UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

VOLUNTARY INFORMATION-SHARING WORKING GROUP

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY
DECEMBER 19, 2016

+ + + + +

The Working Group met in the *Room, of the Hilton Arlington located at 950 North Stafford Street, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., The Honorable Diane Burman, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT

DIANE BURMAN, New York State Public Service Commission
ERIC AMUNDSEN, Panhandle Energy/Energy Transfer Partners
KATE BLYSTONE, Pipeline Safety Trust
BRYCE BROWN, The ROSEN Group
ROBERT BUCHANAN, Seal for Life Industries
DAN COTE, NiSource Gas
JASON CRADIT, TRC Oil and Gas (Willbros Divestiture)
SHERINA MAYE EDWARDS, Illinois Commerce Commission *
ALICIA FARAG, LocusView Solutions
MARK HERETH, Process Performance Improvement Consultants
LEIF JENSEN, Sunoco Logistics

WALTER JONES, Laborers' Health & Safety Fund of North America *
MICHAEL KELLER, The University of Tulsa *
MICHAEL LaMONT, Integrity Plus
JOHN MacNEILL, Utility Workers Union
ALAN MAYBERRY, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
HOLLY PEAREN, Environmental Defense Fund
SIMONA PERRY, Pipeline Safety Coalition and Consulting Services, LLC
JOE SUBSITS, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
MICHELLE THEBERT, Georgia Public Service Commission *
CHRISTOPHER WARNER, Mears Group, Inc.
MARK ZUNIGA, UniversalPegasus International, Inc.

ALSO PRESENT
CHRISTIE MURRAY, PHMSA, Designated Federal Official
MARIE THERESE DOMINGUEZ, PHMSA Administrator
ALAINA ANDERSON, PHMSA Attorney Advisor
AHUVA BATTAMS, I&E Attorney
SHERRY BORENER, PHMSA Chief Data Officer
DREW HEVLE, Kinder Morgan
CHRIS McLAREN, PHMSA Transportation Specialist
CHRISTINA SAMES, American Gas Association
CAMERON SUTTERTHWAITE, PHMSA Transportation Specialist
STARR SILVA, Special Assistant to the PHMSA Administrator
JOHN STOODY, Association of Oil Pipe Lines

*** Present via teleconference**

CONTENTS

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

(8:45 a.m.)

MS. MURRAY: Well, good morning everyone. Happy Monday.

We're going to go ahead and get started with our very first Voluntary Information-Sharing System Working Group meeting.

Next slide, Pam.

First I want to just say thank you to everyone who was able to travel out to our working group meeting on very short notice.

We were aggressively working to get our nominations and appointments made so that we could convene today.

So, thank you very much for those who are able to join us in person and those who are joining us remotely over the phone.

Those individuals who are on the phone, could you please announce your name?

(SIMULTANEOUS SPEAKING)

MS. MURRAY: I'm sorry, can you say that again? One of you, hopefully, at a time?

And, if you're not speaking, please mute your line.

MEMBER KELLER: Mike Keller, University of Tulsa.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Mike.

MEMBER KELLER: You're welcome.

MEMBER JONES: Walter Jones, Laborers' Health and Safety Fund.

MS. MURRAY: Can the gentleman who just spoke please speak again?

MEMBER JONES: Walter Jones, Laborers' Health and Safety Fund.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

And, then, the young lady who was speaking?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Sherina Maye Edwards, Illinois Commerce Commission.

MS. MURRAY: All right, thank you, Commissioner Edwards for joining us also.

MEMBER PERRY: And, Simona Perry, Pipeline Safety Coalition.

MS. MURRAY: All right, thank you, Ms.

Perry.

Any others joining remotely?

MEMBER THEBERT: Michelle Thebert, Georgia Public Service Commission.

MS. MURRAY: Good morning, Michelle.

MEMBER THEBERT: Good morning.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, so, by my count, we have five individuals joining remotely.

All right, well, good morning. I'm Christie Murray. I am serving in today's working group committee meeting as the Designated Federal Officer who will be presiding over the committee meeting today.

Next slide?

Now, for those who are joining us remotely, are you able to see the presentation that we have displayed?

MEMBER KELLER: I'm still sitting in the virtual lobby. This is Keller.

MS. MURRAY: All right, well, we will work to get you the presentation slides so that you're able to join this.

For the few introductory aspects, they won't be absolutely needed, so I think you'll be fine. But, once we get into the presentations, we'll make sure you have a copy of the presentations in case we have issues with the virtual conference -- meeting conference.

So, I wanted to just set the stage by talking about the purpose of the working group that we're participating in.

Ultimately, the goal of this working group is to fulfill Section 10 of the Protecting Our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety which is our Pipes Act of 2016.

And, this congressional mandate we received from our reauthorization this past summer has us focusing on developing or considering the development of a voluntary information sharing system that will allow our industry to collaborate to ultimately improve inspection and other pipeline safety related information to be able to improve gas transmission and hazardous liquid pipeline

facility integrity risk analysis.

Ultimately, the main deliverable from this working group will be to provide recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation on this subject matter.

Next?

So, a bit of safety and housekeeping before we get too far into the details.

For those who are physically here, we do have exits that are outlined on the diagram in front of you. There are three exits to my right and then there's also the exits to my left.

In either case, you'll want to take the stairway down to the main lobby level to exit the building.

Also, in the event that you need to take advantage of the restroom facilities, they are immediately to my left outside the door. The ladies room is on the right side and the mens bathroom is on the left.

Next?

Also, if you have not done so already,

please silence your mobile devices so that we can minimize any disruptions during the meeting.

And, also, thank you, audience, who -- and members of the public who are joining us as well to our meeting. We definitely are interested in a great dialogue and rich conversation around information sharing.

We will ask that if comments are made, we will give an opportunity for those comments and hold your comments until we open the floor.

And, also, please keep your remarks relatively brief so that we can allot time for multiple individuals to be able to share.

Also, there's an opportunity if needed or if you want to take advantage of it to have written comments submitted to the docket. And, we provided the docket number listed here.

For those who are remote, it's PHMSA, P-H-M-S-A, dash 2016-0128.

Next?

So, what I wanted to do generally is generally is talk a little bit about the agenda.

If everyone around the table, does all the committee members have one of these blue folders? Did everyone get the reading material for today?

Okay, raise your hand if you didn't and we'll make sure you get a copy of it. Okay, great.

So, everyone should have a copy of the meeting agenda. I won't read it in its entirety, but, what I did want to just point out is we really have kind of a thematic approach to the set up of this first meeting.

Because it is a the first meeting, it's important to focus on some of the committee management aspects and also to lay the foundation for information sharing with some introductory conversation that will lead to some great dialogue.

And, also, have an opportunity for the committee to discuss how the committee will meet and what information, presentations, educational input they may need in order to conduct the committee's business.

And, we'll also talk a bit about subcommittee needs.

Also, we will break for lunch around noon today. And, lunch will be on your own. In your folders you may find, if it's not in your folders, definitely at the registration desk, the list of restaurants that are in the vicinity for lunch.

And, then, we'll close out with any action items that we may come up with during the meeting. We'll recap those and close our meeting out this afternoon.

Any questions so far? Okay.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Ms. Murray, this is Sherina Edwards. Are you going to -- is there an opportunity where the people in the room are going to introduce themselves just so that we know who's there?

MS. MURRAY: Yes, absolutely. We will do introductions in just a few moments.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Okay.

MS. MURRAY: So, what I will do is, I

will -- I want to introduce first the Committee Chair, the Honorable Diane Burman and she will be chairing the committee with us. And, I'll have her introduce herself briefly now.

CHAIR BURMAN: Hello, my name is Diane Burman. I am with the New York State Public Service Commission.

And, as I see today, it's really a getting to know you day. We'll include an educational component of what the general substantive information is.

We're going to get a sense of this working group and the tasks at hand.

To me, the substantive objective of the group is to develop recommendations on how best to establish a voluntary information sharing system to exchange and protect pipeline safety and inspection related data.

The integrity and reliability of our natural gas system is paramount. At the core of that is safety.

My focus as a state regulator is on

how important pipeline safety is to everyone, regulators, the public, the gas companies and gas consumers.

We all have to work together to ensure that the latest technologies and best practices are responsibly incorporated into the pipeline and distributors' daily procedures.

Opportunities to engage with PHMSA such as this are important and a continued working relationship is vital to provide constructive concerns and comments and help us achieve our objective on continuing and improving pipeline safety.

Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you very much.

Next, we will have opening remarks by PHMSA's administrator.

All right, well, we're going to actually do a few things in reverse. Cameron, if you can bring back up the -- actually go to the next few slides.

What we'll do is kick it off with

introductions. But, as I set the stage for introductions -- one more, thank you -- I do want to talk about how the membership of the committee as we do introductions and as you're listening to introductions how the membership was very deliberately laid out as far as the stakeholders that are represented on the working group.

As a part of our Section 10 of Pipes Act mandate, the mandate specifically specifies that we have to have a member of the working group from PHMSA, also industry stakeholders and a vast number of represented groups such as operators of pipeline facilities, inspection technology coating, cathodic protection vendors and pipeline inspection organizations.

Also, we have to have safety advocacy groups represented, research institutions, state public utility commissions, state pipeline safety inspectors, labor representatives and other entities.

Next slide?

So, with that being said, and this may

be a little difficult to read, but as you can see, we have 24 members on the working group. And, each of those members have been categorized by one of the groups, the represented groups that I mentioned previously.

This is a bit small, but we can certainly provide this to you so that you can see.

Also, in your folders, there is a committee roster that has a designation next to each individual's name as to which group they are participating in.

Next slide?

So, now, what I think we can do is definitely go around and do introductions and have everyone introduce themselves.

Let's see, we can start with Ms. Dominguez and work our way around counterclockwise from her. And, just tell us your name, title, organization and maybe what connects you to this working group or what's of interest to you.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Good morning, everyone. My name is Marie Therese Dominguez and I serve as the administrator for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration at the U.S. Department of Transportation.

And, I'm about to tell you in a few minutes why I think this is so incredibly important.

And, I want to thank you all very much for agreeing to participate in this groundbreaking work group on voluntary information sharing.

MS. BORENER: Good morning, I'm Sherry Borener. I serve as the Chief Data Officer at PHMSA.

And, I'm here today to do my very best to figure out how to support whatever decisions you make about information sharing and to set up structures and basically to support your implementation of all of the information sharing you decide to do as a result of the committee's work.

So, thank you very much. I'll be speaking this afternoon about VIS.

MEMBER LAMONT: Good morning, I'm Mike LaMont, Vice President of Integrity Plus. And, my background is developing integrity management programs and helping operators comply with the requirements.

And, I'm excited to be here. I look forward to finding a solution that everyone can -- that really works for everyone.

MEMBER HERETH: Good morning, I'm Mark Hereth with Process Performance Improvement Consultants.

I've been in the industry 37 years. My early years in petrochemicals and refining, the last 24 or so in pipelines.

I've worked a lot around ILI and data sharing including investigations looking at the ILI and how we can improve the use of the technology.

I also worked on a group in INGAA looking at how to advance, as Chairman Burman

said, the best available technologies and to bring them to the forefront for use in every day compliance.

And, Chairman Burman, I appreciate your comment and I fully support them in terms of you, the committee and through all the job that we have in front of us. I'm honored to be on this committee.

Thank you.

MEMBER WARNER: Good morning, I'm Chris Warner from -- I'm Senior Vice President of Mears Group.

And, in my early life, I was an operator working on transmission integrity, so I have a long history of being concerned about pipeline integrity.

Ten years ago, I transitioned to Mears Group with his a cathodic protection consultant, direct examination consultant. And, it also has a branch of inline inspection.

So, this really is close to my heart both from an operator perspective and from a

consultant perspective. So, appreciate being a part of this committee.

MEMBER ZUNIGA: Hi, my name's Mark Zuniga. I'm with UniversalPegasus. We are an inspection service provider along with an inspection technology service provider.

I, myself, have been in the pipeline industry in and around applying technology to pipeline projects for the past 20 years or so.

MEMBER MACNEILL: Good morning. My name is John MacNeill. I'm the National Safety Director for the Utility Workers Union of America. I represent members that work in the utility industry in gas, steam, electric.

And, I'm here to hopefully make a difference and help for the safety of my members.

Thank you.

MEMBER JENSEN: Good morning. My name is Leif Jensen. I'm with Sunoco Logistics. I have about 30 years in the industry, 20 of which is in natural gas, across the board, local distribution, transmission and storage.

The last ten years have been with Sunoco operating hazardous liquid pipelines across the nation.

I am the Senior Director of Asset Integrity which includes corrosion, pipeline integrity, small pipeline projects, compliance and so forth.

And, you know, my primary interest in joining this group, and I'm honored to be here, by the way, is all in the spirit of pipeline safety and protecting the sensitivities that operators have, the confidentiality requirements, you know, protection from FOIA and so on.

So, I think the -- in the spirit of pipeline safety far outweighs a lot of those other elements. And, I think that we will have the opportunity to persevere.

So, thank you.

MEMBER COTE: My name is Dan Cote. I am Vice President of Pipeline Safety and Compliance for NiSource.

I've been a utility operating guy for

over 40 years and was doing distribution integrity management before it was a regulation or before it was even considered as a need in the industry.

My passion, quite frankly, is pipeline safety. In my mind, the most basic service we provide is the right of people to live in their homes unmolested with the secure energy source. And, that's our challenge here.

In my mind, the information arena is one that will allow a enormous opportunity for us to get better through the sharing of information.

So, I'm excited by this opportunity and I believe, if we execute this well with a central theme of pipeline safety, this will be successful.

Thank you.

MEMBER CRADIT: Hi, good morning. My name's Jason Cradit. I'm Senior Director of Technology for TRC.

My main focus has been in cybersecurity as well as cloud data management in

and around pipeline systems previously with General Electric, PII, Willbros and MJ Harden.

Thank you.

MEMBER FARAG: I'm Alicia Farag with LocusView Solutions. We are a subsidiary of GTI, Gas Technology Institute.

We do technology for collecting and analyzing asset and integrity data. And, I'm hoping to bring a perspective on the actual mechanics of data sharing from multiple stakeholders.

MEMBER BLYSTONE: I'm Kate Blystone. I'm with the Pipeline Safety Trust. I'm the Outreach Manager for them.

And, my interest in pipeline safety began in 1999 after the pipeline explosion in Bellingham. I was the first intern for Safe Bellingham back when I was much younger which was the predecessor to the Pipeline Safety Trust.

So, this has been an issue for me for a very long time. And, I just hope to bring a perspective of the public to this table today,

just the general public who's going to be affected by our decisions.

MEMBER PEAREN: My name is Holly Pearen. I'm a Senior Attorney at the Environmental Defense Fund.

EDF is pleased to participate in the working group and is primarily interested in fostering a dynamic environment for research and perfection, advance leak detection inspection technologies.

The transportation and storage sector contributes about 20 percent of the methane emissions from the natural gas sector. And, we think that more robust, less destructive inspection technologies can be developed and start -- and deployed to state lowering those emissions.

Sharing information about the available technologies and respective strengths and weaknesses is essential to expedient and efficient R&D.

And, I think on a different note, EDF

has watch with, you know, some dismay at the increasing deterioration of communications between energy, transportation proponents, communities and environmental stakeholders.

And, really feel that when parties pull back and stop conversing and retreat to talking points, nothing productive happens and conflicts, you know, can become more entrenched.

And, so, in the spirit of fact-based transparent dialogue and honest communication, I think this working group can really set a great example and move forward towards productive rather than positional dialogue and sort of focus on the shared goals of safe, efficient energy transportation.

MEMBER BUCHANAN: I'm Bob Buchanan. I'm with Seal for Life Industries. We're a division of Berry Plastics Corporation. And, for the most part, I'm a coatings guy.

We manufacture and develop various different coating technologies, plus, we also have a cathodic protection system. So, we kind

of have a unique approach to or a viewpoint on corrosion prevention of pipelines whether it's from coatings or CP and, again, different coating technologies.

Obviously, my interest is getting to know and getting, I would say, closer to PHMSA to a degree. As a vendor, we are -- have always been a stakeholder, but we've never really had a voice at PHMSA, so I think it's important to be able to -- I'm quite honored to be on this working group, by the way.

And, it's very important to be able to get closer to and get to know PHMSA better. So, I guess really, it's about pipeline safety, whether it's through some sort of corrosion prevention technology, but also information sharing and understanding what's going on with the pipeline world.

MEMBER BROWN: Good morning. My name is Bryce Brown. I'm a Vice President in Group Strategy Management for the ROSEN Group. I'm in my 26th year with the organization coming from

the data side, through integrity side.

We, as a company, are an asset care company with a longstanding history and portfolio on inline inspection. And, we, as an industry of inline inspection service providers, have a vested interest in understanding the synergies and the effective sharing of data.

And, it's an honor for myself to be invited and participate in this.

Thank you.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Good morning, Eric Amundsen with Energy Transfer. I've been with those assets for 35 years.

Like the others, I'm honored to be a part of this group. It's a very noble thing that we're going to try and solve here.

Start by acknowledging and applauding the legislation. I think it really does address a gap that we have in the industry, but not too naive to think that it's going to be easy. If it was easy, we would have done it already. Right?

So, I think we've got a lot of

challenges before us, but I think we've got, looking around the room and with all the experience and diversity of this group, it's very excited at where we'll end up here.

But, again, back to, I think it's a gap that we really need to address. It seems very simple in its, you know, in its context. This is the, you know, the check part of the plan-do-check-act, continuous improvement cycle.

But, to be honest, we don't -- this is something we don't do very well. As an industry, we don't do very well as companies and working with our service providers, obviously. Otherwise, we wouldn't be sitting here.

So, really anxious to be a part of moving the ball here and closing this gap.

Thank you.

MEMBER SUBSITS: Hi, it's Joe Subsits. I am the Chief Engineer with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. I'm here representing the National Association of Pipeline Safety Representatives.

And, as an inspector, I've seen many operators and I've seen them work through ILI processes. And, the science isn't always perfect, but I've seen them a lot of things and learn a lot of good things, but it's just a shame that a lot of these things get lost.

And, I see this as a great opportunity to learn from each other and to help our own organizations get better in the process.

MS. WHETSEL: I'm Cheryl Whetsel on the Advisory Committee Manager. You're going to get to know me pretty well, at least for administrative matters as the time goes on.

In addition to managing this committee, I also manage the gas and the liquid pipeline safety advisory committees. I'm in the Office of Rulemaking and I also manage the standards incorporated by reference.

And, just one administrative matter, I am looking for a committee roster that has a little note at the top that says please update your information. If anybody has that, if they

could give it to me so I can start moving it around the room.

If I don't find it, I apologize to those people who have already maybe filled out their information and might have to do it again.

But, if you have someone else who manages your calendar, an administrative assistant or someone you would like to add to the listing, please let me know and I'll put them on the mailing list so you'll have a secondary person to manage your calendar then when we have meetings.

That's it.

MR. SUTTERTHWAITE: Cameron Sutterthwaite, Acting Director, Standards of Rulemaking, PHMSA.

