off free for that.

17 You're just this is early warning
18 information that allows the industry to take
19 action sooner. And that's probably a better way
20 of thinking about it is this is a way providing
21 or for the industry to tell each other about
22 early issues and to take action before it's a

1 real issue.

2 But in that context, there's propriety
3 pieces of data in there and you probably don't
4 want other people to know. So it has to be
5 protected some way.

6 I mean, just to finish that up, for
7 instance, during the time that FAA was
8 implementing S&S and they were doing volunteer
9 information sharing, they shut down, they
10 grounded the MD-80 fleet for a while. They just
11 said no.

12 So it wasn't like they didn't take
13 safety actions. They still take safety actions.
14 But they have other means to identify issues
15 earlier. So I just want to reassure you that
16 you're not unsafe.

17 (Simultaneous speaking.)

18 MR. COTE: You raise a very
19 interesting point in this though, one that I
20 agree with. There's an enforcement, a regulatory
21 enforcement path in the FAA, and there's one in
22 PHMSA that's very clear. We all know it, and

1 it's relevant for generations.

2 There's voluntary information sharing
3 to make the industry better. Those are two
4 fundamentally different paths. And I think
5 that's the point.

6 The way I see this, I don't see us
7 getting to a point where there is specific data
8 about the pipeline between Goshen and
9 Merrillville, Indiana, for example, that says we
10 pigged it and we found 112 anomalies and three
11 dents and 12 wall loss situations and here's
12 where they are.

13 What there might be is a company
14 pigged 122 miles of line, of 30 inch line, and it
15 found the following. And on its test digs, it
16 validated that those pig runs, and this is the
17 pig that it used, and these were the various
18 specific tools, and this is what it found to the
19 95th percentile.

20 MS. BORENER: So linking the pig
21 findings to the dig data is that essential
22 validation of what you can get from pigging,

1 that's extremely important, I sense that this is
2 very, very important to --

3 MR. COTE: Well, it's important
4 because, see because what that does is that's
5 affirmative industry information that other
6 operators who need to pig lines and are using
7 pigs and understand their data better, thus do
8 better with risk assessment.

9 And so in other words, if I find I
10 have a 68 percent wall loss on that 30 inch line,
11 and I know the last five guys that have used that
12 tool, it was right 97 percent of the time, I
13 better get up there and dig a hole pretty darn
14 quickly and find out what's going on with that
15 line. That is valid pipeline safety data to make
16 things safer.

17 But that's at a macro level. I mean,
18 I don't see a lot of situations where the data
19 that gets shared needs to be so specific that, I
20 mean, you were talking about enforcement for
21 example.

22 The regulators are going to say oh my

1 God, you had, you know, you've had 12 corrosion
2 anomalies on three miles of pipe, what's the
3 matter with you. I mean, I don't see it reaching
4 that level of data granularity, and don't think
5 it needs to with this.

6 Does anyone have a different view of
7 that because I think if it does, if that's our
8 intent for the industry, we won't get anyone to
9 volunteer to share data.

10 And at the same time, I would argue
11 that the macro data gives the public a pretty
12 darn good assessment of the way pipelines work
13 and what operators are doing to make them better.

14 And you can tell the bad actors in the
15 pipeline business the same way you can tell the
16 bad actors in the airline business. Instead of
17 airplanes falling from the sky, we have
18 incidents. And those aren't hard to figure out.

19 MR. KIEBA: Those are good points.
20 And I've seen it both ways. I've been in other
21 voluntary efforts, the AGA, it's an
22 industry/government, it's the plastic pipe

1 database committee. They collect plastic pipe
2 failures and fittings.

3 And a part of that, one, was scrubbing
4 all the initial information on who sent it in,
5 where it is which it's good from that end, but
6 sometimes you get to the back end, you want to
7 learn more about that incident or that failure
8 because it might have been reported incorrectly.

9 And you want to learn more about it,
10 but once it gets scrubbed on the front end, you
11 don't have that ability to go back to the
12 original record. So I could see value in both
13 ways.

14 I agree with you, you don't want all
15 the data to fall along the entire track because
16 that could be dangerous.

17 MR. COTE: And so maybe to your point,
18 maybe you do have two, you have two avenues, one
19 that's public and one that's for the operators.
20 And so in the first scrubbing, to your point, the
21 operators, you know, see the more generic data.
22 But if it's gee, I want to know about that

1 plastic tee that popped off and how old it was,
2 what the material was, so on, you can eventually
3 dig in.

4 MR. KIEBA: And that was part of that
5 initial charter, again more trust in following
6 this voluntarily, there's going to be anonymity
7 in the data. And we won't see who actually
8 submitted and how.

9 Or sometimes there's other cases where
10 we see a bunch of data points popping up and we
11 want to know, is it maybe part of a repair and
12 replacement program. It could be more well
13 explained. But sometimes it's difficult to
14 figure that out if you lose that disconnect. But
15 someone else had a comment?

16 MS. BORENER: Yes. I just was going
17 to say that's exactly the design that -- there's
18 just layers of access. So what the general
19 public can see versus what a contributing airline
20 can see when they come into that interface is
21 different, it's restricted.

22 And even if you're a contributor, you

1 can see your data but you might not be able to
2 see anybody else's. so you can see what your
3 data points are, and you can see a plot that says
4 what everybody else's data look like.

5 So you know where you are relative to
6 everyone else but you don't know who owns all
7 those other points. And that's the idea is to
8 give you context and to give you that, you know,
9 that access without endangering the proprietary
10 nature of the data.

11 MR. WARNER: That's where we're
12 getting to the change powers. At least you can
13 see all the data points. You can say I'm over
14 here, why is my success rate so much lower than
15 everybody else's.

16 MR. KIEBA: I wonder what you're
17 thinking, Dan or anyone else from industry, that
18 we need to break it up further. Like, the
19 industry component, is there certain aspects that
20 only operators see versus the vendors? How do
21 you break that up?

22 MR. COTE: I need to think about that

1 vendor piece a little more closely because I
2 hadn't given that a lot of thought. But in my
3 mind, ultimately system risk data is literally
4 owned by the operators.

5 MR. KIEBA: I agree.

6 MR. COTE: And so that needs to be,
7 that should be pretty darn transparent through
8 avenues like AGA. There is a pretty fair amount
9 of transparency. Never at the segment level, but
10 at the system level. You can look at AGA data on
11 anything from corrosion on bare steel to
12 excavator damage.

13 And across those spectrums, there are
14 people in the top core tile and people in the
15 fourth core tile. And so you know where you lie.
16 And so it gives you the name of some companies
17 that are in the first or second, you know, first
18 or second, or even deciles.

19 And so if you want to match up, it's
20 pretty easy to know who to reach up to. And
21 that's all pretty darn good data. For example,
22 for people that want to proof which is the

1 purpose of this. I mean, in terms of the
2 vendors, yes, it's in their best interest to make
3 tools and processes and technology better for the
4 industry.

5 So certainly sharing more rather than
6 less with them is valuable. I'm not sure they
7 need to get to the point if they see the curve
8 and understand the plots, that I'm not sure they
9 need to necessarily know who those operators are.
10 I could be persuaded on that one.

11 But I think the spectrum sort of
12 descends from there. I mean, does anyone have a
13 fundamentally different view of that kind of
14 layered process? I mean, my real worry is if
15 this becomes uncomfortable for operators, they
16 won't share the data. That's a killer.

17 MR. KIEBA: And I agree, that's a
18 first starter for any voluntary collection is how
19 to get there. I mean, that's a good point, how
20 far can we really get there by realistically we
21 have to have a draft report by July and a final
22 report by December. But where do you start. And

1 maybe it is starting to improve or what we can
2 share with any industry and then having to go
3 from there.

4 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Well, it has to
5 almost result in something better than what is
6 done today, I mean, to compel participation. If
7 what we recommend isn't better than what we're
8 doing today, why would anybody do it?

9 MR. HERETH: I guess I look at it from
10 the standpoint of it should be so compelling that
11 they want to voluntarily share. It's not a
12 matter of how are we scaring them off. It should
13 be compelling that they want to share the data.
14 There's so much value in it, right? That's
15 really where we should be getting to.

16 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: I think if we look
17 at, you know, there's it's being done today at
18 the operator and service provider level. You
19 know, it's being done at the industry association
20 level.

21 I think almost every association has
22 a lessons learned process, you know, effective or

1 not. But SGA, AGA, PRCI, INGAA, AOPL, API, I
2 think every one of those associations, just to
3 name a few, you know, promote and conduct lessons
4 learned sessions that are closed sessions
5 typically, but they're doing that today.

6 You know, is it our intent to supplant
7 all of that disconnected sharing of information
8 and come up with a system to do it best?

9 MR. COTE: I wouldn't use the term
10 supplant. But the way I think about it is
11 structuralizes. And if you can put it in a
12 common structure that's readily accessible, I
13 think that's what we're trying to do.

14 Not so much supplant. I've been over
15 those sections and they're typically good. But
16 if you happen to have been out sick that day or
17 miss it, you missed it.

18 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So is that in effect
19 our task statement is to come up with what you
20 just said?

21 MR. COTE: Yes, because what I heard
22 the other groups figure out what data to collect,

1 right, and we're supposed to figure out how to
2 share it, or how --

3 MR. JONES: Best practices for
4 sharing. Are there best practices that
5 incentivize voluntary information sharing? Do
6 they have access to all of those layers, or their
7 access is restricted to the level so that more
8 people are comfortable with giving more
9 information and they may not necessarily are
10 going to be having to deal with enforcement.

11 MS. BATTAMS: That data is protected
12 by law. So they can't bring an enforcement
13 action except in limited circumstances.

14 MR. JONES: So it's incentivized?

15 MS. BATTAMS: Right. And I mean,
16 don't get the wrong idea, criminal activity is
17 still, you know --

18 MR. JONES: Yes --

19 (Simultaneous speaking.)

20 MS. BATTAMS: But yes. And there are
21 some nuances. But the idea is that the data is
22 protected and, you know, if you put your data up

1 there and say oh, I did a pig and I have these
2 leaks, enforcement isn't going to knock on your
3 door and say thanks for bringing us that, you're
4 busted.

5 So that's how the FAA put their
6 structure in place. But it did take a long time
7 to sort of sort out the legal wrangling. And
8 hopefully we won't have to suffer for that long.

9 MR. JONES: Do we have that in our
10 ability?

11 MS. BATTAMS: Not yet. That would
12 have to be part of the recommendations. And
13 that's what the, in theory the legal subcommittee
14 will focus on once they know what and how the
15 data, you know, what the data is going to be and
16 then what the recommendation is going to be for
17 wheres, hows to access it, all that stuff.

18 Then they can start, you know, working
19 through the legal ramifications which is why I
20 was saying earlier, it's very dependent on those
21 decisions because say there's, say the only thing
22 that's going to be end up being shared doesn't

1 need to be protected, well then there's the legal
2 ramifications are much lower.

3 And if, you know, a very high level of
4 detail and sensitive information that needs to be
5 required both by law and for other purposes, for
6 the operator or the vendor, the ramifications are
7 different.

8 MR. JONES: So we heard earlier the
9 API and all this kind of voluntary information
10 sharing services. Why do they do it, and what is
11 the incentive here? Do we know that?

12 MR. COTE: I mean, AGA does it to
13 basically communicate risks and allow people to
14 better understand risks that they might not have
15 encountered.

16 I mean, the trick in fighting fire is
17 the first rule for smoke, not if the whole damn
18 forest is on fire. And so by doing that,
19 particularly around near miss data, if you had a
20 near miss, I may avoid you. Simply stated.

21 MR. JOHNSON: It's definitely a place
22 where the interested to learn to come together.

1 Even in closed operational settings. So it's
2 operational, about your worst nightmares,
3 whatever they might be, how they found it --
4 possible solutions sometimes too.

5 It's not just identification, it's
6 sometimes solutions as part of the process. It's
7 about learning. So those are your closed only
8 sessions. That's great. But sometimes you got
9 to share more to get more, and that's where
10 everything kind of falls apart on this point.

11 MR. COTE: So we did do one in INGAA
12 Foundation which is operators, service providers,
13 and some environmental firms, it's the whole life
14 cycle. And they are, and actually we have one
15 union that's a member of the organization.

16 And what we do there is actually have
17 a database that's called a repository. And
18 people can put lessons learned in there. And
19 then anybody that's a member can go and look at
20 that lessons learned. They use it for
21 dashboards, they use it for training, use it for
22 a variety of applications.

1 And then we do lessons learned
2 meetings that are open to all the members. So
3 everybody hears what -- and then there's, but
4 there was a whole legal group that developed all
5 the safeguards for protecting people putting
6 information in.

7 MR. JONES: Right, fair enough.

8 MR. BROWN: So, Mark, just something
9 about, I mean, I'm looking at one of these emails
10 from INGAA, I'm on an email chain from, is it
11 Paul McKay?

12 MR. HERETH: Yes.

13 MR. BROWN: Are those the lessons
14 learned you're talking about?

15 MR. HERETH: Yes.

16 MR. BROWN: So in that database, you
17 don't put the company name.

18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 MR. HERETH: You can, your company
20 name can be in there, your logo could be in
21 there, you could have pictures. But it can also
22 be done anonymously. So there's differing

1 levels. Some companies actually present, and
2 they want to be very open about it. Others are,
3 you or I could put it in confidentially.

4 MR. BROWN: So I mean, and that's
5 something that --

6 MR. HERETH: Or anonymously.

7 MR. BROWN: -- certain areas, yes.
8 But my point is that anybody, Dan said that ATA
9 does something very similar. Cliff mentioned
10 these closed door sessions on OSGA has round
11 tables where they sit together and they talk
12 openly, very openly without any kind of suppliers
13 at the table about issues, near misses, what have
14 you, or experiences.

15 But that's that control mechanism.
16 But then for example these lessons learned from
17 INGAA, this is another way of bringing it to the
18 public's, I'm a board associate member of that,
19 right, of the association.

20 So I get to see that as well. And so
21 then there's another level which is everybody
22 else in the room that's not part of this industry

1 day in and day out, they get to see those same
2 lessons learned.

3 What I'm trying to say is there are
4 several things that are happening. Is it our
5 task here to look at those and say what else do
6 we need to do in each case to bring in a level of
7 environment that this mandate is asking for.

8 How is that being put in different
9 domains of accessibility so that other parties
10 have access to it just as well, like the public.

11 You know, you have a lot of data,
12 discreet data points, and which way would you put
13 that to another level so that the public can go
14 to that website and see that, oh wow, they are
15 making progress because there's a lot of features
16 that were outliers that help what level of R&D is
17 out there based on these outliers.

18 Is that also part of the duties of
19 this group to look at it that way, or are we
20 needing to really look at developing the singular
21 outside wall of those separate approach.

22 (Simultaneous speaking.)

1 MR. HERETH: I'm going to set this up
2 for Eric to really respond to it. But I think
3 that's Eric's first point out of his thought was
4 really building on what's already going on,
5 right? It's improving what we've already got.

6 MR. BROWN: And Dan said this, if you
7 can come to a common structure between all the
8 different entities, is there a way to pull from
9 it to a single location that just takes advantage
10 of everything that's already being done now
11 today. Is that an idea for how to get there?

12 MR. KIEBA: Yes. It's something I
13 really keyed off of Walter. And then Dan, you
14 know, what are the incentives or what's the
15 trust. So one, what are the incentives to take
16 part in this, and two, how people get that trust
17 to submit to the voluntary. I think there's two
18 layers of that.

19 But I think keying off of that is one
20 of our items to think about. And then certainly
21 what we've come up with has to then be vetted by
22 legal certainly and go from there.

1 MR. JOHNSON: I think the other
2 question you asked or just kind of eluded to is
3 what kind of data are we talking about. Are we
4 talking about basic lessons learned, which is
5 more anecdotal, or are we talking about the hard
6 data information?

7 Two different, entirely different
8 worlds of information in the information
9 databases.

10 (Simultaneous speaking.)

11 MR. JOHNSON: So which ones do we want
12 to get after to create best practices? Is the
13 best way to lessons learned or is it more the
14 individual data? And then what do we show the
15 public to make sure they know as well?

16 So that's kind of, there's a lot of
17 pieces here we got to look at. It's not just an
18 answer, it's multiple layers of data that we all
19 really need to be successful, which ones we want
20 to put in the database, which ones we need to
21 have in certain ways, what's successful. And
22 that's what we need to go after.

1 MR. KIEBA: Yes, and that's where I
2 think we need to lean on the other subcommittees
3 because they have to determine what data to
4 share, and they don't figure out how best to
5 share it.

6 MR. HERETH: Yes that's really, at
7 least in terms of what we discussed this morning,
8 that's within the scope of the process sharing
9 group is we'll define the data. And we had a
10 really good discussion about anecdotal and how it
11 can have little value unless it's validated and
12 qualified in some way, that we really have to
13 have data that's actionable and information
14 that's actionable. We had a pretty good
15 discussion about that.

16 MR. KIEBA: All right. Just in the
17 interest of moving the discussion along, the last
18 part is this report element, and this was pulled
19 right from the kick-off presentation. But I'm
20 sure any of this can be modified too depending on
21 what the subcommittee decides on.

22 Certainly again that first bullet is

1 a mandate item. Some of these were again from
2 the kickoff but we can, just again thinking big
3 picture of where we want to be by July for the
4 draft report thinking about some of the report
5 elements.

6 There are some deliverables on here.
7 Again, these were just from the sample statements
8 that we could figure out what deliverables we
9 want to put out. Certainly the short term ones
10 are report outs of the parent committee tomorrow.
11 Eventually, a summary report.

12 I think this was from, we don't have
13 a deliverables table yet but we can, I saw other
14 subcommittees were developing one, so we can
15 think about that.

16 A list of acronyms and common
17 terminology, that came off of multiple
18 subcommittees. So the thought there was does
19 each subcommittee come up with it or does the
20 overall, is that a reporting group function, is
21 that each subcommittee figures that out. We're
22 thinking report committee. And then sources and

1 references that use.

2 And I think that's it for the, yes, at
3 least what we started with. So I guess I'll punt
4 back to Eric where you want to go from here.

5 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Well, I've got a
6 draft task statement here. I'm cheating a little
7 bit because I'm going back to something that we
8 worked on six months ago. See if it's still
9 relevant.

10 So this is a little bit tweaked, but
11 it hasn't changed a lot from a two slide kind of
12 presentation that I did to the full Committee
13 last year sometime. We kind of put it in the
14 form of a task statement, so evaluate existing
15 processes and make recommendations on best
16 practices that will promote the sharing of daily
17 information that accomplishes one, participation
18 of all stakeholders, again compelled by the value
19 proposition.

