UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

VOLUNTARY INFORMATION-SHARING SYSTEM
WORKING GROUP

+ + + + +

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

APRIL 5, 2018

+ + + + +

The Voluntary Information-Sharing

System Working Group met in the Grand Ballroom of

the Hilton Arlington, 950 North Stafford Street,

Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., Christie

Murray, Designated Federal Official, presiding.n

PRESENT

DIANE BURMAN, Chair
ERIC AMUNDSEN, Member
KATE BLYSTONE, Member
BRYCE BROWN, Member
DAN COTE, Member
JASON CRADIT, Member
ALICIA FARAG, Member
MARK HERETH, Member
LEIF JENSEN, Member
WALTER JONES, Member
MICHAEL KELLER, Member (via teleconference)
MIKE LaMONT, Member
JOHN MacNEILL, Member
RANDY PARKER, Member
HOLLY PEAREN, Member
JOE SUBSITS, Member
CHRISTOPHER WARNER, Member
MARK ZUNIGA, Member

ALSO PRESENT

CHRISTIE MURRAY, Designated Federal Official
HOWARD "SKIP" ELLIOTT, PHMSA Administrator
AHUVA BATTAMS, PHMSA
SHERRY BORENER, PHMSA
JOHN DeLEEUW, American Airlines (via
      teleconference)
MICHELLE FREEMAN, PHMSA
MAX KIEBA, PHMSA
ERIKA LEE, Common Ground Alliance
KAREN LYNCH, PHMSA
HUNG NGUYEN, PHMSA
CHERYL WHETSEL, PHMSA

CONTENTS

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

2   8:31 a.m.

3   CHAIR BURMAN: So we're going to start

4   right now. I'm going to turn it over to Dr.

5   Christie Murray to get us started.

6   DR. MURRAY: Good morning, everyone.

7   Welcome and thank you for joining us at today's

8   Voluntary Information-Sharing System Working

9   Group Advisory Committee Meeting.

10   Are there any participants joining us

11   by phone and can you hear me?

12   MEMBER KELLER: Yes, I can hear you.

13   This is Mike Keller.

14   DR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you. Anyone

15   else on the line? Okay. So it's Mike Keller for

16   now. So thank you, Mike. We just wanted to

17   confirm that we did have our connection in place.

18   Also, were you able to open the PowerPoints we

19   sent last night, or did you get those PowerPoints

20   for the subcommittee report outs?

21   MEMBER KELLER: Yes, I got those

22   PowerPoints. Thanks.

1   DR. MURRAY: Okay, great. We do not

2   have a Skype line set up, Mike, but we could

3   certainly set one up for you. And I am also

4   going to email you the PowerPoint slides that

5   we're going to go through this morning if that

6   would be fine with you.

7   MEMBER KELLER: Yes, I think that

8   would be fine. Just let me know when you're

9   flipping slides and I can follow along.

10   DR. MURRAY: Absolutely. So thank

11   you, everyone, for joining. Under the Federal

12   Advisory Committee Act, my name is Christie

13   Murray and I will be serving as the Designated

14   Federal Official presiding over today's meeting.

15   From a housekeeping standpoint, I want

16   to remind everyone who's here where the restrooms

17   are located. If you go out the doors immediately

18   to my left, the women's restroom is straight

19   ahead. The men's restroom is adjacent across the

20   hallway to the left.

21   If you haven't already done so, for

22   those who are in the room, please silence your

1   mobile devices so that we can minimize

2   disruptions.

3   And for those participants from the

4   audience, thank you very much for joining us as

5   well. We'd ask that with your participation,

6   you'd hold your comments until we open the floor.

7   And as a reminder, please keep your comments

8   concise, less than five minutes. For those who

9   are interested, we will also be accepting written

10   comments and they can be submitted to the Docket

11   PHMSA-2016-0128.

12   The purpose of the Voluntary

13   Information-Sharing Group Advisory Committee is

14   really to fulfill Section 10 of the Protecting

15   our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing

16   Safety Act of 2016. Under that act -- and I'm

17   summarizing and generalizing. But under that

18   act, this group is required to consider the

19   development of a voluntary information-sharing

20   system to encourage collaboration across the

21   pipeline industry to improve inspection

22   information, information sharing with the

1   purposes of improving pipeline safety.

2   This group's main deliverable will be

3   to provide a recommendation report or

4   recommendations in general back to the Secretary

5   of Transportation. And I wanted to just note

6   that this group has a very aggressive schedule.

7   We are currently working to be able to have that

8   recommendation report developed and submitted to

9   PHMSA by December of 2018.

10   Back in November, the Advisory

11   Committee had a lot of discussion and voted on a

12   strategic mission statement. I'm not going to

13   read it in its entirety.

14   But I will highlight again that this

15   group is to provide recommendations to the

16   Secretary of Transportation on the development of

17   a secure voluntary information system that

18   encourages collection and analysis of integrity

19   inspection and other related information with the

20   hopes of improving pipeline safety or the gas

21   transmission, gas distribution, and hazardous

22   material pipelines in a measurable way.

1   The intent of the system that's under

2   consideration will be to provide a collaborative

3   environment that's proactive in nature. It can

4   facilitate technological advancements and

5   ultimately lead our industry to actionable

6   outcomes.

7   From a safety standpoint, again,

8   immediately to my left are four set of exit

9   doors. You can exit out of any of those doors.

10   There is a bit of construction going on out in

11   the main hallway, so you can take the stairs or

12   possibly the elevator if the elevators are

13   available and it's not a fire situation. Down to

14   the main lobby, out the front doors, and our

15   meeting place will be immediately across the

16   street from the hotel.

17   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Right now, we're

18   going to take attendance so we can establish a

19   quorum. We're going to start over here. If you

20   can just state your name, your title, and who you

21   represent.

22   MEMBER FARAG: Alicia Farag, President

1   of LocusView.

2   MEMBER MACNEILL: Scotty MacNeill,

3   National Safety Director for Utility Workers

4   Union of America.

5   MEMBER WARNER: Chris Warner, Senior

6   Vice President for Mears Group.

7   MEMBER JENSEN: Leif Jensen, Sunoco

8   Pipeline.

9   MEMBER COTE: Dan Cote, Consultant,

10   NiSource.

11   MEMBER CRADIT: Jason Cradit, Senior

12   Director of Technology for TRC.

13   MEMBER ZUNIGA: Mark Zuniga, Chief

14   Information Officer for UniversalPegasus.

15   MEMBER LAMONT: Mike LaMont, Vice

16   President, Integrity Plus.

17   MR. ELLIOTT: Good morning. Skip

18   Elliott, PHMSA Administrator.

19   CHAIR BURMAN: Diane Burman, New York

20   State Public Service Commission Regulator.

21   DR. MURRAY: Good morning. Christie

22   Murray with PHMSA, DFO for the Advisory

1   Committee.

2   MS. BATTAMS: Ahuva Battams, PHMSA

3   Pipeline Safety Attorney.

4   MR. NGUYEN: Hung Nguyen, Office of

5   Pipeline Safety, PHMSA.

6   MS. LYNCH: Karen Lynch, Office of

7   Pipeline Safety, PHMSA.

8   MS. WHETSEL: Cheryl Whetsel, Office

9   of Pipeline Safety, PHMSA.