And, that's it. Am I'm just here to support.

MR. MCLAREN: I'm Chris McLaren with PHMSA. I've been at PHMSA for 15 years basically developing and implementing the integrity management inspection programs.

It's been a main focus for me as well as other things. And, I am here as part of the committee staff to support the committee.

MS. ANDERSON: Alaina Anderson, I'm with PHMSA'S Office of Chief Counsel the General Law Division.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Good morning. I'm Alan Mayberry, Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

I'll give a couple remarks in a bit, but, you know, I'd just like to say, first, that, you know, I look forward to this -- of the outcome of this group as another tool in our toolbox for, you know, looking at pipeline safety and ensuring pipeline safety.

You know, it goes beyond regulations and the typical things you tend to see. I think this -- we have a great opportunity in this working group. So, I look forward to, you know, the discussion and the ultimate end product.

Thanks.

MS. MURRAY: All right, and I'm

Christie Murray. I'm the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Policy and Programs. And, I have been with PHMSA for about six and a half years now.

When I'm not in acing role, I am the Director of our Program Development Division. We handle everything from the MPMS system, damage prevention, 811, public awareness, our community assistance and technical services program and more.

So, happy to be here.

Next, I'm want to make sure that I give the individuals on the phone first an opportunity to introduce themselves. And, then, I'll ask any other PHMSA staff who's here to go to the microphone if it's there. We'll grab the microphone, we'll get that there.

But, give them an opportunity to introduce themselves as well.

So, on the phone, I'm going to call your name just so that we don't have to have you talk over each other.

Mr. Keller?

MEMBER KELLER: Hi, sorry, I have a wicked cold this weekend, so I am kind of getting over that.

My name is Michael Keller. I am an Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Tulsa in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

My research interest in material science, so a mechanics guy and a good portion of my research has been in understanding the performance of repairs for damaged pipeline and pressure equipment as well as in erosion and corrosion of oil field equipment, actually, through our erosion and corrosion center at the University of Tulsa.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

Mr. Jones?

MEMBER JONES: Hi, again. I'm Walter Jones. I'm the Assistant Director of Occupational Safety and Health at the Laborers Health and Safety Fund. We're a fund of the laborers union and their signatory contractors.

And, I provide safety and health support to our signatory contractors.

I look forward to participating on this committee. And, where possible, instituting best practices that go beyond the minimum requirement.

MS. MURRAY: Great, thank you.

Commissioner Edwards?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Sorry, I was on mute.

Hi, again, Sherina Maye Edwards from the Illinois Commerce Commission.

And, Commissioner Burman mentioned earlier, I think our focus is exactly there. I think it's great that we're represented on the committee.

But, I feel this is a bright light. We definitely be determined, have long-term relations and going forward on what we think necessarily needs to take place from a regulator standpoint.

Looking forward today to kind of just getting the framework and seeing how we can maybe

most provide our value here then take it back to our regulators through work.

Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

Dr. Perry?

MEMBER PERRY: Hi, I'm Simona Perry. I'm Vice President of Pipeline Safety Coalition. We're a safety pipeline, safety education group, organization.

I'm also Research Director and founder of c.a.s.e. Consulting Services. I'm trained as both an ecological risk assessor as well as a social scientist.

So, I'm very honored and excited to be a part of this group. One of my main concerns is understanding how people translate risk, the public in particular, how industry can play a larger in helping in that education and translation piece by providing clear, concise information about the risks from pipelines as well as just looking at the, you know, the social and kind of cultural, believe it or not, gaps

that we have when we talk about in forwarding communication on issues where people, you know, safety is involved.

So, I really look forward to being a part of this.

Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

And, finally, Ms. Thebert?

MEMBER THEBERT: Hi, Michelle Thebert, Georgia Public Service Commission. I've been with the Commission for 20 years this year. And, a majority of those were spent in rates and regulation department.

I've been on the pipeline safety side for four years come this March. So, I've kind of seen both sides of the safety versus the call submitter implications, you know, with rates.

So, I'm looking forward to, you know, I'm a big proponent for transparency in the industry and hopefully this will, you know, spread throughout the industry and people realizing it's not about thanks for your

information, it's good, sometimes, depending on what it is.

So, I'm looking forward to participating. Thank you for having me.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you very much.

Now, we'll ask if there are any PHMSA staff members here to please introduce yourself.

MS. WHITE: Hello everybody. I'm Nancy White, Director of Policy and Programs for the Office of Pipeline Safety. I'm here to support this effort and very much looking forward to seeing how this can carry the safety ball forward.

Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you.

MS. BATTAMS: I'm Ahuva Battams. I'm an attorney with the Office of Chief Counsel in the Pipeline Division. I'm also here for support.

MR. HOLLINGSHEAD: Hello everyone. I'm Brandon Hollingshead. I'm the Assistant

Chief Counsel for General Law within PHMSA's Office of Chief Counsel.

MS. SILVA: Hello everybody. I'm Starr Silva with PHMSA and I'm the Special Assistant to the Administrator.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: I just want to make a really clear statement. Please don't everyone get overly concerned about the number of attorneys that are in the room.

Part of it is, is that this is a federal advisory committee and we need to make sure that it's run smoothly and actually abides by the law. So, the charter and the work that we're doing actually is part of the reason why our legal staff are here.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you. Good point.

Okay, so, Cameron, if you could back up a couple of slides. Next, what we'll do is we'll back up and we will -- we look forward to opening remarks from Ms. Dominguez and Mr. Mayberry.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: All right, good morning everybody. This is Marie Therese Dominguez.

As I said before, I serve as -- I have the privilege of serving as PHMSA's Administrator. And, for those that know me and those that don't, I'll be a little bit more direct.

I couldn't be happier that this group is meeting today. This is something that I think is absolutely fundamental to the next level of pipeline safety which is looking not only at safety management systems but also really taking information and sharing it in new ways that we can actually identify emerging risk earlier and actually address it and really lead to a new level of pipeline safety.

So, first and foremost, I want to thank everyone very much for your participation today, for coming on short notice. It really is incredibly important that we were able to assemble today.

And, I just want to share with you some opening remarks to set the stage a little bit and look forward to a very productive day.

Welcome, first and foremost. I am actually very thrilled to see all of you joining together from such diverse representative groups to consider the development of a voluntary information sharing system that will truly improve pipeline safety across the entire industry and across for the American public.

Your participation is extremely crucial and its critical. This working group will collaborate on inspection information, feedback and information sharing with the purpose of improving gas transmission and hazardous liquid pipeline facility integrity risk analysis.

This working group will provide recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation.

It will also provide unique insight on information sharing matters including whether a sharing system is needed.

How it can be most effective and ways to encourage the exchange of information, inspection information and the best practices for the protection of proprietary and security sensitive information.

But most importantly, I think your input will help further pipeline safety across the industry by figuring out a mechanism to actually share information collaboratively.

So, why is this so terribly important? PHMSA's existence is really to look at pipeline safety across the board for the American public.

And, one of the ways that we've been looking to advance that goal is to look at safety management systems. And, a safety management system, or an SMS, is the best structure for sharing information and managing safety.

It's critical that we develop an SMS in order to encourage information sharing, promote better safety practices across all the industries that we work with and for the benefit of our stakeholders to achieve the best possible

safety outcomes.

Safety management systems are a very, very comprehensive look at everything that an operator does as well as, for instance, PHMSA, we're also taking on developing a safety management system for ourselves, how you actually tie every action that you're doing to a process that's connected to a safety outcome.

The essential components for a successful SMS system are data analysis and sharing. Sharing of information and in a non-punitive setting, whether that be through reporting or actions by employees or anything else.

Information sharing is facilitated by a system that encourages open reporting of issues and protects against any sort of retaliation writ large.

Awareness and discussion are also crucial aspects and allow -- and it really allows for an organic flow of information across the board.

And, I want to make a distinction, data sharing, which is different from information sharing is another crucial component of a successful safety management system.

Data sharing is more granule than information sharing. You don't need to work with data sharing in order to benefit from information sharing. But, it's a useful tool to have in a larger safety management system arsenal.

Pipelines within the United States are moving higher volumes of product than ever before, putting an unprecedented amount of demand on the entire infrastructure system.

An SMS would provide a plan for keeping pace with this demand without sacrificing safety.

Many industries, whether they be aviation, the chemical industry, the nuclear industry, among others, have utilized safety management systems to actually manage risk and improve safety over the course of their time.

And, we've seen this time and time

again. One of the things that I asked when I first came to PHMSA was, one, how are we quantifying our impact on safety?

And, secondly, and so we've tied all of the organizational changes that we've made and all of our actions back to that metric of how do we actually improve safety across the board and the actions that the agency takes.

But, secondly, how do we actually make sure that we are structured in a way that our acts on a day to day basis and the work that we do as a regulator impacts safety in a way that we can actually begin to quantify?

And, when I first came on board, one of the first things that I did was have the opportunity to talk to the industry, in particular, and one of the first questions that I posed was, where is the pipeline industry on adopting a safety management system?

I can say now, 20 months later, there is a very aggressive effort underway by the pipeline industry to really look at pipeline

safety management systems across the board.

And, the reason that this work is so important is because it truly advances that measure.

It gets to the next level of not just adoption internally by the industry of a safety management system, but then, how do you take that information and share all the work that you all are doing, the industry in particular, that the you I'm referring to, sharing it in a platform.

This committee's work will be figuring out, how do you actually take information and data and share it in a way that you can really identify risk in a new way?

And, it's the benefits of it are not only for the American public for a safer system, but also for the operators themselves and for everyone benefitting from the system.

You've got lower injury risks, you've got more information sharing. You've got a way of detecting problems before they become accidents or incidents.

And, that's the importance of the work that you're undertaking today.

So, SMS really looks at integrating that modern safety concept into a repeatable, proactive, standard operating procedures grounded truly in safety.

They advance safety by counting for the culture of an organization, it's systems and processes and human behavior and using information to really -- all this information to mitigate risk.

SMS would be useful for investing in predictive analysis capabilities, improving integrity verification procedures and utilizing data to stay ahead of technical developments that could pose new and unforeseen safety risks that we don't yet know about.

A commitment to safety management systems will help provide operators to manage the multiple facets of pipeline safety, fundamentally changing the day to day operations by incorporating a focus on safety into absolutely

every single aspect of a pipeline management system.

As Christie just -- Dr. Murray said before, the Pipeline Safety Reauthorization Bill or the 2016 Pipes Act, which Congress passed in June and the President signed, really supports the progress towards a holistic view of safety by moving toward an SMS and this next generation of safety data collection and sharing.

And, the most primary way it does that is by the creation of this working group, the voluntary information system working group.

You all will collaborate to generate recommendations, again, for the Secretary of Transportation regarding information sharing systems, stimulating an exchange of inspection information will also, again, providing protection for security sensitive information.

Some of the specific things that you'll do include identifying the need for a system to confidentially share pipeline dig verification data with inline inspection

operators.

Encouraging the sharing of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies.

You all will be looking at sharing data to increase knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of the varying types of inline inspection technologies.

Creating a secure system that protects proprietary information while also encouraging information sharing and the development, again, of advanced technologies.

Protecting safety and security sensitive information and determining associated regulatory funding and legal issues.

By bringing together representatives from safety advocacy groups, research institutions, state public utility commissions, state officials responsible for pipeline safety oversight, state pipeline safety inspectors, labor representatives, PHMSA officials, industry stakeholders and other entities who represent the

public, we hope to take advantage of the breadth, the depth, the knowledge that you all bring to the table and your experience to truly represent and develop the best possible safety management systems that we can possibly apply to the pipeline industry.

A strong safety management system across the pipeline industry must include a platform to share and analyze data, allowing users to see emerging trends and informing best practices.

This collaboration can be achieved while still protecting proprietary interests, but allowing for a marked improvement on safety.

In the interest of increasing transparency and building on trust, PHMSA has made annual reports of incident data for each operator available online.

The PHMSA website also shows operators integrated into larger safety systems, larger safety programs.

We have interactive web pages

displaying 20-year incident trends, pipeline infrastructure trends, pipeline replacement updates, raw data, flagged data files and integrity management performance measures.

We're a regulator. And, we hold operators accountable through our regulations and enforcement actions.

But, our rules, whether they're prescriptive or performance-based, like every regulator, can only serve to achieve minimum federal requirements.

It's essential that we find a way to fill the gaps between regulations and push for a cultural change to make safety the number one priority. Transparency, collaboration and the adoption of an SMS engenders a safety conscious culture within the pipeline industry.

In the course of this transformation, the cooperation of communities and the public will be invaluable. Pipeline safety is a shared responsibility, one in which all stakeholders must be involved.

So, thank you all very much for agreeing to serve on this historic working group. Your efforts will lead to strong -- to groundbreaking, I'm sure, new level of safety in this industry, in the pipeline industry.

And, I challenge you, I think somebody said it earlier, this is going to be a challenge. It's not going to be easy, but we have the right group of people together. I'm sure you'll forge relationships, get to know one another and truly get some very positive work done.

Because, I think you have the opportunity to truly make a significant difference. You have a chance to actually roll up your sleeves, do some work here that will truly lead to the next level of pipeline safety in this country.

And, I very much appreciate your willingness to take it on and look forward to working with you. You have a great team here supporting you from PHMSA.

So, with that, I'll turn it back over

to Dr. Murray.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you very much.

And, I'll pass it to Alan for remarks.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Okay, thanks, Christie.

I guess really my remarks really qualify more as opening thoughts to begin the day. But, I just wanted to welcome you and appreciate your participation in this important working group.

You know, especially on this short notice. I know many of you had to travel across the country to get here, so appreciate your taking time out of your day on Sunday, no less, to be here for this important meeting.

We're very pleased with the turnout today.

And, I'm also honored to be around such a diverse group of distinguished people. I'd say your experience and your backgrounds were quite impressive.

I think that will work very well on this committee.

I know, at times, when you have such a large diverse group, sometimes I think it can be a challenge to get to an end. But, I think, in this case, that will definitely help to have the perspectives that you each bring to the table here.

And, by the way, I'm switching hats. I'm giving you really my thoughts as the Associate Administrator, not as a committee member, although they're sort of related, they go hand in hand.

I'm a little bit out of order here in that I'm on the committee but also leading the pipeline safety program.

I was very intent on meeting the mandates that came out of the 2016 Act, not to mention the earlier Act out of 2011.

But, anyway, nonetheless, I view this as, you know, if you talk in terms of the theme which I've discussed frequently, is we really

need to be focused on preventing the next accident.

You know, in the aftermath of large low probability, high consequence events, often times, we are left to look at, well, what happened and how do we avoid or prevent that from happening in the future.

And, certainly that is very important to do and we do that quite well. But, I would tell you that we really need to be focused on preventing the next accident.

And, to me, this group is what that is all about as far as the information sharing initiative that we're here to discuss today.

You know, in the mandate, the focus was inline inspection and certainly that is a major issue. I think it's a media issue as Eric has pointed out. It's an area that has been a challenge for all of us.

And, as a regulator, I can tell you, from my perspective, time and time again, in the aftermath of an accident, we often hear from the

operator that, well, I just pigged that line or I'm in the process of pigging the line.

We've even had accidents where a pig is in the line when the line gets shutdown.

So, you know, where there's some lines that we can, you know, take from those types of incidents and then your knowledge that can really improve how information is shared related to ILI.

So, I look forward to that discussion.

But, you know, we're not limited, and this is the way I see it, to ILI. Certainly, that's what the mandate says, but my hope for this group is that whatever we come out with will be applicable to other areas, the other less, you know, areas with involving less well-known technology that are much simpler and, you know, dealing with just basic, you know, leak issues and distribution systems or coating issues and the like.

So, we're really about, you know, setting up a system for sharing information that could apply to the variety of issues that are out

there, the universe of issues that are out there, not only ILI, although, again, that is the specific mandate we have before us.

You know, I would add, you know, for you who've not been involved with PHMSA in the past, you newbies around the table, this is, you know, very important to us as the regulator to have input from our stakeholders, the diverse stakeholder community.

Of course, in this case, we're going to be serving up information to the Secretary for further action. But, your input is crucial to that process, and really, to all of our processes as we develop policies to apply nationally. And, I encourage your input.

I was telling Christie and Diane before the meeting started that really it's hard to mess up here. You really can't mess up in this process other than not providing input.

And, so, really, it's incumbent upon you to provide the input that we need to, you know, to move this process forward. So, I

encourage you to do that and I look forward to the conversation.

And, then, finally, I would just like to say a word of thanks to the PHMSA staff for landing this thing on the date. Today was the deadline in the mandate to actually stand up this working group.

And, I can tell you, there was a lot of work being done in the background leading up to this. So, just my appreciation to Christie and the team that really, you know, worked late hours and I think missed some football games with kids and the like. And, a lot of things, a lot of work was done just to put this on today. So, my appreciation to PHMSA and the PHMSA staff to do that.

And, with that, I'll put my member hat back on and turn it back over to Christie.

MS. MURRAY: Thanks, Alan.

Just a couple more things from me. This is a federal advisory committee meeting. Committee members and members of the public are

asked to preserve order and decorum during this meeting.

No one shall, neither by conversation or otherwise, delay or interrupt the proceedings or the peace of the committee, nor disturb any member while speaking or refuse to obey the instructions of the Chair or Designated Federal Officer or its presiding officer.

If someone chooses to be disruptive, we will have to ask them to leave.

Next, I will hand it over to our Chair, Commissioner Burman, for remarks.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

And, so I heard from Alan that you can't mess up and then I just heard that if I'm disruptive, I'll be asked to leave.

I really, first, just want to thank the administrator. With her leadership, this really has gotten off the ground. And, you know, it reminds of a quote about many people have the right aim in life, they just never get around to pulling the trigger and the vision must be

followed by the venture. And, it's not enough to stare up the steps, we must step up the stairs.

And, that's really what we're doing here today.

For order of business and for the lawyers who, I know, are making sure that we follow, this is a meeting of the Department of Transportation's Voluntary Information Sharing Working Group.

The meeting is being recorded. A transcript will be produced for the record. The transcript and the presentations given today will be available on the PHMSA website on the egov docket at www.regulations.gov and the docket number for this voluntary information sharing working group is PHMSA-2016-0128.

Just order of business, please mute your phones and any other electronics.

Introduce yourself each time you speak so your comments can be acknowledged in the meeting transcript. And, if you have a question or comment, please set your tent card on its

side.

A quorum has been -- a quorum is established if the majority of the committee members are in attendance. That's in person or via conference call. And, we have determined that a quorum is present and we're now officially called to order and we can start the official agenda.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, so, for Agenda Item 2, the Charter Review.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, for those of you who are the phone, in the email I sent you yesterday, you should have a document that is labeled Charter. Please open that. We're going to pull it up here as we speak and we will be reviewing key elements of the actual Charter.

Thank you, Cameron.

As specified in the Charter, this committee will be known as the Voluntary Information Sharing System Working Group, or we can refer to it as the Group.

And, the Charter is established in accordance with the provisions of Section 10 of the Protecting Our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2016, Public Law 114-183, the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 and 41 CFR 102-3.50(a).