20 Two, integrity management process and
21 technology improvements. You know, so
22 identification of current gaps in technology

1 and/or analytics that need to be closed. Sharing
2 that occurs between technology providers and
3 operators, I think primarily.

4 Sharing of enhanced processes and
5 practices, i.e. solutions to known problems
6 including experience with new data information
7 technology. Trying of education of lessons
8 learned with respect to execution of the various
9 integrity management processes.

10 So again, improved analytics, sharing
11 near misses, how those were avoided, subsequent,
12 post-incident related RCFAs and subsequent
13 company regulated learning.

14 So again, systemic or acute process
15 improvements, cultural improvements, technology
16 and technology deployment improvements. So not
17 just, you know, the sensor technology, but how
18 that technology is employed.

19 And the last one is communication to
20 stakeholders. So again, looking at kind of the
21 current state and recommending best practices in
22 those core primary areas.

1 And then as kind of a framework, again
2 this is information you've seen before as well.
3 Sharing opportunity as characterized. So how do
4 we do it, you know, the how do we do this? You
5 know, one we focus on the high value
6 opportunities.

7 So the opportunity results in an
8 increase of knowledge, process improvement, or
9 best practice at a company level. To this end
10 the sharing should target the right side of the
11 value chain. So I've got data information,
12 knowledge, understanding, and wisdom. So we
13 would target, you know, at least initially the
14 knowledge, understanding, and the wisdom parts of
15 that value chain.

16 Process would be characterized by
17 being very deliberate, sharing process is an
18 active engagement between one or more parties.
19 So it's not just throw things against the wall,
20 see if they stick and see if anybody pays
21 attention to them.

22 But there's a very deliberate

1 pitch/catch relationship. You know, at a minimum
2 at least one party is learning, gaining knowledge
3 or wisdom from another party or their engaged
4 collectively, collaboratively in a process
5 improvement.

6 Third, that it's actionable, so the
7 result of that engagement, or engagements,
8 generates action by one or more of the parties.
9 And processes or practices change within the
10 entity or entities, whether that be the industry,
11 the operator, regulator, service providers, and
12 then lastly is measurement.

13 So the sharing process as well as the
14 results of the improvement, actions are
15 measurable from not only a process or leading
16 indicators but as well as --

17 MR. HERETH: Can you go back to your
18 first slide there? May I ask you a question?
19 Maybe this is a question about how you're going
20 to go about doing what you do. But isn't a part
21 of this also looking at best practices in terms
22 of how other industries, other things, have

1 actually shared information. So it's this plus --

2 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, yes, good point.

3 MR. HERETH: And that's where I
4 struggle to some degree because it's how much
5 effort do we put into each of those, because
6 they're both important, right?

7 If we don't do this well, then all
8 we're going to have is some generic well, this is
9 how we would share data. So we have to do some
10 of this too and that's where this is helpful, it
11 really is. Well I think what I did this morning
12 which is overwhelmed.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. COTE: Well, to your point, the
15 challenge we need to impose on ourselves is, is
16 the data that we're generating truly actionable.
17 Now, there's a number of industry experts on our
18 Panel.

19 We should be able to look at the data
20 and say I could take that and use that to improve
21 my blind safety or no, that data is meaningless
22 in the context of really applying principles that

1 could be scanned over or reused.

2 That's sort of the trick, that's why
3 to get back to the latest discussion, that's why
4 I see us we need to do this, you know, very
5 layered sort of matrix, because if we try to do
6 it all in one, then no one's going to contribute.

7 MR. HERETH: And so, Dan, to your
8 point Eric's next slide creates the context --

9 (Simultaneous speaking.)

10 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Why do it if it's not
11 going to result in some --

12 MR. COTE: Exactly, that's exactly
13 right. Now the question, the real trick to this
14 is, because this sort of hypothesizes, several of
15 these hypothesize what sounds like one-on-one
16 share.

17 The question is can we scale it with
18 data and yet frame the data fields tightly enough
19 then the whole data integrity thing, in terms of
20 the providers, can we create that matrix that
21 will really benefit us as an industry. I think in
22 many categories the answer is probably yes.

1 MR. HERETH: Yes, in fact I think
2 there's two examples that I know we talked about
3 this morning, if I may just briefly go into them.
4 So, one was Leif Jensen raised the concept of we
5 better be doing this one-on-one sharing right
6 now, right?

7 MR. COTE: Right.

8 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: But we need to be
9 thinking about how can we get the ILI service
10 providers to be sharing so they're all learning
11 from each other in a way that doesn't take away
12 from their competitive edge among other things.

13 PARTICIPANT: Which is a pretty good
14 question.

15 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes. And it's
16 interesting that none of them are sitting in this
17 room, well with the exception of Mr. Warner who
18 has analyzed that technology. But yes.

19 And then the second one that Sherry
20 raised this morning, Sherry Borener, is that you
21 know we may have a block of data and she says we
22 may be able to look at that data and say ah,

1 there's an outlier there. Why is that outlier
2 there, right? I want to understand that?

3 And that's a whole different level of
4 analysis. I love the smile on your face.

5 MR. WARNER: Going back to the inline
6 inspection we talked about yesterday too, if I'm
7 a low performing inline inspector. I think I'd
8 want to know that, because then I can go and say
9 you know, we need to spend more R&D to move our
10 stuff up or we're going to die off in the
11 industry.

12 So I think there is a motivation for
13 them to share, you know, they may not share on
14 dot A, but at least they will know that on dot A
15 compared to A through G or somewhere on that
16 chart.

17 MR. HERETH: Yes, and a simple way to
18 manage that is to write, for each operator to
19 write in their ILI purchase specification, the
20 supplier will be a member of the volunteer --

21 (Laughter.)

22 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: That's what's got to

1 be done, but tomorrow we'll talk about --

2 (Simultaneous speaking.)

3 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: -- accumulated 50,000
4 data points from tool runs and then verification
5 dates that begin to show how tools are working.
6 That's a real world done project as of today.

7 MR. COTE: And can you imagine the
8 value that would add. But you're right, if
9 you're those five providers that use the crappy
10 tools, the industry knows it, you're not going to
11 get much work.

12 MR. JOHNSON: It doesn't always. But
13 what we've seen already, just for our small
14 samples, and again, it's across 50,000 data
15 points which sounds like a lot but it's not.
16 We've already seen the vendors change their
17 specifications, already.

18 MR. COTE: Oh, to tighten up.

19 MR. JOHNSON: To tighten up and say
20 here's what we're doing and here's what we're
21 missing. So already with a small body that it
22 is, that it's a great model for what I think

1 we're trying to talk about here.

2 You can see how this works already.

3 Now it is can we go to a larger format, can we
4 have the projections that we need to do this in a
5 way that can really raise the industry
6 dramatically? That's where we are right now.

7 So I think what you're looking for is
8 being done. We do have it, and it has worked
9 out, for two reasons.

10 One, we have a great base of auditors,
11 but two, five of the largest in-line specialty
12 vendors are part of our vendorship. So they're
13 actively engaged in and want to see a difference
14 and, you know, change the game. But I think
15 we've got it.

16 Will we root out some bad players?

17 Yes. Does that mean they go away, hey maybe they
18 invest in R&D and catch up. But let's be honest,
19 as operators, we need that.

20 MR. COTE: Well, you're exactly right.

21 And the amount of the situation in the
22 distribution side may be damaged.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

2 MR. COTE: The number one cause in the
3 country. Now you have contractors locators today
4 who have rate of three, or four, or five damages
5 a thousand. And you have people who are less
6 than one damage a thousand.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

8 MR. COTE: And once you publish that
9 to the industry, who wants to hire the guy that
10 gets hit five times a thousand locates?

11 MR. JOHNSON: And then when you say
12 you change.

13 MR. COTE: Precisely, exactly.

14 (Simultaneous speaking.)

15 MR. COTE: And all of that is
16 available today.

17 MR. JOHNSON: And you put it all in
18 one individual slot for everybody to have access
19 to it and call it a day, we're good. But, you
20 see, I think that's what makes the most sense.
21 If we could put the database, and it's not just
22 in-line specialties, it's not just A&Es. Every --

1 MR. COTE: All the various ones.

2 MR. JOHNSON: If all the various ones
3 move into a uniformed platform that then has wide
4 operator access, we could see a shift --

5 MR. COTE: Right.

6 MR. JOHNSON: And then I think a lot
7 of that is getting from where we are to where we
8 need to be. We just got to want to.

9 MR. COTE: No, and a lot of that comes
10 from simple statistical analysis.

11 MR. JOHNSON: I understand, because
12 the other thing we found too is that we actually
13 have a problem going to the operators and pulling
14 that out because --

15 MR. COTE: Yes.

16 MR. JOHNSON: This is the one too, you
17 could bring that out and it will be a major
18 opportunity. So it's --

19 (Simultaneous speaking.)

20 MR. WARNER: If you could this in the
21 contract with the operator, the vendor --

22 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Right.

1 MR. WARNER: -- supply the data to the
2 database as well as to the operator, it would
3 take a lot of headache off of --

4 MR. JOHNSON: It works for everyone.

5 MR. WARNER: Yes.

6 MR. JOHNSON: It works very well. It
7 works very, very well.

8 (Off-microphone comments.)

9 MR. KIEBA: To be honest, we say it
10 works well, but we don't know that because others
11 aren't part of our discussions, and somehow you
12 have to figure out how do you share that
13 information.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Well like I said, we
15 started back in 2012, you guys are coming along
16 now. We would love to work with this inquiry
17 group.

18 MR. KIEBA: Yes.

19 MR. JOHNSON: And really a chance to
20 change the data because we can do it for our
21 members which is awesome.

22 (Off-microphone comment.)

1 MR. KIEBA: Yes, but it goes back to
2 this question, is there a certain information you
3 want to share amongst the industry and then
4 regulators, and then --

5 MR. JOHNSON: Well, it goes back to
6 talking about the legal side. If we can do it
7 appropriately, you'll see the sharing, like FAA
8 does. Because the program works.

9 MS. BATTAMS: Right, but the reason
10 FAA can do that is it depends on where the data
11 is housed, you know, because like as it's set up
12 right now, we couldn't give any more protections
13 because --

14 MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

15 MS. BATTAMS: -- it's not ours. And
16 I know this has come up in all the subcommittees
17 that I visited today, actually almost all of
18 them, you know, the other factor that's important
19 to keep in mind is the cost of the cheating this.

20 Members pay to be in these industry
21 groups. And so, you know, that's helping with
22 funding that's generating the money, the revenue

1 to fund the database and, you know, this
2 important work.

3 How do you picture that happening
4 overall where the Government might be involved,
5 or the public might have access, you know,
6 something like that just to make sure it's on
7 everybody's mind.

8 MR. KIEBA: Is there anything we're
9 missing here?

10 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: I've got some
11 thoughts on the statement, how do we tweak it.
12 And I did go back and have, to Mark's point in
13 the points including other industry, VIS models
14 and practices.

15 MR. KIEBA: Okay, yes.

16 MR. COTE: A friendly amendment to the
17 first line under the integrity management bullet,
18 identification of current gaps in technology
19 and/or analytics. How about identification of
20 current gaps in data, technology, and/or
21 analytics? There will be times when simply
22 tracking something a little bit differently will

1 give us very actionable information.

2 MR. JONES: I just have a question.
3 If their group, like yours and others, who are
4 already doing a lot of this but at a, not at a
5 large enough scale is what I'm hearing, is that
6 reflected in that statement there, or do we need
7 to say pulling together these groups, or is that
8 sufficient, because I read that as reinventing
9 the wheel. And in some cases that may be needed.

10 But to get the ball rolling, we use
11 proof of concept that we've already seen in the
12 field as basis to keep the, to get moving or keep
13 moving. And I don't know that I see that there.
14 Unless someone can show me that, I don't know
15 that I see that.

16 MR. WARNER: I think that's what Eric
17 was getting at.

18 PARTICIPANT: I think if we maybe add
19 Walter's point about our own industry. I mean, I
20 think I want to say existing processes it would
21 be what PRCI is doing it with SGA, AGA, API, you
22 know, all of those best practice sharing.

1 MR. JONES: Yes, including the --

2 (Simultaneous speaking.)

3 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: And we can enumerate
4 those. Examples are --

5 PARTICIPANT: That would help me out,
6 especially the way he explained it. And then you
7 could see how you can go from one to growing to
8 this other.

9 MR. KIEBA: I see we're talking about,
10 I wonder if that first bullet could be
11 identification of model processes, or good
12 processes?

13 PARTICIPANT: We could just say
14 current practices.

15 MR. KIEBA: Current practices?

16 PARTICIPANT: Yes.

17 MR. KIEBA: So identification of
18 current practices?

19 MR. HERETH: It's almost a separate
20 sub-bullet. So where you have -- well, may I
21 suggest where you have identification of current
22 data, it's almost like developing a baseline,

1 right? Identification of a baseline or the
2 current data.

3 MR. JONES: Using, development of this
4 using existing, whatever.

5 MR. HERETH: Whatever the existing the
6 mechanisms are.

7 MR. JONES: Be they models and --

8 MR. COTE: Actually, you could modify
9 that. Why don't you say identification of
10 current data and then identify the gaps in that
11 data? And so you're building on the curve. I
12 mean, I think there's likely a lot more out there
13 that people believe or understand.

14 PARTICIPANT: Yes.

15 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: I don't know why it's
16 not showing the screen, it would be easier.

17 PARTICIPANT: It's connected into a
18 line that's carrying the signal to Kate.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. HERETH: Dan, what was your
21 comment there, identification of --

22 MR. COTE: Yes, identification of

1 current information sharing practices. And then
2 a gap analysis, then perform a gap analysis.
3 Something along those lines.

4 PARTICIPANT: Or, we don't necessarily
5 just have to do gap analysis though. It's an
6 identification of current sharing might be good
7 as well, too.

8 MR. JONES: Exactly, figure out what
9 we're doing today. I mean, I would hypothesize
10 that it's not absolutely perfect and that the gap
11 analysis will uncover, you know, needed
12 additions.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Even more areas.

14 (Off-microphone comments.)

15 MS. BORENER: Because other people
16 find problems. So one of the reasons that you
17 might have people who aren't in the industry in
18 your pool of participants is because they list
19 out things that others don't.

20 So if it's law enforcement, if it's
21 somebody from Fish and Wildlife who happens to
22 walk past a location where there's a leak,

1 there's all kinds of people who have information.

2 So one of the principles of this is
3 it's like crowd sourcing. The more people you
4 get involved in this and provide information, the
5 better the acuity of the information you have.

6 So that's one of the reasons to kind
7 of open the door, insert frontiers, you know,
8 because a lot of people participate. And it's
9 also a reason to think about how can we draw on
10 the incentives so that it's not just limited.

11 Also, I wanted to talk about this
12 other issue about R&D. You talked a lot about
13 your R&D in terms of making your tools better.
14 But there are techniques for collecting
15 information like using, you may answer this or
16 whatever, that might give you faster access to
17 the data, that will coordinate with the location
18 of your inline inspection tools.

19 So there are all these frontiers on
20 that side that you could think about if you said,
21 you know, here's a limit but this is why we would
22 want to move past it. So we want faster

1 detection, you might use UAS, et cetera.

2 So that's something that you can say.

3 And people do use them in the field. So that's a
4 group of people that you could bring in to talk
5 about the applications and technology that are
6 different from the ones that we spoke about.

7 (Off-microphone comments.)

8 MS. BORENER: And there were out to
9 mean something else.

10 MR. JONES: But the question is how do
11 you get over that fear of opening up yourselves
12 to realize. You know, like, because I agree with
13 you guys, this is not going to work if operators
14 don't feel comfortable. And then I just wasted a
15 couple years here.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MS. BORENER: So one of the other
18 things is you really do need, although nobody in
19 here has, they're not really represented in any
20 of the groups. But from a financial perspective,
21 what do you save by allowing yourself to open
22 yourself to this risk as opposed to a different

1 risk.

2 So how do you know the risks and what
3 happens when you have the loss. So what's the
4 risk that you have for exposing your information,
5 and how much better off are you if you get rid of
6 this financial risk by taking the proprietary
7 data?

8 MR. COTE: You know, that's a really,
9 I mean, that's very insightful. And I mean, my
10 experience in the industry is 85 percent or more
11 will want to improve their own performance.

12 That will be its own reward for an
13 awful lot of operators. I would love to be able
14 to say it's absolutely 100 percent, but I haven't
15 been drinking today so I'm not going to say that.

16 And so what will happen ultimately is
17 that, you know, one to fifteen percent, whatever
18 that number is of operators, over time their data
19 will show. And if we have a public compendium of
20 system data that deals -- when I think of
21 distribution issues for example, excavator
22 damage, bare steel, varies on components. You

1 know, I can kind of give you the list.

2 What will ultimately happen is
3 regulators will look at that data and they won't
4 know whose it is, but they'll know their own
5 operators' data. So if one being great and 120
6 being worse, if I'm 119 on corrosion on bare
7 steel for example, the regulator in Virginia is
8 going to come knocking on my door and say, what's
9 going on in your system? You're bottom quartile,
10 or bottom decile, or bottom five nationally.
11 What do you do?

12 Ultimately, that's the way this
13 manifests itself. Now, that's five or ten years
14 from now, but that tends to be what moves the
15 less than participants.

16 MR. HERETH: That was purely a
17 hypothetical. He would never do that.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. HERETH: The other thing that
20 this can be used for, this database, as varied as
21 we think it may be, is it can become an insurance
22 tool. Where do you fit on this matrix. Are you

1 in the top five, the bottom five and your
2 insurance is getting --

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 MR. HERETH: There are different ways
5 to look at this data.

6 MR. JOHNSON: I'm in a different
7 industry, primarily, but we don't see RI actually
8 improve significantly. We always make the case
9 for safety, we just don't see it moving, you
10 know, you said 85. I thought that was extremely
11 high.

12 I mean, we're lucky if we go 40, 50
13 percent, you know, that we're looking at RI. And
14 everybody is like, we'll make money by not
15 complying. You know what I mean?

16 And that's safer, you know what I
17 mean, and for a lot of people. And it's only
18 when, as you say, if this tool can be used for
19 enforcement to weed out the bad actors or, I know
20 a lot of us, many of this at this table don't
21 want public line, but it's actually a public
22 connection.