10   MS. BORENER: Sherry Borener, Office

11   of Pipeline Safety, PHMSA.

12   MEMBER HERETH: Mark Hereth, Managing

13   Director of the Blacksmith Group and the current

14   chairman of the INGAA Foundation.

15   MEMBER PEAREN: Holly Pearen, Senior

16   Attorney, Environmental Defense Fund.

17   MEMBER SUBSITS: Joe Subsits,

18   Washington Utilities and Transportation

19   Commission representing state regulators.

20   MS. FREEMAN: Michelle Freeman, Office

21   of Pipeline Safety, PHMSA.

22   MEMBER BROWN: Bryce Brown, The ROSEN

1   Group, Vice President of Market Strategy

2   representing the industry and inspection

3   technology providers.

4   MR. KIEBA: Max Kieba, PHMSA, Office

5   of Pipeline Safety and also ADFO for best

6   practices.

7   MEMBER PARKER: Randy Parker, Vice

8   President of Regulatory Affairs for Kinder

9   Morgan.

10   MEMBER BLYSTONE: Kate Blystone,

11   Outreach Manager for the Pipeline Safety Trust

12   and representing the public.

13   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen,

14   Senior Vice President, Gas Operations, Energy

15   Transfer.

16   CHAIR BURMAN: Great. And those on

17   the phone?

18   MEMBER KELLER: Mike Keller, Professor

19   of Mechanical Engineering, University of Tulsa.

20   CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else on the

21   phone? Okay, great. And I'd just like to also

22   acknowledge we have some people in the audience

1   too, so thank you for being here.

2   Right now, there is an established

3   quorum, so I call this meeting of the Voluntary

4   Information-Sharing System Working Group

5   Committee to order.

6   Just a reminder, the meeting is being

7   recorded and a transcript will be produced for

8   the record. The transcript and the presentations

9   will be available on the PHMSA website and on the

10 eGov docket at www.regulations.gov, and the

11 docket number for this meeting is PHMSA-2016-

12 0136.

13   I'd also like to remind folks that to

14 introduce yourself each time you speak so your

15 comments can be acknowledged in the meeting

16 transcript. And set your card on its side if you

17 care to make your comment.

18   We will shortly review the agenda.

19 But before we do that, I'd just like to really

20 thank everyone for your participation. We really

21 have a full agenda today.

22   Yesterday, we spent time with the

1 subcommittees, and I really was very pleased to

2 see how really we took the charge of

3 collaboratively working together and moving

4 forward in trying to fulfill our obligation under

5 the statute. But also our obligation on the

6 intent of what we're trying to do is to work

7 together to create something that really can help

8 to facilitate our goal of improving pipeline

9 safety and making it even more real for us.

10   So with that, I'd like to turn the

11 floor over to PHMSA Administrator Elliott who's

12 here with us today to share his thoughts with us

13 today. So thank you.

14   MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Madam

15 Chairman, and good morning to all of you. I want

16 to first let you know that I will adhere to Dr.

17 Murray's orders to be very brief, so I will.

18   All I wanted to do today was come over

19 to thank you. This is my sixth month as PHMSA

20 Administrator. This is the second opportunity

21 I've had to attend one of these meetings. And of

22 all of the great opportunities I've had in my

1   time at PHMSA, I find that I look most forward to

2   the updates that I hear about this group because

3   it's such important work that you do. So my main

4   reason here today really is to say thank you and

5   to encourage you to please keep doing the good

6   work.

7   It's no secret that Secretary Chao's

8   main goal is safety. Safety will always be

9   number one of the Secretary. Safety will always

10 be number one with PHMSA.

11   My background in 40 years in the

12 railroad, I saw some things that I didn't like

13 very much, when we damaged the environment, when

14 we displaced people. And I think it's this type

15 of collaboration between industry, the public,

16 and the regulators that really will get us to new

17 and greater levels of collaboration, cooperation,

18 and safety.

19   The other part about this forum that

20 I really like is the exchange of ideas on

21 inspections and especially technology. I may

22 have been around for quite a while, but I'm smart

1 enough to know that I do think that a lot of that

2 additional little amount that we need to get to

3 that aspirational but I do think achievable goal

4 of zero incidents will take good work on the

5 research and development side, automation and

6 technology.

7 So the more that across the spectrum

8 of operators and research institution and

9 agencies such as PHMSA or DOT can share about

10 good ideas that will promote safety, we can never

11 do that enough. And you're a catalyst to make

12 sure that that communication, those open lines of

13 discussion will always be something that we will

14 look forward to doing at PHMSA. And if we can

15 move the ball forward by ensuring that we have

16 forums like this, then that's something we'll do.

17 But please, my heartfelt thanks for

18 the work you do. I know a lot of you come from

19 long distances to achieve what you do.

20 Everybody's perspective is important.

21 Everybody's perspective is important. So please

22 -- at least from what I hear anyway, you're not a

1 bashful group. So I ask you to make sure that

2 you're always representing your concerns and your

3 interests because that's what's going to make

4 this group as successful as it's been. So thank

5 you for your time.

6 And Madam Chairman, I'll turn it back

7 to you.

8 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you so much. So

9 now we're going to, right now, review the agenda

10 for today.

11 So we do have Committee business. I

12 guess first, we're going to have the aviation

13 speaker. Okay. We're going to do that. We're

14 going to talk about SMS. But then we're going to

15 have the subcommittee report outs.

16 We have seven subcommittees, the

17 Process Sharing, Mission and Objectives,

18 Regulatory, Funding, and Legal, Best Practices,

19 Reporting Technology, R&D, and Training

20 Qualification. All seven committees met

21 yesterday, some in groups, some solo. And so

22 we'll work through that and see from that.

1   From my perspective, what we're really

2   looking for with the report outs also is what is

3   helping to formulate the next steps but also

4   hearing what some of the challenges are, where

5   some of the common goals are, and also seeing

6   where we are needing more clarity and where we

7   might be getting tripped up and having discussion

8   around some issues that need further development

9   or needing the larger group to discuss and come

10   to either some consensus on or agreement that

11   we're not going to have consensus on and

12   understand how much more in the weeds we need to

13   be or how much we're getting too bogged in that.