In Section III of the Charter, it specifies -- and, I'm not going to read the Charter in its entirety, I may just highlight key aspects that I think are relevant for our discussion today.

But, I think the objective is important and I think I touched on it earlier, but I want to reemphasize that the Group is responsible for providing the Secretary of Transportation with independent advice and recommendations on the development of a voluntary information securing system to encourage collaborative efforts to improve inspection information feedback and information sharing with the purpose of improving gas transmission and hazardous liquid pipeline facility risk integrity

risk analysis.

In the next section, the description of duties, the Group shall consider and provide recommendations to the Secretary. And, those recommendation considerations as outlined below include the need for an identification of a system to allow -- to ensure that dig verification data are shared with inline inspection operators to the extent consistent with the need to maintain proprietary and sensitive -- security sensitive data in a confidential manner to improve pipeline safety and inspection technology.

Also, to look at ways to encourage the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies.

Next, in Part C, this group will also outline opportunities to share data, including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and inline inspector vendors to expand their knowledge of the advantages and

disadvantages of the different types of inline inspection technology and methodologies.

In Section D, to look at options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and risk -- enhanced risk analysis.

And, then, in E, understand the means and best practices for the protection of safety and security sensitive information and proprietary information.

And, finally, looking at the regulatory funding and legal barriers to share the information described in the paragraphs I mentioned above.

And, ultimately, and you'll keep hearing this theme reiterated throughout our meeting, our main objective will be to publish the Group's recommendations on the PHMSA's website once we have made those recommendations to the Secretary.

So, we will actually make the recommendations, this committee will make the recommendations to the Secretary for public website sharing.

Section V highlights that the Group reports to the Secretary of Transportation.

And, then, I'm moving to Section VI, support. So, the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration is here to provide support to this Group's efforts and serve as the Group's sponsor.

In Section VII, the estimated annual cost, operating costs, we've anticipated roughly $250,000 for travel, meeting space, recording of the proceedings, plus one-half of a full-time equivalent of staff support.

This amount also covers limited conference management support for the meetings provided by a contractor.

Section VII discusses the Designated Federal Officer. This DFO, as you may hear us refer to it, must be a full-time or permanent

part-time employee appointed in accordance with agency procedures.

PHMSA's Deputy Associated Administrator for Pipeline Policy and Programs or that individual's designee will serve as the DFO. In this case, it will be as the Acting Deputy Administrator for Policy and Programs today.

The DFO will approve or call all advisory committee and subcommittee meetings, prepare and approve all the meeting agendas, attend all committee and subcommittee meetings, adjourn any meeting when the DFO determines adjournment to be in the public interest and share meetings when directed to do so by the Secretary.

We're anticipating that this working group will meet approximately four times per year face to face. There may be other needs for virtual briefs and conversations, informational briefings based on the needs of the committee.

In addition, the duration of this working group, this working group will exist to

the point where we actually fulfill the obligations to provide those recommendations to the Secretary.

So, the Group's purpose will be fulfilled once the recommendations are published on the website.

Unlike some of our other federal advisory committee's which are more longstanding, this Group does have a beginning and an end to it.

Termination, so this Charter will terminate two years after its effective date unless, (a) it's renewed in accordance with the FACA requirements and other applicable requirements, or (b) the Group is terminated earlier because we've fulfilled our purpose.

And, the last section, it just specifies, as I mentioned previously, the membership and designation of the members who are serving on this working group.

Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you very much.

Does anyone have any comments or questions about the Charter? Anyone on the phone?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Yes, hi, my name is Sherina Edwards.

I guess the only question, I was trying to look through this late last night as well, but, the only thing I guess hasn't been resolved for me after this overview is, for as far as the members on the committee, I understand that we have a Charter and it would be -- there's like a two-year provision.

But, as far as the members, so do we as members stay -- what our -- is it a term or are we -- how do we roll off, that type of thing I was curious about.

CHAIR BURMAN: Under the Charter, Section XII, it states that the Group will consist of no more than 30 members appointed by the Secretary for a term of three years.

So, as I read it and I'll look to the lawyers for PHMSA to confirm, that means that the

appointments that were given this month will last for three years, assuming the committee is in operation.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Right. But, is that regardless of whether or not you're still at your current place of employment or does that not matter? Is it the person or is the title? I guess that's what I'm trying to say.

CHAIR BURMAN: I think what she is asking is that to the person or in their position as like, for example, myself as a state regulator. Would, if I left the state or my position, would there be another person appointed or does it -- do I remain in that position?

MS. ANDERSON: Oh, it's to the person.

CHAIR BURMAN: To the person?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

CHAIR BURMAN: The way I understand it is, if I would leave, not that -- please no news story, I'm not planning on leaving, but, if my term ended or I left my state position as a state regulator, then by default, my term would end and

there would be a vacancy.

MS. ANDERSON: Yes, so it would be -- it would depend on each situation.

Oh, sorry, this Alaina Anderson with PHMSA Office of Chief Counsel.

CHAIR BURMAN: Alan?

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Just to reinforce that, this is Alan Mayberry.

Yes, it's to the position and if a person leaves employment with their current -- where they're currently employed, that would create a vacancy that we would need to reappoint another member.

So, it's specific to the person, not the position that they're in. And, that's an important note that there really is no proxy to your participation in this group, it's to the individual. Your participation, that's a role that's not -- you can't delegate it to another person say within your organization.

MS. ANDERSON: And, that information will be more -- it'll be covered more when we

discuss the Bylaws as well.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

Does anyone else have any other comments, questions?

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Question here, Eric AMUNDSEN with Energy Transfer.

You know, Section IV of the description of duties, to me, seems somewhat constraining. So, I guess my question is, are we bound or constrained by this description of duties, which is very specific to sharing ILI data with or ILI vendors and industry, community and stakeholders.

Can we, if the need be, can we expand beyond this or are we constrained by the duties as written here?

CHAIR BURMAN: Alaina?

MS. ANDERSON: Well, these are the requirements. We are required to do this, so I know that you'll discuss this more later this afternoon. But, you absolutely do have to

provide these recommendations.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: So, I guess, to clarify, as long as we do this, can we do more?

MR. MCLAREN: With regards into other inspection technologies?

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Yes, because, you know, again, this seems to me to be very specific and, you know, we'll nail this, but if we identify, you know, Ms. Dominguez talked about SMS and so I think there's a lot of other opportunity and topics to share information on just beyond ILI dig data, you know, feeding back to our technology providers.

You know, you can go toward -- then what do you do with that? How do you turn that into recommendations?

So, again, I just -- I'm just afraid that we're a bit bound here and would hope that we would have some opportunity to push the boundaries out a little bit if we so see the need.

MS. ANDERSON: That's what you're

going to have to deliberate and figure out.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: So, the answer to that, and I'll answer to the agency, so on behalf of PHMSA, as Alaina pointed out, according to the statutory requirements, at a minimum, you have to look at ILI data.

If the work group wants to make recommendations that go beyond that, you're absolutely free to do so. And, can expand that as to how you would look at data sharing writ large.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Does anyone else have any questions or comments? And, again, remember, if you do, to raise your tent card.

And, for those on the phone, does anyone have any further comments or questions as related to the Charter?

Okay, then, hearing no --

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: One more -- I'm sorry -- one more.

I mean, that said, do we need -- does the Charter need to be modified to allow that

flexibility?

MS. ANDERSON: No.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, so now, and, Eric, do you feel your comments were addressed?

Okay, so now, we'll move on to Agenda Item 3, the Committee Orientation, and I'll turn it over to Cheryl.

MS. WHETSEL: While he's getting up the slides, I just wanted to tell you, what I'm going to cover right now is administrative concerns and parliamentary procedures.

And, again, the -- if someone could raise their hand, I'm getting a little nervous about my roster. And, the administrative whiz kid, I won't let you go out with my roster. So, whoever has the roster -- thank you -- all right. And, once you're finished if you could take it across the room.

Again, make sure that you have the correct information so we can get in touch with you by phone or by email. And, again, if you could provide an administrative assistant or some

other person's name that helps you with your calendar, I will add them to the mailing list.

Any future changes, you're going to want to send to me. I found that industry folks have a way of changing their titles very frequently. So, if you could let me know of any changes, I'd appreciate that in the future.

And, you can send it to my email address which is my name plus dot.gov. I'm sure you'll have it in your inbox many times.

Again, this has been a miracle putting on this particular meeting in the short time frame that we've had. But, just so you know, the Federal Advisory Committee does make us -- well, the statute states that we have to a have 15-day notification in the Federal Register for each and every meeting that we have.

So, we will be providing at least 15-day notification in the future, which we did this time as well. And, I'm not sure how many people caught it.

Scheduling meetings is a really tricky

business with trying to pull together so many people in one place at one time.

Generally, what we'll do is check our executive calendar and select two or three sets of dates and then I'll go out and poll members.

Once we have your comments back, then we'll select the date that the majority of the members may attend.

Again, we will try and get out any information packages to you at least 15 days in advance of the meeting. However, we do like to try and do that a little bit earlier whenever possible.

A few of you are eligible for invitational travel. So, just so that you know, that travel is reimbursed up to the limits allowed by the Federal Travel Regulations.

Travel information is available on the GSA's website and that information is there if you care to look for any regulatory information yourselves.

Just so you know that we are required

to make all of your airline or other type of transportation reservations because we use certain contract carriers in the federal government.

So, anyone requiring invitational travel, we will have to make your reservations.

I think a couple of you may have issues this time by having to make your own reservations and we will work with you on getting that reimbursed.

I should have made my slides a little bit larger on my paper here.

I'm not going to go through all of the little significant issues here on this slide. It's primarily for those people who will be accepting invitational travel so they can refer back to this later.

As far as the meals and incidentals, I do want people to know that you do not have to have any receipts for your meals. That's usually a question that people ask. But, do keep your receipt for your eTicket, the itemized bill for

the hotel.

You can also get reimbursed for parking, tolls, shuttle services. But, you need to have a receipt for anything over $50.

So, down at the bottom of this slide, there's travel questions you can call either myself or you can call Janice Morgan. And, Janice, could you stand?

Janice is also the guru of all things hotel related. She is our conference manager, she has been for a long time, so some of you already know her. But, you'll get to know her as well.

Thanks, Janice.

Okay, just briefly, parliamentary procedures, just Robert's Rules of Order is the standard for facilitating discussions and group decision making.

The full set of rules, as I'm sure some of you know, it's very complicated. The committee, once you get to a point where you're going to be voting, you might want to discuss

those Robert's Rules.

You can use a modified version of it. I've read where most committee or board meetings will just use the four motions that are at the bottom of this screen there.

And, I've also provided on the next slide just definitions for those motions.

And, that's all I have. I'm available for anybody who is having issues with invitational travel. Please see me at a break and let me know -- anybody else has any issues let me know.

Also, generally, we will make arrangements for a block of rooms at the government rate. The government rate is $182 for this hotel. If, for some reason you did not get that rate, please let me know and Janice will wave her wand and put you right into the block so you will get that rate.

And, any other questions, please feel free.

Yes?

MEMBER COTE: Yes, just a comment on the 15 days, many will be interested in the deliberations of this committee. And, the people that I've been wanting to attend or submit comments, 15 days isn't very much time.

To the extent you can extend that out as much as possible, I'm sure it would make everyone's life easier and it would produce more external engagement.

MS. WHETSEL: Thank you.

The powers that be are in the room here, so I'll make sure they know that.

I'm sorry, what was your name again?

MEMBER COTE: Oh, Dan Cote, I'm sorry.

MS. WHETSEL: Dan, thank you for that comment. I am always pushing to get it out earlier, too.

And, I think someone else might be talking about the docket. But, everything will be provided on the docket, all of the documents that we pass out to the individuals on the committee and you'll get a meeting transcript

following this meeting for your reading enjoyment.

And, also on the website, we also provide the information. So, I hear you. Thank you very much.

Any other questions?

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you, Cheryl.

So, now, we're moving to Agenda Item 4 which is a review of the Bylaws.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay, it's Alaina Anderson, Attorney Advisor for PHMSA's Office of Chief Counsel.

We mentioned the Bylaws, so I mentioned the Bylaws earlier.

The Bylaws provide additional guidance in addition to the Charter. The Bylaws -- our Bylaws are made up of the FACA regulations, the Federal Advisory Committee Ag regulations, a little bit of the Department of Transportation's committee policy.

We have a committee policy that DOT drafted that all of the operating administrations

follow.

In addition to that, it's also some guidance from the General Services Administration, GSA, which is responsible for providing us with the FACA regulations.

So, a little bit of all of that is in here in addition to some language that we added as well.

So, you'll see some of the language that we already had in the Charter. So, some of the information that we've talked about before.

So, you'll see the purpose. Some of this, again, came from -- directly from the Pipes Act of 2016 that what you're supposed to do to consider the development of the voluntary information sharing system. You'll see that language again.

In the authority section, you have the Pipes Act, you have FACA. And the 41 CFR 102-3.50, I just wanted to say that that basically explains that Congress basically directed us to establish this advisory committee. It is

nondiscretionary.

In the Section III, we talked about -- some of this language comes from GSA just explaining the committee membership size and appointments. We talked about this earlier, appointments are personal to the member and are not transferrable to another individual. Members may not designate someone to attend and participate in discussions or vote in their place.

The second paragraph, this is also from GSA just additional guidance that we should have a fairly balanced membership. And, I think we did a really good job with that.

That will be defined by several factors and so we just listed that there.

Membership is voluntary. However, members, again, are expected to attend and participate in meetings, including those held via teleconference or through another electronic medium.

Additionally, members may be required

to provide written input for reports and recommendations.

Here, yes, we did, we are required in the Charter to state terms. And, here, we listed, yes, you can serve for terms of three years.

But, again, if you do complete the recommendations, provide us with the recommendations and they are posted maybe in six months, you may get this done in six months, then, of course, you won't be serving for three years.

If a vacancy occurs, PHMSA will take action to fill the vacancy. When this working group terminates, all appointments to this working group will terminate.

Again, although this is called a working group, we did take that language from the Pipes Act of 2016. This is an advisory committee because it meets the definition of what an advisory committee is under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

When you go to meeting procedures, we took most of this from the FACA regulations. So, the agenda, these are requirements, the minutes and the records, the majority of this is required by the FACA regulations and the requirements that you -- that we have from the Department of Transportation with open meetings and closed meetings.

With voting, when a decision or recommendation under this working group is required, the Chairperson will request a motion for a vote.

Any member, including the Chairperson may make a motion for the vote. A quorum is required for a vote.

In other words, a majority of the current members of this working group must be present whether attending in person, by teleconference or through another electronic medium.

At a meeting, to perform the committee's statutory duties, the DFO will assure

there is adequate representation of members to ensure a fair and comprehensive vote.

With the roles, we wanted to make sure that everyone know what exactly you're supposed to do. So, the Chairperson, we have the duties, which I think she is -- knows what she's doing.

And, the DFO, this information, again, comes from the FACA regulations and the Department of Transportation's policy.

And, advisory committee manager, Cheryl is over there.

And, committee member, an appointed individual to the committee who attends and participates in committee meetings, gathers information as necessary to discuss issues presented, deliberates and provides verbal or written consensus advise to the Secretary or to PHMSA.

And, committee staff, any federal employee, private individual or other party who is not a committee member and who supports the committee and/or any subcommittees that may be

established.

We have additional information. Some of this was in the Charter regarding compensation and expense reimbursement.

And, then, we also have the section regarding subcommittees. You may get to the point where you're discussing the recommendations and decide that you need some more expertise. And, so, the Office of Chief Counsel can provide additional information than what's already in the Charter and the Bylaws as to how to actually set up the subcommittee.

So, you can have more individuals come in in addition to you all to determine how to actually provide recommendations to the Secretary.

And, those are the Bylaws.

Do you have any questions?

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

Before we take any questions, again, put up your tent cards if you do, just an order of business.

I see that it is about 10:10 right now which means that if once we're done with the Bylaws section, we would be taking lunch.

So, what we're going to do is flip around the order of business and Agenda Item 5, the introduction to the voluntary information sharing portion will go before lunch.

And, unless, of course, we have a two-hour discussion on the Bylaws.

So, with that, I'm going to open it up for anyone who has any comments or questions on the Bylaws in the room.

Anyone on the phone?

We've done an amazing job. Oh, wait, one question.

MR. MCLAREN: This is Chris McLaren with PHMSA. And, while I have the experts sitting next to me, I just kind of wanted to discuss the formal nature of the establishment and use of the subcommittee.

In the Bylaws, it kind of talks about a fairly structured subcommittee where a report

is issued.

Are there -- is that a firm formalness to establish a subcommittee or can the subcommittee be established that would just come in and provide verbal recommendations? Or does it need to be a work product that's provided? Do you understand my question?

MS. ANDERSON: I do understand your question. And, I haven't seen any guidance that says that it has to be in a certain format, whether they -- but I do know that they -- the subcommittees do have to report to this actual committee.

So, that's the only thing that I've seen in writing. I can go back and we can go back in and find anything else. But I haven't seen anything.

Cheryl, I know that you've researched this, too. And, have you seen anything?

ME. WHETSEL: Yes, we will provide a transcriber. So, there'll be a transcript for each and every meeting, even if it is a

subcommittee meeting.

It's a really great reference so individuals can go back and review what was said during the meeting. And, it is verbatim so, you know, you're not going to miss anything.

So, we will have a transcriber at every meeting. But, I would think that for each and every subcommittee, we would want to at least have a list of action items and things that are being reported out.

MR. MCLAREN: And, as a follow up question, I guess it's just a more of a question of the formalness of the subcommittee, and I guess I'm thinking more of a sub-work group where a group -- is there a mechanism for a voted on or a volunteered for a group of individuals to go talk about a topic and come back and report out at the next meeting verbally or in writing?

MS. WHETSEL: I would say that the committee at large is going to make those kind of decisions on who's going to sit on the meeting. As long as the reporting back out to the larger

committee.

And, I believe the DFO is expected to be at every meeting. So, even the subcommittee meeting. So, does that help?

MR. MCLAREN: Yes, it does. Thank you.

MS. WHETSEL: Are you sure?

MC. MCLAREN: Well, it says that there's not a step below. It sounds like it's a subcommittee.

MS. WHETSEL: It's a subcommittee, but you're -- the group here will decide on, you know, what kind of expertise they want to go to and, you know, for additional information.

And, I see, Alan has his tent up. So, I'll let him go forward as well.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: No, I was just going to reinforce that the report out will come in many forms. I would expect it might be a, you know, addressing the committee, the larger committee, you know, on a topic.

And, we haven't, you know, one of the

discussions items is what subcommittees do we need to form. You know, maybe this one on, you know, legal type issues and protection of information type issues, that kind of thing.

But, the group will go off and do, you know, further -- a deeper dive on the topic and then come back and report to the group. While there perhaps is another subcommittee working on another, you know, issue in parallel reporting back. So, it should work.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Eric?

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: A quick question, Eric Amundsen.

Just I guess process-wise, is there an intent for the committee to vote and adopt the Charter formally or is it given to us in a sense?