1 You know, in my field, no one really
2 cares about workers, but if the dust doesn't go
3 in the worker mouth but it falls onto the
4 public's cars, we get action.

5 So I don't know what it became
6 sometime to workers. I'm like no, take pictures
7 of the cars. And then the owner's like oh, hell.
8 You know, and they deal with it. That's the --

9 (Simultaneous speaking.)

10 MR. JOHNSON: So that's all I'm
11 saying. I'll just stop.

12 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So, just be another
13 minute here or so. So, make some tweaks to this
14 on that first sub-bullet. That good? Still like
15 this in terms of framework for what this best
16 practices should accomplish?

17 MR. HERETH: Actually, I think that
18 framework works for all of the subcommittees.
19 I'm sitting here looking at that. I think, I
20 don't see, I think it's pertinent for all the
21 subcommittees, yes. Looks good.

22 MR. KIEBA: Yes, I agree. And to what

1 extent each subcommittee can focus on it or
2 highlight what parts they focus on, because even
3 I saw in the previous slide you had training and
4 education, well, I mean the other group, yes.

5 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: And then so the kind
6 of last piece of our deliberation this afternoon
7 is, you know, identification of external
8 resources and how we will collaborate with the
9 other subcommittees.

10 So I think, you know, just threw one
11 up there to kind of get the list started, but I
12 think obviously with what Walter has done with
13 the PRCI project and Cliff, like, I want to learn
14 from them and we'll hear in some detail tomorrow
15 about how they went about that. But are there
16 other examples?

17 I think some of the things we need to
18 think about, you know, is what works, what
19 doesn't work. You know, what keeps operators and
20 service providers from collaborating and sharing
21 information.

22 Is there competitive issues, legal

1 issues, those sorts of things. How do we go into
2 this eyes wide open and not recommend something
3 that --

4 MR. COTE: Is a non-start.

5 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Is a non-start.

6 Right.

7 MR. KIEBA: Yes, I mentioned earlier
8 the off shore folks, we're paying them initially
9 on some of the safe offshore stuff they're
10 working on. It is a combination of what's
11 mandated versus a voluntary piece to it, but
12 they're going through a lot of lessons learned
13 too just from start of the process.

14 But they can potentially be helpful to
15 bringing in, just as a guest, they don't want to
16 be a member or they don't want to be formally on
17 the record for, you know, to the parent
18 committee, but it's a thought if you want to look
19 at what others have done.

20 MR. HERETH: Yes, that's a good idea.
21 They were certainly motivated.

22 MR. KIEBA: Right. A very clear

1 limited space. Yes.

2 MR. HERETH: Yes, so it would be good
3 to draw on that experience.

4 MR. KIEBA: And they went through a
5 similar, based on our initial meeting with us,
6 you know, what folks were comfortable sharing and
7 not sharing and what level of detail.

8 Who collects the data, I think in
9 their case, if I remember, was a third party and
10 then ultimately they did it. It might have been
11 even another agency. I think it was Bureau of
12 Transportation Statistics.

13 Oh, that was the other part is they,
14 Society Petroleum Engineers or they went through
15 another technical society that helped a few, some
16 of that as well. And that helped get an overall
17 trust level going.

18 And that list, Eric, is that members
19 or is that guests for the subcommittee?

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 PARTICIPANT: Yes, so it would
22 probably be both.

1 MR. LAMONT: If you want to hear from
2 API and AGA and you know, and start to kind of
3 hey, we'll consider you in a lot of this stuff.
4 Let's bring them in and maybe have them come in
5 and speak.

6 MR. COTE: I was thinking the same
7 thing, because they will give you a perspective
8 on where the hot buttons are for their members.
9 In other words, you know, we asked them that five
10 years ago, couldn't get it out of them versus
11 this is how they're prepared to share now. And
12 that would be, I mean, not 100 percent but from a
13 macro view, they could probably do that really
14 quickly.

15 MR. KIEBA: Yes, I'm interested from
16 them how do they even to start to get even
17 operators in a room to talk to one another, I'm
18 sure even that had a comfort level. What were
19 the ground rules of that to get started?

20 MR. COTE: You know though, just a
21 sort of a brief editorial. You know, the trick
22 to this, if I think about AGA data, it goes all

1 of the AGA data across 120 operators tends to go
2 to the technical guys in the company.

3 It never gets to a policy level where
4 someone's working through it and say okay, you
5 know, because they'll code it in a 1 to 120 and
6 there's no, in other words, it's an arbitrary
7 science.

8 So, but I know I'm company 57 for
9 example. Great news, I'm number three in damage
10 prevention, but I'm number 97 on human error, you
11 know what I mean? But the people who really make
12 decisions for the corporation never see the data.

13 And the time-in in my mind is SMS.
14 That's where you start to identify risk and it
15 elevates the policy levels.

16 So people in positions of authority
17 are saying hey, wait a minute, we can't afford to
18 be 99 in human error, you know what I mean? That
19 number is way too high. And so, what are we
20 doing wrong.

21 I mean that's what's going on in the
22 industry today, mind you. There's a lot, tons of

1 good data, but it doesn't, it isn't published in
2 a way that elicits high level recognition at the
3 corporate level, and I don't know how other
4 operators see that, but I tend to.

5 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So any other
6 Subcommittee Members requests that we want to
7 make? Associations, or --

8 MR. COTE: AGA, because they're big,
9 you know?

10 MR. KIEBA: Well they're big, but I
11 mean, you're a member, right?

12 MR. COTE: Yes.

13 MR. KIEBA: Are you talking member
14 companies or the association staff?

15 MR. COTE: No I would have the
16 association vote.

17 (Simultaneous speaking.)

18 MR. COTE: Exactly, staff member.

19 MR. KIEBA: Staff member.

20 MR. COTE: Because they can kind of
21 help quickly reconcile what data is easily
22 available, and what people are comfortable

1 giving.

2 MR. KIEBA: Because they handle most
3 of that.

4 MR. COTE: Exactly.

5 MR. KIEBA: So an AGA staff member of
6 --

7 MR. COTE: Right. More from a process
8 of hey, you know, what do you think about this?

9 MR. MCLAREN: With regard to the EEC
10 work that they've done, that's the database of
11 failures compiled.

12 MR. KIEBA: That's possible. Well you
13 said there's other info sharing with the larger
14 integrity data.

15 MR. MCLAREN: Yes, qualitative SMS
16 evaluation data stuff.

17 MR. COTE: Not so much that. I was
18 thinking more of the, you know, statistical
19 operating data in terms of, you know, leaks per
20 mile on bare steel, leaks per mile on plastic,
21 excavator damage per thousand locates. I mean, a
22 lot of very common operator industry methods.

1 No, I mean of all the areas, incident
2 data is absolutely the hardest to get. Anything
3 that is really serious, people, pardon the
4 expression, clam up tighter than a bull's butt.

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MR. HERETH: I can't wait to read this
7 transcript.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. COTE: Maybe this is off-base, but
10 I heard interest sharing, best type of sharing,
11 like inside a company, sharing data within
12 themselves, so it maybe get up to that level of
13 management or whatever. Like, the company
14 sharing east coast/west coast data or anything
15 like that.

16 MR. COTE: Large companies do, we do
17 for example. We will look across our seven
18 states and share state data on, you know, 40, 50
19 different risks.

20 MR. KIEBA: How about any value for
21 municipal to be part of this APGA?

22 MR. COTE: You bet you.

1 MR. KIEBA: Talk about scaling.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Hey, Mark, do you think
3 it would be valuable to have Jason come and
4 present what he's doing as far as lessons
5 learned?

6 MR. HERETH: Well, I think it's
7 probably worth having each of the associations
8 come and talk about their lessons learned. And
9 in the case of the foundation, it could be the
10 lessons learned repository.

11 (Off-microphone comment.)

12 MR. HERETH: And we had the challenge
13 there when we started in 2012 was, how do you get
14 people to participate?

15 (Off-microphone comment.)

16 MR. HERETH: Right.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. No, it really is,
18 it's a great story. I would actually have Paul
19 McKay present it because he manages it. He
20 really understands it well.

21 MR. JOHNSON: I'm sure either Paul or
22 Jason would be the best bet.

1 MR. KIEBA: Yes, yes.

2 PARTICIPANT: McKay.

3 MR. KIEBA: McKay, it's M-C and then
4 K-A-Y. Yes, he could actually demo it and show
5 it and --

6 PARTICIPANT: That's what we have here
7 --

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MR. KIEBA: Yes. That's where he's
10 really, really good. The advantage of, for
11 example, having like APGA is that you have Erin
12 Kurilla there now who came from AGA. So she kind
13 of, if she still has a little bit of a foot.

14 PARTICIPANT: It's sort of a bridge
15 between the two that's there.

16 MR. KIEBA: There's a bridge there.

17 MR. COTE: That's an idea. So, we'll
18 have her as a subcommittee member?

19 MR. HERETH: Or a presenter. I'm
20 think you could certainly add her as a
21 subcommittee member too.

22 (Simultaneous speaking.)

1 MR. COTE: Yes. I'm fine either way.
2 I could see the value in a subcommittee member or
3 a guest for --

4 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Who's that?

5 MR. COTE: APGA. And then it's Erin,
6 E-R-I-N, Kurilla, K-U-R-I-L-L-A

7 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Kurilla?

8 MR. COTE: Yes, Kurilla.

9 (Off-microphone comments)

10 MR. LAMONT: Stuart is probably the
11 best person for that.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Stuart?

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 MR. KIEBA: I do remember they're
15 getting rid of their PPTS effort, or not doing as
16 much with it?

17 MR. JOHNSON: They're changing it
18 right now.

19 MR. KIEBA: They're changing it.

20 MR. JOHNSON: There's some
21 modifications going on. So, yes.

22 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Time for break.

1 Let's head on out. Let's go outside and thaw
2 out.

3 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
4 went off the record at 3:09 p.m. and resumed at
5 3:29 p.m.)

6 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: I think we're about
7 ready to tie a bow around this, really. I've
8 been kind of building the presentation for
9 tomorrow as we go here.

10 PARTICIPANT: That's going to be a
11 presentation.

12 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, and one of the
13 things, I was talking to Mark and Bryce out in
14 the hall, it was not critical to the task
15 statement, but again just to get some concepts in
16 front of everybody as to kind of build, you know
17 if everybody kind of agrees on those kind of five
18 contexts that we talked about, those being the
19 last four, kind of building a matrix.

20 You know, so for each context, what is
21 the data or information that is intended to be
22 shared, who are the parties that are involved and

1 engaged in that sharing, again, what's the
2 desired outcome, maybe include what are some of
3 the obstacles. You can kind of building a matrix
4 to get head wrapped around, because not all
5 stakeholders are engaged in all of the context,
6 right? What else?

7 MR. COTE: Would you accept a friendly
8 amendment on the first bullet, take existing data
9 and the technology capacities, because data
10 pretty clearly is not the same as technology.
11 And for some pieces of our industry, it's really
12 aggregating the data we have today, not
13 necessarily creating new technology. Perfect,
14 thank you.

15 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So if everybody would
16 kind of get a head nod on that, we'll build that
17 tonight. It'll be just kind of more reference
18 material than anything.

19 MR. COTE: But I like it. I mean, as
20 a contextual document it really defines at a very
21 high level what's being proposed.

22 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Right.

1 MR. COTE: And if this gets approved
2 tomorrow, then it makes the next steps much
3 easier because the framework's now there.

4 MR. KIEBA: Yes, and I guess that was
5 my general question because I saw some of the
6 other subcommittees add a lot more detail of what
7 they hope to get done, but my guess is if you
8 don't even approve the top part, you're going to
9 have to redo that anyway. As long as it's
10 reasonable to start with a pretty high level and
11 if that gets accepted then --

12 MR. COTE: I think we have to. If we
13 go to too much detail now, then we're going to
14 get down to the weeds and get into this debate.
15 If you drill down sort of one layer at a time.

16 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: And again, you know,
17 we're not trying to solve --

18 MR. COTE: Right, we're trying to
19 frame.

20 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: We're trying to
21 frame.

22 MR. COTE: You're exactly right.

1 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: You know, and give
2 recommendations, you know, whoever goes and
3 solves it, here's the things you need to think
4 about.

5 MR. COTE: Exactly.

6 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Here's the framework,
7 here's what it should accomplish, here are the
8 parties involved.

9 MR. KIEBA: Then for following
10 meetings we could figure out if this gets
11 approved, how far --

12 MR. COTE: Yes, you know, ironically
13 for a group of sort of hands on operating guys,
14 our deliverable is a recommendation. Which
15 means, after that do you get into this is how you
16 really do all this.

17 MR. KIEBA: Okay.

18 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Exactly.

19 MR. COTE: Too bad this joint doesn't
20 have a fire pit we could go sit around.

21 (Simultaneous speaking.)

22 MR. COTE: Right, exactly. There you

1 go.

2 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: All right, we missing
3 anything? If not, no reason to sit here.

4 MR. HERETH: On Cliff/Walter, you're
5 thinking of them as a subcommittee member.

6 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes. I want to
7 confirm that.

8 MR. HERETH: And I guess my only
9 question with Walter is are you going to be able
10 to get his time?

11 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

12 MR. HERETH: He'd be great, I guess
13 it's just can you get his time.

14 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

15 MR. COTE: Well, let's try.

16 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, yes. Hey we got
17 yours.

18 MR. COTE: No, I think it's a good
19 idea. I like it.

20 MR. KIEBA: Do we need to add more
21 around HA staff what we're looking for there?

22 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: I don't think so.

1 MR. KIEBA: I know we talked about it.

2 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

3 MR. KIEBA: Is there any particular
4 committee you think might be for the staff?

5 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, what is their
6 contribution that we're looking for?

7 MR. COTE: Their contribution will be
8 on the current data that they capture, the
9 current statistical industry data that they
10 capture. And they did a very formal process
11 every couple of years and, I mean, they produce
12 reams of data. The question is how to, you know,
13 what were their challenges in getting it?

14 I think what I would ask them is,
15 first of all, is that data that they, I mean,
16 could we simply share that and import it or how
17 would we go about doing that if we wanted to.
18 That's one.

19 I think the second question is as we
20 think about soliciting distribution companies for
21 data, I mean, what obstacles did you guys run
22 into in terms of the challenges around it? And

1 those would be the two questions I would ask.

2 MR. HERETH: And do you know who it
3 is, that's really the bench marking stuff that
4 they do?

5 MR. COTE: Yes, that's the bench
6 marking.

7 MR. HERETH: Who runs that now?

8 MR. COTE: I think it's Andrew.

9 MR. HERETH: It's Andrew Lou
10 (phonetic).

11 MR. COTE: I think so, I'm not 100
12 percent certain.

13 MR. HERETH: That's who it used to
14 be.

15 MR. COTE: Yes. And I don't know that
16 he handed it off. He may have, we can find out.
17 He's going to be here tomorrow. So we can ask
18 him.

19 MR. HERETH: Okay, good. Yes, either
20 Andrew or Christina could speak to it.

21 MR. COTE: Yes, exactly.

22 MR. HERETH: Andrew's probably the

1 more accessible.

2 MR. COTE: Yes.

3 MR. HERETH: On a continual basis,
4 yes. You know, I guess the other thing is, is as
5 a presenter, there's a difference between INGA
6 and the INGAA Foundation. And so I would have
7 C.J. Osman come from INGAA, because we do a whole
8 bunch of different lessons learned things there
9 that are different than what we do in the
10 Foundation.

11 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay, so both?

12 MR. HERETH: Yes, I would have Paul
13 McKay and C.J. Osman.

14 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay.

15 MR. HERETH: Yes, and then the last
16 name is O-S-M-A-N.

17 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay.

18 MR. KIEBA: Do we have -- oh, sorry.

19 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Well, we're going to
20 ask Stuart to kind of the same thing, lessons
21 learned?

22 MR. KIEBA: So we'll talk about, if I

1 remember, recall, we would talk about both the
2 SMS RP but also anything on their voluntary,
3 like, they call it pipeline info exchange or the
4 new version of PPTS. I can't remember what it
5 stands for, Pipeline Performance Tracking System,
6 is that right?

7 PARTICIPANT: That's what it was,
8 right.

9 MR. MCLAREN: Dave, Mark, and Stuart,
10 they said that they were utilizing the DOT
11 accident form more now and the PPTS less.

12 The days of Cheryl producing all those
13 detailed reports and advisories is gone. That is
14 now RCP, but it's at a much lower frequency with
15 less output.

16 MR. KIEBA: Yes, because I just
17 thought the PPTS collected a lot more or just
18 lower level, maybe not reportable stuff, but I
19 don't know.

20 MR. HERETH: The very same thing
21 happened within INGAA. So we used to have all
22 this data that we collected. And then as the

1 incident data report has really gotten more and
2 more robust, we don't do that anymore because one
3 of the challenges is how do you get everybody to
4 submit data? Well the beauty of the incident
5 report, everybody submits data.

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 MR. MCLAREN: Most everybody.

8 MR. KIEBA: You don't have any choice.

9 So it gives you 100 percent coverage.

10 MR. HERETH: And so the very same
11 thing happened within INGAA. We really don't do
12 very many separate data collection exercises
13 anymore. And we rely on the PHMSA database
14 because it's really good.

15 MR. KIEBA: And I think what APJ would
16 help is what's the most basic information the
17 municipals use because they're not going to --

18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 MR. KIEBA: That's all they go by,
20 right?

21 MR. MCLAREN: That's kind of the shame
22 of the PPTS and the kind of going way out stuff

1 with the FRA and the FAA because those were some
2 excellent near miss modeling from the FRA's that
3 they presented on.

4 I was talking with Amy Nelson about
5 process design flow diagrams, and she's got one
6 for MPMS that she sent. And I reply back, you
7 know, I agree that something like that should be
8 in our final report out for both qualitative and
9 quantitative data gathering.

10 However, how do we go to FRA and FAAs,
11 and what's your process flow diagram? I mean, I
12 saw some, but they were very high level and they
13 didn't really include that, so I think that's an
14 important part of the discussion.

15 PARTICIPANT: Yes, I like that.

16 MR. MCLAREN: Hey, Cliff's got a
17 process flow diagram system.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we do.

19 MR. MCLAREN: I would love to see a
20 copy of it.

21 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: We have guests,
22 potential members. On the upcoming interim

1 meetings, the other groups talked about, at least
2 three, the potential for having a joint meeting
3 with Best Practices, Process Sharing and R&D.

4 We have to check with the parent
5 committee if that's even allowed to do a big
6 joint committee because that's getting pretty
7 large. But the thought was with some of these,
8 especially in the morning, they overlapped and
9 some people in one that ideally would have been
10 in another.

