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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Off-microphone introductions.)

MR. BROWN: Bryce Brown of the Rosen Group.

MR. MCLAREN: Chris McLaren, PHMSA.

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

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

(No audible response.)

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: I do.

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

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

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

practices, process sharing, and the technology committee.

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

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

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

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

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

around this in a consistent way.

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

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

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

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

the same level.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: So there's the notion

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

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

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

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

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

interacting threats.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Yeah, and then we'll

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BATTAMS: Can you make it bigger?

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

MS. BATTAMS: Thank you.

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

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

improvement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BLYSTONE: Cool.

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

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

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

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

certainly have industry regulators and then serving the public.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It really doesn't speak to the broader

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then there's something that maybe the

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Good point.

MR. HERETH: So why is it you would

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Agreed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Though, again, that was

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

MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

PARTICIPANT: Welcome to DC.

MR. KIEBA: Thoughts from you, Kate?

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Yes.

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

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

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

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

It's just something.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HERETH: Well, the fifth one --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

MR. JONES: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

capability.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Off-microphone comments.)

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

(Off-microphone comments.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

something that a company wants to share.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MS. BORENER: It might be helpful --

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

real issue.

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

it's relevant for generations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The regulators are going to say oh my

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

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

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

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

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

database committee. They collect plastic pipe failures and fittings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And even if you're a contributor, you

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

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

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

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

MR. COTE: I need to think about that

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

MR. KIEBA: I agree.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. JONES: So it's incentivized?

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

MR. JONES: Yes --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. JONES: Right, fair enough.

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

MR. HERETH: Yes.

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

MR. HERETH: Yes.

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

MR. HERETH: Or anonymously.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

Two different, entirely different worlds of information in the information databases.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

Certainly again that first bullet is

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

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

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

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

references that use.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But there's a very deliberate

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes, yes, good point.

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

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

could be scanned over or reused.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Right.

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

PARTICIPANT: Which is a pretty good question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Laughter.)

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: That's what's got to

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Oh, to tighten up.

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

we're trying to talk about here.

You can see how this works already. Now it is can we go to a larger format, can we have the projections that we need to do this in a way that can really raise the industry dramatically? That's where we are right now.

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

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

Will we root out some bad players? Yes. Does that mean they go away, hey maybe they invest in R&D and catch up. But let's be honest, as operators, we need that.

MR. COTE: Well, you're exactly right. And the amount of the situation in the distribution side may be damaged.

MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

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

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

MR. COTE: Precisely, exactly.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

MR. COTE: All the various ones.

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

MR. COTE: Right.

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Yes.

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Right.

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

MR. JOHNSON: It works for everyone.

MR. WARNER: Yes.

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

(Off-microphone comments.)

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Yes.

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

(Off-microphone comment.)

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

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

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

MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Okay, yes.

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

give us very actionable information.

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

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

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

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

MR. JONES: Yes, including the --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

PARTICIPANT: We could just say current practices.

MR. KIEBA: Current practices?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. KIEBA: So identification of current practices?

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

right? Identification of a baseline or the current data.

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

MR. HERETH: Whatever the existing the mechanisms are.

MR. JONES: Be they models and --

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

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

MR. COTE: Yes, identification of

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

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

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

MR. JOHNSON: Even more areas.

(Off-microphone comments.)

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

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

there's all kinds of people who have information.

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

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

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

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

detection, you might use UAS, et cetera.

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

(Off-microphone comments.)

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

risk.

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

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

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

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

know, I can kind of give you the list.

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

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Is there competitive issues, legal

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

MR. COTE: Is a non-start.

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Is a non-start. Right.

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Right. A very clear

limited space. Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

PARTICIPANT: Yes, so it would probably be both.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Yes.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. COTE: Exactly, staff member.

MR. KIEBA: Staff member.

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

giving.

MR. KIEBA: Because they handle most of that.

MR. COTE: Exactly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

(Laughter.)

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

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

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

MR. COTE: You bet you.

MR. KIEBA: Talk about scaling.

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

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

(Off-microphone comment.)

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

(Off-microphone comment.)

MR. HERETH: Right.

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Yes, yes.

PARTICIPANT: McKay.

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

PARTICIPANT: That's what we have here --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

MR. KIEBA: There's a bridge there.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Who's that?

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Kurilla?

MR. COTE: Yes, Kurilla.

(Off-microphone comments)

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

MR. JOHNSON: Stuart?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

MR. KIEBA: They're changing it.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Time for break.

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

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

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

PARTICIPANT: That's going to be a presentation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Right.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: We're trying to frame.

MR. COTE: You're exactly right.

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

MR. COTE: Exactly.

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

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

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

MR. KIEBA: Okay.

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Exactly.

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. COTE: Right, exactly. There you

go.

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes. I want to confirm that.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

MR. COTE: Well, let's try.

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

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: I don't think so.

MR. KIEBA: I know we talked about it.

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

those would be the two questions I would ask.

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

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

MR. HERETH: Who runs that now?

MR. COTE: I think it's Andrew.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. COTE: Yes, exactly.

MR. HERETH: Andrew's probably the

more accessible.

MR. COTE: Yes.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay, so both?

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay.

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

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

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

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

PARTICIPANT: That's what it was, right.

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. MCLAREN: Most everybody.

MR. KIEBA: You don't have any choice. So it gives you 100 percent coverage.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

PARTICIPANT: Yes, I like that.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we do.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Off-microphone comments.)

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Do we, now?

MR. HERETH: I don't think --

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

PARTICIPANT: Subcommittees getting together.

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: -- in person conference call?

MR. HERETH: Yes.

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

MR. HERETH: I think that would be --

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

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

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

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

MR. MCLAREN: Oh, no.

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

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

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

PARTICIPANT: Can we vote now?

(Laughter.)

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

MR. MCLAREN: Yes, absolutely.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay. What else?

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

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

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

extended subcommittee members to outnumber the committee members.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

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

MR. MCLAREN: Guest presenters.

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

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

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

MS. BORENER: It is a relevant question.

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

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

(Simultaneous speaking.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HERETH: He comes at a price.

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

PARTICIPANT: Fair point, right, fair point.

(Off-microphone comments.)

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Okay. I recommend we adjourn.

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

CHAIR AMUNDSEN: Yes.

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

E

U

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.

Neal R. Gross

Court Reporter