MS. ANDERSON: The Charter's been filed and established and it needs to be renewed every two years. But, yes, it's established, no need to vote on it.

CHAIR BURMAN: I think as just a personal preference, also, that we should

probably vote to adopt both the Charter and the Bylaws. And, Eric, I think you're going to make a motion for that, if you want, and then we'd have someone second it just for, you know, making sure that we're following the formal process.

I do just want to note two things, one the Charter, which, Eric, you raised a good question on in terms of the scope as well as in the Bylaws with the subcommittees, both the Charter and the Bylaws refer to subcommittees and I would think that some of the work that we might do and look expanding, we do through the subcommittees.

Under the Bylaws, it says that the Chairperson may have subcommittees with approval of PHMSA. So, the way, as long as I remain Chair, the way I'd work is working through the formal meetings to decide what subcommittees we may need.

And, so, and if we need to, we'll set that up through that process so that everyone has an ability to weigh in on the relevant

subcommittees and the work that would be tasked with that.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Agreed.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

MEMBER JENSEN: Well, Leif Jensen once again with Sunoco Logistics.

While we're talking about subcommittees, I think it would be appropriate to remind everyone, as we frame the context of subcommittees, that our goal here is pipeline safety.

And, there's a lot of debate going around the nation as it relates to environmental issues, climate change and that as long as we keep the framework focused on pipeline safety, then we will persevere.

If we don't have that common ground and framework well established, then we all start going off in tangents and that's when the dissidence begins.

So, thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, does anyone else

have any comments or questions in the room? On the phone?

Okay, now, I'm going to open it up if someone wants to make a motion to approve both the Charter and the Bylaws?

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen, Energy Transfer. I'd like to make a motion to approve the Voluntary Information Sharing System Work Group Bylaws as written.

CHAIR BURMAN: Can I have second?

MEMBER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIR BURMAN: All those in favor?

Opposed?

Abstentions?

Okay, the motion is approved.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen, Energy Transfer. I'd like to make a motion to approve the Voluntary Information Sharing System Working Group Charter as written.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

Second?

MEMBER SUBSITS: Second.

CHAIR BURMAN: All those in favor?

Any nos?

Abstentions?

With that, the motion is approved.

Okay, so now, we're going to take just a five minute break and then we're going to go into Agenda Item 5, Introduction to Voluntary Information Sharing.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:15 a.m. and resumed at 10:20 a.m.)

CHAIR BURMAN: I think we're back right now. Can those on the phone hear us?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Yes.

MEMBER PERRY: Yes.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And before we begin on Agenda Item 5 on the Introduction to Voluntary Information Sharing, I'd just like to make sure before we move forward if there are any further questions on any of the other agenda items or comments that someone would like to

make. Please raise your tent card. Eric.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Again, Eric Amundsen, Energy Transfer. Since in the mode of voting and actually approving some things, I thought it would be a good idea if we formally voted in our Chairman.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you for that. I've actually only held public office once. But I never was voted on before and I only ran for office as school secretary and lost. With that, here we go. Does someone want to make a motion?

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen, Energy Transfer. I would like to make a motion to vote Diane Burman as our Chairman of this work group.

CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone want to second that?

MEMBER HERETH: Second.

CHAIR BURMAN: Any discussion? No. Okay. All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes)

Any nos?

(No verbal response)

Any abstention?

(No verbal response)

With that, the motion has been approved. Thank you. I'm honored to serve.

And now we'll move on to Agenda Item 5, Introduction to Voluntary Information Sharing.

5. INTRODUCTION TO VOLUNTARY INFORMATION SHARING

DR. BORENER: Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak with you all. I was so impressed as you introduced yourselves. And I know I'm going to learn an awful lot from you over the time that I'm able to support this Committee.

I was recently in a training program and the Surgeon General spoke. He said there are three things that you need to say.

CHAIR BURMAN: Can you just state your name?

DR. BORENER: I'm sorry. My name is Sherry Borener and the Chief Data Officer and

Senior Research Advisor of PHMSA. I will in just a second. So I was recently at a training program and the Surgeon General spoke. And he said it's very important to communicate the story of me, the story of us, and the story of now.

To introduce myself to you, I've been with the Department of Transportation since 1986. I started there a couple of weeks before Challenger. I was working with pipeline safety when the Bellingham accident happened.

This is my life. I've been doing this my whole life. And nothing is more gratifying than seeing people who are committed to it and want to improve safety.

What I'm going to talk about today is a broad context for safety management systems, the value of information sharing and very specific information about data sharing programs from my last nine years of experience at FAA. Hopefully, these things will set a context and help you to think about what your objectives will be for your program, where the best value may be

and the long term commitment that you might have to make to information sharing in order to get the best benefit.

Why do you want to do this right now? Probably because you've discovered that there are things that you can improve by having better information sharing.

Our first topic and why am I going to talk about SMS first is because Safety Management Systems are the basis for information sharing. Safety Management Systems can be used to interpret historical data, to discover failures from the past and to take action.

But when we want to get into a proactive system, we have to collect data at the hazard level. It's more detailed. And finally we have to decide what's actionable and what's advisory.

I'll talk about the advantages and disadvantages of just simple information sharing systems, systems like ASRS where people give you near miss reports or error reports, but you don't

have detailed data, then consider the alternative of more detailed data, data sharing, and finally the issues of data protection.

These topics will be on the board. I've been told I speak very, very quickly. So I'm going to slow down and go back over that one more time. We're going to talk about SMS, Safety Management Systems. We'll talk about improved information sharing. We'll talk about data sharing and data protections and the legal structure that will allow you to protect the proprietary data that you want to share. And finally how is this going to go forward? What are the issues that we have on the table to discuss?

How many people have worked with a non-punitive reporting system of some sort, something inside of API, the Data Mining Committee? So we have people here who have worked in this area before.

Non-punitive reporting systems are a critical first step to getting people involved in

information sharing. API published 1173, your rule or recommended practice on SMS. And within the plan, do, check, act concept is an idea of information sharing for identification of safety issues, for addressing risk and actually approaching it in a business-like manner.

PHMSA recently published our own SMS guidance and program following on from plan, do, check, act. But we are talking about risk management which requires that we have information that is available on the entire industry, safety assurance which is post hoc evaluation of the performance of the systems and processes that have been put in place to manage safety and safety promotion which really is promotion of a non-punitive reporting culture.

Everyone here has probably done -- we've been in the safety business for a long time -- reactive safety management. An accident has happened. We've gone out. We've had an investigation. We have findings.

The NTSB has provided information back

to us. We've figured out which of those causal factors had the most profound effect on the event. And we took some action. Either we had a regulation or a procedure or a new technology or a combination of those.

Proactive safety management is a step forward that says let's use what we've seen in the past to identify indicators of those events in the present. We know that corrosion leads to leaks of a certain type or perhaps to rupture. So we've taken action that's proactive based on our understanding of the inspection data, the accidents and so on.

Predictive safety management goes beyond that. And this is evaluation of safety issues at the constituent level. So that's as detailed as the specific data that comes from your data system or from the ILI data. All three of these things are necessary to have an effective safety management system.

What we're talking about today is information sharing and data sharing. The FAA

has implemented a system of this type and it started in 1975. Last year, they passed a final rule on SMS systems that enabled people to have information sharing that's protected where proprietary data is shared. This has been a long road. And I'll talk a little bit about what that means.

But one of the basic values of this is that early detection is available to you as well as future risk analysis which means it could inform design, it can inform siting, it can inform training. It doesn't necessarily just have to inform inspection and response.

I said this a second ago. SMS accomplishes its risk management process initially through historical data. So just going back and looking at incidents and accidents and using that to make a decision about the future.

In 1975, FAA initiated the Aviation Safety Reporting System. Has anybody here heard of ASRS? It's very similar to BSEE. Okay.

Let's say that I'm a pilot and I would

really rather not have to share something that is a potential error on my part with my direct line management. But I know that this is a risk. So I want to report that I've made an error and this is an actionable error.

It's not something that has resulted in an incident or an accident, but it was an error nonetheless. I consider it to be a risk. And it's something like it was about midnight. It was the end of the day. It was a long shift. We were just coming back. I came up. I was taxiing on the runway and I missed my turnoff. And it put me in a position where I was almost in a collision course with another aircraft.

No accident has occurred. But the fact that there were two or three risk factors present was very important in that event. And the fact that something went right, the fact that there was no collision happened is also important.

So this non-punitive reporting environment (ASRS) has collected millions of

datapoints of this type. That leads to things like improved runway lining, earlier reporting on fatigue, changes in the manner in which information is provided to pilots.

Later on, because we now have runway systems that are covered by radar and have automated systems for reporting and detection of runway violations, these data are collected passively. And we can identify these errors automatically from the system, very much like the inspection data, the data systems that you have now can do for pipelines.

Let's talk about the Heinrich Triangle. Information sharing is pretty easy to achieve. It's one of the goals that this Committee could achieve pretty straightforwardly. And the idea behind it is that if we could improve our safety culture so that people feel comfortable identifying their errors the near miss reporting, hazard identification, discussing what went wrong and also what went right, what your barriers are that successfully prevent

events, these things would be very valuable to you.

This is what the ASRS program is, the Air Traffic Safety Reporting System for air traffic controllers, others in other industries. In fact, BSEE has a similar program. It's all based on this concept. For every fatal accident, there's a ratio of about 9.8 to 1.0. For every fatal, the number of serious accidents outnumber them by about 10 to 1. And accident incidents in general 30 to 10 and 600 to 30 is the ratio for incidents or negative environmental conditions that result in accidents in reportable events.

This study conducted by Conoco in 2003 which was a retrospective study of their own incident data showed that this ratio pretty much held. These 3,000 near miss events were good indicators of how often they were going to have serious events and possibly fatalities.

So why do you want near miss data? Because near miss data is actionable and it allows you to prevent that injury and fatality

that you don't want at the top of the pyramid. But you do have to collect a lot more data to be able to get that information.

So I'm going to give you a couple of quotes here from a couple of near miss reporting programs, BSEE's If You Observe It Report It from the FAA since 1975. They supported ASRS. And this guidance came from the FAA's Commercial Aviation Safety Team on how to establish an effective voluntary information sharing program.

Probably the most important is to establish trust and to build confidence in the members of the team. The second is to make sure that everyone is involved. Third is focus on safety. I think that was something we heard earlier from you, Jeff. Establish information and data governance controls.

This is something that our organization PHMSA can really support, establishing this data governance structure that allows you to share information without sharing proprietary data. And then make sure that it's

collaborative and that it's really driven toward results.

Supporting or exchanging data for the sake of having a big data-sharing program is going to be frustrating and tiresome. It won't be something that really is rewarding unless it's focused on specific issues and actionable items. So I urge you to identify the safety issues first and get the data to support the analysis as opposed to going in the opposite direction.

I mentioned these two programs. I'm going to talk more about CAST because the Commercial Aviation Safety Team is the thing with which I've had the most experience. Since 2003, I worked with the Commercial Aviation Safety Team which is a team like this. It started out as a working group. And it's a permanent FACA committee within the FAA.

Its purpose is to help industry, labor and government to identify issues, safety risk issues, identify potential solutions including regulatory and non-regulatory options, looking at

both the cost-benefit analysis and the business case for the company. Why is this going to pay off for you to be able to address this safety issue? It includes the Aviation Safety Analysis and Information Sharing system (ASIAS) which is a very big information sharing program that collects minute data on aircraft performance, but also collects these independent, personal reports from ASRS.

These things are combined into a very broad information network. Then once a quarter members of the CAST team come together to talk about these issues. The last meeting had about 1,000 participants.

So imagine this in your industry. A time when hundreds or even a thousand members of the industry could come together to talk about the things that they know are safety issues that need to be addressed in the industry. They can suggest and organize specific study groups. They can get access to the data to do the analysis. And they can take action either voluntarily or in

a regulatory environment to deal with those problems.

The best thing about InfoShare is that the time lag that's required for regulation doesn't constrain the members. If they discover an issue, they find an answer. They know what the correct action or answer could be. They can go ahead and do it that day. That's a huge improvement over waiting for the government to come up with a palatable and acceptable regulation to control risk. That can be the difference between a life and a death.

It is extremely important. And it's something that I think the team would tell you they're very, very proud of because they've been so successful at it.

Safe Outer Continental Shelf is the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Department of Interior program. This was implemented very recently. And the rule that implemented this was in April of 2016. So this is just very recently. I think he talked about

this. The Director was visiting us.

This system is very much like ASRS where it's near miss reporting. It's collected independently by a third party through the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. The data are aggregated and then the information becomes actionable as provided back to the industry.

So you can have a Cadillac. You can have the ASIAS which has a very, very big broad base of information, very complex algorithms, a lot of data. But it's also very effective to have near miss reporting because it's something you can take an action on right away.

Let's talk about data sharing. By the way, did anybody want to comment on any of these earlier points or?

MEMBER JONES: Yes, I just had one question.

DR. BORENER: Sure.

MS. BAL: This is Walter Jones with the Laborers' Health & Safety Fund. I just want to point out that those of us in industrial

hygiene and worker safety know that the term near miss is used pretty broadly and widely.

But these are not near misses. They are actually misses. And we tend to use the term close calls. But we're trying to gain traction in using words for what they mean. I just wanted to point that out.

DR. BORENER: Okay. I believe the definition that BSEE has is near miss reporting. It says voluntary reporting of near miss incidents. This is exactly their definition.

But your point is very well taken. Any condition or hazard that should be reported and close calls, but even hazardous environments I think are important to report. This is really the essence of the whole thing is to get more data and information to everyone on issues that need action.

Data sharing. If I know that -- I know this because we have reports -- for instance the number of times that two aircraft come within a potential collision situation in a particular

airspace that that's happening too frequently. It happens more frequently in one location than any other. I can ask the pilots. I can ask the air traffic controllers what were the circumstances and why did that happen.

Another alternative is I can go directly to those system components that collect their information and I can ask them what does this indicate about the behavior of the system now. So one is passive data collection. The other is voluntary information sharing.

They really are not substitutes for one another. So it's important to have the operator tell you what the circumstances are. But the use of this data is helpful to you if it's possible to design or to organize a response that goes beyond training and procedure.

What we're looking for when we talk about data sharing -- I really want to be specific about this -- is that we're looking at the component tree reporting to us directly, not via the operator. So we're taking sensor data.

We're taking condition data. We're taking through-put data, other things that can be passively collected by the system itself and provided back to us in order to diagnose the condition of the system. And what's harder about this is that you have to know what that data really indicates.

When you collect a lot of data, you have to decide is it actionable, is it bad. I can get weather data and I'm very happy that my phone keeps giving it to me. But I get weather data every five minutes. It tells me it might rain in about five minutes. And if it does rain, it won't rain very hard.

Did I need to know that? Sometimes collecting data requires an additional intelligence level. We need more information from the operators. We need more reporting from the operators to be able to understand how to interpret it and actually use it for action.

That's not to say you don't want the information. But when you're collecting this

data and you're pooling this data, you do have to structure it in a way so that it addresses a question that's important to you.

I would suggest that when you look at this we think about what studies could we get from our near miss or other information sharing that would help us to decide what data we want to collect and how to share it.

And then finally protection of proprietary data is a big issue now. It always has been in the industry, but it's even more significant since we have data breaches. So the exchange of data versus the exchange of information are topics that we have to address.

One way of thinking about that is do we really have to send the data in order to use the applications that help us to interpret it. And one work group may want to address the question "How could we design analytical systems that look at data without us having to move data from place to place?"

So I have an anecdote here which is

about traffic collision avoidance systems. It's again in the FAA. The reason I brought it up is because it's not your area. I don't want to frighten you when you fly back, but I want to tell you.

There is a set of databases that were brought together, safety reports from airlines, aircraft performance data which is on board data just like the data that's in the pipeline, air traffic reports, the radar passively collected data, other weather and infrastructure data that's relevant to whether or not aircraft are performing correctly in safe separation. What is that? It's three miles and a thousand in the area of the terminal.

One of the things that the Commercial Aviation Safety Team became concerned was why are we having many, many more traffic collision avoidance systems alarms over a particular airspace. In this case, it was Oakland. And the Oakland airspace design promoted in a sense more conflicting air traffic events. This was

identified by looking at the combination or fusion of all of these different datasets.

Once this was identified as an issue, it was possible to deconflict the design of the airspace, not just the aircraft themselves. And using that process, the CAST decided to continue to perform a metric analysis, a monthly analysis, of whether or not other locations were having similar problems.

This is an ongoing safety assurance program that's built upon a fusion of these primary data sources. But the original reason it was studied was because of air traffic safety reports, particularly because of T CAST events.

This probably is a normal process for the kind of thing that you'll do in the future. You'll have safety reporting. Somebody will tell you that they have a consistent problem when they go out and they want to mark a line. There are two or three lines that are buried together and they can't determine which one is the active line.

You'll use the information that you can collect from various sources to decide to how best to address that issue. Those things will be identified geographically around the country. You'll have a general assessment of the risk not just in one location or for one operator but for all operators nationwide.

That will give you an idea of how important that problem is and whether or not you should address it. Then having decided that, you'll come up with either technological or procedural or both kinds of solutions to the problem.

Earlier I talked about how you use historical data to understand safety and to implement the SMS. Now we're talking about data at the very detailed level, constituent data, and data like the data that you get from inline inspection which is like this sort of data.

I put this picture up here because I was looking for something that would describe the concept of what you would be able to do once

there's an agreement upon this information sharing environment. I'd like to be able to support using this analysis to do targeted research on safety around the network. And I think this is a very good way of thinking about what are the options for the outcomes of our activities might be.

I mentioned most of these programs. But people would probably like to know more about ASIAS. ASIAS likes to think of themselves as the needle in the haystack program. The data that they're analyzing is at such a fine grain that they really are literally looking for the smallest detail that predicts a potential issue in the future.

ASIAS includes government, industry, labor and operator and OEM. So it's the entire complement of the industry that's involved in the Commercial Aviation Safety Team and ASIAS. And all of these partners share their data. That's essential.

The operator as well as the

manufacturer, the vendors and the people who have to execute as well as the government share their information. And it's non-punitive.

Why is this important? Because it's working. So around 2000 -- I think it was 1997 -- was the beginning of the Gore Commission. There had been a number of horrible accidents. There was the ValuJet accident. There was another accident in Little Rock. Three or four really terrible complete-loss accidents for aircraft. Vice President Gore established a commission to try to figure out how to reduce the safety risk.

So this is 1996. Right now, I think in 2015, we had no fatal accidents. So this thing works. It identified some root causes. It identified data that helped us to improve the safety of the system. It was very successful.

And it's successful worldwide. ASIAS and the information sharing process has been adopted by all of the organizations that are identified on this map. This is an older map.

So they are probably even broader. I know there are more partners in Latin America at this time. That's really a testament to how successful it is and how well the structure transfers from organization to organization.

I talked about this briefly. But there's been an 82 percent drop in the fatal accident rate since 1996 after implementing the Commercial Aviation Safety Team's recommendations.