11 Otherwise, we might need to talk about
12 if we want to have some calls or webinars, even
13 if it's an hour or two hour, in the interim as we
14 get into additional task statements.

15 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes. Are all
16 subcommittee members are required to participate?

17 (Off-microphone comments.)

18 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Do we, now?

19 MR. HERETH: I don't think --

20 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: We were talking in
21 the hall, Mark and Bryce and I, you know, get
22 together in Houston and kind of hash through some

1 things. I mean, is that allowed? Can we do
2 that? Or do we need to have all --

3 MR. HERETH: Well, I was thinking that
4 we would add whoever wanted to come on on the
5 phone so that we were still --

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Open, it remains
8 open, yes. Yes, we could do it in combination --

9 (Simultaneous speaking.)

10 PARTICIPANT: Subcommittees getting
11 together.

12 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: -- in person
13 conference call?

14 MR. HERETH: Yes.

15 MR. KIEBA: Three subcommittee members
16 could gather and talk. And I'm in Houston, too.

17 MR. HERETH: I think that would be --

18 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, I would correct
19 that and say, you know, we would do a kind of a
20 combination face-to-face with all subcommittee
21 members invited on the phone. I would think that
22 would be --

1 MR. KIEBA: I would think even if you
2 do smaller, as long it's reported up through the
3 subcommittee, then eventually the parent, I think
4 that's fine. I think the only careful thing is
5 everyone just needs to be careful. You can't
6 talk to me directly unless you're there, you
7 know, I think that's the only, if anything I'm
8 more a limiting factor than anything else.

9 MR. MCLAREN: Oh, because you have to
10 be present.

11 MR. KIEBA: And vice versa, I can't
12 have one or two people saying I think we should
13 do this and then, you know, so if anyone comes to
14 me, I have to share with at least some members of
15 the subcommittee.

16 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay.

17 MR. KIEBA: It's a good question to
18 ask Christie though is, but I would think in
19 person as long as you open up on the phone. I
20 don't think there are, if I remember, no quorum
21 requirements. Does anyone remember for
22 subcommittee meeting work or work groups, I don't

1 think -- Chris, or there's our Chair?

2 MR. MCLAREN: For the subcommittee, an
3 ADFO has to be present.

4 MR. KIEBA: EMF is like a smaller
5 group, probably?

6 MR. MCLAREN: Not a working group. A
7 work group does not have to have a DFO, an
8 established work group. Now, if the three
9 subcommittee chairman want to talk amongst
10 themselves, I think that's where you ask whether
11 you call that a work group with no DFO needed.

12 In terms of who you can call, I don't
13 think there's any problems with three of us. But
14 with work groups, there's no DFO needed.

15 MR. KIEBA: So that could be a benefit
16 of setting up work groups. So that's how you
17 guys were starting to do one, right? So that's
18 an opportunity to, if you want to set up work
19 groups --

20 MR. MCLAREN: What you need is to make
21 sure that the assumptions were all lining up and
22 aligned to this.

1 MR. HERETH: I don't think that's
2 something that needs to be set up by tomorrow,
3 right, on the work groups?

4 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Work groups? I don't
5 think so. You know, Bryce, you guys set up three
6 work groups within your subcommittees. So sub-
7 sub-committees?

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MR. MCLAREN: So if you want to get
10 in, you better get here early.

11 MR. HERETH: He's already on the
12 process sharing committee.

13 MR. MCLAREN: Oh, no.

14 MR. HERETH: He's already committed.
15 And we're not going to release him from his
16 contract.

17 MR. JOHNSON: What are you willing to
18 change for us?

19 MR. COTE: Well, you know, this means
20 though that you all have to support the missions
21 and objectives presentations tomorrow so that I
22 get up from under that.

1 PARTICIPANT: Can we vote now?

2 (Laughter.)

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 MR. KIEBA: So there's a possibility
5 we could switch around any DFOs if needed.

6 MR. MCLAREN: Yes, absolutely.

7 MR. KIEBA: So, we don't want to hold
8 up the ability for a subcommittee to meet if I
9 can't do it or something.

10 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay. What else?

11 MR. MCLAREN: I had one observation
12 about, I want to reiterate the statement I made
13 earlier about the number of external SMEs that
14 we're looking at for each of these.

15 I mean, we may have a whole herd of
16 these people. And I think that's a good question
17 for Christie and/or Diane and/or whoever. How
18 many external SMEs as a subcommittee and as a
19 subcommittee do we get? I mean, we want six,
20 they've got about seven or eight. Maybe seven.

21 MR. COTE: Just as a matter of
22 governance, I wouldn't think you would want the

1 extended subcommittee members to outnumber the
2 committee members.

3 MR. KIEBA: So if I can just clarify
4 that, I think for this subcommittee they're
5 asking for Cliff or Walter, right?

6 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

7 MR. KIEBA: And they're asking for an
8 AGA staff member. So that's just two committee
9 members. Then those others are guest presenters.

10 MR. MCLAREN: Guest presenters.

11 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

12 MR. KIEBA: Just to clarify, I think.
13 With the potential that if any of those guest
14 presenters wow us, that we might say they might
15 be subcommittee. But you know, right now they're
16 guest presenters.

17 MR. HERETH: So then it is a relevant
18 question.

19 MS. BORENER: It is a relevant
20 question.

21 MR. MCLAREN: Because we identify by
22 cause, and want to see FAA. And again it talks

1 about ASIAS and OQA and, I mean, there are other
2 committees --

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Well, and I think we
5 got to coordinate it between subcommittees too.
6 If we're both, you know, like Warren Randolph,
7 he's probably going to be a hot commodity, right?
8 We don't want him having to do three or four
9 presentations, so we should collaborate on that,
10 combine it.

11 MR. COTE: Yes, that's a good idea.

12 MR. MCLAREN: It's kind of the
13 interesting part of using the afternoon of the
14 day two for the presentations, and I think if we
15 stay on that program, which I like, continue
16 with us asking better and more pointed questions
17 after each working meeting.

18 MR. HERETH: I think the other thing
19 to this point that we need to be sensitive to is
20 that we have to be careful, I think, that we
21 don't have the public members feeling like
22 they're overwhelmed, because that's happened

1 recently in a couple of committees and it's
2 actually caused one or two public groups to
3 withdraw from those committees. And I don't
4 think that's where we want to get to.

5 So I think we have to be really
6 careful adding large numbers of industry folks,
7 whether it's operators and service providers, I
8 have a lot of confidence that Kate would be vocal
9 and that probably Holly would be as well. But I
10 don't think we want to have them in that position
11 where they feel like they have to speak up. I'm
12 just offering that, and we need to be sensitive
13 to that.

14 MR. KIEBA: A fun one to put on if you
15 want is someone like Kuprewicz. He's very vocal,
16 but he might help give some insight on what's
17 really needed or not, if we start approaching at
18 what we want to share in public.

19 MR. HERETH: He comes at a price.

20 MR. KIEBA: He does, yes, no question.

21 MR. HERETH: And I'm not talking about
22 dollars.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. KIEBA: But if you pitch it in a
3 reasonable way, he also sometimes gives
4 reasonable feedback.

5 PARTICIPANT: Fair point, right, fair
6 point.

7 (Off-microphone comments.)

8 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay. I recommend we
9 adjourn.

10 MR. KIEBA: Are you all set for
11 questioning tomorrow?

12 CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

13 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
14 went off the record at 3:49 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A

- A&Es** 75:22
AA 7:14
ability 13:15 47:11
55:10 117:8
able 17:10 49:1
69:19 71:22 86:13
105:9
above-entitled
101:3 121:13
absolutely 28:21
83:10 86:14 97:2
117:6
accept 102:7
acceptable 31:20
accepted 103:11
access 29:21 48:18
49:9 54:6,7 55:17
60:10 75:18 76:4
79:5 84:16
accessibility 60:9
accessible 53:12
108:1
accessing 37:5
accident 39:17
109:11
accidents 39:1
accomplish 89:16
104:7
accomplished
27:17
accomplishes 9:12
65:17
accumulated 73:3
accumulation
14:21
accurate 34:18
acquisition 37:22
acronyms 64:16
action 42:19,22
54:13 68:8 89:4
actionable 40:17
41:2 63:13,14
68:6 69:16 80:1
actions 43:13,13
68:14
active 67:18
actively 74:13
- activity** 54:16
actor 39:14,15
actors 46:14,16
88:19
actual 17:13 22:3
acuity 84:5
acute 66:14
add 30:5 73:8 80:18
99:20 103:6
105:20 113:4
adding 120:6
additional 15:22
21:12 112:14
additions 83:12
address 4:2 11:20
13:2
addresses 12:22
ADFO 115:3
adjourn 121:9
adjust 30:5
ADMINISTRATION
1:1
advantage 61:9
99:10
advisories 109:13
advocates 20:6
affect 37:14,21
38:11,18 39:2
affirmative 45:5
afford 94:17
afternoon 3:4 90:6
119:13
AGA 46:21 50:8,10
53:1 56:12 80:21
93:2,22 94:1 95:8
96:5 99:12 118:8
agency 92:11
agenda 3:6 5:10
aggravated 29:22
aggregated 30:20
aggregating 102:12
Agile 32:11
ago 33:2 65:8 93:10
agree 22:11 43:20
47:14 50:5 51:17
85:12 89:22 111:7
Agreed 25:6
agreement 26:8
- agrees** 101:17
ah 71:22
ahead 3:4 28:11
Ahuva 1:14 3:22
airline 35:18 41:10
46:16 48:19
airlines 23:10
airplane 42:7
airplanes 38:22
46:17
albeit 12:20
alert 42:10
aligned 115:22
alignment 16:18
allow 56:13
allowed 112:5
113:1
allowing 85:21
allows 42:18
Amal 4:5
amendment 79:16
102:8
America 1:21
amount 50:8 74:21
Amundsen 1:11,13
3:3,10 4:15,19 5:7
6:17 10:22 20:16
27:6,12 33:8
39:21 40:10 52:4
52:16 53:18 65:5
69:2 70:10 71:8
71:15 72:22 73:3
76:22 79:10 81:3
82:15 89:12 90:5
91:5 95:5 100:4,7
100:22 101:6,12
102:15,22 103:16
103:20 104:1,6,18
105:2,6,11,14,16
105:22 106:2,5
108:11,14,17,19
111:21 112:15,18
112:20 113:7,12
113:18 114:16
116:4 117:10
118:6,11 119:4
121:8,12
Amy 111:4
- analysis** 11:17
34:21 37:9 72:4
76:10 83:2,2,5,11
analytic 12:14
analytical 9:3
analytics 9:11 66:1
66:10 79:19,21
analyzed 71:18
and/or 66:1 79:19
79:20 117:17,17
Andrew 107:8,9,20
Andrew's 107:22
anecdotal 62:5
63:10
anomalies 44:10
46:2
anomaly 42:5
anonymity 48:6
anonymous 41:12
anonymously
58:22 59:6
answer 4:7 8:11
62:18 70:22 84:15
anti-trust 22:18,21
antitrust 36:9
anybody 49:2 52:8
57:19 59:8 67:20
anymore 110:2,13
anyway 23:19 25:3
103:9
AOPL 53:1
apart 57:10
APGA 97:21 99:11
100:5
API 53:1 56:9 80:21
93:2
APJ 110:15
applicant 8:2
application 7:9
applications 57:22
85:5
applying 69:22
appreciate 4:20
approach 9:3 60:21
approaches 12:21
approaching
120:17
appropriately 78:7

approve 103:8
approved 103:1
 104:11
arbitrary 94:6
area 27:2 38:6
areas 18:15 59:7
 66:22 83:13 97:1
argue 46:10
Arlington 1:10,10
articulate 8:13
ASIAS 119:1
asked 29:8 32:16
 62:2 93:9
asking 9:5 29:12
 60:7 118:5,7
 119:16
aspects 49:19
assess 12:22 21:22
assessment 7:12
 7:16 9:18 45:8
 46:12
assessments 8:6
 24:11
asset 40:2 41:7
associate 1:20
 59:18
association 52:19
 52:21 59:19 95:14
 95:16
associations 53:2
 95:7 98:7
assumptions
 115:21
assure 7:17 8:4
ATA 59:8
attempt 6:21 7:19
attention 67:21
attorneys 4:1
audible 4:18
audience 21:15
 22:9
auditors 74:10
authority 94:16
available 29:18
 30:16 75:16 95:22
avenues 47:18 50:8
avoid 56:20
avoided 66:11

aware 12:4 13:8
awesome 30:15
 77:21
awful 86:13

B

back 10:4 12:6,7
 16:3 20:4 26:11
 26:13 27:21 28:2
 28:5 36:5,21 47:6
 47:11 65:4,7
 68:17 70:3 72:5
 77:15 78:1,5
 79:12 111:6
bad 37:18 39:14,15
 46:14,16 74:16
 88:19 104:19
Baker 8:9
balance 39:10
ball 80:10
bare 50:11 86:22
 87:6 96:20
barrier 36:10
base 74:10
based 37:2 40:15
 60:17 92:5
baseline 81:22 82:1
basic 62:4 110:16
basically 23:9
 56:13
basis 8:19 80:12
 108:3
Battams 1:14 3:22
 3:22 16:5,8 36:18
 39:7 54:11,15,20
 55:11 78:9,15
beauty 110:4
believe 29:8 82:13
Bellamy 8:9
belong 10:18
bench 107:3,5
benefit 70:21
 115:15
BESSE 35:20 36:1
best 1:6 3:5 5:22
 8:10,16 9:20 10:3
 10:8,13 12:6
 14:10 15:10,18

16:13 18:3 20:7
 20:19 28:8 36:4
 51:2 53:8 54:3,4
 62:12,13 63:4
 65:15 66:21 67:9
 68:21 80:22 89:15
 97:10 98:22
 100:11 112:3
bet 97:22 98:22
better 14:7 35:11
 42:19 44:3 45:7,8
 45:13 46:13 51:3
 52:5,7 56:14 71:5
 84:5,13 86:5
 116:10 119:16
beyond 24:14
big 30:9 64:2 95:8
 95:10 112:5
bigger 16:5,7
bit 6:16 18:7 65:7
 65:10 79:22 99:13
black 17:12,14
Blacksmith 3:16
blind 69:21
block 71:21
Blystone 1:15 4:16
 17:11,18,22 29:2
 29:7,11,15
board 59:18
boats 7:22 33:17
body 73:21
bolster 13:20
Borener 1:15 3:20
 3:20 37:13 40:9
 40:14 41:17 44:20
 48:16 71:20 83:15
 85:8,17 118:19
borrow 25:19,20
bottom 87:9,10,10
 88:1
bow 101:7
break 20:15 49:18
 49:21 100:22
breaking 19:21
bridge 99:14,16
brief 93:21
briefly 71:3
bring 24:16 54:12

60:6 76:17 85:4
 93:4
bringing 31:5,6
 55:3 59:17 91:15
brings 27:12 39:21
broad 23:16
broader 20:22
 21:11
brought 15:14
 19:15 25:11 26:4
Brown 1:16 4:9,9
 58:8,13,16 59:4,7
 61:6
Bryce 1:16 4:9 6:5
 8:8 101:13 112:21
 116:5
build 101:16 102:16
building 61:4 82:11
 101:8,19 102:3
bull's 97:4
bullet 19:12,15,20
 33:8 36:3,13
 63:22 79:17 81:10
 102:8
bunch 48:10 108:8
Bureau 92:11
BURMAN 1:17
business 46:15,16
busted 55:4
butt 97:4
buttons 93:8
buy 34:11

C

c 16:11
C-1 27:7
C.J 108:7,13
call 20:4 32:14 35:9
 75:19 109:3
 113:13 115:11,12
called 57:17
calls 112:12
capabilities 11:16
 13:16 33:11
capability 11:20
 34:1
capable 33:21
capacities 102:9

capture 106:8,10
car 34:11
careful 26:19 114:4
 114:5 119:20
 120:6
cares 89:2
Carl's 25:20
carriers 23:11
carrying 82:18
cars 34:10 89:4,7
case 26:5 31:18
 60:6 88:8 92:9
 98:9
cases 18:8 48:9
 80:9
catch 74:18
categories 70:22
cause 75:2 118:22
caused 120:2
center 35:11
certain 11:22 23:1
 39:22 49:19 59:7
 62:21 78:2 107:12
certainly 15:12,21
 16:10,12,15,16
 17:4 18:7,13 19:1
 20:9,13 26:6
 29:17 51:5 61:20
 61:22 63:22 64:9
 91:21 99:20
cetera 85:1
chain 58:10 67:11
 67:15
Chair 1:11,13 3:3
 4:15,19 5:7 6:17
 10:22 20:16 27:6
 27:12 33:8 39:21
 40:10 52:4,16
 53:18 65:5 69:2
 70:10 71:8,15
 72:22 73:3 76:22
 79:10 81:3 82:15
 89:12 90:5 91:5
 95:5 100:4,7,22
 101:6,12 102:15
 102:22 103:16,20
 104:1,6,18 105:2
 105:6,11,14,16,22

106:2,5 108:11,14
 108:17,19 111:21
 112:15,18,20
 113:7,12,18
 114:16 115:1
 116:4 117:10
 118:6,11 119:4
 121:8,12
chairman 3:11
 115:9
challenge 28:7
 69:15 98:12
challenges 36:10
 106:13,22 110:3
chance 17:9 19:18
 77:19
change 21:8 37:11
 38:18 49:12 68:9
 73:16 74:14 75:12
 77:20 116:18
changed 65:11
changes 22:10
changing 100:17
 100:19
characterization
 24:14
characterize 10:1
characterized 67:3
 67:16
characterizing
 12:18
charge 26:14,16,20
chart 72:16
charter 48:5
cheating 65:6
 78:19
check 12:7 112:4
Cheryl 109:12
Chief 2:13
choice 110:8
Chris 2:11 3:17
 4:11 115:1
Christie 2:12
 114:18 117:17
Christina 107:20
CHRISTOPHER
 2:16
Christy 15:14

circumstances
 13:9 54:13
clam 97:4
clarify 118:3,12
class 7:9 8:10
clear 43:22 91:22
clearly 102:10
Cliff 6:10 59:9
 90:13 118:5
Cliff's 111:16
Cliff/Walter 105:4
closed 53:4 57:1,7
 59:10 66:1
closely 50:1
coast 97:14
coast/west 97:14
code 94:5
collaborate 90:8
 119:9
collaborating 5:18
 90:20
collaboration 11:17
collaboratively
 68:4
collect 47:1 53:22
collected 109:17,22
collecting 84:14
collection 51:18
 110:12
collectively 28:8
 68:4
collects 92:8
combination 91:10
 113:8,20
combine 119:10
come 4:6 14:12
 15:8,12 35:22
 42:1 48:20 53:8
 53:19 56:22 61:7
 61:21 64:19 78:16
 87:8 93:4 98:3,8
 108:7 113:4
comes 76:9 114:13
 120:19
comfort 93:18
comfortable 54:8
 85:14 92:6 95:22
coming 21:1 33:6