14   From my perspective, also looking at

15   the gaps that may be there and understanding that

16   part of our role is to facilitate our moving

17   towards recommendations to the Secretary and

18   understanding that this is really a moving

19   towards a report that's then going to be used to

20   next actions and next steps so that the

21   facilitation is in looking at what this means for

22   a continually moving to something that then

1   becomes real.

2   So understanding that the development

3   of this is helping to develop a process that will

4   roll forward, understanding that there will be

5   many other voices that will be involved in that.

6   So needing to have some options and ability for

7   flexibility in there. But needing also to hear

8   from others -- in particular, the public -- to be

9   able to facilitate a product that works.

10   And that's really the goal towards

11   that and trying to anticipate that this should

12   not be a static report nor should it be a static

13   product. But including in that, the ability for

14   understanding that things will change and the

15   flexibility with that. So as we've heard about

16   the need for technology and the analytics that go

17   into that, it's very helpful.

18   One of the key things, I think, is

19   also the ability for trust and how to incorporate

20   that and the security of that trust and how do we

21   incorporate that. So those are some of the

22   things that we'll be looking at. And then after

1   we resolve all those issues, we take lunch.

2   (Laughter.)

3   CHAIR BURMAN: And then we go back to

4   the Committee business and we hear report out of

5   the Common Ground Alliance, again, a voluntary

6   reporting system.

7   This also will give us an opportunity.

8   I think many of us are aware of the reporting

9   system, but one of the key things for me in this

10   is, what are some of the things that are missing

11   or can be utilized for formulating other things

12   to incorporate in a voluntary system?

13   Again, it's not a one size fits all.

14   Different states do different things. But

15   looking at it and how does that help us? What's

16   different about it? How can we incorporate it?

17   And maybe that will help formulate some

18   opportunities for enhancements in what we're

19   doing in this working group.

20   And then we'll look at some governance

21   and IT architecture scope. To the degree that

22   we've taken care of that through our subcommittee

1   report outs, we may not need that and we may have

2   a fuller discussion and opportunity for time on

3   other issues that produce.

4   Then we'll have the committee

5   preparatory discussion. This is really sort of

6   the procedural process of, where are we? What

7   are the next steps?

8   We have a real big time line issue

9   substantively as well as process-wise. I'm very

10   much cognizant of the fact that we need to have

11   some clear guidelines in sticking to that because

12   otherwise we can get sidetracked very easily. So

13   I'm very much focused on never slipping from

14   those time lines and also being careful that we

15   incorporate substantively what we need to. So

16   that committee prep discussion will help us.

17   We will have meetings, a

18   teleconference in between our meetings as well as

19   a planning committee meeting with myself and Dr.

20   Murray and the subcommittee chairs to make sure

21   that we are all on track with what we need to do,

22   both substantively and process-wise. Then we'll

1   have an action item recap and closing remarks and

2   then we'll call it a day.

3   Hopefully, if we do all of this

4   quickly, we'll be done a little earlier. But we

5   also have a 5 o'clock deadline. It will be a

6   hard stop at 5. But I anticipate we might be

7   done a little earlier than that. So that's where

8   we are now, and I think we can move into general

9   announcements.

10   Thank you.

11   DR. MURRAY: All right. Well, first,

12 I want to start out with my announcements by

13 saying thank you. Over the last year and a

14 couple of months, we, as a body, have made

15 substantial progress. To think that this

16 advisory committee was just stood up in December

17 of 2016 really speaks to how much collaboration

18 and enthusiasm this group has put forward with

19 the work that we're seeing transpire.

20   Last night, I left here and went to my

21 15-year-old's freshman basketball banquet.

22 Almost didn't make it, but I made it. And he was

1   surprised to see me there because he didn't think

2   I would. But in those moments, it reminds you of

3   how critical and how important various events

4   are, just like this work we're doing. But I'm

5   glad I didn't miss this event because my son did

6   get MVP of his freshman basketball team which was

7   a surprise to him and me, so I was really

8   excited.

9   (Applause.)

10   DR. MURRAY: But the reason I'm

11 bringing it up is because as I sat there and I

12 was extremely excited about him, as I drive to

13 his banquet, I was extremely excited about the

14 work that we've been getting accomplished. And

15 so I thought about this group in terms of being

16 MVPs in the industry with what we're doing now.

17   So I just want to encourage you to

18 keep up the efforts. We're seeing a lot of great

19 ideas come out of the work we're doing. The

20 energy, the enthusiasm to work together. We're

21 asking phenomenal questions. We're bringing in

22 exceptional guest speakers to really help to

1   inform and advise what's going on with the

2   advisory committee. So I just really wanted to

3   say there's a lot of MVP work going on as a part

4   of this committee.

5   As we move forward, it's the natural

6   tendency to want to dig really deep into the

7   details. And so one of the things that we have

8   been continuously talking about is, how can we

9   set the framework for an unprecedented voluntary

10   information-sharing system in the pipeline

11   industry to improve safety and with the

12   recommendations allow for flexibility, creativity

13   in how it's developed and implemented?

14   So just a reminder and to share with

15   the public audience who didn't have the benefit

16   of being in the closed subcommittee meetings

17   yesterday, we talked a lot about staying at

18   somewhat of a higher level and not feeling like

19   we have to literally design the system itself.

20   It's difficult because I know there

21   are a number of technical individuals at the

22   table or those who have personalities that just

1   want to roll up your sleeves -- because I'm one

2   of them -- and get things done. But we have to

3   resist the urge of developing the solution but

4   create a framework that helps to empower what

5   we'll take place next.

6   So thank you for all your collective

7   efforts. There are some gaps that we've been

8   identifying. And I think it's fantastic to think

9   about those things, bring them up, have some

10   discussions so we can figure out how to mitigate

11   those.

12   But there's also some really great

13   integration that took place yesterday,

14   identifying ways that various subcommittees can

15   integrate where one subcommittee's boundaries

16   begin and where it ends and where another

17   subcommittee may pick it up.

18   So very encouraged by what we saw. A

19   lot more work to be done. I think we have the

20   right people involved. We'll continue to get

21   additional experts on the subcommittees to assist

22   with the work that you're doing.

1   For those who are interested, I know

2   that there were a number of questions about,

3   where can we find documents related to the

4   voluntary information-sharing effort? So I

5   wanted to make sure we touched on that.

6   The documents from each of the

7   advisory committee meetings are on PHMSA's

8   meeting registration page. And I've provided the

9   link in the PowerPoint presentation. When you

10   click on that link, it will take you to not just

11   all the VIS meetings but all of the PHMSA public

12   meetings that have been held.