How does this happen? You could certainly voluntarily share information now. But if you are going to share information in an environment where there are issues of proprietary data protections or legal protection the individuals who decide share potentially damaging information, you need some kind of legal authority.

The FAA established the FAA 14 CFR Part 193 which protects data from the Freedom of Information Act. This is probably the single most important item for members of the operator

community.

If you're sharing detail data about the operation and the content of what you're moving -- for instance, if you have to share not just location but also through-put information -- you don't want your competitor to know that. That's not going to be helpful to you and it's a deterrent to getting management to work with us if they have to do that.

So the Freedom of Information Action protection which was extended to the air carriers encourages them to share that data without the fear that they're going to give some competitive information away that would undercut them in a particular market. This is really essential. It also protects voluntarily supplied data.

It's not a get out of jail free card. It's not an amnesty card. You can't have a terrible accident that was preventable. You can't be impaired and then report through a voluntary information program and say that you're okay. That's not the purpose of it. But it does

protect you if you're showing or sharing information that is serious and has a safety implication.

And finally there are interpretative orders on the flight operational quality assurance data which is the very detailed data off of the aircraft that are shared among the partners. This is data that's right down to when does the gear come down, what do the flaps do, etc. This is very specific data. It's analogous to the data that you might get from ILI data.

But it needs to be protected again because it's an indication of how the operator actually performs their job and especially the pilot who is flying. So that pilot union is also protected. You don't want to have somebody have action against them because they decided to do a go-around because of safety when someone outside judges "Well, you could have landed."

And those are very important financial decisions. So it's something that needs to be protected.

BSEE just recently -- this is April 29, 2016 -- published their rule on voluntary reporting of near miss incidents according occurring on the outer continental shelf. And their data are collected by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics which is also protected by this proprietary coverage. So their data are not subject to FOIA either.

This is something that would have to be discussed. Again, it's a topic that you might want to discuss as part of this group.

This is just more detail about this. It's in your handout. But again, I think this is extremely important because companies will want to share data if they know they have protection.

The last part of this presentation and then you get to go to lunch. There are lots of opportunities for partnerships and for sharing of information. That information can be very basic, near miss, hazardous conditions. It can be pooled together and used for action, whether or not specific data are exchanged.

More detailed information improves just the fidelity of your actions, so the higher quality of the data, the higher fidelity of the data, the higher of the frequency of the data. Right now, the data that it's shared with Office of Pipeline Safety is annual. More frequent data exchange. Higher fidelity can improve the way that you either anticipate issues or respond to them.

One of the questions that you probably will have to address is where will that data reside. One concept might be that the data all goes to a big, single information environment and it's interpreted there.

Another is there is a standard for data exchange that the data stays home. Personally, I like the data stays home, but this is up to you.

Imagine that you have an application that can ask each one of your databases a question and get an answer without transferring data to a single central repository. It might

avert some of the issues we have with security. It's a topic to talk about and maybe a work group would want to address that.

I know that baselining and benchmarking inline inspection data is probably going to be one of the big issues here. As we talk about that again what's the right framework for that benchmarking, what's the right location for that? Do you need a special pet pipeline in which you do this testing. That's something that we would talk about as an R&D activity.

And then how can the government help you? What is it that we can do? I talked about the structures that the FAA had. Those are very valuable structures. Protection from FOIA. Protection on voluntary information sharing.

Creating those safety cultures so that both the company and the operator, the worker, are protected. That's the way that you build those things that were on the first slide up there. You build the trust and you build the ongoing relationship that allows you to actually

discuss and detect the issues that you want to address.

I talked about all these. I hope that this is helpful in setting some of the context for what you'll be doing over the next few months. Anybody want to talk here?

CHAIR BURMAN: So right now, I think we're going to open it up for some discussion and questions on this. Kind of how I look at this is that this is significant parallels that we may be able to draw upon. This slide is really the key.

And some of what you said talked about trust being important, but also a framework that's clear and that framework includes the what's collected, who collects, the why it's collected and the how and the when it's collected. But everyone shares and that it's non-punitive.

And then it identifies what the safety issues are, what the data is, what the root causes are. Legal and regulatory certainty is very important, the legal authority which looks

at protecting data from the Freedom of Information Act as well as protecting voluntarily shared data and looking at any regulatory orders and guidance that helps to further protect. But again it comes back to really what the opportunity is and what everyone is working on together with the idea of improving in our case continuing and improving pipeline safety at the very core of it.

With that, I would like to open it up for discussion from those around the table. If you could put up your tent cards if you have any comments. Alan.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: I want to try to seed some of the conversation and since you asked, Sherry, just that fourth bullet up there when we talk specifically to ILI. And I referred that in some of introductory thoughts.

I think of this in a couple different areas. One, the need to share information between the tool vendor, service provider and the operator, you know, that back and forth

information. In that scenario, I think that I'm not so sure. That's the function that needs to happen really regardless of what we're talking about here relayed information, sharing. But that's an area of need certainly and an area that we see that needs to be practiced, a routine practice.

Even though I know a lot of operators do it already, it's an area we see of need. That's just so the tool vendor can really perfect how they assess the features that are passed onto the operator to dig and to refine the capability and the operation of the tool.

That versus the performance of tools for various threats that are out there. And you had a slide with the Pull Test Facility in Houston. I know one of the goals of the R&D of that facility that's been stood up by PRCI and I know has received some forms of R&D funding to give a Good Housekeeping seal of approval on tools for different threats.

I know a concern is that facility has

been stood up relating to proprietary information that each vendor has on their particular tool. But how do we leverage that for standing up a system to share information like that to better inform the operator community. In the failures that we see and fortunately again they are very rare, but they are very high consequence.

We almost get it right. But how do we get the information out there to make sure to really head off these accidents? I'll just throw that out for initial conversation and thought.

DR. BORENER: Well, sometimes the quality of the technology is not commensurate with the interpretation. In other words, the technology may be detecting things quite well. That happens in the nuclear industry. It happens in aviation.

But the ability of the operator either the air traffic controller or the pilot to actually interpret that information and take the right action is limited because it's buried in a million other alarms and alerts that are

happening. It's very hard to figure out which one you're supposed to do.

This is why Boeing is even talking about making an easy button that just brings you to a level of flight no matter what. Sometimes so many things go wrong in the airplane that you don't know which one to do.

It's both things. It's both improving the inline inspection data and ground-truthing it probably with actual physical data, but also improving the human interface. Then people will actually take the right action once they get the information or the alarm. Both things have to come together.

CHAIR BURMAN: And we're going to take questions just for order of business from the table, then from the phone and then we're going to open it up for public discussion. Dan.

MEMBER COTE: Just a comment. And, Alan, I would like to respond to your question if I may. From a strategic view, I think this sort of process fits both distribution and

transmission. But in terms of practical application because the variables are so much greater in distribution systems than transmission, honestly it's not so much an issue of near misses.

We respond as an industry on the distribution side to millions of motor complaints that translates into hundreds of thousands or millions of leaks and tens of thousands easily of grade one leaks, the most serious types. You can define those as potential near misses for explosions, arguably and debatably. But that's much different than the process of ILI, for example, where you can much more proactively analyze your systems.

Another critical difference is the presence of SCAITA (phonetic), detailed SCAITA, on transmission lines that do not exist on most distribution lines. So the process needs to be different. That creates a fundamental and philosophical question in my mind for this Committee.

We sort of skated around it a bit this morning. But that is do we develop a process that really captures distribution risks and remediation issues. I think that looks much different than this.

DR. BORENER: Right.

MEMBER COTE: And perhaps in that you do the inverse of this. You start with what really causes explosions in distribution systems.

PHMSA today captures a great deal of data on individual incidents across the country. With all due respect, it produces very little information on the actual root causes of those explosions when you drill all the way down.

And so there's currently a vast repository of data out there that is available for analysis. And how would LDCs contribute to that? Perhaps that's a different way of assessing and doing root cause data on those incidents.

But the first question before we go too far for this group is is that on the table.

Now I heard the discussion on ILI and how much we expand it beyond that. But in my mind if we ignore distribution pipeline safety as a committee we're ignoring 80 percent of the risk to the citizens of this country.

I mean certainly transmission failures can be much more sensational. But they're far more frequent on distribution systems. So that's something we need to start with because I see a separate path than the one that you have mapped out here for distribution systems. So it's a strategy issue.

DR. BORENER: Okay. Hopefully, what we have is a strategy for enabling information sharing. And it's not specific to a particular type of transmission line or to a distribution line. And it's not specific to a product.

The idea of showing you the analogy to the FAA was really to just take the balcony view and say, "Can this be done?" There's a big difference between general aviation aircraft and 121, but they both apply. This should give you

the structure to collect the information, share it in a non-punitive environment and then take action no matter what the topic is.

And the fact that there's a specific case which has to do with ILI, that's a topic that should be thought of as a subset of the general thing I think of information sharing, volunteering information sharing.

MEMBER COTE: Understand. And my point was though that the tools and processes will be far different. And again I'll just say one final time and then take my Prozac. We have not firmly determined that that's in scope yet in my mind. And I would like to hear that validated.

DR. BORENER: Okay.

DR. BORENER: Do you want to validate that?

CHAIR BURMAN: I think it's a very good point and when we get to later looking. Remember again the threshold question first is do we need a voluntary information sharing and then

if we do, what does that look like. So I think those are some of the issues that we'll be looking at.

Does anyone else at the table? Please raise your tent card. Excuse me. Mark.

MEMBER HERETH: Could you, Dr. Borener, speak a little bit more about how CAST and ASIAS use data to create information or provide information to maybe draw the distinction there?

DR. BORENER: Yes, and hopefully I can even talk about the original issue. Issues arise in CAST because there are either accidents or incidents. And this was the post hoc assessment of the 1996 system. So a set of 100 or so topic areas were identified and then they were rated with respect to their severity.

The one that was the most severe was control flight into terrain, people flying directly into a mountain or something like that, and then identifying from there what the safety issues were, what the problems were, what the

failures were and then what the design or procedural or whatever operational changes would be that would address that safety issue.

CAST really has a prioritizes method of deciding what safety issues to address and where for industry wide, acknowledging that that's different from where there are big disparities among the operators in this industry. I think the other part of CAST that's important to remember is that they themselves know there's a big difference between a 121 carrier and a personal general aviation operator. So safety analysis is conducted for all of the levels in the aviation system as well.

So the way that information might come to CAST is that five or six operators will come in and they'll say, "Look. We had this problem. I've had three airplanes land with less than minimum fuel in the last three months."

This is a really bad thing. You can't do a go-around. You can't go to an alternative airport. That would be a very high risk. You'd

lose everybody.

So they identify this risk issue. And then they go back and they might go to FOQA data. And Flight Operational Quality Assurance data is onboard data on the airplane. And they would look around the datasets they have for the last six months and they would say, "How many landings did we have at or within 10 percent of minimum fuel at the time of the landing? Is this a pervasive problem?"

If that's happening, they go back to the air traffic control facilities where that's happening and they ask people "Why are these aircraft landing min fuel?" And the air traffic controllers might be saying "We've got a problem with stats." "We've got a problem someplace else down the line" or "We can't really get people onto the runway" or "We've got a closed runway like we had at LaGuardia." But this whole problem then is described from every perspective in the system. Then in a room just like this one, they talk about what are the alternatives to

deal with that risk.

So this is really a process that because this group has been working together since 1996 they can do. They can sit down and they can say -- The head of flight ops from United Airlines is sitting there. He can say, "Okay, I'm going to train people this way. I'm going to give this notice. I'm going to change this. And they're going to take off with more fuel than they usually would have had for that route because we know this is happening."

And air traffic can say, "Okay. We're going to stack you differently." In other words, they can cooperatively solve the problem without pushing a regulation at all. Or if it's necessary to have a regulation, they can also do that.

That's the general approach. As I said, personal reporting and detailed data are analyzed in a fused manner to be able to identify what the issues are and then take action.

CHAIR BURMAN: Mark.

MEMBER HERETH: So that data exchange goes both ways with the operators and the manufacturers. It's a two way pathway.

DR. BORENER: Right. It's a multi-way street.

MEMBER HERETH: Yes.

DR. BORENER: I think I put up a slide about InfoShare. The point of InfoShare if you'll excuse the analogy it's kind of a Las Vegas rules meeting where what goes on in the room stays in the room.

People come together. They talk about their safety issues. They talk about problems that they've had. They will carriers and manufacturers, the air traffic organization, the FAA safety organization, altogether.

And if it's an air traffic session, they talk about problems they've had in air traffic. And if it's about landing gear, they'll talk about that.

And the important thing is that if they feel that they need more detailed study they

can come from InfoShare directly to the ASIAS program and say, "Do a detailed study on landing gear failures in this aircraft type or in this type of runway or in this type of landing situation."

Then that study again will be focused using the data that's available from all of these different views of data sources. Then the next quarter they'll come back and say, "Here's what we found." So it makes it actionable.

To your point, that doesn't require that the system be designed focused on a particular accident type. It just has to be designed in order to enable people to share information.

CHAIR BURMAN: Are there any more questions at the table? And then we go over here to Chris. So you go.

MEMBER JENSEN: Once again, Leif Jensen from Sunoco Logistics. Hi Sherry. What you presented was the ultimate result. And my question is more around the process of how this

group gets there.

My understanding is really about FOIA as it really applies to government. And in that case with the FAA, there was government and FAA working through and developing a process.

When I reflect around the stakeholders in this group, we have several non-government and non-operator stakeholders. I'm somewhat concerned as it relates to FOIA and confidentiality as we develop the process. I'm curious if you have any perspective of how FAA and government establish that mutual trust as they developed the process to come up with a result.

DR. BORENER: Many long hours in meeting rooms was that trust established. The first question is do you really need data that could be FOIA'ed. In 1996, it was pretty clear what the failures were. And the data that was necessary to understand that was available from an NTSB reporter and accident investigation.

Sometimes it's not really required

that very detailed proprietary data be exchanged. The 1975 establishment of the Aviation Safety Reporting System, that legislation or that rule in 1975, allows air traffic controllers, pilots and others to non-punitively report their issues to a third party. That third party is indemnified under that rule.

The same thing happens with this system, the BSEE, SafeOCS system. That allows non-punitive reporting and third party collection through the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

There's a legal authority that's the same as the US. Census that the Bureau of Transportation Statistics enjoys. So that allows people to provide information to them and it's protected from FOIA.

Why does it matter to the industry? Because if you send stuff to the government for information, then it becomes subject to FOIA.

So either your industry competitor or other individuals might want to get information that way. And it's important if you want to

maintain proprietary nature of the data to figure out how to protect it in the same way as Census data is protected. I think even though the government is the one that's subject to it that's why it's important. Did that answer that?

MEMBER JENSEN: And just as a follow-up to that, we're going to go through as Eric pointed out earlier some rough times as we develop this program. And there's going to have to be some element of confidentiality amongst the non-operator and non-governmental stakeholders in the room. And we have to establish that up front because if what I heard you say is the data that we submit to the government is protected from FOIA or can be. But the data that we may ultimately share amongst ourselves over the course of the next two or three years may not be protected.

DR. BORENER: No. But you can design it so that it's de-identified. So the governance process, the data governance process, which is another topic that you need to discuss as you

talk about information sharing can be designed so that when data are provided the owner of the data, the qualities of the data that would identify it to you or to one particular owner are stripped away from the data.

So you only have the information about the event and the context, but not the operator or something proprietary about the event that would be potentially damaging. That's important because some of these data could be reverse engineered into something that would be useful in some competitive way. But it's not the intention of the program.

The program is just for the safety issues that it's going to address. So we don't really want to get more data than we need to take a safety action.

And the data governance process once that is established even if we aren't the arbiter, even if the government is not involved, you as members of that committee can also establish that governance process and use a third

party vendor to provide that protection for yourselves.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. We're going to go to Alan. Chris, I know you also had a question. And I do believe some folks on the phone have some questions as well. So we're going to open it up to Alan. And then, Chris, if you're okay, we'll hold it for folks on the phone and then come back to you. Alan.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Okay. Thanks, Madam Chair. Diane, I want to make sure that we addressed or just at least close the loop on your concern. We have a statute that we'll fulfill the requirements to address the topic at hand which relates to ILI. I mean specifically it was related to inline inspection.

I think that's a starting point. I know that there's discussion on can we go further. My hope, my expectation, is that we would -- You know, we haven't solved this Rubik's Cube yet. My hope, my expectation would be that what we come out of here would be a platform for

not just transmission but distribution as well.

So as we approach this, I think we know the issues. Those are in the business related to the challenges of inline inspections, the issues that are out there.

Similarly, there are issues on distribution related to leak management for instance which has been a focus. We probably ought to look at leak prevention or what are learnings from the accidents that really we can avoid similar things in the next accident.

There are a lot of -- By far, most of the people who were injured or die in this country it's probably from distribution accidents out there, notably of course third party or other outside force damage. But I think it's possible to have a platform or framework that would be applicable to both. We just have to keep that in the back of our mind.

We do need to solve the mandate. But I think we'll do a disservice if we're not able to at least have the framework that could be

applied to much more than just transmission inline inspection. And that's really the true spirit of SMS and we're trying to solve here to share information.

MEMBER COTE: That's comforting to hear. Thank you, Alan.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. And before we go to those around the room, we're going to open it up to those on the phone who may want an opportunity to ask any questions. Is there anyone on the phone?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Yes, this is Sherina Edwards from Illinois Commerce Commission. Thank you. This has been I think a fantastic discussion.

And something I've been thinking about as we've been talking is we're dealing with this a lot on the state level from a cybersecurity perspective. And we've seen a lot over the last couple years. We're dealing with critical infrastructure.

I'm wondering essentially is that

something necessarily that we should be talking about here and not necessarily trying to reinvent the wheel. For example, I don't know what the extent of or the level of any breaches has been. That's something that we've considered.

I think also from a voluntarily information perspective again we're dealing with this on a state level in that we do not have any mandates specifically for our utilities to necessarily report their breaches to us or anything. We ask them to. So they generally will do.

But because there is no specific statutory mandate these utilities need to provide us with this information. Essentially they can refuse to do that or they can literally just provide the information that they wish to share.

And a lot of that is the fear of the fact that they are providing this critical information and opening themselves up to a liability and a vulnerability. And we as commissioners and regulators feel the same way.

But if we're taking certain information from them, we are now vulnerable.

So the conversation has been again on a voluntarily basis how much should be provided. We are having again these very same or similar discussions. So I'm wondering if it's something that we could talk about potential breaches or breaches that have occurred. And then we can go from there and say, "Okay. This is what we should do as far as mandating."

I know the concern obviously is when it gets to industry and government. That crossover line, it gets to be very sensitive. And there are some states I know, for example Indiana, I believe Connecticut. They have gotten FOIA exemptions where they are able to, for example the utilities, provide this very critical information over to the regulators. If they were FOIA, there would be an exemption where they wouldn't have to provide that information.

So again, I just want to make sure that we're not reinventing the wheel and that

we're considering perhaps other industries or sectors of the industry. Maybe we can apply some of that here.