77:15
comment 20:16
 21:12 48:15 77:22
 82:21 98:11,15
comments 10:14
 35:7,13 77:8
 83:14 85:7 100:9
 112:17 121:7
commerce 39:6
Commission 1:17
 2:15 4:14
Commissioner
 1:17
commitment 4:20
committed 116:14
committee 6:2,20
 7:18 10:11,19
 21:16 47:1 64:10
 64:22 65:12 91:18
 106:4 112:5,6
 116:12 118:2,8
committees 119:2
 120:1,3
commodity 119:7
common 53:12
 61:7 64:16 96:22
communicate
 13:15 56:13
communication
 66:19
communications
 33:15
communities 13:18
 20:1
community 19:8
companies 22:20
 50:16 59:1 95:14
 97:16 106:20
company 23:9 38:1
 38:5 39:2,6 44:13
 58:17,19 66:13
 67:9 94:2,8 97:11
 97:13
compared 41:11
 72:15
compel 52:6
compelled 65:18
compelling 52:10

52:13
compendium 86:19
competitive 71:12
 90:22
compiled 96:11
complex 31:15
Compliance 1:18
complying 88:15
component 49:19
components 20:6
 86:22
comprehensive 8:3
concept 71:4 80:11
concepts 16:2
 101:15
concern 23:7
condition 40:2,11
 40:11
conduct 5:15 53:3
conference 113:13
confidence 13:20
 33:11 120:8
confident 40:13
confidential 23:11
confidentiality 26:8
confidentially 59:3
confirm 105:7
Congress 26:15,20
 27:4
congressional
 26:12
connected 82:17
connection 88:22
consequence
 12:21
consequences
 40:21
consider 5:18 6:7
 15:11 93:3
consideration
 27:13
considerations
 5:14
considered 24:22
 39:20
consistent 7:1 8:5
 9:9 28:16
consistent/best 7:9

Consultants 1:19
consumers 20:1
Cont'd 2:9
context 6:17 10:20
 13:5 14:5,9 21:4
 36:15 40:17 43:2
 49:8 69:22 70:8
 101:20 102:5
contexts 7:3 10:16
 11:14 101:18
contextual 102:20
continual 108:3
continually 14:3
continue 34:19
 119:15
continues 28:6
continuous 16:22
contract 76:21
 116:16
contractors 24:11
 75:3
contradictory
 28:20
contribute 70:6
contributing 48:19
contribution 106:6
 106:7
contributor 48:22
control 59:15
cool 17:22 41:14
coordinate 84:17
 119:5
copy 111:20
core 50:14,15 66:22
corporate 95:3
corporation 94:12
correct 78:14
 113:18
corrosion 11:22
 46:1 50:11 87:6
cost 78:19
COTE 1:18 21:12
 23:7 24:7 25:6
 26:22 28:14,19
 31:1 32:11,15
 35:3 43:18 45:3
 47:17 49:22 50:6
 53:9,21 56:12

57:11 69:14 70:12
 71:7 73:7,18
 74:20 75:2,8,13
 75:15 76:1,5,9,15
 79:16 82:8,22
 86:8 91:4 93:6,20
 95:8,12,15,18,20
 96:4,7,17 97:9,16
 97:22 99:17 100:1
 100:5,8 102:7,19
 103:1,12,18,22
 104:5,12,19,22
 105:15,18 106:7
 107:5,8,11,15,21
 108:2 116:19
 117:21 119:11
country 75:3
couple 3:8 85:15
 106:11 120:1
course 22:5
coverage 110:9
cracks 34:12,12
crappy 73:9
crashes 41:14,17
create 62:12 70:20
creates 70:8
creating 10:20
 102:13
criminal 54:16
critical 101:14
crowd 84:3
cultural 66:15
current 35:1 65:22
 66:21 79:18,20
 81:14,15,18,21
 82:2,10 83:1,6
 106:8,9
curve 51:7 82:11
cycle 57:14

D

daily 9:11 65:16
damage 50:12 75:6
 86:22 94:9 96:21
damaged 74:22
damages 75:4
damn 56:17
Dan 1:18 29:4 31:5

49:17 59:8 61:6
 61:13 70:7 82:20
dangerous 47:16
darn 45:13 46:12
 50:7,21
data 9:2,14,16 10:7
 11:3,3,11 14:11
 20:20 21:20,21
 22:1,6,14 23:8,10
 29:13,18,21,22
 30:9,10,11,13
 31:1,3,7,12,14
 32:20 33:13 34:14
 34:21,22 36:11,22
 37:4,8,15 38:9
 39:17 40:5 43:3
 44:7,21 45:7,15
 45:18 46:4,9,11
 47:15,21 48:7,10
 49:1,3,4,10,13
 50:3,10,21 51:16
 52:13 53:22 54:11
 54:21,22 55:15,15
 56:19 60:11,12
 62:3,6,14,18 63:3
 63:9,13 66:6
 67:11 69:9,16,19
 69:21 70:18,18,19
 71:21,22 73:4,14
 77:1,20 78:10
 79:20 81:22 82:2
 82:10,11 84:17
 86:7,18,20 87:3,5
 88:5 92:8 93:22
 94:1,12 95:1,21
 96:14,16,19 97:2
 97:11,14,18
 101:21 102:8,9,12
 106:8,9,12,15,21
 109:22 110:1,4,5
 110:12 111:9
database 34:16
 37:5 47:1 57:17
 58:16 62:20 75:21
 77:2 79:1 87:20
 96:10 110:13
databases 62:9
dates 73:5

Dave 109:9
day 53:16 60:1,1
 75:19 119:14
day-8:18
day-out 8:19
days 109:12
DC 28:22
deal 26:18 40:7
 54:10 89:8
deals 86:20
dealt 23:10
debate 103:14
December 17:3
 51:22
decide 10:11
decides 63:21
decile 87:10
deciles 50:18
decision 40:19 41:1
decisionmakers
 20:2
decisionmaking
 38:18
decisions 9:17 10:1
 55:21 94:12
defect 34:14 42:9
define 11:10 33:13
 63:9
defines 102:20
definitely 56:21
definitive 27:10
degree 69:4
deliberate 6:3
 67:17,22
deliberation 90:6
deliverable 104:14
deliverables 64:6,8
 64:13
delivering 9:9
demo 99:4
demonstratively
 41:10
dent 40:17
dents 44:11
dependent 55:20
depending 37:11
 63:20
depends 78:10

deploy 8:3 10:9
 14:12 33:22
deployed 13:22
deploying 8:22 9:8
 13:20 14:1
deployment 7:10
 66:16
descends 51:12
described 28:15
description 35:5
descriptions 20:9
design 48:17 111:5
desire 37:14
desired 7:5 102:2
detail 56:4 90:14
 92:7 103:6,13
detailed 109:13
detection 85:1
determine 63:3
determining 12:17
develop 5:13
developed 58:4
developing 12:9
 60:20 64:14 81:22
development 18:2
 82:3
DFO 3:14 115:7,11
 115:14
DFOs 117:5
diagram 111:11,17
diagrams 111:5
Diane 1:17 117:17
dice 26:10
die 72:10
difference 74:13
 108:5
different 7:3 18:22
 19:5,10,22 20:6
 27:16 37:1,2,10
 37:11,12 38:2
 44:4 46:6 48:21
 51:13 56:7 60:8
 61:8 62:7,7 72:3
 85:6,22 88:4,6
 97:19 108:8,9
differently 79:22
differing 58:22
difficult 48:13

dig 10:2 44:21
 45:13 48:3
digs 44:15
direct 7:12 9:18
 24:11
directive 26:12
directly 114:6
Director 1:20
disappear 6:15
disconnect 48:14
disconnected 53:7
discover 42:2
discreet 60:12
discuss 25:22
discussed 63:7
discussion 8:8
 10:14 15:13 17:6
 20:3 25:5 63:10
 63:15,17 70:3
 111:14
discussions 5:20
 15:5 18:10 19:16
 19:20 20:14 77:11
distribution 23:17
 24:19 74:22 86:21
 106:20
ditch 9:21 10:3
 25:14
dive 14:9
document 15:6
 17:16 36:14
 102:20
doing 9:10,18,19
 10:3 12:7 23:18
 33:17,19 34:4,11
 34:13 36:1 40:12
 40:13 43:8 46:13
 52:8 53:5 56:18
 68:20 71:5 73:20
 80:4,21 83:9
 94:20 98:4 100:15
 106:17
dollars 120:22
domains 60:9
door 55:3 59:10
 84:7 87:8
dot 72:14,14 109:10
draft 15:1,7 51:21

64:4 65:6
dramatically 74:6
draw 84:9 92:3
drill 20:14 103:15
drinking 86:15
driver 26:14
driving 12:13
dropdown 16:18
due 37:20
dust 89:2
duties 60:18

E

E-R-I-N 100:6
earlier 31:10 32:2
 34:8 43:15 55:20
 56:8 91:7 117:13
early 42:11,17,22
 116:10
ears 27:20
easier 28:3 82:16
 103:3
easily 95:21
east 97:14
easy 50:20
edge 71:12
editorial 93:21
education 66:7
 90:4
EEC 96:9
effect 39:5 53:18
effective 52:22
effort 69:5 100:15
efforts 4:21 46:21
egg 23:20
eight 117:20
either 98:21 100:1
 107:19
element 63:18
elements 36:16
 64:5
elevates 94:15
elicits 95:2
else's 49:2,4,15
eluded 62:2
email 4:1,4 58:10
emails 58:9
EMF 115:4

employed 66:18
enable 7:22
encountered 56:15
endangering 49:9
Energy 3:10
Energy/Energy
 1:14
enforcement 43:20
 43:21 45:20 54:10
 54:12 55:2 83:20
 88:19
engaged 68:3
 74:13 102:1,5
engagement 67:18
 68:7
engagements 68:7
Engineer 2:13
Engineers 92:14
enhance 26:21
enhanced 66:4
enormous 24:16
ensure 7:19
entered 41:19
entire 23:18 47:15
entirely 62:7
entities 61:8 68:10
entity 68:10
enumerate 81:3
environment 38:14
 60:7
environmental
 57:13
environments
 13:10 34:17
Eric 1:11,13 3:10
 15:2 29:3 61:2
 65:4 80:16 92:18
Eric's 61:3 70:8
Erin 99:11 100:5
error 25:15 94:10
 94:18
especially 28:5
 81:6 112:8
essence 33:16
essential 44:21
essentially 23:11
established 115:8
et 85:1

evaluate 65:14
evaluation 96:16
evaluations 16:20
eventually 48:2
 64:11 114:3
everybody 8:15
 49:4,15 58:3
 59:21 75:18 88:14
 101:16,17 102:15
 110:3,5,7
everybody's 4:20
 79:7
exactly 27:5 38:9
 48:17 70:12,12
 74:20 75:1,7,13
 83:8 95:18 96:4
 103:22 104:5,18
 104:22 107:21
example 9:4 24:10
 35:17 38:21 44:9
 45:21 50:21 59:16
 86:21 87:7 94:9
 97:17 99:11
examples 35:16
 71:2 81:4 90:16
excavations 9:19
excavator 50:12
 86:21 96:21
excellent 111:2
exception 71:17
exchange 109:3
exclusively 26:18
execution 66:8
exercises 110:12
exist 24:18 33:20
 34:6
existing 7:10 11:15
 12:16,17,18 33:12
 33:18 65:14 80:20
 82:4,5 102:8
exists 12:11
expect 13:5,11
experience 66:6
 86:10 92:3
experiences 59:14
experts 30:16 33:2
 69:17
explained 48:13

81:6
exposing 86:4
expression 97:4
extended 118:1
extensively 24:22
extent 24:18 28:16
 90:1
external 6:8 90:7
 117:13,18
extremely 45:1
 88:10
eyes 91:2

F

FAA 30:10 41:21
 43:7,21 55:5 78:7
 78:10 111:1
 118:22
FAAs 111:10
face 72:4
face-to-face 113:20
fact 71:1
factor 78:18 114:8
factors 37:12
failure 47:7
failures 47:2 96:11
fair 24:13 32:17
 35:4 50:8 58:7
 121:5,5
fairly 20:17
fall 27:20 47:15
falling 46:17
falls 57:10 89:3
false 13:2
fantastic 39:16
far 51:20 98:4
 104:11
faster 84:16,22
fear 85:11
features 60:15
FEBRUARY 1:8
feedback 26:16,20
 35:10 121:4
feel 85:14 120:11
feeling 119:21
feels 30:21
feet 39:13
field 80:12 85:3

89:1
fields 70:18
fifteen 86:17
fifth 31:11,16,22
fighting 56:16
figure 23:4 46:18
 48:14 53:22 54:1
 63:4 64:8 77:12
 83:8 104:10
figures 64:21
fill 12:17 33:19 34:5
filling 33:12
final 51:21 111:8
financial 85:20 86:6
find 13:6,11 23:6
 45:9,14 83:16
 107:16
finding 39:10 40:21
findings 44:21
fine 17:19 29:22
 100:1 114:4
finish 43:6
fire 39:13 56:16,18
 104:20
firms 57:13
first 4:22 7:7 14:16
 15:3 20:10 31:13
 47:20 50:17,17
 51:18 56:17 61:3
 63:22 68:18 79:17
 81:10 89:14 102:8
 106:15
Fish 83:21
fit 16:13 34:15
 87:22
fitness 26:20
fittings 47:2
five 7:3 31:10 45:11
 73:9 74:11 75:4
 75:10 87:10,13
 88:1,1 93:9
 101:17
fleet 43:10
float 14:16 33:17
floating 7:22
flow 111:5,11,17
fluid 28:6
focus 11:3 40:6

55:14 67:5 90:1,2
folks 19:18 36:2
 91:8 92:6 120:6
follow 3:6 5:9
follow-up 5:16
following 44:15
 48:5 104:9
foot 99:13
forest 56:18
form 22:10 65:14
 109:11
formal 106:10
formally 91:16
format 28:4 74:3
forth 7:20 20:4
forward 6:4
found 13:11 37:20
 38:7 40:22 41:22
 42:9 44:10,15,18
 57:3 76:12
foundation 57:12
 98:9 108:6,10
four 11:14 14:19
 31:13 75:4 101:19
 119:8
fourth 12:19 50:15
FRA 111:1,10
FRA's 111:2
frame 70:18 103:19
 103:21
framework 67:1
 89:15,18 104:6
framework's 103:3
free 42:16
frequency 109:14
friendly 79:16
 102:7
front 47:10 101:16
frontiers 84:7,19
full 65:12
fun 120:14
function 15:14
 64:20
fund 1:21 79:1
fundamental 27:13
fundamentally 44:4
 51:13
funding 78:22

further 17:5 20:14
 49:18

G

G 72:15
gaining 68:2
game 74:14
gang 22:4
gap 11:17 12:17
 18:17 33:12 83:2
 83:2,5,10
gaps 12:16 33:19
 34:6 65:22 79:18
 79:20 82:10
Gas 1:18
Gateway 1:10
gather 113:16
gathering 111:9
GE 8:9
gee 47:22
general 16:2 20:5
 48:18 103:5
generates 68:8
generating 69:16
 78:22
generations 44:1
generic 47:21 69:8
getting 7:15 12:5
 12:11 14:1 18:7
 35:10 41:22 44:7
 49:12 52:15 76:7
 80:17 88:2 100:15
 106:13 112:6
 113:10
give 17:9 19:18
 22:18 32:20 36:20
 49:8,8 78:12 80:1
 84:16 87:1 93:7
 104:1 120:16
given 50:2
gives 46:11 50:16
 110:9 121:3
giving 54:8 96:1
Glebe 1:10
go 3:3,11 10:2
 14:20 16:3,4
 21:10 26:11,13
 28:11 30:17 31:12

36:16,19 40:1
 47:11 52:2 57:19
 60:13 61:22 62:22
 65:4 68:17,20
 71:3 72:8 74:3,17
 79:12 81:7 88:12
 89:2 91:1 94:1
 101:1,9 103:13
 104:20 105:1
 106:17 110:19
 111:10
goal 5:13 26:13
goals 28:2
God 46:1
goes 28:2 36:21
 40:4 78:1,5 93:22
 104:2
going 6:4 9:18 12:7
 14:16 17:20 23:14
 26:18 27:14,21
 28:11 30:10,17
 38:11 39:1,22
 40:5 45:14,22
 48:6,16 54:10
 55:2,15,16,22
 61:1,4 65:7 68:19
 69:8 70:6,11 72:5
 72:10 73:10 76:13
 85:13 86:15 87:8
 87:9 91:12 92:17
 94:21 100:21
 101:10 103:8,13
 105:9 107:17
 108:19 110:17,22
 116:15 119:7
golden 23:20
good 5:10 16:6
 23:21 31:18 32:9
 35:3 40:14 46:12
 46:19 47:5 50:21
 51:19 53:15 63:10
 63:14 69:2 71:13
 75:19 81:11 83:6
 89:14,21 91:20
 92:2 95:1 99:10
 105:18 107:19
 110:14 114:17
 117:16 119:11

goose 23:20
Goshen 44:8
gotten 110:1
governance 117:22
government 37:6
 79:4
granularity 46:4
great 29:21 30:12
 30:13 57:8 73:22
 74:10 87:5 94:9
 98:18 105:12
ground 93:19
grounded 43:10
group 1:4,16,16
 2:17 3:16,18 4:10
 7:6 18:22 19:17
 24:2 36:17,19,20
 36:21 58:4 60:19
 63:9 64:20 77:17
 80:3 85:4 90:4
 104:13 115:5,6,7
 115:8,11
groups 19:22 53:22
 78:21 80:7 85:20
 112:1 114:22
 115:14,16,19
 116:3,4,6 120:2
grow 30:4
growing 81:7
guess 3:3 12:5
 31:21,21 52:9
 65:3 103:4,7
 105:8,12 108:4
guest 91:15 100:3
 118:9,10,13,16
guests 92:19
 111:21
guy 75:9
guys 29:2 30:21
 33:2 39:9 45:11
 77:15 85:13 94:2
 104:13 106:21
 115:17 116:5

