

# Advisory Committee Voting Protocol

1/12/17



# Items for Voting

- Reassessment Period 6-Month Grace Period
- Safety Features for Pig Launchers/Receivers
- Provisions to Address Seismicity
- Inspections Following Extreme Events
- Management of Change



# Reports

The verbatim meeting transcript serves as the Committee report unless another document is provided by the membership.

The docket number for this meeting is  
**PHMSA-2016-0136.**



# Committee Action

- The Gas Pipeline Advisory Committee (GPAC) is to consider provisions proposed in the NPRM titled: “Safety of Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipelines” as published in the *Federal Register* (81 FR 20722) on April 8, 2016, for their technical feasibility, reasonableness, cost-effectiveness, and practicability.



# Chairman

- When a decision or recommendation of the Committee is required, the Committee Chair will request a motion for a vote.
- Any member, including the Committee Chair, may make a motion for a vote.
- A **quorum** is required for a vote - a majority of the current members of the Committee must be present at a meeting to perform the Committee's statutory duties.



# Statutory Language

- Committee Action: Members consider each proposed rule and the draft regulatory evaluation.
- The motion should include terminology from the Statute to indicate the committee has carried out its responsibilities.
- Motions must originate from and be seconded by members of the committee.



# 3 Options for Calling a Motion

- Agree as proposed.
- Not in agreement.
- Propose a change.



# Sample language – agree as proposed.

“The proposed rule as published in the *Federal Register* and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation **are technically, feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable.**”





# Sample language – not in agreement.

“The proposed rule as published in the *Federal Register* and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation **are not (or cannot be made)** technically, feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable.”



# Sample language – propose a change.

“The proposed rule as published in the *Federal Register* and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation are technically, feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable **if the following changes are made -**

**[members draft language they wish to propose.]**



# VOTING

1  
1



U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials  
Safety Administration

To Protect People and the Environment From the Risks of  
Hazardous Materials Transportation



# Voting Language for 6-Month Grace Period for Reassessments

## § 192.939

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to the provision for 6-month grace periods for the reassessment intervals, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable.

**GPAC - Voted**  
**Approved Language**  
**1/12/16**

1  
2



# Voting Language for Safety Features on Launchers and Receivers

## § 192.750

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to the provision for safety features on ILI launchers and receivers, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable.

**GPAC - Voted**  
**Approved Language**  
**1/12/16**

*Note: PHMSA clarified the rule language does not require “relief valves” or use “relief valve” as a term per the GPAC’s concerns.*

1  
3



# Voting Language for Seismicity

**§§ 192.917(a)(3); 192.917(b)(1)(xxxv); 192.935(b)(2)**

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to provisions for addressing seismicity, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective.

**GPAC - Voted**  
**Approved Language**  
**1/12/16**

1  
4



# Voting Language for Pipeline Inspections Following Extreme Events

## § 192.613

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to provisions for pipeline inspections following extreme events, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable if the following changes are made:

- Clarify that the timing in § 192.613(c)(2) begins after the operator has made a reasonable determination that the area is safe.
- Clarify in the preamble that operators are encouraged to consult with pipeline safety and public safety officials in order to make those determinations.
- Delete “whichever is sooner” at the end of §192.613(c)(2).
- Change the word “infrastructure” to “facilities” per the presentation slides.

**GPAC - Voted**  
**Approved Language**  
**1/12/16**

1  
5



# Voting Language for Management of Change

## §§ 192.911 & 192.13(d)

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to provisions for management of change, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable if the following changes are made:

- For non-IM assets, provide a 2-year phase-in period with a notification procedure for justified extensions.
- Clarify the requirement only covers significant changes that affect safety and the environment.
- Clearly state this requirement does not apply to distribution or gathering lines.

**GPAC - Voted**  
**Approved Language**  
**1/12/16**