And for me it's very timely. I just wrote an article on this entire thing. And the issue of providing that information to government and the issue of confidentiality and the feeling of that vulnerability, I just wanted to raise that here.

DR. BORENER: I think that is very well received on this end. It's very important to have the information from the state designees, essentially the operators who are managed by the states to share back to PHMSA. Right now, they're in different databases. They're separated.

Sharing within government is also covered as well as sharing between government and industry. I think I heard you say that there's a structure already in place in Indiana. Is that what you said?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Yes, that is.

DR. BORENER: I see. And so that would be a fantastic thing to bring back to the team, I think, the organization to understand how we could piggyback upon other people's structures. And then of course there is the issues of how to get information into a central environment.

MEMBER EDWARDS: And maybe, Commissioner Burman, this would be something that we'd want to consider for one of the subcommittees. I know we're going to discuss that later on. But it's a thought.

DR. BORENER: I'm sorry. I really didn't get the last thing you said.

CHAIR BURMAN: That was Commissioner Edwards talking about how we might be able to through our national utility regulatory NARUC have this as a topic. That's also a -- I'll do a shameless plug now. Our next meeting is in D.C. February 12th through the 15th. And we will be talking about a lot of very important energy related issues, especially the committee to be at

is the Gas Committee and our Pipeline Safety Subcommittee. Sorry.

DR. BORENER: No, don't apologize. So federated data management. I was wondering if people here might have some experience with that. But I think creating federated data connections as opposed to a single, large database might address some of the issues, especially with our state partners.

I won't talk about it in detail now. But I think probably some of you know what I'm talking about. And that's something that creative ways of dealing with the fact that we have a very big distributed system have to be addressed in our context I think.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And I know, Chris, do you still have or does anyone else on the phone before we move to those in the room who might have a question or a comment?

MEMBER PERRY: Yes, this is Simona Perry. And I wanted to just add that I wanted to thank you, Dr. Borener. I feel that the trust

issue is one of the biggest things. I think all of us on the committee are going to have to work on.

I hear Mr. Jensen on being a little bit unsure of having folks who aren't in industry or government on the committee. And I think that's really important.

I believe that one of the issues with information sharing in the pipeline realm has been a lack of real trust between the government, industry and the public. So I'm very honored to be on this committee because that.

And I also feel very strongly that understanding the human factors in all of this is really important. We're talking about a lot of data that's easily, maybe not so easily, but it can be collected remotely as Dr. Borener said.

However, really when it comes down to it, it's who is reading that data. And I'm really interested in understanding more about that, the training that's involved, what that means. And I think that information sharing is

really what we'd have to start talking about. The data collection is key and making sure that there are systems in place, that they are secure.

And also one other thing that I wanted to add on the data security. I know that there is a research institute at the University of Texas Taylor or Tyler that actually has a grant I believe to look at cybersecurity at least on status systems. And that might be something as well to talk about how they're looking at that. You guys might already be aware of that.

But I just think it's really important to continue dialoguing about what it means for the public to understand not specific data, but for them to understand how sharing is taking place within the industry and within the government and between the two. I think that's where a lot of trust can be built. Thank you.

DR. BORENER: Thank you. I'm glad I can point this out from another industry and also understand some of the pitfalls of going through the process of establishing an open information

sharing environment. But I really liked what you said.

It's not sharing identifiable specific data, but de-identified data that leads to information and helps us to identify problems and engineers solutions. Then we come back as the operators and the government and figure out how to transmit that, what training is required, what design is required. That's the point of the program.

MEMBER PERRY: Thank you. Exactly.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Now we're going to move on to those around the room. And also just keep in mind that a lot of these items that we're talking about when we get to later talking about what should be the key topics or areas of focus in the subcommittees that that's something that we should be looking at. We heard a couple of things, cybersecurity, as well as protection data. So just keep that in mind so that something doesn't fall off the table that really should be incorporated into a subcommittee for

further discussion.

Now I'm going to turn it over here.

MEMBER WARNER: So this is Chris Warner. As a follow-on to what I heard on the phone and also Dan's comments about all the information that we currently have available and the quality and the analysis of that data, I think in our history we haven't done a lot to figure out how do we verify the quality of that data and then how do we compile that and analyze that data.

So I'm also curious whether we're going to do something similar to the aviation industry where we actually establish or have a subcommittee that looks at establishing something like CAST or ASIAS. Is that how you pronounce it?

DR. BORENER: Yes.

MEMBER WARNER: That looks at this data that we're going to gather on a voluntary data basis and validates the accuracy, the quality of that and then begins to go deeper into

saying "Okay. Let's go to industry and manufacturers or other suppliers and says 'What can we do about what we're seeing in this data?'"

DR. BORENER: Yes.

MEMBER WARNER: Because I don't hear that right now. I hear we're talking about just getting the data. I'm kind of curious to know if that's possibly a subcommittee or an actionable part of what we're doing.

DR. BORENER: I think that was the most productive thing about CAST. ASIAS is just a big database. Whether or not data is actionable and it's meaningful really comes from the members of the CAST who read it and decide what to do with the information they collect.

On PHMSA's side the point is well taken. There is a lot of incident and accident data that have been collected and are stored at PHMSA. Sometimes the ability to actually go back and use that for information is restricted.

One of my jobs is to try to get that data into a shape so that it's actually useable.

And it's cross industry useable. There are some initiatives internally that we've taken to improve the ability to read the narrative data, to classify it and then provide that out for data sharing as well.

But the people who know what it means are the people in the industry. So they're the ones that need to be working with us every day to read that and make sure it makes sense.

CHAIR BURMAN: Do you have any more questions before we move on to someone else?

MEMBER WARNER: No, that's it for me.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you. Mike.

MEMBER LAMONT: Thanks. Mike LaMont, Integrity Plus. One thing I want to point out is that pipelines are very different than aircraft. With aircraft we have what? Just three major commercial manufacturers and there's a certain shelf life for aircraft.

With pipelines, there's many different manufacturers and then product types that we're

moving, a very unique environment. Some are very arid environments. Some are coastal environments.

I think it's going to be very challenging to extract actionable data for pipelines unless we're able to come up with some categories perhaps of pipelines and say this type of product, these type of pressure, these types of diameters. So I think it's going to be challenging.

That's one of the things that makes the integrity management rule so effective is that it accounts for all the different types of assets and unique environments and allows operators to go "We know better than anybody what our highest risk assets are and we're able to manage to do those." But just a comment.

DR. BORENER: But that's very important. So the idiosyncratic nature of each of those pipes, the structure of the organization and even the environment in which they operate is important. But it may be that there are things

from the integrity management program that would benefit from cross-national information.

The only question I would ask is would you want to know if the identical kind of pipe that you're looking at deployed in another environment has a very different behavior. That vulnerability once it's used in a different situation would be something you would want to account for in your safety management program.

So you have a successful integrity management program. How would more information improve that performance?

CHAIR BURMAN: Alan.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: I just wanted to make two points. First, on the issue of data quality. That's a very important point that we should look at that. And that would be something that we focus on. I mean the information we create from the data is only as good as the data itself much like we say the validity of a risk management plan is only as good as the information you have on the pipeline system. I

think that's a good point.

And then, Mike, I related to your comment. I would agree. I think it's a good example with FAA. I mean certainly the aircraft movement a lot of that is automated. When we're dealing with inline inspection, there's not a system that reports that immediately. It's not really a SCADA-type function.

And it's an area that we've looked at. I think we as an agency can do better to measure of the effectiveness of integrity management. And that's probably an area -- I mean certainly NTSB has pointed out that how do we know that IMP has been effective.

One thing we look at or statistics that are reported to us on repairs that are made are integrity management repairs. But if you have a rising number of repairs, is that a good thing or a bad thing? Does it mean you have issues or is it a good thing that you're finding?

You know everything you're reporting, every defect that was repaired that got close to

the 80 percent mark or above it, that's potential prevented accident. What can we share on that?

I think there's opportunity as we discuss further to talk about that point right there like immediate repair conditions. Would you expect in a mature integrity management program should that start going down? Or if it's not going down, what's the issue? Are there issues with ILI performance or the assessments that we require? Is there something to be learned on technology we might need to improve to address that issue if it is an issue?

I think there are learnings from that for instance. That's all I had.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And then we're going to move to this side of the room and then we'll come back to this side. Kate, I think over here you had your tent card up before Eric.

MEMBER BLYSTONE: I sure did. Kate Blystone. At any rate, thank you. I think this was a really great introduction to the topic. And I certainly studied the FAA work before I got

here and I really appreciate the detailed analysis there.

Mr. Jensen, it's fair for you to bring up the FOIA issue because I will say as a member of the public and a representative from the Pipeline Safety Trust that's a big concern for us. It's discomforting to know that this data would go somewhere where the public couldn't access it.

However, I think there are ways to ameliorate that concern. And one of the things, I'm a planner. I'm a urban planner. For me, part of planning is a system in which you go through all these steps and then you revisit.

And the concern and something to record for future action is it feels it's necessary for us to have in our recommendations some sort of check to make sure that whatever system we put in place is actually working. I'd like to see the 82 percent reduction. But how do we know that it's working?

I think knowing that it's working and

there aren't tweaks to be made would help deal with the discomfort that comes with the stuff being away from the public's eyes. And I wanted to ask you about that.

When this system was set up and CAST was put into place, (1) is there a public representative on CAST? Or is the public allowed to participate in any way, shape or form?

(2) Did they do some analysis to say we really need more data on this? We're not getting this. Is there a GAP analysis that takes place every time they meet?

DR. BORENER: Yes. And both things happen. So first I want to say the fact that you don't know that it was Southwest Airlines that had that near miss doesn't mean that you don't know the near miss happened.

The events are captured. It's just the attribution to the particular operator that's de-identified. And you have to know the context in which the thing happened in order to be able to do something with it.

So when CAST established its safety program it did too things. It set up a tracking program that's a process tracking program. So if they said everybody needs to be trained on stick-shaker events they went around and asked everybody, "Did you put it in your training program? How many people have been trained? How many times has this happened?"

And then likewise they establish a passive system monitoring metric that comes off of the airplane so that they can say "Does it happen" and "Are people taking the right response?" Both things are in place. It's process, personnel orientated activity as well as a passively collected data analysis activity that confirms the two things. People can say they're doing things, but you can go back and see if they really are or not.

The other part of this I think is that the data that you have, there is a lot of data. I mean when I came to the agency the first time I worked with this agency was in 1994.

I wrote a report on leak detection systems. And I went to different operators and I asked them, "How do you do that?" And some of them had little pieces of paper and they were -- No, it's true. Some people really did. And they did a flow balance every few hours and that was mostly to keep the operators awake I think because there wasn't really much happening.

And then there was Enron. And they had some great big system and it was very complicated. So the first thing is you have the data. You have the information, but it's very hard to generalize around the similar circumstances that are happening to different operators.

Within operator maybe you're doing just fine. But if you have an anomalous condition that is happening to someone else it's hard for you to find that out and then use what they know to inform your own operation. That I think we can address.

And I think the public would be able

to find out what the conclusions of the analysis would be. They wouldn't just be able to say "Well, it was this guy right here." That should hopefully be the best of both worlds. Of course, it's always going to be an opportunity for improvement.

The other thing is that when detail data started being shared by the airlines they really did not want any kind of detail shared. They were very, very uncomfortable about it.

So their first step was to say "We'll give you a monthly average." And gradually they realized that without knowing exactly what day or what the weather conditions were like or whether or not it was snowing when it happened, that there was a limit to the usefulness of the data they were collecting. So they were spending a lot of money to collect the data. They might as well fuse the information on that actually helps them to interpret it.

It's taken maybe five years to get from we'll share the information in an aggregate

level to we'll share the detail. And that really is about trust. It's really just about that. It's about protection of the data that needs to be protected versus the conclusions and creating a relationship I think among industry and government where their focus is on the problem and not an adversarial relationship among them.

This really allows you to bring together all of your resources to address an issue and to work together toward that.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Now we're going to go to Eric. Then we'll go on the other side of the room for one more question. Then we'll go back to the phone And then we'll see if anyone else has any more questions before we open it up for public discussion. Eric.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen. I guess an observation or perspective or question. I'm really just trying to get my head wrapped around what the data is. I'm trying to boil all of this down and try to boil down maybe the conversation and the presentation that's been had

so far this morning. And it's been great.

What is the data? In my mind, I think the data is the miss. It's not necessarily describing a physical condition as being the data. The condition is what the condition is. How well are we as humans in utilizing the technology that we have to characterize that real and actual physical condition correctly and then auctioning off of it.

So there are two components to that. Have you characterized that correctly and then have you taken the correct action? And a miss could be either one of those two. It was characterized correctly, but you didn't do the right thing. Or it wasn't characterized correctly and you thought you did the right thing, but you really didn't. But in any case, it's a miss.

Kind of boiling that up a little bit higher is how do we define success in this context. How do we know that we're good or we're good enough? To me the data is some way to

measure that, to tell us as an industry and as stakeholders are we getting better and how do we know. What is better? What does good enough look like?

I think if we can get there with this committee and this work group then we'll really have accomplished something. I think it's less about the physical condition and this tool measured this. And they matched up or they didn't. It's how well did we figure out that they didn't match up and what did we do about it and at the end of the day we made the right decision.

DR. BORENER: I agree. I think that is taking action for safety. And all these tools are arrayed just for the purpose to make the right decision at the right time and to give authority to the person who has to make the decision so that they can feel that their decision is well founded.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Now we're going to move over here to Mark. Then we'll open

it up again to the phone, then back to the table if there are any. And then we'll open it up for public discussion. Thank you.

MEMBER HERETH: Some of the constituents or some of the parties that we're behind the bill, the legislation, that we find ourselves working with today were not only looking at how to prevent failure, how to improve the way in which we use tools to prevent failure, but also to look at how we can advance the technology and make improvements in the technology to preclude failure.

My question is are there examples that we have in CAST where they've looked at not just from a failure or near miss perspective, but looking proactively at data in that predictive sense that you talked about to look at how can we use our systems better to preclude failure. So it's a different view.

DR. BORENER: Some of the early work in CAST really revolved around alerting and I'll talk about the Terrain Avoidance Warning System

first because that relates to the deadliest accident which is the CFIT accident. This topic came up to CAST. Actually, there's also fuel tank inerting which just finally got 20 years later passed last year. And that was that TWA 800 flight.

But the idea of Terrain Avoidance Alerting or TAWS is that the aircraft itself can tell as you approach terrain that you're in the wrong place because there's onboard radar that says that this is the wrong thing for you to be doing. That is a post hoc piece of information that can be analyzed. It can be passively detected and analyzed.

But then using that a system to provide a warning to the cockpit that you're about to hit a mountain and you've got to pull up tells you stop doing that essentially. It gives you that warning. So then it avoids the collision or it helps you to avoid the collision by making you take a response that you might not have been aware of.

That's a direct result of the deliberations of the Commercial Aviation Safety Team. And they recommended the TAWS Alerting System be deployed in all commercial aircraft before the rule went into place. For two years before that, this group acted and Boeing engineered that system. It's now basically required in all aircraft.

Fuel tank inerting is a more interesting thing because there was a lot of contention in CAST about fuel tank inerting. It's a rare problem. You might remember the --

In this particular case, there was a spark in an empty fuel tank on an airplane that caused its catastrophic loss. That's TWA 800. If you ever want to see something about that go out to the NTSB. They have a reconstruction of part of that there. And the recommended safety response on the part of the team was that an inerting device or an inerting process be put into that tank to avoid the possibility of the spark in this accident.

Part of the industry said, "No, it's too expensive." It doesn't happen that much. The risk from that is not that high. It's not warranted. It's not as important as other things that we might do.

And the team decided that there would be a phased-in approach that allowed for full application over a long time period. So the final rule on that took about 20 years from the time that TWA 800 happened to the time that it was actually implemented.

I'm bringing that example up because it's a negotiated process. It's a process where costs and benefits are weighed and the entire industry weighs in on the answer. So it is definitely on the side of safety. But if other things are more critical before that thing has to be addressed that ends up being lower down on the list of implementation requirements.

So both things have happened. TAWS went into effect within two years. Fuel tank inerting took 20.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone at the table have any questions or comments? Anyone on the phone?

(No verbal response)

Now we're going to open it up for public discussion. Whoever wants can go to the mike.

MS. WHETSEL: Please be sure to state your name and where you're from for the court reporter.

MS. SAMES: Christina Sames, American Gas Association. I think the major challenges, well most of them, have been identified. But before I begin, I want to say fully supportive of this initiative.

We, American Gas Association, actually aggressively pushed for something like this six, seven, I don't know how many years ago. Our challenges were how do you share relevant information, how do you make it non-punitive, how do you create an environment where people willing share voluntary information. They have all been

discussed.

I think that it would be very simple if we were only talking about -- simple a relative term -- what PHMSA inspects. The challenges that Dan Cote brought up and others is when you get to how do you get acceptance not only from Federal Government but also from state government.

I think starting with ILI data we can begin to look at ILI data for interstates and intrastates and how do we create a framework that then could be expanded to things like near miss reporting, information that operators find that are safety concerns.

I know a number of AGA's members voluntarily report these types of items to their state regulators. I know others that are very hesitant to do so and it really depends on the environment.

When I think through the amount of data that could be collected to me it's really overwhelming. And it really gets back to some of

the discussions of what is data overload. If the committee can really focus on relevant data that allows us to take actionable actions, how do we take great information and then say, "Oh, didn't quite know that.

It's a new piece of data that I can utilize to improve my safety."

We actually created something similar -- I saw Max. Yes, Max Kieba is here -- on the distribution side classic pipe failure reporting voluntary. Max, any idea how many tens of thousands of datapoints we now have?

MR. KIEBA: I'm not sure if I can say.

MS. SAMES: Yes, it's well over 40,000.

MR. KIEBA: It's only about 50.

MS. SAMES: About 50 now, yes. It just keeps increasing. But a voluntary information sharing group made up of various stakeholders that analyze the data and then determine and create status reports on here is what we're seeing.

I really see something like this that can also be very similar to the PPDC. Information collected. Information analyzed by stakeholders. Information shared so that many can take actionable items. But it gets back to what data, how do we keep it secure and how do we make it non-punitive.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

MR. STOODY: Hello. John Stoody from the Association of Oil Pipe Lines. And I wanted to say that we're excited about this process. We think it's a great group of people who have come together from what we have interacted with the operators, the vendors, the members of the public, the other entities. We all know that we have safety in mind.

We think that the FAA is a great building block and there are many solutions to be offered from the FAA model. But we also see challenges beyond that that the FAA model falls short. And when I think about aviation, what we don't see in the conversation today about

aviation is whether we should have airplanes or whether we should be flying from point to point or whether it would be good to stop flying airplanes and whether it would be good to stop having new airplanes flying around.

And we do see that in the pipeline to date. And people are coming to the table with those solutions and there are good policy discussions to have. But it's a much more existential debate on whether we should even have pipelines or whether we should have new pipelines.