13   And you can look for each of the

14   advisory committee meetings. And when you click

15   on that meeting registration link, it will

16   provide you the agenda, the transcript -- we'll

17   be posting the transcripts after the meetings

18   there -- all the presentations that we're able to

19   share, and more information and reference

20   material. Also, you can visit our PHMSA website

21   under the standards and rulemaking section and

22   you can see the official and view the official

1   voluntary information-sharing activities there as

2   well.

3   Also, as a general announcement, I do

4   want to remind everyone to save the date. It's

5   April and June will be here before you know it.

6   Our next meeting will be June 20th for the public

7   meeting. But the subcommittee will also be

8   meeting the day before on June 19th to continue

9   to advance the work that's taken place.

10   The location is still to be

11 determined. These meetings are happening so

12 quick. We're running alongside on planning, so

13 we're in the process of solidifying a meeting

14 location. And we'll provide that as soon as it's

15 available. Also, the meeting registration site

16 is open for those who are interested and what to

17 register for the upcoming meeting.

18   And if you're interested in the

19 meetings beyond the June meeting, we will be

20 meeting. We've set the dates for the remainder

21 of the year. So we'll be meeting in August on

22 August 23rd for the next public meeting and then

1 October 17th and December 19th, which if all goes

2 well in the crystal ball, we will be voting and

3 finalizing the recommendation report this group

4 is working so hard to produce. So exciting work,

5 aggressive schedule, but we have the right

6 people. So I'm confident it'll happen.

7 We do have a guest that will be

8 joining us. I don't know if he's -- he's joining

9 us by conference call. I'm not sure if he's

10 dialed in yet. So Mr. John DeLeeuw, are you on

11 the line? Okay. He's scheduled to dial in at 9.

12 It's about four minutes before 9, but I'll do a

13 little bit of setting the stage and hopefully

14 he'll dial in as I'm talking.

15 At our last advisory committee

16 meeting, we had the National Transportation

17 Safety Board join us and share their perspectives

18 on information sharing and some of the work

19 they've done with the aviation industry. And out

20 of that conversation, they recommended that we

21 reach out to Mr. John DeLeeuw who is a 787 pilot

22 for American Airlines. And he also serves as a

1   senior manager for flight safety at American

2   Airlines and he's been doing that for about five

3   years.

4   The purpose of his talk with us today

5   is really to introduce himself because we'd like

6   for him to come back at the June meeting and

7   really talk in more detail about his experiences.

8   He has had experiences with safety

9   data assurance programs such as the Flight

10 Operations Quality Assurance Program, the

11 Aviation Safety Action Program, some of which we

12 talked about yesterday with FAA. But he also

13 plays an integral part in integrating elements of

14 safety management systems at American Airlines.

15 And that is really the essence of what he will

16 share in his conversations, give more of a slant

17 to the safety management system component.

18   Yesterday, we had Captain Neil Raaz

19 join us who's also with American Airlines and

20 they co-presented with Warren Randolph with the

21 FAA. And that was a very insightful

22 conversation. So I'm looking forward to Mr.

1 DeLeeuw also sharing his insights.

2 Mr. DeLeeuw, is that you joining us?

3 MR. DELEEUW: That was just me joining

4 in. You said 8 o'clock, and I'm on time.

5 DR. MURRAY: All right. Perfect

6 timing. I was just setting the stage with you

7 being able to introduce yourself. I did share

8 just generally a little bit about your American

9 Airline background, and I shared with the group

10 that we're looking forward to having you come

11 face to face to our June meeting.

12 So with that, I'll turn it over to you

13 just for a quick introductory and maybe talk a

14 little bit about your interactions with safety

15 management systems.

16 MR. DELEEUW: Perfect, okay. Well,

17 welcome, everybody. Thanks for letting me join

18 in.

19 So my background is I was a military

20 pilot for nine years and then I've been with

21 American for 28. In the period of that, I've

22 always been involved in safety. And about eight,

1   nine years ago, I was the manager of safety for

2   all of American Airlines aviation side. So that

3   included programs like ASAP -- which we'll

4   discuss a little bit -- and FOQA and LOSA. These

5   are all -- I know they're all acronyms, but

6   they're all safety programs.

7   So I ran the safety role at American

8   for about five years. But in addition to that, I

9   do teach the SMS program at the University of

10   Southern California Aviation Safety School. I do

11   that about once a month, and I'm quite involved

12   with the oil and gas industry with establishing a

13   similar type Aviation Safety Action Program in

14   the oil and gas world, particularly on a deep

15   water rig in the Gulf of Mexico and that type of

16   thing.

17   So that's kind of my background. I'm

18   currently a 787 pilot. I fly typically from

19   Dallas to China and so I get to practice what I

20   preach, I guess.

21   But the big thing that's changed in

22   aviation -- and which is why I think you'd

1   probably like to chat with me, I guess -- is that

2   back in '93, the airline started something called

3   the Aviation Safety Action Program which came

4   actually something out of the nuclear industry.

5   And it has been highly successful over the last

6   20-plus years.

7   And nowadays, as an airline, you won't

8   find an airline that doesn't have an ASAP -- we

9   call ASAP program. So it's highly effective and

10   it has been a culture change. And it has been

11   the change that's made safety so -- to the degree

12   that it is now in the airline industry.

13   It's been nine years that we've had an

14   aviation accident of what we call Part 121 or a

15   commercial air carrier. So in the last nine

16   years, there's been no passenger fatalities in

17   the United States from an American carrier. We

18   did have Asiana and UPS had an accident, but

19   there's been no passenger fatalities. So the

20   safety record is pretty awesome right now.

21   So that's kind of my background and my

22   intro, and I can go from there if you like.

1   DR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you, John.

2   Are there any questions from the

3   committee to John initially considering he will

4   be back in June?

5   CHAIR BURMAN: Dan?

6   MEMBER COTE: This is Dan Cote. Just

7   a question, Captain. In terms of the evolution

8   of your voluntary -- or the airline industry

9   evolution of the voluntary information-sharing

10 program, how would you fit that into the

11 evolution of the safety management systems that

12 the airlines have adopted? Were those concurrent

13 and driven by the same fundamental causes, or

14 were those pretty much separate?

15   MR. DELEEUW: No, that's a great

16 question. So ASAP -- which is the acronym for

17 the Aviation Safety Action Program. ASAP really

18 got started in '93. But the SMS program, the

19 Safety Management System, really which was

20 adopted by ICAO, the FAA finally joined on board

21 about 10, 12 years ago and started the process in

22 making sure all the carriers were going to be SMS

1   compliant which, by the way, March of this past

2   years was the due date and almost all the

3   carriers are there.

4   But part of SMS -- and there's really

5   four components to SMS. You have safety policy.