H

HA 105:21
halfway 41:18
hall 101:14 112:21

handed 107:16
handle 96:2
hands 104:13
happen 28:13
 53:16 86:16 87:2
happened 109:21
 110:11 119:22
happening 60:4
 79:3
happens 83:21
 86:3
hard 29:8 31:4,5
 46:18 62:5
hardest 97:2
hash 112:22
hazard 38:10
HAZARDOUS 1:1
head 6:22 101:1
 102:4,16
headache 77:3
Health 1:20,20
hear 29:3,3 35:11
 90:14 93:1
heard 31:2 53:21
 56:8 97:10
hearing 18:5 80:5
hears 58:3
hell 89:7
help 7:21,22 15:19
 60:16 81:5 95:21
 110:16 120:16
helped 92:15,16
helpful 10:20 30:22
 37:1 40:9 69:10
 91:14
helping 15:15
 78:21
helps 11:10
herd 117:15
Hereth 1:19 3:15,15
 10:15 23:22 25:4
 25:7 27:9 31:22
 32:4,7 52:9 58:12
 58:15,19 59:6
 61:1 63:6 68:17
 69:3 70:7 71:1
 72:17 81:19 82:5
 82:20 87:16,19

88:4 89:17 91:20
 92:2 97:6 98:6,12
 98:16 99:19 105:4
 105:8,12 107:2,7
 107:9,13,19,22
 108:3,12,15
 109:20 110:10
 112:19 113:3,14
 113:17 116:1,11
 116:14 118:17
 119:18 120:19,21
hey 29:2 74:17 93:3
 94:17 96:8 98:2
 105:16 111:16
high 12:20 14:1
 33:18 56:3 67:5
 88:11 94:19 95:2
 102:21 103:10
 111:12
highest 14:17
highlight 90:2
hire 75:9
hit 75:10
hold 117:7
holding 39:13
hole 45:13
Holly 120:9
honest 74:18 77:9
hope 103:7
hopefully 55:8
hot 93:8 119:7
hour 112:13,13
housed 37:6 78:11
Houston 112:22
 113:16
how's 11:12
hows 55:17
huge 18:16
human 94:10,18
hundreds 27:16
hydrostatic 7:12
hypothesize 70:15
 83:9
hypothesizes
 70:14
hypothetical 87:17

I

i.e 66:5
idea 26:5 34:20
 41:3 49:7 54:16
 54:21 61:11 91:20
 99:17 105:19
 119:11
ideally 36:7 112:9
ideas 6:6 34:7
identification 57:5
 65:22 79:18,19
 81:11,17,21 82:1
 82:9,21,22 83:6
 90:7
identified 6:9 8:10
 21:15
identify 22:1 43:14
 82:10 94:14
 118:21
identifying 12:15
 12:19
ILI 7:11 9:3 24:10
 25:13,16 27:1
 71:9 72:19
imagine 40:16 73:7
immediately 42:2,4
impact 27:3
impediments 28:10
implementing 43:8
import 106:16
importance 25:12
important 6:10 9:22
 10:11 26:2 27:4
 45:1,2,3 69:6
 78:18 79:2 111:14
impose 69:15
improve 7:8 14:4
 18:11,15 25:8
 33:10,19 34:19
 52:1 69:20 86:11
 88:8
improved 11:12
 12:14 39:11 66:10
improvement 1:19
 13:14 17:1 18:16
 67:8 68:5,14
improvements 22:2
 65:21 66:15,15,16
improving 25:13,14

39:4 61:5
in-house 9:16
in-line 74:11 75:22
incentive 56:11
incentives 61:14,15
 84:10
incentivize 54:5
incentivized 54:14
inch 44:14 45:10
incident 16:20 47:7
 97:1 110:1,4
incidents 46:18
include 24:1,3
 102:2 111:13
including 66:6
 79:13 81:1
inclusive 21:19
incongruity 28:15
incorrectly 47:8
increase 67:8
incredibly 26:1
Indiana 44:9
indicators 68:16
individual 62:14
 75:18
industries 68:22
industry 7:8,14
 8:11 11:17 12:3
 13:8,17 18:4 19:1
 19:6,6 24:8,8 27:3
 27:15,19 33:10,14
 34:9,16 35:18
 40:20 41:13,19
 42:18,21 44:3
 45:5 46:8 49:17
 49:19 51:4 52:2
 52:19 59:22 68:10
 69:17 70:21 72:11
 73:10 74:5 75:9
 78:3,20 79:13
 80:19 83:17 86:10
 88:7 94:22 96:22
 102:11 106:9
 120:6
industry's 13:16
industry/govern...
 46:22
info 96:13 109:3

information 6:18
7:4 10:4 11:4,6
18:3 19:5,7,9,9
20:20 21:20 22:20
23:6,16 24:5
29:14 33:7,13
35:6 37:15 38:7
38:16,17,21 39:4
39:11 40:5,18
41:1,11 42:3,18
43:9 44:2 45:5
47:4 53:7 54:5,9
56:4,9 58:6 62:6,8
62:8 63:13 65:17
66:6 67:2,11 69:1
77:13 78:2 80:1
83:1 84:1,4,5,15
86:4 90:21 101:21
110:16
INFORMATION-S...
1:3
informative 31:19
informs 41:4
INGA 108:5
INGAA 53:1 57:11
58:10 59:17 108:6
108:7 109:21
110:11
initial 17:2 47:4
48:5 92:5
initially 35:20 67:13
91:8
initiative 32:12
35:21
inline 72:5,7 84:18
innovative 18:2
input 23:8
inquiry 77:16
insert 84:7
inside 97:11
insight 120:16
insightful 86:9
inspection 9:19
37:20 38:8 72:6
84:18
inspector 72:7
instance 15:16
16:14 19:22 43:7

insurance 87:21
88:2
integrated 8:4
integrating 9:15
10:7
integrity 1:22 8:6
11:21 12:21 40:8
65:20 66:9 70:19
79:17 96:14
intended 101:21
intent 13:19 46:8
53:6
interacting 12:1
interaction 11:8
interest 51:2 63:17
97:10
interested 22:6,12
23:4 56:22 93:15
interesting 43:19
71:16 119:13
interface 48:20
interfacing 5:18
interim 111:22
112:13
internally 36:11
introductions 3:9
4:8
invest 74:18
investigation 16:20
invisible 23:12
invited 113:21
involved 79:4 84:4
101:22 104:8
ironically 104:12
issue 12:4 13:6
26:7 42:6 43:1
84:12
issues 11:21 36:9
40:8 42:22 43:14
59:13 86:21 90:22
91:1
It'll 102:17
item 20:13 64:1
items 16:11,16
61:20

J

Jason 98:3,22

JD 34:8,10
Jensen 71:4
job 5:10
Joe 2:13 4:12
Johnson 6:10
26:11 27:5,21
32:13 34:7 56:21
62:1,11 73:12,19
75:1,7,11,17 76:2
76:6,11,16 77:4,6
77:14,19 78:5,14
83:13 88:6 89:10
98:2,17,21 100:12
100:17,20 111:18
116:17
joint 104:19 112:2,6
JONES 1:20 31:9
32:2,6,9,17 41:8
54:3,14,18 55:9
56:8 58:7 80:2
81:1 82:3,7 83:8
85:10
judgement 22:7
July 51:21 64:3
jump 31:9
June 17:7

K

K-A-Y 99:4
K-U-R-I-L-L-A
100:6
Kate 1:15 4:16
17:10 25:19 29:1
31:1 32:18 33:1
35:11 36:14 82:18
120:8
Kate's 22:12
keep 39:8 78:19
80:12,12
keeping 5:8
keeps 90:19
key 16:11 21:19
24:15
keyed 61:13
keying 61:19
kick-off 63:19
kickoff 64:2
Kieba 1:21 3:13,13
5:6 14:22 16:6,9
17:15,20 18:1
22:11 23:21 26:3
29:1,5,10,13 35:8
35:14 46:19 48:4
49:16 50:5 51:17
61:12 63:1,16
77:9,18 78:1 79:8
79:15 81:9,15,17
89:22 91:7,22
92:4 93:15 95:10
95:13,19 96:2,5
96:12 97:20 98:1
99:1,3,9,16
100:14,19 103:4
104:9,17 105:20
106:1,3 108:18,22
109:16 110:8,15
110:19 113:15
114:1,11,17 115:4
115:15 117:4,7
118:3,7,12 120:14
120:20 121:2,10
kill 23:19
killer 51:16
kind 5:8,10 6:5,21
6:22 7:3 8:7,19
11:5 12:22 13:14
14:8,20,21 22:12
29:3 34:14 37:9
37:15 41:2,6 42:4
51:13 56:9 57:10
59:12 62:2,3,16
65:11,13 66:20
67:1 84:6 87:1
90:5,11 93:2
95:20 99:12 101:8
101:16,17,17,19
102:3,16,17
108:20 110:21,22
112:22 113:19
119:12
kinds 84:1
knew 40:20
knock 55:2
knocking 87:8
know 5:12,14,16
6:9 7:7,8,13,15

8:7,8,9,12,21 9:8
 9:14 10:8 11:2,3,6
 11:18,21 12:3,20
 12:22 13:1,1,5,10
 13:16 14:1,6,10
 14:11,15 15:17
 20:18,19 21:1
 24:9,13,21 27:14
 27:19 28:2,17
 29:16,17 32:18,18
 32:18,19 33:3,16
 33:19 34:10,10
 37:6,19 38:12,20
 39:8,9,12,14,19
 40:1,11,12,15,16
 41:7,9,13,18
 42:12 43:4,22
 45:11 46:1 47:21
 47:22 48:11 49:5
 49:6,8 50:15,17
 50:20 51:9 52:17
 52:19,22 53:3,6
 54:17,22 55:14,15
 55:18 56:3,11
 60:11 61:14 62:15
 65:21 66:17 67:4
 67:5,13 68:1 70:4
 71:2,21 72:8,9,13
 72:14 74:14 77:10
 78:11,16,18,21
 79:1,5 80:13,14
 80:22 82:15 83:11
 84:7,21 85:12
 86:2,8,17 87:1,4,4
 88:10,13,15,16,19
 89:1,5,8 90:7,10
 90:18,19 91:17
 92:6 93:2,9,20,21
 94:5,8,11,18 95:3
 95:9 96:8,18,19
 97:18 101:16,20
 103:16 104:1,2,12
 106:1,12 107:2,15
 108:4 109:19
 111:7 112:21
 113:19 114:7,13
 116:5,19 118:15
 119:6

knowledge 24:17
 25:8 35:1 67:8,12
 67:14 68:2
known 66:5
knows 36:22 73:10
Kuprewicz 120:15
Kurilla 99:12 100:6
 100:7,8

L

Laborer's 1:20
laid 31:17
LAMONT 1:22 93:1
 100:10
language 28:16
large 80:5 97:16
 112:7 120:6
larger 74:3 96:13
largest 74:11
lastly 68:12
latest 70:3
Laughter 69:13
 72:21 82:19 85:16
 87:18 97:8 117:2
 121:1
law 42:12,13 54:12
 56:5 83:20
layer 103:15
layered 51:14 70:5
layers 48:18 54:6
 61:18 62:18
lays 23:20
lead 39:11
leading 13:14 68:15
leak 39:18 83:22
leaks 55:2 96:19,20
lean 63:2
learn 26:5 30:4 36:1
 47:7,9 56:22
 90:13
learned 16:21 18:3
 21:3 35:18 52:22
 53:4 57:18,20
 58:1,14 59:16
 60:2 62:4,13 66:8
 91:12 98:5,8,10
 108:8,21
learning 57:7 66:13

68:2 71:10
leg 25:21
legal 4:5 26:7 36:15
 36:16,19 37:2,11
 38:2 55:7,13,19
 56:1 58:4 61:22
 78:6 90:22
legged 25:21
Leif 71:4
lessons 16:20 18:3
 21:2 52:22 53:3
 57:18,20 58:1,13
 59:16 60:2 62:4
 62:13 66:7 91:12
 98:4,8,10 108:8
 108:20
let's 18:10 22:15
 34:2,3,4 74:18
 93:4 101:1,1
 105:15
level 6:21 7:14 8:1
 8:5,14,16 10:19
 14:1,17 33:11,18
 45:17 46:4 50:9
 50:10 52:18,20
 54:7 56:3 59:21
 60:6,13,16 67:9
 72:3 92:7,17
 93:18 94:3 95:2,3
 97:12 102:21
 103:10 109:18
 111:12
levels 19:10 59:1
 94:15
lie 50:15
life 57:13
likewise 41:4
limit 84:21
limitations 22:19
 36:5
limited 54:13 84:10
 92:1
limiting 20:18
 114:8
limits 40:1,6
line 44:14,14 45:10
 45:15 79:17 82:18
 88:21

lines 45:6 83:3
lining 115:21
linking 44:20
list 23:14 64:16
 83:18 87:1 90:11
 92:18
listed 24:2
listening 30:18
literally 50:3
little 6:16 15:4 18:7
 50:1 63:11 65:6
 65:10 79:22 99:13
lives 38:6
local 19:22
locates 75:10 96:21
location 61:9 83:22
 84:17
locators 75:3
logo 58:20
long 55:6,8 103:9
 114:2,19
look 17:19 18:14
 20:5 24:9 26:8
 31:2,3,8 40:15
 49:4 50:10 52:9
 52:16 57:19 60:5
 60:19,20 62:17
 69:19 71:22 87:3
 88:5 91:18 97:17
looked 35:17
looking 19:12 33:6
 58:9 66:20 68:21
 74:7 88:13 89:19
 105:21 106:6
 117:14
Looks 89:21
loose 4:3
lose 22:4 48:14
loss 44:11 45:10
 86:3
lot 5:22 22:5 26:5
 39:2 45:18 50:2
 60:11,15 62:16
 65:11 73:15 76:6
 76:9 77:3 80:4
 82:12 84:8,12
 86:13 88:17,20
 91:12 93:3 94:22

96:22 103:6
109:17 120:8
Lou 107:9
love 72:4 77:16
86:13 111:19
low 12:20 72:7
lower 49:14 56:2
109:14,18
lucky 88:12

M

M-C 99:3
macro 45:17 46:11
93:13
main 5:13
maintenance 28:17
major 76:17
making 12:10 23:11
60:15 84:13
manage 72:18
management 1:16
16:22 65:20 66:9
79:17 97:13
manages 98:19
mandate 16:10,16
20:11,13 60:7
64:1
mandated 91:11
manifests 87:13
Mark 1:19 3:15 6:4
6:19 58:8 98:2
101:13 109:9
112:21
Mark's 79:12
marking 107:3,6
match 50:19
material 48:2
102:18
MATERIALS 1:1
matrix 70:5,20
87:22 101:19
102:3
Matt 29:3
matter 46:3 52:12
101:3 117:21
121:13
Max 1:21 3:12,13
5:2,4

McKay 58:11 98:19
99:2,3 108:13
McLaren 2:11 4:11
4:11 96:9,15
109:9 110:7,21
111:16,19 114:9
115:2,6,20 116:9
116:13 117:6,11
118:10,21 119:12
MD-80 43:10
mean 21:18 23:13
24:9,14,20 31:2
43:6 45:17,20
46:3 51:1,12,14
51:19 52:6 54:15
56:12,16 58:9
59:4 74:17 80:19
82:12 83:9 85:9
86:9,9 88:12,15
88:17 90:4 93:12
94:11,18,21 95:11
96:21 97:1 102:19
106:11,15,21
111:11 113:1
117:15,19 119:1
meaningful 35:6
meaningless 69:21
means 43:14
104:15 116:19
meant 39:12
Mears 2:16 3:17
measurable 68:15
measurement 9:21
68:12
measurements
10:3 25:15
mechanism 59:15
mechanisms 82:6
meet 117:8
meeting 17:3,4,7
31:10 92:5 112:2
114:22 119:17
meetings 5:8,16
15:5 19:3 25:12
58:2 104:10 112:1
member 6:8 57:15
57:19 59:18 72:20
91:16 95:11,13,18

95:19 96:5 99:18
99:21 100:2 105:5
118:8
members 5:2 12:3
15:2 22:13 26:13
58:2 77:21 78:20
92:18 93:8 95:6
111:22 112:16
113:15,21 114:14
118:1,2,9 119:21
mentioned 33:1
59:9 91:7
Merrillville 44:9
messaging 33:14
met 1:10 35:20
methodology 7:13
methods 96:22
middle 29:6
Mike 1:22 8:9
mile 96:20,20
miles 44:14 46:2
mind 39:8 50:3
78:19 79:7 94:13
94:22
minimum 68:1
minute 89:13 94:17
minutes 33:1
missed 53:17
misses 59:13 66:11
missing 73:21 79:9
105:2
mission 21:13,14
25:1
missions 116:20
model 73:22 81:11
modeling 111:2
models 79:13 82:7
modifications
100:21
modified 63:20
modify 82:8
money 9:22 78:22
88:14
months 65:8
morning 3:7 5:9,21
6:13,20 7:2 8:8
18:6 20:4 27:22
63:7 69:11 71:3

71:20 112:8
morphology 11:22
motivated 91:21
motivation 72:12
mouth 89:3
move 29:5 35:14
72:9 76:3 84:22
moves 87:14
moving 63:17
80:12,13 88:9
MPMS 111:6
multiple 62:18
64:17
municipal 97:21
municipals 110:17
MURRAY 2:12

N

N 1:10
name 23:13 50:16
53:3 58:17,20
108:16
nation 34:9
nationally 87:10
nature 49:10
near 56:19,20 59:13
66:11 111:2
nearly 24:15
necessarily 51:9
54:9 83:4 102:13
NEE 26:8
need 8:21 10:10
14:12 18:15,17
28:16 42:5 45:6
49:18,22 51:7,9
56:1 60:6 62:19
62:20,22 63:2
66:1 69:15 70:4
71:8 72:9 74:4,19
76:8 80:6 85:18
90:17 104:3
105:20 112:11
113:2 115:20
119:19 120:12
needed 80:9 83:11
115:11,14 117:5
120:17
needing 60:20

needs 11:4 21:8
25:19 40:6 45:19
46:5 50:6 56:4
114:5 116:2
negative 39:5
negatives 13:2
Nelson 111:4
never 39:17 42:8
50:9 87:17 94:3
94:12
new 1:17 12:9,14
66:6 102:13 109:4
news 94:9
nightmares 57:2
NiSource 1:18
nod 102:16
non-start 91:4,5
North 1:21
notion 8:15 10:22
12:6 21:1
November 18:1
nuances 19:19
54:21
number 26:14
69:17 75:2 86:18
94:9,10,19 117:13
numbers 41:6
120:6

O

O-S-M-A-N 108:16
objectives 14:19
21:13,14 25:1
116:21
observation 117:11
obstacles 36:4,9
102:3 106:21
obvious 5:21
obviously 5:17
21:22 23:15 40:2
90:12
Occupational 1:20
occurs 66:2
off-base 97:9
Off-microphone
4:8 35:7,13 77:8
77:22 83:14 85:7
98:11,15 100:9

112:17 121:7
offer 24:11 30:10
offering 120:12
officially 3:18
offshore 35:21 36:2
91:9
oh 32:4 45:22 55:1
60:14 73:18 89:7
92:13 108:18
114:9 116:13
okay 4:19 5:7 6:15
13:5 29:5 32:6,9
79:15 94:4 104:17
107:19 108:11,14
108:17 114:16
117:10 121:8
old 48:1
once 15:3 41:19
42:12,13 47:10
55:14 75:8
one's 70:6
one-on-one 70:15
71:5
ones 62:11,19,20
64:9 76:1,2 85:6
open 15:21 58:2
59:2 84:7 85:21
91:2 113:7,8
114:19
opening 85:11
openly 59:12,12
operating 96:19
104:13
operational 57:1,2
operations 26:15
operator 7:22 8:3
9:2,14 11:8,9,9,16
13:4 24:17 28:5,7
52:18 56:6 68:11
72:18 76:4,21
77:2 96:22
operator's 38:22
40:7
operators 7:13 8:3
8:14 10:5 11:7
21:16,17,21 22:9
24:2,5 25:2,10
26:19 36:10 45:6

46:13 47:19,21
49:20 50:4 51:9
51:15 57:12 66:3
74:19 76:13 85:13
86:13,18 90:19
93:17 94:1 95:4
120:7
operators' 39:13
87:5
opportunities
14:13 67:6
opportunity 67:3,7
76:18 115:18
opposed 85:22
optimal 9:16
option 16:19
OQA 119:1
organization 57:15
original 47:12
OSGA 59:10
Osman 108:7,13
outcome 7:5,20
102:2
outcomes 7:5
outlier 72:1,1
outliers 60:16,17
outnumber 118:1
output 109:15
Outreach 1:15
outs 64:10
outside 13:17
60:21 101:1
overall 10:13 15:9
23:5 26:2 64:20
79:4 92:16
overarching 10:16
10:17
overlap 5:22
overlapped 112:8
overwhelmed
69:12 119:22
owned 50:4
owner's 89:7
owns 27:6 37:5
49:6

P

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-...