So for the FAA model to be specific, for example, de-identification may be good for Southwest versus United. But it's really not about that. It's about airplanes at all. So just taking the name off doesn't help if there are some stakeholders -- and I'm not talking about in this room -- who would use the process to question whether we should even have pipelines. So that's why we will be asking about questions about the CAST model, who participated,

was that public, were the solutions public, were the problems public and what role that was in terms of the stakeholders who don't necessarily share pipeline safety as their ultimate goal. They may have other goals that might conflict with pipeline safety or making pipelines safer.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

DR. BORENER: I do want to respond that people may not decide whether there should or there shouldn't be airlines. But they sure do argue about runways. There are a lot of places that have acknowledged that the traffic is there, but they want no more.

And that is an issue that CAST has to deal with as well because expansion of service or service to new communities is always contentious. So I think your point is very well taken.

CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone else have any questions from the public? Anyone else on the phone?

(No verbal response)

Anyone else at the table? Dan.

MEMBER COTE: Just an observation. I was interested in that discussion on defining success. Several of you have framed questions without really asking the question what constitutes success in this arena without putting it in quite that format.

And for me, the model the FAA used is a pretty clear. They counted the number of planes that fell out of the sky. And that became the criteria. And we saw very impressive charts that showed dramatic reductions over the life of the program.

In my mind, that defines success for us. We know how many incidents we have in gas systems every year where federally reportable incidents where we essentially blow things up. And that's a pretty clear scorecard in my mind. And from the public's perspective, not advocates for specific positions or specific causes, but from the public that we serve that's the criteria that most of them use.

At least as a starting point, I would

recommend this committee, but back to where we started in terms of making this about pipeline safety. And the way we define pipeline safety is not blowing things up. In my mind, we have a pretty easy framework to use as a scorecard going forward. There's a pretty good history in the past of counting those and we know how many we've had. And we can certain track it going forward. Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone else have any questions on the phone? At the table? In the audience?

(No verbal response)

So now we're going to take a lunch break. I'm going to make an executive decision unless I get overruled by everybody to come back at 1:30 p.m. I think that gives us time and then we're go to go. Thank you, everyone. We'll stand at ease right now until 1:30 p.m. Is that correct? Okay.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:07 p.m. and resumed at

1:40 p.m.)

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. We're ready to get started now. We're going to be on Agenda Item 6, Overview of Recommendation Deliverables, Proposed Common Language Definitions.

AGENDA ITEM 6: OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATION DELIVERABLES PROPOSED COMMON LANGUAGE DEFINITIONS

MR. McLAREN: Well, good afternoon. I'm Chris McLaren with PHMSA. And this review of the recommendation deliverables is around Section C of Section 10 of the PIPES Act. And you've seen this list of six items now a few times. And thank you, Cheryl, for having a great discussion and doing some brainstorming sections around the deliverables.

I think that this provides a good introduction into some of the discussions we'll have later about subcommittees that are on the agenda, about some of the topics where we need to have additional information gathered and additional thoughts.

I thought if anybody would like to

have we can spend five or ten minutes on each one or groups of them in case anybody had any talking points. I note that we did have quite a bit of discussion prior to lunch.

The first two are the need for and the identification of a system to ensure that dig verification data are shared within inline inspection operators to the extent consistent with the need to maintain proprietary and security sensitive data in a confidential manner to improve pipeline safety and inspection technology. And I would like to include number two in this initial discussion, ways to encourage the exchange of pipeline inspection information and the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis.

There's a lot of definitions in there. And that's my next section is to talk about definitions which I think will be very key to us having a good basis for our discussion going forward. So the definitions discussion will come

later, but there certainly are a lot there. Does anybody have any thoughts or comments or feedback on these two to start out with?

CHAIR BURMAN: And if you do please raise your tent card. Anyone on the phone?

(No verbal response)

MR. McLAREN: I'll continue on in just laying some ideas out there for the meeting minutes. Cheryl talked about API, the PPTS data gathering and triaging exercise. There's also the AGA, Plastic Pipe Database Committee that gathers data like that. She also talked about the new BSEE, OCS data exercise and there's several others, the FAA experience, etc., that we talked about. So there's a lot of venues out there.

The third one is opportunities to share data including dig verification data between operators of pipeline facilities and inline inspection vendors, to expand knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of the different types of inline inspection technologies and

methodologies.

CHAIR BURMAN: Sherry.

DR. BORENER: Sherry Borener from PHMSA. I can see that the content is identified in these three bullets. I'm not sure exactly what the deliverable is. Maybe that my confusion.

For instance, in number one, we know that there is the need for this. Does this mean that we would do a white paper? Would we encourage some sort of prototype development? I mean I'm not sure what these things are. So the deliverables themselves, could you clarify a little bit about what that means?

MR. McLAREN: Yes. Thank you. And that's in Section D of the Act where it talks about the deliverable being "the Secretary shall publish recommendations provided under Subsection C on a publicly available website of the Department of Transportation."

So the recommendations would be included in some sort of a report would be an

initial possible vision for that. It could then be posted to the PHMSA website to further the discussion.

CHAIR BURMAN: Christie.

MS. MURRAY: And I would just add to Chris' remarks -- this is Christie Murray with PHMSA -- that what we meant by recommendation deliverables here were to make sure that we come back and revisit the required aspects of the mandate that this group is tasked with, making sure we account for as part of our effort.

Ultimately, the recommendations that we or this committee will submit to the Secretary must address these required areas. So these are the required areas that our deliverables must cover just for clarification purposes.

MR. McLAREN: I'd like to note some of the discussion we had previously during Sherry's session also about the fact that this framework that we're building looking for ways to leverage on other pipeline safety topics such as distribution, maybe control room management,

abnormal operation events, etc. But these are the specific deliverables that we must meet at a minimum.

Okay. Next slide. Number four is options to create a secure system that protects proprietary data while encouraging the exchange of pipeline inspection information in the development of advanced pipeline inspection technologies and enhanced risk analysis. Again, here we see several definitions. And I think if there's any comments or feedback and discussion from the group, remembering that we're going to be I'm sure dwelling on definitions for the next couple of meetings probably in some aspects.

Okay. Hearing no comments, number five, means and best practices for the protection of safety and security sensitive information and proprietary information. Certainly we rely on a lot of the expertise. Hopefully, Sherry will be able to participate in our meetings multiple times and other presenters on how the FAA has done that and other organizations have done it

and are planning on doing it like at BSEE.

MEMBER WARNER: Chris. This is Chris Warner. It seems like it's more than just protection of safety and security sensitive information. It also seems like it's operator or vendor specific information as well. I just wanted to clarify that that was also part of the division.

MR. McLAREN: Well, maybe we could certainly rely upon one of the PHMSA lawyers in the room. As an engineer, that's how I would interpret it. But I would rely upon maybe a legal opinion on that if we needed it.

CHAIR BURMAN: Could you repeat the question?

MR. McLAREN: So in number four or number five it talks about proprietary specific to safety and security sensitive information. I think for this to be successful it's also going to have to guarantee privacy around whoever submitted the information, kind of what we see at the FAA. You don't have the specific airline

name or operator name and possibly even the vendor. And it's providing the tool.

MS. BATTAMS: I definitely think that that's something we will be very sensitive to to make sure that we're sharing the information, the detail, we need and then keeping in mind the non-punitive nature of the voluntary sharing.

At this early date, I'm not sure what specific information we will be redacting or protecting in a specific way. But it's definitely something that we will all be working to agree on to make sure that everybody is comfortable and we're still achieving our goal of sharing the information necessary to improve the pipeline safety.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: This is Marie Dominguez. I think that looking at how to actually define all of that should I think -- I would suggest that you continue to make a recommendation on what the scope of all of that would be and perhaps actually have a work group that would generate some of those deliverables on

how to look at that.

CHAIR BURMAN: Alan.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Yes, you know, I'm trying to solve this. I think that's one of the areas valid for discussion when we look at identifying challenges to make for a successful system. Certainly, that is something that's on the table that we would need to identify and address.

CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone on the phone?

(No verbal response)

Okay, Chris.

MR. McLAREN: Thank you. And I think that that goes into number six. Our mandate does say that we shall consider and provide recommendations on these. So consideration and recommendations on the regulatory funding and legal barriers to sharing information described in one through four. I think that's all a very important discussion to get noted and to have on the table.

CHAIR BURMAN: Not hearing any

questions or comments, we'll continue.

MR. McLAREN: Okay. So that was a discussion of the deliverables. The next topic is definitions. And in committee work and work group work, considering common definitions seems like a very important thing especially when we see the number of definitions that we have coming at us. We have Section 10 of the Pipes Act of 2016 instead of the PSIA. My mistake. And I've got some of those listed on the next slide.

We also have the FAA program, 14 CFR 193. And that's where Sherry was getting some of her verbiage of the different types of data and some of the things. There's also within the FICA regulation a whole load of definitions. And there may be other terms and sources that we find that we need to utilize to make sure we're all on the same page.

It shows on the next slide some of the volume of these things that I think that we need to work through. It may be appropriate to have some group go out and do this work and bring it

to the committee.

But there is a wide variety of definitions that I think need to be detailed. Some of them are pre-existing such as within the FAA 14 CFR 193 as well as in the FICA regulations. So I think we have to look at others to make sure that for instance that the information definition in the FAA regulation meets our needs. And we need to be cognizant of it because it is a commonly used definition in a regulation currently.

DR. BORENER: So I have a -- This is Sherry Borener. I think that's crucial in two ways. There's a need to have a common language for the definition of the actions of this committee and whatever subcommittees you launch.

And then in addition to that, there's a need for common taxonomy of events just in order to be able to exchange information. For instance, one of the callers I think said that they would call what I had referred to as near miss as a close call. That's a different kind of

taxonomy that's different than these definitions that are on the board here which have to do with the actual structure of our work.

An ongoing issue is a standard definition of events and conditions that would be reported in both accident and incident data. I think that's an important working group for us to put together.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone have any comments on the phone?

(No verbal response)

Okay, Chris.

MR. McLAREN: On the next slide actually shows some of the definitions that were within 193 that I found. And there weren't very many. I thought I would have found 15 or 20 personally and I found these. But de-identified for instance is one word that Sherry used this morning.

And there's information. It sounds like during this discussion of information and data that we're going to need maybe to refine

that a little bit more in terms of what we mean, in terms of the information versus the more granular data since we are dealing with very technical reports.

DR. BORENER: Yes, actually the FAA publishes a lot of airworthiness directives and other documents that aren't in the rule, but that are interpretations. They're like your frequently asked questions. And they provide more clarification about. For instance all of the FOQA constraints are published within an AD.

If you remind me I'll go back and find the other documents that link to 14 CFR 193. But there's also something specifically that was published in 1975 on ASRS that has more definition that we can also use if that's helpful.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: This is Alan Mayberry. Just a point of clarification just to make sure people understand and maybe it is understood, but this is FAA regulation and we're just talking about what can be. So if we proceed

with this, we would need to propose part of it.

You look at what we're going to deliver in the end. It would be a recommendation for something like this that would be applicable to the pipeline industry. Just wanted to clarify that. Thanks.

CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone have any questions or comments in the room? On the phone?

(No verbal response)

And just an order of business before we go to Joe that after this section we will open it up to the public in the audience if they have any comments or questions as well before we move to the next action item. Joe.

MEMBER SUBSITS: When I look at the description of duties, (1) A and C clearly seem to indicate that this should be looking at inline inspection activities where B is a little more general in that. Is this all within the context of inline inspection or can we assume that B deviates from A and C in terms of going beyond inline inspection?

CHAIR BURMAN: So we're looking now at the charter, correct?

MEMBER SUBSITS: Yes.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Do you need Legal up here?

MR. McLAREN: No, I think Alaina specifically addressed that within talking about the diversity of the team and the intent of the authors of the statute that C is the intent, but B describes that this shall be a diverse group meeting these membership guidelines.

So I think the answer to your question, Joe, is there's no deviation. They are talking about C and these are the individuals that would work on it.

MEMBER SUBSITS: One more question. A asks for a process to ensure that dig validation data is shared. And a lot of discussion today tend to focused on near miss and unique situations where this seems to indicate that reporting of routine validation information. Was that the intent?

CHAIR BURMAN: Alan will also talk for a minute. But I do think that if you look at the entire section in the description of duties I think that gets back to Dan's original question which is the scope. Some of these can also be pulled out to make it broader or narrower. When we get to the scope we're going to have to in the subcommittees look at exactly what we mean when we're talking about different groups that might be outside of this group that we need to include in that as well as who might be part of any information sharing collaborative efforts.

Alan, do you have anything to add?

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Just some thoughts. I think when we're talking about sharing inline inspection data really it's about improving the performance of the tools, improving the information sharing which necessarily I think you also talking about miss or near miss reporting.

Really these are opportunities to learn. They are cases where when I think about the data that we'll be seeing in such a system

obviously it will be the ones that don't go to failure, but they'll be ones that almost went to failure.

So it's kind of a miss by chance. And it's all with the goal of learning from that dataset. I mean there's more to learn. But that dataset I'm thinking in particular about.

While we dodged right there, what can we learn from that to make sure that we can apply learning nationwide and prevent, help ensure safety and then prevent accidents? I think we're all kind of talking about that when we're talking about information sharing. I think it automatically goes to that. Thanks.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you and, Chris, do you want to continue? Thank you.

MR. McLAREN: That is the last slide on that discussion. And thank you, Sherry, for leading such a vigorous discussion prior to lunch and getting a lot of those talking points out.

CHAIR BURMAN: I think before we go on to the next section we want to open it up for any

comments or questions in general before we get to the committee planning. If anyone on the phone or at the table before we open it up to the public to weigh, this is an opportunity now to also give some feedback from what you've heard so far.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Diane, this is Sherina Edwards in Illinois. I just wanted to say that I'm not sure if we were ever able to get past that lobby with the online visuals. But it's pretty difficult to follow along without the presentation slides.

I know we're trying to listen, but to the extent were we ever able to get that up and loaded? I know we were told that it was being worked on, but have we advanced past that stage?

MEMBER PERRY: This is Simona Perry. I can see it on my computer.

MEMBER JONES: This is Walter Jones. I can see it as well.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Okay. I guess I for some reason still can't. I'll try to reload maybe. Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: And, Commissioner Edwards, someone is sending you the slides as we speak.

MEMBER EDWARDS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone have any comments, questions, discussion, whether on action six or on anything else we've heard so far today?

MEMBER MACNEILL: Yes, John MacNeill, Utility Workers Union of America. My question is we're looking out to industry for data sharing to get information. I don't see anybody from the utility industries like Con Edison or Detroit Edison. Are we going to be reaching out to any utilities for any information?

CHAIR BURMAN: I'm going to let Dan respond to that.

MEMBER COTE: I'm Dan Cote. I'm with NiSource. We operate distribution companies in seven states and the AGA is here as well. But I am the LDC representative.

MEMBER MACNEILL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: With that, does anyone else have any comments, questions, that they want to identify now in the room? On the phone? In the audience?

MR. HEVIE: Drew Hevie, Kinder Morgan. The charge seems to focus the charter towards risk analysis. And pipeline integrity risk analysis has a specific definition of evaluating whether a particular threat exists, what is the severity or likelihood of that threat, what are the consequences resulting from that threat.

And I just wanted to mention that the deliverables don't really seem to be going towards risk analysis. They seem to be going towards improving assessment technologies. Just a comment.

CHAIR BURMAN: Alan.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Thanks, Drew. I mean referring to risk analysis or risk management is the overall goal here. I think when we're talking information sharing we are really dealing with risk analysis because we're

informing that program.

Risk analysis is much better if you have valid information in that risk analysis. To that end, what we're delivering or what we will deliver -- I think we'll vote on whether or not we deliver -- will support risk management to that end.

And I think it's up to the committee. We ended up with a statutory language and that's what we must do. But if there are some recommendation, I think we really need to develop recommendations. If there's anything we need to tweak and really the conversation is set up like this, we need to tweak it. Here's where we really need to go. I think that will need to be part of the outcome of this group to help frame the conversation of where it needs to go and come out with a recommendation like that. Thanks.

CHAIR BURMAN: So I look at this then as we have these statutory duties and we're looking to see how to implement it best. It gets back to Eric's comments in the beginning in terms

of the scope and then us as a committee deciding whether it meets the definition of the statutory duties. But also in the spirit of what the intent is to also look at how we incorporate that. It's also keeping in mind that that's part of the working group in working together to identify those issues.

To the extent that it's helpful also keep in mind that I think we heard loud and clear the over core scope is on continuing and improving pipeline safety. To the extent that there may be other issues that we identify we need to make sure that we're laser-focused on the clear objectives and then those flight issues that may come up that may have a place or the working group may determine is too broad or too far off from the overall objective of our duties here. Is that fair?

MEMBER MAYBERRY: I think so, yes.

CHAIR BURMAN: And, John, do you still have your tent card up because you want to add more?

MEMBER MACNEILL: I'm sorry.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thanks. Sherry.

DR. BORENER: This is Sherry Borener. I believe under our recommended deliverables or recommendation deliverables there's something about options to create a secure system. And in that sense, there's a requirement I think on our side, from PHMSA's side, to support SMS which is a Safety Management System, not just a risk analysis system that's a step in that process.

But also somewhere in here we should probably address governance and that includes the data quality, data format and also the management of the data itself. So that governance could be a partnership as well. It doesn't have to be a single entity or a government only. And either under the regulatory or legal framework or in the actual control of the data, I think we should talk about governance.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Does anyone else at the table have any comments, questions or discussion? On the phone? In the audience?

(No verbal response)

Now we'll move onto the next agenda item.

CHAIR BURMAN: All right. So now we're here. Committee planning, next steps. I think one of the threshold questions for me is after hearing all that we've learned today the threshold question of do we have any more work to do. Do we have any work to do? And is this something that we should continue and then drill down on the specifics of what that means and what the scope is? Is there a need for the voluntary information sharing system working group to continue?

If someone wants to discuss that and then we can maybe open it up for a vote. I'm not looking to shut it down right now. I'm just looking to make sure that we clarify the threshold question of is there a need for this and should we move on. Mark.

MEMBER HERETH: This is Mark Hereth from PPIC. Should we do that in form of making a

motion at this point then? Okay. I'll make a motion to move that the voluntary information system work group has a purpose and that we vote to establish this group to meet the objectives of the charter.

MEMBER COTE: I second the motion.

CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Any discussion?

(No verbal response)

Okay. Let's move for a vote. All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

All those opposed.

(No verbal response)

All those abstaining.

(No verbal response)

Hearing none, the motion passes.

All right. So now we come to the next step which is the hard work that needs to be done. I guess for me it's really opening it up to the committee to now offer their thoughts. My perspective we're also looking at what would be the identifiable subcommittees that we might be

looking at from topic areas so that we can open it up for some discussion and then see what we're looking at and then what the next steps would be from that.

I think I did hear -- and I'll start the conversation, but I hope others join in -- that there was some identifiable needs for some discussion on what the scope should be. There was some focus on the need for cybersecurity. There was some focus on the need for what I call those things that should be in the bucket and out of the bucket and looking at what the --

Look. There are some suggestions. So these are at least some suggestions that are up there, best practices, policy/legal/funding, data and information structures and system development. To the extent that we can use this as a framework for some of our discussion on what seems relevant, what seems not relevant and what we also need to make sure we include.