6   You have safety risk. You have safety assurance,

7   and then you have safety promotion. So those

8   four components make up the SMS pillars we call

9   them. And ASAP falls in the safety assurance

10   component.

11   And so ASAP was already here. So when

12   SMS became part of the world of aviation, one of

13   the requirements for SMS is to have a voluntary

14   confidential reporting program. Since ASAP was

15   already up and running and had been for some

16   time, it just naturally flowed into one of the

17   components of SMS.

18   But the ASAP program, because of when

19   it started, it's probably responsible for pushing

20   the SMS programs to be formalized in the aviation

21   world. Because prior to that, I don't think you

22   could've really said you had a voluntary

1   confidential program.

2   But because ASAP was up and running

3   and going very strong, it just made it easier for

4   the SMS implementation. Because if they were

5   totally started at the same time, not only would

6   you have to start an SMS program, you'd also have

7   to start a voluntary confidential program. And

8   the two of them together might not have gelled

9   completely.

10   But fortunately, there was already --

11   the car was already pretty much built when SMS

12   got started. And so to answer your question, so

13   they were separate. But the ASAP program is part

14   of one of the components of SMS and there's

15   several of them. But that is probably the

16   biggest driver. And if we did not have a robust

17   voluntary confidential program, the SMS program

18   would not work very well. In fact, it would not

19   be able to survive in my opinion.

20   Because in the ASAP world, the thing

21   about that's made the airlines different -- and

22   it's been a culture change -- is that without the

1 employees reporting problems confidentially and

2 voluntarily, you really miss where the hazards

3 are at. Because I was in management, so I get

4 this. Even though I'm still flying, it's hard to

5 find where things are not working right. And if

6 people think they're getting in trouble, they're

7 certainly not going to report it.

8   If there's a culture where it says,

9 look, you report your problem. And unless you

10 were using alcohol, drugs, or substance abuse or

11 you were lying or you intentionally did

12 something, we're going to accept your report.

13 And if you get your report accepted, the FAA will

14 not do anything to your certificate. The company

15 will not discipline you.

16   And so therefore, there's every

17 incentive for the employees to say, hey, you're a

18 problem that I see. And so when we started in

19 '93, we might have got -- I think we received,

20 like, one report the first month. And over time,

21 I mean, at American Airlines -- last year at

22 American, they received 13,000 reports in one

1   year. Delta receives 14,000. Southwest had

2   10,000.

3   So when you think of all the airlines

4   getting all these reports in, we're fixing stuff

5   way before there's ever an accident happening

6   because we've already seen the noise out there, I

7   call it, prior to accidents and incidents

8   happening. So that's the difference.

9   And so without a culture where people

10   feel free to report problems without fear of

11   retribution, you couldn't fix things because you

12   wouldn't know what was broken. And so that is

13   what allows -- that the method that works so

14   effectively because the SMS program, they're

15   working great. And the reason it's working so

16   good is because we're having these employees

17   report their problems.

18   So it's kind of a long answer, but I

19   hope that answered your question.

20   MEMBER COTE: It did very well. Thank

21   you.

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else have any

1   questions in the audience? Okay.

2   MR. DELEEUW: So if this will help,

3   the petroleum -- the oil and gas industry,

4   particularly the drilling industry and the

5   Chevrons and Exxons, they have a lot of incidents

6   on the rigs such as the deep water rigs. And

7   when they ship out a deep water rig, I mean, it's

8   costing these guys a million dollars a minute to

9   operate these things.

10   So they're very sensitive to any kind

11   of injuries, certainly any accidents. And so

12   over the years, I've been preaching the gospel in

13   ASAP, I guess I'd call it. And now they've taken

14   quite a bit of interest.

15   So we're looking to start a petroleum

16   safety action program. And I've met with the

17   director of BSEE which is the Bureau of Safety

18   and Environmental Enforcement which regulates the

19   oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico. And there's

20   starting to be some traction to that. I think

21   it's just a matter of time before they kind of

22   jump on board and do that same thing.

1   So there are different industries that

2   are looking at it. In my opinion, in about 30

3   years, the medical industry will have something

4   like this, the oil and gas industry will,

5   probably the pipeline industry will because it's

6   no longer a -- we don't want employees who know

7   problems not to report them because of fear of

8   retribution.

9   And I think that's the big safety

10   culture change that's happened in the airlines,

11   if that will kind of help where I'm pushing this

12   thing to.

13   CHAIR BURMAN: Mark?

14   MEMBER HERETH: Mark Hereth with the

15   Blacksmith Group. Thank you for your comments

16   and thank you for taking the time today, John.

17   Could you give us some thoughts on the

18   things that you think are really important as we

19   would stand up a voluntary information-sharing

20   and particularly how we can draw on safety

21   management systems to help us in that?

22   MR. DELEEUW: Well, so part of a

1   safety management system, if you're going to

2   manage safety -- which is ultimately what you're

3   going to do -- the whole idea behind management

4   safety is to identify hazards. And once the

5   hazard has been identified, do you find ways to

6   mitigate the risk of these particular hazards?

7   So the whole SMS program, like I said,

8   hinges on determining where the hazards are.

9   Because if you're going to do a policy or

10   procedural change or you find a control you have

11   that's no longer effective, you've got to do a

12   safety risk assessment to reassess the risk

13   that's available to the organization. And I've

14   got plenty of examples which when I see you in

15   June, I can go into those in detail.

16   But at the end of the day, it's just

17   a formalized way to manage risk that's

18   identified. Here's the big key, though, is if

19   you don't know the hazards that are out there,

20   it's hard to manage hazards that are unknowable.

21   And that's why the ASAP program is so

22   critical because the employees end up buying --

1   not because you're selling them a product that

2   doesn't work. They're buying into the fact that

3   management is saying or the government is saying,

4   look, we want to help manage risk because all of

5   us want to go home at the end of the day to momma

6   and papa or go home to see your kids.

7   And that's the goal of this. It's not

8   some new program out there. We're not trying to

9   do some sort of -- another feel good safety

10   survey. No, we truly want to manage our safety

11   programs.

12   So I think that that's kind of the

13   key. But SMS as a whole, the advantage of an SMS

14   program, though, if that's what's going to be

15   instituted, you are having a much smarter way to

16   manage your safety programs. Because when you

17   have a new boss, then somebody wants to always

18   change something. Somebody says, oh, I know a

19   better way to do it.

20   If you have an SMS program, everything

21   that you've made, all the changes you've done,

22   it's all been documented and it's all been

1   formally -- it's all formally documented and you

2   keep these controls in place.

3   So you don't just make changes because

4   someone says, oh, I think it's a better idea.