3:1
p.m 1:11 3:2 101:4
101:5 121:14
page 17:19,20
36:14
Panel 69:18
Panhandle 1:13
paper 4:3
paramount 40:2
pardon 97:3
parent 64:10 91:17
112:4 114:3
part 6:11 10:12
14:14 15:9,13
18:13,15,20 19:11
21:9 26:6,16 30:9
37:13 38:4 47:3
48:4,11 55:12
57:6 59:22 60:18
61:16 63:18 68:20
74:12 77:11 92:13
97:21 103:8
111:14 119:13
PARTICIPANT 6:15
28:22 71:13 80:18
81:5,13,16 82:14
82:17 83:4 92:21
99:2,6,14 101:10
109:7 111:15
113:10 117:1
121:5
participants 83:18
87:15
participate 84:8
98:14 112:16
participation 52:6
65:17
particular 5:22 13:6
20:17 22:1 27:7
38:22 106:3
particularly 56:19
parties 60:9 67:18
68:8 101:22 104:8
Partners 1:14
parts 28:12 67:14
90:2
party 68:2,3 92:9
passing 22:7

- path** 43:21
paths 37:11 44:4
Paul 58:11 98:18,21
 108:12
pay 78:20
paying 91:8
pays 67:20
peers 31:20 41:11
people 17:9 22:6
 23:17 37:8 38:18
 43:4 50:14,14,22
 54:8 56:13 57:18
 58:5 61:16 75:5
 82:13 83:15,17
 84:1,3,8 85:3,4
 88:17 94:11,16
 95:22 97:3 98:14
 112:9 114:12
 117:16
percent 34:18,18
 45:10,12 86:10,14
 86:17 88:13 93:12
 107:12 110:9
percentile 44:19
perfect 11:15 83:10
 102:13
perfected 12:11
perform 83:2
performance 1:19
 8:5,10,14,16
 12:16 40:15 86:11
 109:5
performing 72:7
person 38:6 100:11
 113:12 114:19
perspective 7:8
 18:5 22:10 25:1
 30:19 31:4 85:20
 93:7
persuaded 51:10
pertinent 26:1
 89:20
Petroleum 92:14
PHMSA 1:1,14,15
 1:21 2:11,12 3:13
 4:1,11 43:22
 110:13
phone 4:15,17 29:6
 32:14 35:10 113:5
 113:21 114:19
phonetic 107:10
pick 16:16
picture 64:3 79:3
pictures 58:21 89:6
piece 13:7 40:18
 50:1 90:6 91:11
pieces 14:18 43:3
 62:17 102:11
pig 44:16,17,20
 45:6 55:1
pigged 44:10,14
pigging 44:22
pigs 45:7
pipe 9:10,20 10:1
 13:7,9 46:2,22
 47:1
pipeline 1:1,15,18
 2:13 19:14 22:3
 22:10 37:17 38:13
 40:19 44:8 45:15
 46:15 109:3,5
pipelines 46:12
pit 104:20
pitch 16:21 121:2
pitch/catch 68:1
place 55:6 56:21
plan 31:11 35:4
 42:2
planning 12:7
plastic 46:22 47:1
 48:1 96:20
platform 76:3
players 11:13 74:16
plot 49:3
plots 51:8
plug 11:1
plus 1:22 69:1
point 18:14 23:21
 27:4 28:8,14 29:8
 31:10,11,16 32:19
 37:12 39:14,22
 42:13 43:19 44:5
 44:7 47:17,20
 51:7,19 57:10
 59:8 61:3 69:2,14
 70:8 79:12 80:19
 119:19 121:5,6
pointed 19:13
 119:16
points 14:4 31:8,13
 46:19 48:10 49:3
 49:7,13 60:12
 73:4,15 79:13
policy 94:3,15
pool 83:18
poor 41:10
popped 48:1
popping 48:10
position 120:10
positions 38:4
 94:16
possibility 35:15
 117:4
possible 10:4,8
 34:20 57:4 96:12
possibly 37:1
post-incident 66:12
potential 37:21
 38:10 111:22
 112:2 118:13
potentially 11:9
 12:20 16:12 18:19
 19:4 36:3,15
 91:14
Power 34:10
Power's 34:8
powers 49:12
PPTS 100:15 109:4
 109:11,17 110:22
practice 10:13 12:6
 67:9 80:22
practices 1:6 3:5
 6:1 8:17 14:10
 15:11,18 16:13
 18:3 20:7,19 36:4
 40:7 54:3,4 62:12
 65:16 66:5,21
 68:9,21 79:14
 81:14,15,18 83:1
 89:16 112:3
PRCI 53:1 80:21
 90:13
Precisely 75:13
preferred 30:20
prepared 93:11
present 1:12 2:9,19
 59:1 98:4,19
 114:10 115:3
presentation 5:12
 63:19 65:12 101:8
 101:11
presentations
 116:21 119:9,14
presented 111:3
presenter 99:19
 108:5
presenters 118:9
 118:10,14,16
President 1:13,16
 1:18,22 2:16
presiding 1:11
pretty 5:21 6:3
 20:10 24:12 27:1
 31:17,18 35:3
 45:13 46:11 50:7
 50:8,20,21 63:14
 71:13 102:10
 103:10 112:6
prevalent 24:15
prevention 94:10
previous 15:5 19:3
 90:3
price 120:19
primarily 11:7
 16:19 66:3 88:7
primary 16:10
 66:22
Principal 1:19
principles 69:22
 84:2
private 37:6
probability 12:20
probably 8:13
 24:13 26:7 29:19
 31:14 42:19 43:3
 70:22 92:22 93:13
 98:7 100:10
 107:22 115:5
 119:7 120:9
problem 76:13
problematic 11:21
problems 39:15

41:22 66:5 83:16
115:13
process 1:19 6:1
7:21 8:4,17 11:2
11:12 12:8 23:4
23:18 25:13,14,17
27:8,9 29:13
30:17 37:21 38:8
41:20,20 51:14
52:22 57:6 63:8
65:20 66:14 67:8
67:16,17 68:4,13
68:15 91:13 96:7
106:10 111:5,11
111:17 112:3
116:12
processes 40:7
51:3 65:15 66:4,9
68:9 80:20 81:11
81:12
produce 106:11
producing 109:12
product 21:15 37:7
program 48:12 78:8
119:15
progress 60:15
progressed 5:9
project 73:6 90:13
projections 74:4
promote 53:3 65:16
proof 50:22 80:11
property 38:11
proposed 102:21
proposition 65:19
proprietary 49:9
86:6
propriety 43:2
protected 43:5
54:11,22 56:1
protecting 20:20
58:5
protections 78:12
proved 3:6
proverbial 23:20
provide 21:9 84:4
provider 9:3,8
13:18 52:18
providers 10:6 11:8

12:3,8 24:1,3,16
25:9 57:12 66:2
68:11 70:20 71:10
73:9 90:20 120:7
provides 29:20
35:5
providing 42:20
public 1:17 19:2,10
19:21 20:5 22:14
23:1,1,6 25:21
29:9,16 30:12,20
30:22 31:13,15,19
33:3,14 37:7 41:4
41:12 46:11 47:19
48:19 60:10,13
62:15 79:5 86:19
88:21,21 119:21
120:2,18
public's 59:18 89:4
publish 75:8
published 95:1
pull 61:8
pulled 17:5 20:10
63:18
pulling 76:13 80:7
punt 65:3
purchase 72:19
purely 87:16
purpose 17:2,21
42:3 51:1
purposes 56:5
pursuit 33:12
put 7:20 53:11
54:22 55:5 57:18
58:17 59:3 60:8
60:12 62:20 64:9
65:13 69:5 75:17
75:21 120:14
putting 58:5

Q

qualified 63:12
qualitative 96:15
111:8
quantitative 111:9
quartile 87:9
question 8:12
27:22 32:15,17

38:20 62:2 68:18
68:19 70:13,17
71:14 78:2 80:2
85:10 103:5 105:9
106:12,19 114:17
117:16 118:18,20
120:20
questioning 121:11
questions 4:5 41:9
107:1 119:16
quick 6:14
quickly 45:14 93:14
95:21
quorum 114:20

R

R&D 27:22 60:16
72:9 74:18 84:12
84:13 112:3
raise 43:18 74:5
raised 71:4,20
raises 41:8
ramifications 37:2
55:19 56:2,6
Randolph 119:6
range 13:21
rate 49:14 75:4
raw 34:21
RCA's 21:3
RCFAs 66:12
RCP 109:14
reach 4:7 20:8
50:20
reaching 46:3
read 17:9 19:18
33:9 80:8 97:6
readily 53:12
ready 101:7
real 27:13 43:1
51:14 70:13 73:6
realistic 22:15
realistically 51:20
realize 30:2,3 85:12
realized 22:4
really 5:8 7:19
10:15,17,18,19
12:13 14:4,14
20:18,22 21:3

22:9 24:16 27:12
29:7 30:12,13
39:16,22 40:6
42:14 51:20 52:15
60:20 61:2,4,13
62:19 63:6,10,12
69:11,22 70:21
74:5 77:19 85:18
85:19 86:8 89:1
93:13 94:11 97:3
98:17,20 99:10,10
101:7 102:11,20
104:16 107:3
110:1,11,14
111:13 120:5,17
reams 106:12
reason 17:12 78:9
84:9 105:3
reasonable 23:6
26:10 103:10
121:3,4
reasons 22:16,17
22:18,21 74:9
83:16 84:6
reassure 43:15
recall 109:1
receive 9:14
recognition 95:2
recommend 14:12
52:7 91:2 121:8
recommendation
10:13 21:9,10
27:14,18 55:16
104:14
recommendations
7:21 15:10,13
16:10 55:12 65:15
104:2
recommending
66:21
reconcile 95:21
record 47:12 91:17
101:4 121:14
redo 103:9
reference 6:14
102:17
references 65:1
refine 16:3 17:5

refinement 15:22
reflected 80:6
refresher 15:4
regard 13:12 96:9
regulated 66:13
regulator 11:9 19:8
 68:11 87:7
regulators 19:1,7
 45:22 78:4 87:3
regulatory 43:20
reinvent 18:8
reinventing 80:8
reiterate 117:12
related 20:12,19
 66:12
relationship 68:1
relative 49:5
relatively 27:2
release 116:15
relevant 16:12,17
 18:19 26:4 38:8
 39:4 40:19 44:1
 65:9 118:17,19
reliable 9:10
rely 110:13
remain 41:12
remains 113:7
remedy 42:1
remember 31:20,21
 92:9 100:14 109:1
 109:4 114:20,21
repair 37:18 38:13
 48:11
replacement 48:12
reply 111:6
report 5:12 14:15
 14:15 34:10,20
 37:7 51:21,22
 63:18 64:4,4,10
 64:11,22 110:1,5
 111:8
reportable 109:18
reported 47:8 114:2
reporting 9:11 10:4
 28:1,4 64:20
reports 9:15 109:13
repository 57:17
 98:10

represented 85:19
request 6:8
requests 95:6
required 56:5
 112:16
requirements 33:4
 114:21
research 15:10,15
 16:9
resources 90:8
respect 66:8
respond 42:5 61:2
response 4:18
restricted 48:21
 54:7
restrictions 38:3
result 52:5 68:7
 70:11
results 21:3 67:7
 68:14
resumed 101:4
reused 70:1
revenue 78:22
review 16:22
reward 86:12
RI 88:7,13
rid 86:5 100:15
right 7:19 8:22 9:5
 9:6,8 17:3 20:10
 27:15 28:21 41:20
 45:12 52:14 54:1
 54:15 58:7 59:19
 61:5 63:16,19
 67:10 69:6 70:13
 71:5,6,7 72:2 73:8
 74:6,20 76:5,22
 78:9,12 82:1 91:6
 91:22 95:11 96:7
 98:16 100:18
 102:6,22 103:18
 103:22 104:22
 105:2 109:6,8
 110:20 115:17
 116:3 118:5,15
 119:7 121:5
risk 31:4 45:8 50:3
 85:22 86:1,4,6
 94:14

risks 22:1 23:14
 56:13,14 86:2
 97:19
Road 1:10
robust 110:2
rolled 15:6
rolling 80:10
room 30:15 35:12
 59:22 71:17 93:17
root 74:16
Rosen 1:16 4:9
round 59:10
RP 109:2
rule 40:15 42:15,15
 56:17
rules 93:19
run 6:19 106:21
running 34:9
runs 44:16 73:4
 107:7

S

S&S 41:20 43:8
safe 30:21 35:20
 91:9
safeguards 58:5
safer 45:16 88:16
safety 1:1,15,18,20
 1:20 2:13 4:16
 19:14 22:4,10
 33:4 39:5,12 41:6
 42:15 43:13,13
 45:15 69:21 88:9
sample 64:7
samples 73:14
save 85:21
saw 16:14 18:20
 64:13 90:3 103:5
 111:12
saying 27:10 28:13
 34:22 40:4 41:6
 55:20 89:11 94:17
 114:12
says 26:12 44:9
 49:3 71:21
scale 70:17 80:5
scaling 98:1
scanned 70:1

scaring 52:12
science 94:7
scope 63:8
scored 23:15
scratch 18:9,18
screen 17:10 32:8
 82:16
scribe 5:1
scrubbed 47:10
scrubbing 47:3,20
search 37:8
second 19:12,15,19
 50:17,18 71:19
 106:19
sections 53:15
sectors 23:1
security 22:17
 28:17
see 17:10,13 19:17
 29:17 35:9 44:6,6
 45:4,18 46:3
 47:12,21 48:7,10
 48:19,20 49:1,2,2
 49:3,13,20 51:7
 59:20 60:1,14
 65:8 67:20,20
 70:4 74:2,13
 75:20 76:4 78:7
 80:13,15 81:7,9
 88:7,9 89:20
 94:12 95:4 100:2
 111:19 118:22
seek 7:5
seen 42:9 46:20
 67:2 73:13,16
 80:11
segment 24:8,8
 50:9
self-explanatory
 32:10
Senior 2:16
sense 14:8 18:10
 30:5,6,7,19 39:6
 45:1 75:20
sensitive 31:14
 56:4 119:19
 120:12
sensor 9:8 12:16

66:17
sensors 12:14
sent 15:1 17:16
 47:4 111:6
separate 60:21
 81:19 110:12
serious 97:3
service 1:17 9:3,7
 10:6 11:8 12:2,8
 13:17 24:1,3 25:9
 52:18 57:12 68:11
 71:9 90:20 120:7
services 56:10
serving 19:2
session 28:1
sessions 5:17 53:4
 53:4 57:8 59:10
set 61:1 78:11
 115:18 116:2,5
 121:10
setting 115:16
settings 57:1
seven 97:17 117:20
 117:20
SGA 53:1 80:21
shame 110:21
share 18:2 19:5,7,8
 20:21 22:20 23:9
 25:3 26:10 30:19
 36:7,11 37:1,14
 38:1,15,16 41:21
 46:9 51:16 52:2
 52:11,13 54:2
 57:9 63:4,5 69:9
 70:16 72:13,13
 77:12 78:3 93:11
 97:18 106:16
 114:14 120:18
shared 6:19 11:4,6
 11:11 19:9 36:6
 45:19 55:22 69:1
 101:22
sharing 6:1,18 7:3
 8:17 11:2 12:6
 13:7 21:2 24:4
 27:8,10 33:7 36:4
 37:16 38:21 39:4
 39:11,16 43:9