Understanding that this is really our first committee meeting, our first working group

meeting, that is helping us from an educational perspective but also a getting to know what we need to know and what we need to do. I also see that there's also a need for looking at what other things may come down the pipe that we need to keep in mind. That gets to the in-the-bucket/out-of-the-bucket, kitchen sink subcommittee.

With that in terms of looking at these different subcommittees, does anybody have any thoughts on this? For those who are on the phone who may not have it up, the subcommittees are four committees.

The first is Best Practices which understands current industry initiatives applicable to this effort and lessons learned. The second, Policy/Legal/Funding which is addressing system security, proprietary data and funding and other policy concerns, the recommendations.

And the third is Data Information Structures which is consider appropriate pipeline

inspection and other safety data and information and data structures. And the fourth is system development, identify system development standards, technologies and alternatives.

I will say that I know this is a lot to digest and this doesn't mean that because we may or may not decide to do one or all or more of these subcommittees that that will lock us in forever and ever. But this is really an opportunity for us to figure out what might be the things that we want to focus on while we move forward.

It may also be that maybe some of you think that we should before we initiate subcommittees have some more time to think about it and weigh in. And that also is something that we should discuss now and look at what we need to do before we get to some of the drill down work that might be applicable.

From my perspective, it's really an opportunity for us to have some real conversation around this. And I am not wedded to any

particular idea in going forward. My focus is on helping us since we have decided that we do want to move forward to look at it from the perspective of how can we collaborate together with the goal of continuing and improving pipeline safety and the voluntary information sharing systems that may be needed to help with that. That's really it from where I come from.

I'm open to anyone who might have some thoughts on this in the room. Mark?

MEMBER HERETH: So there were -- Mark Hereth with PPIC. There were several of us that discussed what we had talked about this morning and really appreciated the background that was provided and the context.

One of the things that we discussed was in one of our future meetings was to actually have several ILI service providers and several operators come in and present their perspectives and do it in the context of opportunities and obstacles or potential obstacles. So what are the opportunities that we have here and those are

really set out to a great degree within the charter and set out very well. But it's what are the challenges and obstacles.

We talked about doing that as a large group. You could do it as a subcommittee and have the subcommittee come back. But we talked about doing it as a large group because we felt it was important in terms of being transparent and having people fully appreciate the nature of the issues in terms of proprietary information and intellectual property. Then people will have an appreciation for those. Then we then find a way to work through those. But we saw a great value in it.

You might have a set of the top ILI service providers and a selection of operators. We even talked about having a combination of an operator and an ILI service provider talking about how they do data exchange today, sort of the current state. Just some thoughts. And those of you at lunch may want to share other ides, but just some initial thoughts there.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Eric.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Maybe just -- Eric Amundsen again -- to add to what Mark said. I always try to simplify things when you're dealing with a complex problem. And this is a complex problem because there is a lot of different stakeholders and constituencies and it's not an easy thing to do on the scale that we're talking about.

Maybe a good starting point is a strawman of sorts. So what does a good process like this look like? Even if it's in generic terms, how do we do plan-do-check-act today generically?

Take the next step further. What does that look like within certain companies. With energy transfer, how do we do this process today with ROSEN? They're one of our service providers and one of our partners in what we do.

To Mark's point as an example, we come in and Bryce and I present how do we do this process today. How does it work? How does it

not work so well? How does it work on maybe certain of our pipeline systems and not so well on others? And why is that? That will give the audience and the committee a sense of the difficulty in doing this so broadly.

It's kind of how do we do it today. What does best practice look like? And what keeps it from doing it or not?

And then take it to the next level that we're talking about it as an industry level. How do you take that and deploy that across the industry? Does it look different than it does within an individual company? Does it look different than it does generically? And what are those challenges?

And then a real key part of this is what's going to motivate or what's going to compel the industry to do this at that broad level. What's in it for us? What's in it for the industry? What's in it for all of the stakeholders? How do we get value doing it at that broader level? Because we're doing it very

well at a company and service provider level, what's going to compel us to expand the application?

I'm not saying there won't be benefit, but those are the questions that we have to answer. That's in the charter. It's ways to encourage the exchange. So we're going to have to compel each other to do this. So we're going to have to come up with those reasons. So again just kind of work it through that process makes sense to me as an approach.

CHAIR BURMAN: And it sounds like also from what you're saying what are the barriers that may prevent us from doing what we would like to do which gets to some of the FAA issues in terms of non-punitive focus.

MEMBER AMUNDSEN: I think there are a lot of barriers. One is the propriety of the information. We're doing this in the context of safety. I think that will tend to undermine that issue. But there's just a lot of challenge I guess mechanically in doing such a broad

application of this process.

I think if we can just get our arms around what's a good process look like and how do you expand it to an industry level, what does that look like, what are the challenges, what are the outcomes that we can expect to compel us to go forward. I think the propriety and the security are easier problems to solve. I think the bigger challenge is going to be how do we do it at an industry level and how do we compel participation.

CHAIR BURMAN: Administrator.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Just building off of what Eric put on the table, something for you all to think about as well is if there's opportunity for large operators to share current practices now and how you're doing the proposal that you've outlined. What's that gamut of operators because everybody is different? If you're looking at different --

Not everybody is here represented at the table in terms of membership of this work

group. But just a suggestion, if that is a way forward that you all take on as a working group how do you get that larger perspective of the entire industry and not just some of the larger players that are investing in some of the ILI tools and technologies, etc. and then discerning them. But what does the entire industry look like and could you in your presentation look to try and represent that larger picture?

I think you're right. At the end of the day, it's looking to see how do you get folks to find in the value in all of this. And that's the entire scope of the industry, not just individual players.

CHAIR BURMAN: Leif.

MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you. Once again, Leif Jensen. To take Eric's example one step further which gets to an issue I had raised before lunch and it's around the immunity and confidentiality issues.

One option would be to bring a case study in front of the group, not just like Eric

suggests, best practices today, but perhaps a miss. And say Sunoco Logistics brought in a case study where we had a release. We had a corrective action order and present the root causes that led up to that. I think that would be a great learning opportunity for this group.

But in order for that to happen, there has to be a confidentiality agreement amongst this group of 24 people so that that information isn't compromised. And I don't know if it fits in the Policy/Legal/Funding area. But that issue needs to get resolved in order to build that trust and faith that our data and information isn't going to be compromised as we build our recommendation.

CHAIR BURMAN: Alan.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: I was thinking in terms of the briefing on the current state that it would be good to hear about current practices there. I'd like to think too that we'd focus on what can be. I guess that would come out of identifying obstacles, but what can be.

I know there are some operators out there that would be great to hear from that have really done a good job of trying to find that needle in the haystack. So it would be great to really find who the leaders are in doing that for looking at a briefing that is focusing on what can be. Who is really ahead of the curve on that since we really want to look toward where we can be as opposed to reacting to the last accident.

I guess it's under the Legal part. If there's anything we need to do to address the concern over your coming to the table here to share information, we certainly want to have open dialogue.

If we're looking at a case study like that, are there other issues that we need to address that might prevent open dialogue here? I guess that's a thought I had, too. I'd be interested in hearing about that.

CHAIR BURMAN: Dan.

MEMBER COTE: Just a recommendation, Madam Chairman. As I listen to the discussion, I

agree with virtually everything the prior speakers have said. But before we get to that stage, it seems to me the critical enabler for all of this and particularly for populating subteams or subgroups is determining what the scope is.

So my recommendation to the committee is there are two ways to go about that. One, it's such a critical issue that, Madam Chairman, you may want the entire committee to work it. But maybe a little more expedient a way is set up a subcommittee to do that between now and the next meeting and have them bring recommendations back to this committee to work. I believe that will expedite the process and will help us frame by the next meeting exactly what the committee's strategy is going forward.

With that, I believe populating the subworking groups will be relatively simple because based on scope very logical next steps will follow. Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone have any

thoughts on what Dan said or any other related to this topic?

MEMBER PERRY: Hi, this is Simona Perry on the phone. Yes, Dan. I think that's a great idea. I would ask just do you consider -- I think the definitional questions -- and by definitions I don't mean the specific taxonomy. I mean the common language that we're speaking in -- should also be something that we I guess prioritize. The scope and the common language that we're all working in.

I wouldn't be opposed if it is not too burdensome that actually I think these are really valuable discussions to have as a fully committee. But I'm not sure. That might take too long. But that's just my addition to what Dan had to say. Thank you.

MEMBER BLYSTONE: Kate Blystone. You said the word expedient. I have a feeling that very little about what we're going to be doing is expedient. I don't know about anyone else in this room, but I'm fairly certain that most of us

want to be on the scoping subcommittee which means it's just the full committee.

And I agree with Dr. Perry who just spoke. I think that we have a responsibility. This is the foundation for what we're going to do. And I think we almost have to have that discussion in a full group.

Maybe instead of establishing a subcommittee for that that we all go away and think about that answer to that question ourselves. So when we come back to this meeting we can bring that perspective.

I also think that we have a lot of trust building to do in this room to make sure that we have good recommendation going forward. If we break into subcommittees too quickly, it could make it difficult for us to achieve that level of trust. Those are just my thoughts.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone else have anything on the phone? Around the table? In the audience?

(No verbal response)

Okay. So from what I'm hearing there are a lot of different issues that we need to cover. I mean obviously we've done a deep dive today at a high level on some of the things and especially because many of us, myself included, really came to this last week at the end of the week and then came here are still trying to digest all that's there and what this may or may not look like.

When I look at this -- then I'm going to turn it over to Christie to help with some of the next steps and action plan -- I look at I think the key takeaway which is that we do find value. We're very interested in having an environment where we can voluntarily share information that helps with the ultimate goal of continuing and improving pipeline safety and not only for evaluating past issues, but also helping us on the future forward. So that we increase our pipeline safety and reduce issues and learn.

A lot of the different issues now come to the second threshold issue which is really the

scoping and the governance issues. I am hearing that the majority of folks want to work on that issue. I think that what's helpful from my perspective is that while we do that scoping and governance work between now and the next meeting that we also look at what else needs to be on that list or what's on the laundry list of things that we need to keep in mind. Then we can determine what should be a part of it and what shouldn't be. And that will also help us with our scoping and our governance.

And also who else may need to be part of that group and may need to come to a meeting to give us some feedback and their own perspectives in terms of listening. We may need different vendors that they need to be here as well as different operators as well as others in the public sector that we may need to have.

There is also the importance of how to make the information confidential as well as to the extent giving us an opportunity for future case studies and analysis which really gets to

the FAA model of helping with taking that information and doing the right data analysis that will help us formulate some action plans for better improvement.

With that, I am thinking that we should focus on how to work through the process so that the next working group meeting can be one that's really detailed oriented and action oriented to focusing on the next steps after that. I do see the framework between now and then needing to have those folks have an opportunity to give us information following all the legal and bureaucratic rules that need to be in place to make that happen.

To the extent that it may not be -- and this gets back to again, Eric. You asked a lot of good questions in the beginning because one of the question you asked is about the formal and informal process. This gets to between now and then we may have a formal subcommittee that's under the charter and the bylaws where the chairman can designate a subcommittee with the

approval of the DFO.

But before that, I'd like to make sure that we have as many people who want to be a part of that work participate. So I'm not necessarily unless somebody has a motion they want to make on other committees thinking that really our direction going forward is scope and governance, to have another committee meeting in the first of 2017. That way we can look to that as the work product.

We will need to have some drill down work beforehand getting to Dan's initial question when we first came which is needing to have the time to digest it as well as to help to facilitate a robust and informative meeting. Then we are making decisions based on a thoughtful process.

I don't know. I want to open it up if anyone has any comments or questions at this time on what we've heard. So is your silence agreement or disagreement?

MEMBER EDWARDS: Yes. Hi, this is

Sherina Edwards in Illinois. I think what you said is spot on. And I think even though because this is our first meeting and we're supposed to try for introductory purposes determine what the overall marching orders will be for this committee.

I think sticking to those that are outlined for now is good. But I think as we continue to meet perhaps in our second meeting or as we perhaps continue to find out other things that perhaps we need to be evaluating, then at that time we can maybe propose another subcommittee. At your discretion or your wish, we can add those in. But I do agree for now that we should keep a limited scope just so as not to put the cart before the horse in a sense.

CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Anyone else at the table? On the phone? In the audience?

(No verbal response)

All right. So I think we now leave it to Christie and to Alan to wrap up in terms of where we are and next steps.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: I was going to suggest that actually this is really an add-on to the last discussion related to scope. I just want to be clear. We have in the statute a somewhat clearly identified path for direction that's focused on talking about addressing the full scope of what we cover beyond what's in the statute. Is that kind of where we are as far as how far encompassing we are?

CHAIR BURMAN: I do want to add to that. I think that the minutes of this meeting will be helpful also to help us make sure that we didn't miss anything. You know there was a lot of robust discussion around transmission vs. distribution, in terms of the different folks that might need to be a part of this discussion, in terms of cybersecurity and others.

I think the minutes will help us in terms of figuring out our scope, understanding that we are limited and not limited in a sense to the statutory duties. And to that extent, we're looking at how now we work within that and expand

it or not based on that need and keeping in mind the overall threshold goal of continuing and improving pipeline safety which is the first and foremost core issue.

MEMBER MAYBERRY: Thanks. So I was going to suggest maybe at the next meeting we have a robust discussion on that. Really I think we'll need to be conversing in the meantime thought as far as what would be the scope and really coming next time prepared to really close that out, close that discussion out if possible.

The other part of that meeting would likely be if everyone is agreeable -- we haven't really discussed it -- a briefing as what Mark had described with some vendors and operators. It might be an opportunity for education plus really peaking the conversation or seeding the conversation on what can be in that area. With that, I'll turn it over to Christie for any other thoughts.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Alan. This is Christie Murray. I just wanted to -- if we're at

the point in the agenda where we're actually doing an action item recap and our next steps -- thank you all for participation, great dialogue.

Some of the key things that I heard which really tie back to where we're going to with the next meeting is what is the scope, can it be expanded, how do we address sensitivities, confidentiality, FOIA concerns. There was a common theme around pipeline safety being the true focus of our efforts.

Also I heard mentioned how do we get people to translate risk in a clear and concise way and to factor in social and cultural gaps in communication. There was a lot of discussion around transparency in the industry. A key theme around building trust as part of this working group and even beyond as we move forward with information sharing activities and initiatives.

Also there was discussion around SMS. How do we keep pace without sacrificing safety in our industry? How are we quantifying the impact on safety? Can we focus on preventing the next

accident? Expanding to include other key pipeline safety areas like distribution systems.

Human factors, making sure we continue to have a focus on that. Also how do we look at the data and information we currently have? How do we make sure it's of quality? It's accurate. How do we build on that from an analysis standpoint?

Also there was a key point about how do we use the data we have, leverage technology to effectively characterize the risk so that we can take appropriate and relevant actions? How do you share voluntarily in a relevant way again focused around with a specific goal of taking action moving forward?

There was a concern that some stakeholders will use this process and the efforts of this working group to question whether pipelines should operate or whether new pipelines should be constructed or just to serve different interests outside of the intent of this working group.

It was also pointed out that we need to really focus on what constitutes success for this overall effort and how do we make sure that we focus on making pipelines safe.

There was a discussion on the need for common language as a part of the committee itself and expanding beyond that with a common taxonomy with the whole information sharing system work moving forward. And how do we make sure we address data, governance, the format, the structure as part of what we're doing?

As I say all that, there are a lot of great pieces that we'll need to flush out. I think this was great to have that much come out of a first working group meeting.

So what will be important as I've heard throughout today is making sure that we focus and make sure that we do some work offline as a committee, to organize around how to derive at a scope.

What I anticipate prior to our next face-to-face meeting is we may need to have a

little homework with the committee and ask for priorities, information that can do a few things. One will be reaching out to poll so that we can understand your calendar and availability. I would say between February and March for the next meeting. But we'll send something out related to that. We can then gauge the availability of the majority.

Two is we'll also be teeing up some areas that we believe the committee based on what we've heard today and going back and getting the transcript data to understand key themes that came out that certainly need to be teed up as a part of the scope. Then summarizing that and sending that back to the group and asking for additional items for consideration for our next meeting's face-to-face scope discussion.

What we'll commit to do is take back what we heard today to try to make sure that we come back with our next face-to-face meeting with a process that will help this group better focus and zoom on where the focus really needs to be as

far as the scope and governance for the working group and getting more input.

Also we will likely be reaching out if there are information briefings that are of interest to the working group that we will ask ahead of time. And if there are recommendations on entities and organizations and/or individuals who are best to come and share on key topics we will also be reaching out to the working group to understand what that could look like as well.

With that being said, I want to thank everybody again. That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIR BURMAN: I just want to take a moment of personal privilege to thank the Administrator. I started talking in the beginning about it's not enough to stare at the steps. You must walk up the steps.

From my perspective, she's been laser-focused in her leadership on this being an important issue. And as we heard from AGA, this has been something that is not new. Folks have been talking about it for a number of years and

trying to grapple with it.

And we really have an opportunity to take this vision and decide how do we as individuals and then within this working group actually do something that we can look at and say we made a difference.

From my perspective, I really am looking forward to trying to work together collaboratively, understanding that there will be some robust discussion. And some of that robust discussion may be more animated than others. But at the end of the day, the core focus is we want to try to do something that has legs not just for now but for the future.

I am cognizant of the fact that learning to walk up steps and the stairs is difficult not just for dogs and babies but for all of us. And we can't necessarily seek to run full force especially if we're wearing slippers up the steps because we may fall down flat on our faces.

To the extent we can take this

opportunity to think about how do we do it, how do we do it carefully, responsibly and with due diligence so that we have a pathway here. Really with that, I think -- Are we done? Administrator.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Yes, thank you. Diane, first and foremost, thank you very much for your willingness to serve and lead this work group. I think it's terribly important and I very much appreciate your words.

You've been very adept. It's pulling together a number of the issues that are being placed on the table and helping guide the discussion already in the first meeting today.

But I wanted to thank each of you. I really meant my comments in the beginning of this session. This really is ground-breaking work that you're undertaking. I thank you for your time. I thank you for your energies that you're going to be devoting to this.

I really think that path forward that you've defined in taking this offline about

scoping the work of this committee is terribly important, understanding the governance of how you want to work and then also the governance of data is important and understanding how to do that in a system where obviously we've got some legal thresholds to be cognizant of as well.

But I do want -- I love the Teddy Roosevelt quote "Man in the Arena." You guys have stepped up. You're in the arena. And you're doing good. So I greatly appreciate the challenges that are ahead of you. I thank you for taking it on. Thank you.

And a big, huge thank you to the PHMSA team who literally work day and night. But I very much appreciate you all on short notice of coming and clearing your calendars for this first meeting. It really is an inaugural step forward.

I wish you all well. Congratulations.

CHAIR BURMAN: And with that, the meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:46 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: Voluntary Information-Sharing Working Group Meeting

Before: USDOT/PHMSA

Date: 12-19-16

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