5   No, let's do a risk assessment. Let's look at

6   the identified risk and let's find ways that

7   we're going to mitigate it.

8   So it's more formalized. So I find it

9   -- I think SMS is a great tool for large

10   organizations or certainly large industries

11   because it does allow you to discuss, formally

12   look at any kind of change you're going to make

13   and it's not just somebody at a whim making a

14   decision.

15   Does that answer your question, or do

16   want it a little more specific than that?

17   MEMBER HERETH: Yes, and I really

18   appreciate that latter point. That's really,

19   really critical. Thank you very much. And by

20   the way, I love those 787s. Those are great

21   planes.

22   MR. DELEEUW: They're a great

1   airplane. And when I see you in June, I'll tell

2   you how SMS helped design that airplane actually.

3   Because we used lessons learned in the industry

4   and rather than make the same mistakes they had

5   in the past, they learned from their mistakes and

6   it affected the way they designed that airplane.

7   But thanks for the information on

8   that. I love that airplane. It'll be the last

9   plane I fly, I can tell you that.

10   DR. MURRAY: Thank you very much,

11   John. We appreciate you joining us today. We

12   look forward to having you come back and met you

13   face to face and continue the dialogue.

14   I will tell you that the work that I

15   think that the pipeline industry is undertaking

16   with this information-sharing system effort is

17   really a signature SMS initiative. When you talk

18   about SMS at an organizational level and then you

19   amplify it to an industry level, we're really

20   excited and encouraged that this is a unique

21   opportunity for this industry to take on looking

22   at SMS in a different way in terms of voluntary

1   information sharing.

2   So we appreciate your insights. Thank

3   you for taking the time this morning. And I'll

4   coordinate with you, and we'll continue to make

5   plans to see you in person in June.

6   MR. DELEEUW: That'll be great. I

7   appreciate the opportunity to do this. When I

8   talk to you, I'll probably ask to invite my

9   colleague who is the SMS manager for American

10   Airlines so you have an SMS manager. She used to

11   work with me, so she's very knowledgeable.

12   So you'd have the ability to have the

13   SMS manager who does their assessments and you've

14   got someone on me who's done the safety side of

15   it. So you'll have two people that can really

16   show you how the system works and can answer all

17   of your questions. So we could probably work

18   something out then.

19   DR. MURRAY: All right. Fantastic.

20   We appreciate it, and enjoy the rest of your day.

21   MR. DELEEUW: Thank you very much.

22   I'll look forward to your email later. We'll

1   keep talking, and I look forward to seeing

2   everybody in June.

3   DR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you.

4   MR. DELEEUW: Thank you. Good

5   morning, everybody.

6   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, great. So now,

7   we're going to be going to the subcommittee

8   report outs, and I'm going to turn it over to Dr.

9   Murray.

10   DR. MURRAY: Thank you. So I want to

11   just go back and continue to make sure that

12   because we have been working with the

13   subcommittees actively as an advisory committee

14   and inviting external members, I want to make

15   sure that I normalize out the discussion for the

16   public participants and to just describe why we

17   have subcommittees.

18   So with the short time frame -- an

19   aggressive time frame that we have, there is a

20   lot of substantive detail that needs to be

21   flushed out concurrently. And the seven

22   subcommittees that have been approved and voted

1 on will help the parent committee to be able to

2 do just that.

3 And so what you see depicted here on

4 the screen, it's just a reminder of how it all

5 will fit together. So the parent committee

6 really sets the stage for what the scope and

7 framework for the recommendations will be and get

8 organized.

9 And then we created back in December

10 of January a report outline. It's really just a

11 framework of some of the high-level topical

12 matters that, at a minimum, we want to make sure

13 are addressed. Those that are a priority are

14 those that specifically come from Section 10 of

15 the mandate. And from that, we built other

16 report topics around those.

17 And then we created the subcommittees

18 who will help to inform the recommendation

19 report. Just a reminder that subcommittees don't

20 make recommendations directly to PHMSA or the

21 Secretary of Transportation. They can only make

22 recommendations to the parent Voluntary

1   Information-Sharing Advisory Committee.

2   So what the committee did in our last

3   meeting in February -- the February 28th meeting

4   -- was to hear from each subcommittee -- all

5   seven subcommittees who presented a task

6   statement. The task statement describes what the

7   subcommittee is authorized to focus on. Anytime

8   there are changes or need to modify the task

9   statement, the subcommittees must come back to

10   the parent committee for approval before

11   initiating new or different work.

12   The subcommittees will continue to

13   work between now and the end of the year to

14   develop recommendations, help to draft potential

15   proposed sections of the report and will be

16   reporting out to the full parent committee. So

17   at each of our advisory committee meetings,

18   moving forward this year, subcommittees will be

19   hearing what's taking place in their offline

20   meetings and also coming forward with

21   recommendations.

22   I suspect that from now through the

1   end of the year, we will get recommendations that

2   may feed into the report at different intervals.

3   So we could get them all at once when we have a

4   draft report, or subcommittees might actually

5   come forward when they have tangible

6   recommendation items to bring to the parent

7   committee and get those voted on individually so

8   that they can go and have some confidence that

9   it'll be supported and they have buy-in going

10   into writing the full report.

11   One of the things I do want to

12   encourage the subcommittees to think about as

13   we're approaching May, June, July and the time

14   frame will soon come upon us to start working on

15   drafting the report is work to draft sections of

16   the report as you go along. There may be some

17   sections that you have at least a framework

18   around. Start thinking about what language that

19   might be and not necessarily wait until July,

20   August when the first draft is due to say, oh, we

21   better put pen to paper.

22   So use the time wisely. I know

1   there's a lot of information and fact finding and

2   case studies and best practice type information

3   we're getting. But please use the time to say,

4   you know what. I think we have enough teeth on

5   this particular matter to at least draft the

6   framework. So I would just encourage that.

7   Here, it just depicts -- and I haven't

8   updated the committee member number. But it just

9   depicts the type of subcommittees that we have.

10   And I'm not going to read those off. And then

11   what PHMSA has done is we have assigned an

12   alternate designated federal official to support

13   and lead each subcommittee from PHMSA's

14   perspective. And then we have volunteers from

15   this parent committee who have agreed to chair

16   each subcommittee.

17   Each subcommittee must have members of

18   the parent committee on all the subcommittees or

19   a subcommittee cannot exist. So we can't

20   feasibility have a subcommittee that does not

21   have parent committee meetings essentially.

22   Then there are a few of us who are

1   floating. Alan Mayberry, who could not join us

2   today due to another conflict in Oklahoma, sends

3   his regards. But Alan, myself, Commissioner

4   Burman, and Ahuva Battams -- which is from our

5   Chief Counsel's office, she's sitting to my left

6   -- we are considered floaters.