44:2 51:5 53:7
 54:4,5 56:10 63:8
 65:16 66:1,4,10
 67:3,10,17 68:13
 71:5,10 78:7
 80:22 83:1,6
 90:20 92:6,7
 96:13 97:10,10,11
 97:14 102:1 112:3
 116:12
sheets 4:3
Sherry 1:15 3:20
 39:21 71:19,20
shift 76:4
shore 91:8
short 64:9
show 62:14 73:5
 80:14 86:19 99:4
showing 17:12
 82:16
shows 34:16
shut 41:22 43:9
sick 53:16
side 24:19 30:12
 67:10 74:22 78:6
 84:20
sight 22:5
signal 82:18
significantly 88:8
similar 13:8,9 59:9
 92:5
simple 72:17 76:10
simply 56:20 79:21
 106:16
Simultaneous
 27:11 28:18 32:1
 41:16 43:17 54:19
 58:18 60:22 62:10
 70:9 73:2 75:14
 76:19 81:2 88:3
 89:9 92:20 95:17
 97:5 99:8,22
 100:13 104:21
 110:6,18 113:6,9
 116:8 117:3 119:3
single 61:9
singular 60:20
sit 10:17 59:11

104:20 105:3
sitting 3:18 4:3
 33:5 71:16 89:19
situation 74:21
situations 11:19
 44:11 45:18
six 65:8 117:19
size 38:21
sky 46:17
slice 26:9
slide 32:5 65:11
 68:18 70:8 90:3
slot 75:18
small 27:3 73:13,21
smaller 114:2 115:4
SMEs 117:13,18
smile 72:4
smoke 56:17
SMS 16:18 94:13
 96:15 109:2
SMS-11 16:22
SMS-9 16:19
society 92:14,15
soliciting 106:20
solutions 57:4,6
 66:5
solve 12:4 103:17
solved 12:5
solves 104:3
somebody 42:8
 83:21
someone's 94:4
someplace 30:4
something's 41:2
sooner 42:19
sorry 108:18
sort 25:2 36:18
 39:20 51:11 55:7
 55:7 70:2,5,14
 93:21 99:14
 103:15 104:13
sorts 24:15 91:1
sounded 31:17
sounds 70:15
 73:15
sourced 11:11
sources 64:22
sourcing 84:3

space 92:1
speak 5:15 20:22
 21:4 29:16 93:5
 107:20 120:11
speaker 35:9
speaking 27:11
 28:18 32:1 41:16
 43:17 54:19 58:18
 60:22 62:10 70:9
 73:2 75:14 76:19
 81:2 88:3 89:9
 92:20 95:17 97:5
 99:8,22 100:13
 104:21 110:6,18
 113:6,9 116:8
 117:3 119:3
speaks 20:18
specialized 24:12
 27:1,2
specialties 75:22
specialty 74:11
specific 41:7 44:7
 44:18 45:19
specifically 24:10
specification 9:5
 72:19
specifications
 73:17
specifying 9:2
spectrum 41:5
 51:11
spectrums 50:13
spend 9:22 72:9
spoke 85:6
staff 95:14,18,19
 96:5 105:21 106:4
 118:8
stakeholder 24:2
stakeholders 13:17
 18:22 19:15 33:5
 33:5 65:18 66:20
 102:5
standard 28:4
standardized 28:1
standpoint 21:13
 23:8 52:10
stands 109:5
start 3:9 15:7 18:9

18:17 51:22 55:18
 91:13 93:2,16
 94:14 103:10
 120:17
started 3:4 65:3
 77:15 90:11 93:19
 98:13
starter 51:18
starting 30:3 52:1
 115:17
state 1:17 33:20,21
 35:1 37:18 38:12
 66:21 97:18
stated 56:20
statement 5:13
 15:1,9 20:17 21:7
 21:11 53:19 65:6
 65:14 79:11 80:6
 101:15 117:12
statements 64:7
 112:14
states 97:18
statistical 76:10
 96:18 106:9
Statistics 92:12
stay 119:15
steel 50:11 86:22
 87:7 96:20
stepped 32:13
steps 4:22 103:2
stick 67:20
stool 25:21
stop 89:11
story 14:7 33:17
 98:18
Strategy 1:16
structuralizes
 53:11
structure 53:12
 55:6 61:7
struggle 69:4
Stuart 100:10,12
 108:20 109:9
study 26:5
stuff 55:17 72:10
 91:9 93:3 96:16
 107:3 109:18
 110:22

sub- 116:6
sub-bullet 81:20
 89:14
sub-bullets 8:20
sub-committees
 116:7
subcommittee 1:6
 1:10 3:5,11,14,19
 3:21 4:21 5:2,16
 6:8,11 15:2,15,18
 17:8,17 18:20
 19:20 20:12 21:14
 23:5 26:9 27:8
 35:22 55:13 63:21
 64:19,21 90:1
 92:19 95:6 99:18
 99:21 100:2 105:5
 112:16 113:15,20
 114:3,15,22 115:2
 115:9 117:8,18,19
 118:1,4,15
subcommittee's
 14:18
subcommittees 3:8
 5:19 10:18,21
 11:1 15:16 16:15
 18:6,21 35:17
 63:2 64:14,18
 78:16 89:18,21
 90:9 103:6 113:10
 116:6 119:5
submit 61:17 110:4
submits 110:5
submitted 48:8
subsequent 66:11
 66:12
Subsits 2:13 4:12
 4:12
success 49:14
successful 3:7
 62:19,21
suffer 55:8
sufficient 80:8
suggest 81:21
suggestions 15:22
 34:15,15
suitable 23:16
summary 64:11

supplant 53:6,10
 53:14
supplier 72:20
suppliers 59:12
supply 31:18 77:1
support 116:20
supposed 41:12,13
 54:1
sure 8:21 9:1,4,7,13
 10:2,12 12:10
 16:6,9 22:19 51:6
 51:8 62:15 63:20
 79:6 93:18 98:21
 115:21
surrounding 17:8
switch 15:1 117:5
system 42:12 50:3
 50:10 53:8 86:20
 87:9 109:5 111:17
systematic 8:4
systemic 66:14
systems 21:22
 28:17

T

table 3:12 21:2
 24:17 33:6 59:13
 64:13 88:20
tables 59:11
tailboards 57:21
take 14:6 17:18
 21:21 24:9 30:6
 42:18,22 43:12,13
 55:6 61:15 69:20
 71:11 77:3 89:6
 102:8
takes 61:9
talk 19:21 31:12
 35:22 59:11 73:1
 74:1 84:11 85:4
 93:17 98:1,8
 108:22 109:1
 112:11 113:16
 114:6 115:9
talked 6:5,12 7:2
 15:3 18:1 19:4
 35:15,19 71:2
 72:6 84:12 101:18
 106:1 112:1
talking 7:11 18:21
 21:5 31:11 45:20
 58:14 62:3,4,5
 78:6 81:9 95:13
 101:13 111:4
 112:20 120:21
talks 118:22
target 21:15 67:10
 67:13
targeted 14:5
task 5:11,13 15:9
 17:2,21 20:9 27:7
 53:19 60:5 65:6
 65:14 101:14
 112:14
team 27:7
technical 23:3
 24:16,17 30:16
 92:15 94:2
techniques 12:15
 84:14
Technological
 11:16
technologies 7:16
 12:10
technology 6:1,20
 7:10 8:17,22 9:9
 11:15,20 12:14,16
 13:21,22 14:11
 15:18 33:12,13,18
 51:3 65:21,22
 66:2,7,15,16,17
 66:18 71:18 79:18
 79:20 85:5 102:9
 102:10,13
tee 48:1
telephone 2:19
tell 14:6 32:21
 33:16 42:21 46:14
 46:15
telling 14:7
tells 11:5
ten 87:13
tend 31:3 95:4
tends 87:14 94:1
term 53:9 64:9
terminology 64:17

terms 33:3,21 51:1
63:7 68:21 70:19
84:13 89:15 96:19
106:22 115:12
test 27:1 44:15
testing 7:12
thank 16:8 32:16
102:14
thanks 55:3
thaw 101:1
theory 55:13
thing 15:8 25:2
39:7 40:21 41:6
41:21 55:21 70:19
76:12 87:19 93:7
108:4,20 109:20
110:11 114:4
119:18
things 6:12 9:6
10:10 30:5,6,18
37:3,19,19,22
38:12 39:20 45:16
60:4 67:19 68:22
71:12 83:19 85:18
90:17 91:1 101:13
104:3 108:8 113:1
think 4:2,6 5:10,20
6:9 8:11,12 10:10
10:19 11:5,10
14:4,9 16:13
18:19 19:3,11,13
19:13 20:17 21:4
21:5,7,8,10 22:13
24:7,9,20,22 25:4
25:7,11,19,20
26:1 27:9 28:11
28:19 29:15,19
30:8,10 31:3
32:11 34:16 35:4
35:16 36:5,18,21
36:22 38:3,20
39:3 40:6 44:4
46:4,7 49:22
51:11 52:16,21
53:2,10,13 61:2
61:17,19,20 62:1
63:2 64:12,15
65:2 66:3 69:11

70:21 71:1 72:7
72:12 73:22 74:7
74:14 75:20 76:6
80:16,18,20 82:12
84:9,20 86:20
87:21 89:17,19,20
90:10,12,17,18
92:8,11 93:22
96:8 98:2,6 99:20
101:6 103:12
104:3 105:18,22
106:4,14,19,20
107:8,11 110:15
111:13 112:19
113:17,21 114:1,3
114:4,7,12,18,20
115:1,10,13 116:1
116:5 117:16,22
118:4,12 119:4,14
119:18,20 120:4,5
120:10
thinking 25:20
42:20 49:17 64:2
64:4,22 71:9 93:6
96:18 105:5 113:3
thinks 7:18
third 12:13 25:21
68:6 92:9
thought 6:18 50:2
61:3 64:18 88:10
91:18 109:17
112:7
thoughts 17:7
22:12 29:1 79:11
thousand 75:5,6,10
96:21
threat 9:1 13:6
threats 12:1,18,21
three 25:20 44:10
46:2 75:4 94:9
112:2 113:15
115:8,13 116:5
119:8
threshold 42:15
threw 90:10
throw 6:13 67:19
tie 101:7
tighten 73:18,19

tighter 97:4
tightly 70:18
tile 50:14,15
time 4:21 31:4,6
32:22 41:14,18
43:7 45:12 46:10
55:6 86:18 100:22
103:15 105:10,13
time-in 94:13
times 75:10 79:21
today 5:7 12:12
14:7 27:16,17
32:2 33:20 34:6,8
52:6,8,17 53:5
61:11 73:6 75:3
75:16 78:17 83:9
86:15 94:22
102:12
tomorrow 5:12
64:10 73:1 90:14
101:9 103:2
107:17 116:2,21
121:11
tonight 102:17
tons 41:8 94:22
tool 45:12 73:4
87:22 88:18
tools 7:12 10:9
25:13 26:21 34:9
34:11,12,13,17
44:18 51:3 73:5
73:10 84:13,18
top 23:14 50:14
88:1 103:8
total 27:3
track 47:15
tracking 79:22
109:5
training 42:6 57:21
90:3
transcript 97:7
transcripts 17:6
Transfer 1:14 3:10
transparency 13:4
13:12,15 50:9
transparency/co...
33:10
transparent 21:1

34:2,3,5 50:7
Transportation
2:14 4:13 92:12
trick 56:16 70:2,13
93:21
truly 69:16
trust 1:15 4:16
19:14 48:5 61:15
61:16 92:17
try 4:7 17:15 29:5
70:5 105:15
trying 13:2 14:3
18:8 20:7,8 25:8
28:9 29:7 35:8
53:13 60:3 66:7
74:1 103:17,18,20
TUESDAY 1:8
turn 10:5
tweak 11:19,20
79:11
tweaked 65:10
tweaks 89:13
two 14:4 31:6 42:7
44:3 47:18,18
61:16,17 62:7
65:11,20 71:2
74:9,11 99:15
107:1 112:13
114:12 118:8
119:14 120:2
type 11:22 36:22
97:10
typically 53:5,15

U

UAS 85:1
ultimate 14:15 22:8
ultimately 13:14
21:17 50:3 86:16
87:2,12 92:10
uncertainty 25:16
uncomfortable
23:17 51:15
uncommon 29:19
uncover 83:11
underlined 16:21
understand 31:15
45:7 51:8 56:14

72:2 76:11 82:13
understanding
 67:12,14
understands 98:20
understudy 9:1
uniformed 76:3
union 57:15
unique 11:18 12:19
unsafe 43:16
upcoming 111:22
use 41:1 53:9 57:20
 57:21,21 65:1
 69:20 73:9 80:10
 85:1,3 110:17
useful 32:21 33:3
useless 32:20
users 21:20
Utilities 2:14 4:13
utilizing 109:10

V

valid 35:5 39:22
 45:15
validated 44:16
 63:11
validation 44:22
valuable 51:6 98:3
value 37:16,21 38:4
 38:11 39:2 40:1
 47:12 52:14 63:11
 65:18 67:5,11,15
 73:8 97:20 100:2
varied 87:20
varies 24:7 86:22
variety 22:15 57:22
various 17:6 24:11
 28:12 44:17 66:8
 76:1,2
vary 24:20
vendor 28:7 50:1
 56:6 76:21
vendors 26:21
 49:20 51:2 73:16
 74:12
vendorship 74:12
verification 27:1
 73:4
versa 114:11

version 29:20
 109:4
versus 34:18 37:6
 48:19 49:20 91:11
 93:10
vetted 61:21
vice 1:13,16,18,22
 2:16 114:11
vicinity 38:19
view 46:6 51:13
 93:13
vintage 13:9
violation 42:14
Virginia 1:11 87:7
VIS 21:16 79:13
visited 78:17
visualization 30:8
 30:11
vital 24:4
vocal 120:8,15
voluntarily 21:2
 48:6 52:11
voluntary 1:3 23:19
 39:8 44:2 46:21
 51:18 54:5 56:9
 61:17 91:11 109:2
volunteer 5:1 43:8
 46:9 72:20
volunteered 5:3
volunteering 23:9
volunteers 5:4
vote 95:16 117:1

W

wait 94:17 97:6
walk 16:1 83:22
walking 5:11
wall 44:11 45:10
 60:21 67:19
Walter 1:20 33:9
 61:13 90:12 105:9
 118:5
Walter's 80:19
wander 4:4
want 4:4 5:15,18
 6:3,7 8:15,18 9:1
 9:4,7,13 10:12
 12:3 15:12,17

18:13 20:14 22:14
 23:2 34:19 36:1
 41:9 43:4,15 47:6
 47:9,14,22 48:11
 50:19,22 52:11,13
 59:2 62:11,19
 64:3,9 65:4 72:2,8
 74:13 76:8 78:3
 80:20 84:22,22
 86:11 88:21 90:13
 91:15,16,18 93:1
 95:6 105:6 112:12
 115:9,18 116:9
 117:7,12,19,22
 118:22 119:8
 120:4,10,15,18
wanted 15:4 26:20
 29:9 84:11 106:17
 113:4
wants 38:1 75:9
Warner 2:16 3:17
 3:17 49:11 71:17
 72:5 76:20 77:1,5
 80:16
warning 42:11,17
warrants 25:5
Warren 119:6
Washington 2:14
 4:13
wasn't 43:12
waste 32:22
wasted 85:14
way 7:1 9:6,10,16
 9:20 10:4,8 15:21
 22:3 23:2,19
 27:15,19,19,19
 28:6 30:20,21
 36:20 40:14 42:19
 42:20 43:5 44:6
 46:12,15 53:10
 59:17 60:12,19
 61:8 62:13 63:12
 71:11 72:17 74:5
 81:6 87:12 94:19
 95:2 100:1 110:22
 121:3
ways 18:2 19:5
 27:16 46:20 47:13

62:21 88:4
we'll 3:3,6,9,11 5:9
 5:17 6:3 10:2
 14:22 17:4 29:5
 63:9 73:1 88:14
 90:14 93:3 99:17
 102:16 108:22
we're 8:22 9:18
 13:2,22 14:3,7
 15:21 20:7,8 21:5
 25:7 28:8 30:2,3,9
 33:21 34:4,5,11
 34:13 36:14 49:11
 52:7 53:13 54:1
 64:21 69:8,16
 72:10 73:20,20
 74:1 75:19 79:8
 81:9 83:9 88:12
 88:13 91:8 101:6
 103:13,17,18,20
 105:21 106:6
 108:19 116:15
 117:14 119:6
we've 6:5 12:10
 28:11 61:5,21
 73:13,16 74:15
 80:11
webinars 112:12
website 60:14
weed 88:19
weeds 18:7 23:3
 25:18 103:14
welcome 3:5 4:19
 28:22
went 3:7 20:4 30:11
 90:15 92:4,14
 101:4 121:14
Westin 1:10
wheel 18:8 80:9
wheres 55:17
wide 13:21 76:3
 91:2
Wildlife 83:21
willing 35:21
 116:17
wisdom 67:12,14
 68:3
withdraw 120:3

wonder 49:16 81:10	93:10 106:11	7
word 36:20	yesterday 72:6	8
words 45:9 93:9 94:6	York 1:17	80 34:18
work 12:2 14:20 21:16 34:12,17 46:12 73:11 77:16 79:2 85:13 90:19 96:10 114:22,22 115:7,8,11,14,16 115:18 116:3,4,6	Z	801 1:10
worked 65:8 74:8	0	85 86:10 88:10
worker 89:3	1	90 34:18
workers 20:2 89:2 89:6	1 94:5	95th 44:19
Workforce 32:12	1:15 1:11	97 45:12 94:10
working 1:4 5:17 7:6 18:14 19:17 34:5 55:18 73:5 91:10 94:4 115:6 119:17	1:20 3:2	99 94:18
works 74:2 77:4,6,7 77:10 78:8 89:18 90:18	100 42:8 86:14 93:12 107:11 110:9	
world 73:6	112 44:10	
worlds 62:8	119 87:6	
worry 51:14	12 44:11 46:1	
worse 87:6	120 87:5 94:1,5	
worst 57:2	122 44:14	
worth 98:7	15 33:1	
wouldn't 53:9 117:22	2	
wow 60:14 118:14	2 17:21,21	
wrangling 55:7	2012 77:15 98:13	
wrapped 6:22 102:4	2016 17:3	
write 72:18,19	2018 1:8	
written 4:2 15:20 28:20	27 1:8	
wrong 54:16 94:20	3	
X	3 36:14	
Y	3:09 101:4	
Yeah 14:22	3:29 101:5	
year 65:13	3:49 121:14	
years 85:15 87:13	30 44:14 45:10	
	4	
	40 88:12 97:18	
	5	
	5 16:11 17:21	
	50 23:14 88:12 97:18	
	50,000 73:3,14	
	57 94:8	
	6	
	68 45:10	

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Subcommittee on Best Practices

Before: PHMSA VIS Working Group

Date: 02-27-18

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