

Rupture Mitigation

§§ 192.3, 192.615(a)(6), 192.620, 192.634(c) and (e), & 192.935(c)(1)

Committee Voting Slides



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

- Changing the definition of ‘rupture’ as recommended by PHMSA staff during this meeting and as presented in the slides.
- Eliminating the prescriptive 10-minute rupture identification.
- Requiring that valves be closed “as soon as practicable” within 30 minutes “of operator identification of a rupture.” Operators must document a method for rupture identification in their procedures manual.
- PHMSA will consider allowing valves to remain open during emergency situations as discussed during the meeting and as presented in the slides. PHMSA will review the issue of allowing certain valves to remain open during emergency situations based on the committee discussion and public comments and ensure that the integrity of the rule is not compromised and would minimize environmental damage.
- Allowing manual valves in non-HCA Class 1 locations only to exceed the 30-minute closure time requirement if the operator submits a notification, demonstrates that installing an ASV or RCV is economically, technically, or operationally infeasible, and provides a specific closure time.
- Revising applicable sections to eliminate duplication and improve readability.



Rupture Mitigation Valves

§§ 192.179(e), 192.634(a), (b), (e), & (h), & 192.935(c)



Committee Voting Slides

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to rupture mitigation valves, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Incorporating reporting requirements of § 192.18 into the final rule.
- Revising the final rule to designated a valve on crossover piping that is locked and tagged closed in accordance with operating procedures as a rupture mitigation valve.
- Revising the final rule to address applicability to multiple replacements that, in the aggregate, exceed 2 miles within 5 contiguous miles within a 24-month period.
- Adding specificity on standards for PHMSA review of 'other technology' and manual valve notifications. PHMSA will consider check valves as a mitigation technology.
- Changing the timeframe to activate Rupture Mitigation valves, after completion of construction, from 7 days to 14 days.
- PHMSA would consider exceptions for 1) pipelines with SMYS of 30% or less and 2) for all GT/GG lines with a PIR equal to or less than 150 feet, but not those within a Class 4 location, considering cost-benefit issues and while maintaining the integrity of the rule.
- PHMSA would support an exception for Type A gathering lines of 12 inches or less and Type B gathering lines. PHMSA will consider the appropriateness of applying this rulemaking, or a separate rulemaking, to gathering lines due to the lack of public notice.
- PHMSA change the implementation of the rule to 24 months after the publication date.



Valve Spacing, Location, Status Monitoring

§§ 192.179(e), 192.634(b), (f), (g) & 192.935(c)



Committee Voting Slides

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to valve spacing, location, and status monitoring, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Revising the rule to clarify that replacement projects in Class 1 and Class 2 locations outside of HCAs do not require rupture mitigation valves unless the replacement project involves a valve (i.e., “opportunistic” approach).
- Specifying that §192.634(b) does not apply to Class 1 and Class 2 pipelines outside HCAs and that spacing requirements in § 192.634 apply to replacement projects covered by § 192.179.
- Specifying in § 192.634(b) that the shutoff segment must contain the new or replaced Class 3, 4, or HCA segment.

(cont.)



Valve Spacing, Location, Status Monitoring

§§ 192.179(e), 192.634(b), (f), (g) & 192.935(c)



Committee Voting Slides

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to valve spacing, location, and status monitoring, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Specifying that rupture mitigation valves would not be required at the downstream termination of the pipeline.
- Specifying that operational block valves be permitted within a shutoff segment and rupture mitigation valves need not be the nearest valve to the shutoff segment.
- Specifying that ASV status need not be monitored if the operator can monitor pressures OR flows to be able to identify and locate a rupture (similar to manual valves).



Class Location Changes

§ 192.610



Committee Voting Slides

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to rupture mitigation valves for class location changes, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Valve spacing proposed in § 192.634 would be applicable to class location changes under § 192.610.
- Excluding pipeline replacements less than 1,000 ft. within one contiguous mile.
- For pipe replacements due to Class Location between 1,000 ft and 2 miles, allowing operators to automate existing valves with RCVs/ASVs and pressure sensors (with maximum spacing of 20 miles) consistent with the operational capability specified in § 192.634.
- PHMSA will consider implementing a timeframe of 24 months for the pipe replacement thresholds identified above.



Maintenance Requirements & Failure Investigation

§ 192.617, 192.745(c), (d), & (e)



Committee Voting Slides

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to maintenance requirements and failure investigations, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Deleting the requirement for point-to-point testing from § 192.745 (duplicates requirements in the control room management at § 192.631).
- Clarifying that implementation of lessons learned and additional P&M measures after incidents are required only where reasonable and practicable.
- Clarifying that annual drills apply to manually-operated valves only (either by manual operation of a local actuator or by hand), not to ASVs or RCVs.
- Specifying that 25% valve closure is sufficient to demonstrate successful completion of the response time validation drill. (cont.)



Maintenance Requirements & Failure Investigation

§ 192.617, 192.745(c), (d), & (e)



Committee Voting Slides – (Continued)

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to maintenance requirements and failure investigations, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Allowing notification by operators that justify a need to extend the timeframes for repair and establishing alternate rupture mitigation valves. PHMSA will consider adjusting the timeframe for repairs to 12 months but as soon as practicable.
- Specifying that alternate compliant valves would not be required to comply with spacing requirements.
- Specifying that § 192.617 (a) and (b), general failure investigations, would apply to distribution lines and paragraphs (c) and (d), failure investigations specific to rupture mitigation valves, would not apply to distribution lines.



Communications with 9-1-1

§§ 192.615(a)(2), (a)(6), (a)(8), (a)(11), & (c)



Committee Voting Slides

The proposed rule as published in the Federal Register and the Draft Regulatory Evaluation, with regard to communications with 9-1-1, are technically feasible, reasonable, cost-effective, and practicable, if the following changes are made:

- Stating that communication with 9-1-1 applies to all ruptures, without exception.
- Limiting § 192.615(a)(2) to emergency preparedness activities and § 192.615(a)(8) to emergency response activities.
- Including provisions for pipelines not located within 9-1-1 areas or that have no public safety answering points.
- Stating that operators may establish liaison with the appropriate local emergency response coordinating agencies, such as 9-1-1 emergency call centers or county emergency managers, in lieu of communicating individually with each fire, police, or other public entity.



Committee Report



Committee Voting Slides

The transcript of this meeting (duly recorded and accurately transcribed), together with the presentation slides documenting the committee's votes during this meeting, represent the report of this proceeding.