7   So as the subcommittees meet each day

8   or with all of their face-to-face meetings, we

9   float between subcommittee meetings to address

10   process questions, any substantive questions,

11   integration questions, help to resolve any

12   conflict, remove barriers. So we really hope to

13   provide insight to all of the subcommittees.

14   Yes, Ahuva wants to make a comment.

15   MS. BATTAMS: Just quickly and I do

16   want to remind everybody that if a legal issue

17   comes up in your subcommittee and I'm not there

18   or Amal Deria, the other attorney that assists

19   with this committee, you can feel free to call us

20   or email us and we will address that question as

21   soon as we are able.

22   DR. MURRAY: Thank you for that. So

1   what have we been doing since we established the

2   subcommittees? When we first kicked off our

3   subcommittees through a conference call back in

4   February.

5   And then as I mentioned, we held the

6   first face-to-face meeting in Arlington on

7   February 27th where the committee started to

8   organize its operations. They developed and

9   voted on task statements on the 28th, the next

10   day, and then identified external members that

11   may be needed or expertise needed for each

12   subcommittee.

13   And then yesterday, we had our second

14   face-to-face meeting here to continue to advance

15   the efforts with the reporting recommendations

16   and to identify integration areas and gaps. We

17   had two presentations yesterday or discussions.

18   We had one with the FAA to talk about their

19   voluntary information-sharing system. And then

20   we had MITRE come in to talk about information

21   sharing, data analysis, and the IT infrastructure

22   and architecture side of developing an

1   information-sharing system.

2   This, you cannot see it. At least I

3   can't see it very well from where I am. So I

4   suspect you might not be able to too unless

5   you're sitting where Eric is sitting. But this

6   is just a depiction of the parent committee

7   members and the PHMSA support staff who support

8   the subcommittees right now.

9   And here, I just wanted to just

10   provide a little bit of visibility into what the

11   subcommittees are asking for in terms of external

12   membership expertise. Those that are in green

13   have already been brought forward for requested

14   approval.

15   So we had our attorney's office do a

16   quick vetting. And so those that are in green

17   have been cleared through our attorney's office

18   and also approved by Commissioner Burman which is

19   the chair of the advisory committee and myself

20   serving as the DFO.

21   Those that are listed proposed -- for

22   example, process sharing still has a need for

1   some additional external members. And I'm not

2   going to read each committee's members and their

3   interest. But I just want to highlight there are

4   some individuals that are in the process of being

5   vetted and approved currently. And then some

6   subcommittees are still identifying people by

7   name who they would like to join.

8   So I just wanted to provide some

9   visibility. And there were three, four, five --

10   two subcommittees that at this time did not need

11   any additional external members. And that would

12   be the Mission and Objectives Subcommittee and

13   the Training and Qualifications Subcommittee.

14   But that could change as new things may emerge.

15   Does anyone have any questions about

16   what's being depicted? Just to give you a little

17   bit of insight. So as we're considering, how

18   will this report be laid out, a couple of things

19   to know. It will have a basic structure as you

20   may have seen with many other reports where you

21   have your front matter, key terms, acronyms,

22   introduction, background. But the key essence,

1   the real substantive content will be in the

2   information-sharing topical areas and then we'll

3   follow that by findings, conclusions, and et

4   cetera.

5   Our Reporting Subcommittee will be

6   providing samples of other reports that have been

7   written by other organizations with

8   recommendations and so forth so that the group

9   can just kind of get a feel for how it was

10   organized, what level of detail was provided the

11   reports so that you have a little bit -- a couple

12   of different examples to look and pull from.

13   And then also, this you probably

14   can't read very well, but it'll be clearer as you

15   reference the actual PowerPoint presentation.

16   But this is just a depiction of you have your

17   report sections on the left. We will be revising

18   this and updating it.

19   But to the right of that, you'll have

20   the committee or subcommittee who's going to be

21   responsible for those topical areas. And this is

22   that information topical area section I talked

1   about that's the substantive part of the

2   document.

3   And then we said, well, you know what.

4   Let's put a time line with what we'd like to get

5   accomplished over the next year or between now

6   and December to make sure that we stay on track

7   with completing these sections.

8   So you'll see that starting at Item 6,

9   there's a lot of work that's starting to take

10   place that started in February. And we suspect

11   between now and July many of the sections -- a

12   lot of the substantive information will begin to

13   get flushed out.

14   And as you can see here starting with

15   Item 13 and around the July-August time frame is

16   when we're expecting the initial recommendations

17   and findings to start to emerge and come forward.

18   We can also parallel that work and work on the

19   key terms, conclusions.

20   So the Reporting Committee will be

21   doing some parallel work as the other committees

22   are working. They'll be setting the structure

1 for the report and getting some of the sections

2 written that we have enough background

3 information to do so.

4   But an important date to me would be

5 Item 15 where the initial recommendation report

6 will be drafted. And we're looking at around

7 August-September time frame to have the initial

8 report drafted. So between now, which is April,

9 and September, there's going to be a lot of key

10 work taking place in the subcommittees and with

11 the parent committee to be honest.

12   And moving from there, there'll be a

13 few iterations of review and comment, updating

14 the draft recommendation report. Ultimately,

15 we'll be bringing the final report back to the

16 parent committee and the December meeting that we

17 hope will get approved with maybe some minor

18 changes. Hopefully, it's not major changes but

19 minor changes or approved as-is.

20   But whatever the committee's desire,

21 we're not going to predetermine what that'll be.

22 But we will plan to bring that forward to have it

1 voted on by the parent committee. And by

2 December, we would like to have that report

3 submitted to PHMSA and ultimately to the

4 Secretary of Transportation.

5   I do want to talk a little bit about

6 how that process will work because the success of

7 the advisory committee will be meeting that

8 December time line with a final report

9 recognizing that PHMSA will accept the report,

10 review the report.

11   One of the concerns that we have heard

12 about is, what will PHMSA do with the report?

13 Will PHMSA change the report, modify the report?

14 And that's not PHMSA's intent. PHMSA's intent is

15 to review the report and to draft a complementary

16 letter to support the report going to the

17 Secretary.

18   If there are things that may need to

19 be notated from our perspective, it would be in

20 our draft memo, not making substantive changes to

21 the actual recommendation report. The report

22 itself will go up to the Secretary with PHMSA's

1   memo, a memo signed by the chair, Diane Burman,

2   from this committee and the actual report itself.

3   Now we will turn it over. I will stop

4   talking which I'm happy to do so and turn it over

5   to the subcommittees.

6   CHAIR BURMAN: And so just before we

7   go on to that, we have seven. And we have about

8   20 minutes for each, give or take a little bit.

9   So just sticking to our process, just look at

10   that.

11   So we're going to go with the Process

12   Sharing Subcommittee first, and we're going to

13   end with the Reporting one because I think that

14   one is more about the structure of the report.

15   So it just seemed the most natural. Okay. All

16   right.

17   So we want to start off with the

18   Process Sharing Subcommittee.

19   MEMBER HERETH: Okay. This is Mark

20   Hereth of the Blacksmith Group. I'm the chairman

21   of that subcommittee. If you'll go to the next

22   slide, please. That's simply a listing of our

1   subcommittee members, and I won't go through

2   that. You've seen that before. Go ahead,

3   please.

4   This next page provides a summary of

5   some of our recent activities and I'll highlight

6   these. Our subcommittee -- and we were joined by

7   members of the Technology Subcommittee, members

8   of the Best Practices Subcommittee, and also

9   Training and Qualification because we had

10   business we wanted to conduct yesterday jointly.

11   We did have a presentation initially

12   by the MITRE Corporation which was outstanding.

13   They're the third party that manages the ASIAS

14   system for the FAA. They provided perspectives

15   on security, de-identification, analysis and

16   evaluation of data and information as well on

17   just general process sharing.

18   It was really built around Q&A which

19   I think all of us felt was really helpful. And

20   they discussed the diversity of data that's

21   managed, I think, which was really important. So

22   they talked about voice data. They talked about

1 structured data, unstructured data, narrative

2 types of information. And boy, that was really

3 eye opening and very helpful.

4   In the course of our meeting

5 yesterday, we held a discussion on possible gaps

6 in, potentially, our scope. We had raised this

7 earlier. It turns out that governance that was

8 something that we thought was missing. And so we

9 actually had Dan Cote come in from Mission and

10 Objectives and had a discussion about that.

11   And through the course of our

12 discussion, suggested that that might be best

13 carried forward by Mission and Objectives, and

14 we'll leave Dan to discuss that this morning.

15 But we had a good discussion regarding that and

16 the importance of it. And I'm going to talk

17 about that a little bit more in a second.

18   We did meet with members of the

19 technology subcommittee yesterday. Actually, in

20 the afternoon because our time with MITRE was

21 quite extensive but of great value.

22   We really looked to clarify the scope

1   of both subcommittees to make sure that we didn't

2   have ineffective overlap. And where we had some

3   overlap that we were going to actually come at

4   things from different perspectives and then

5   create a better product that way. So I think

6   that was a good discussion yesterday, and Bryce

7   may choose to add something later on. But I

8   think that really helped both groups.

9   One of the outcomes that came out of

10   that was the expressed expectation that the

11   Process Sharing Subcommittee would produce a

12   listing and initial kind of taxonomy for the

13   types of data that would be shared, both

14   collected -- shared in terms of collecting it and

15   put it into a voluntary information system and

16   then also sharing that information back out to

17   various stakeholders.

18   So we're going to build -- we talked

19   about this in an earlier meeting. We're going to

20   build a map which maps data types to

21   stakeholders. And you'll hear more about that in

22   the future. If you could go down just a touch.

1   We had planned to talk about final

2 product concepts. Our alternate designated

3 federal officer has been very helpful in helping

4 us see that we need to think about where we're

5 going and what our end product is going to look

6 like.

7   So I understand that we're going to

8 have some discussions with the chairman and Dr.

9 Murray in the future to go through that. And

10 we're very anxious to hear about that because we

11 really do -- one of the things we talked about

12 yesterday is we actually want to begin to write

13 after talking with you all because that will also

14 help us identify gaps as we write. So I think

15 that's a really, really key point.

16   I think Dr. Murray provided a great

17 update on the membership status, so I won't

18 elaborate on that anymore. And if we go to the

19 next slide.

20   In terms of our future business, we

21 have spoken with Dr. Drew Hevle of Kinder Morgan

22 to come in and talk to us about 1163. He's set

1 up and ready to do that. We're going to schedule

2 that in a webinar. I'm going to discuss, Dr.

3 Murray, with you and the chairman. You may want

4 to see that presentation at the committee level

5 as well. It's so central to what we'll be doing.

6 I think there's great value in that.

7   We're going to schedule a series of

8 WebEx meetings between sessions, and we've talked

9 about a couple different things, a couple of

10 which will come up here. We'll talk about end

11 product expectations as I spoke about earlier.

12 We're also going to ask Chris Warner who's a

13 member of the main committee who works for Mears

14 to come in and talk about direct assessment.

15   So we've had prior presentations on

16 in-line inspection. There was some interest

17 expressed yesterday about direct assessment. And

18 actually, we'll invite anyone that would like to

19 participate in that to hear that even though it

20 will done under the auspices of process sharing.

21   I know Chris will do a great job

22 there. His company was involved in developing DA

1 standards, applies the DA process, the four-step

2 process, routinely. And then I'm hoping that

3 we'll have involvement from Dan Cote and others

4 via phone that can weigh in from an operator's

5 perspective. And that last one is redundant, so

6 I apologize for that.

7 Then just one other topical area that

8 I wanted to go through, if you go to the next

9 slide, is Eric Amundsen and I -- and some of you

10 guys saw this yesterday. Eric and I, in the

11 course of looking at potential overlap issues

12 between the Process Sharing and the Best

13 Practices Subcommittees began to develop a view

14 of where we think the voluntary information-

15 sharing might go.

16 And across the top in those blue

17 boxes, what we did is we depicted all of the

18 ongoing activities that where voluntary

19 information-sharing has undertaken today. Now,

20 it's largely within trade organizations, although

21 we do reflect labor unions there which are very,

22 very important as well.

1   One of the things that we wanted to

2   show in this is there are a lot of things going

3   on. One of the opportunities here is to

4   capitalize on those without disrupting what

5   they're currently doing.

6   So for example, what's done in AGA or

7   API or APGA or INGAA, those can continue to be

8   done in the way that they're done. But to figure

9   out how to draw the lessons learned out of those

10   and bring those into a voluntary information-

11   sharing system.

12   We have PHMSA investigations and

13   enforcement. And if you've ever looked at some

14   of the investigation reports that PHMSA staff do,

15   they're quite extensive and have a lot of detail

16   in them. PHMSA research and development provides

17   some perspectives, also NTSB investigations.

18   Then on the right-hand side in the tan

19   or brown colors, we've got the PRC Technology

20   Development Center, projects that PRCI has, an

21   ILI assessment. We also list GTI because GTI has

22   a bunch of integrity management assessment

1 | validation work going on, some of which is in DA

2 | as well as ILI.

3 | We're going to hear later today from

4 | the Common Ground Alliance. And so for those of

5 | you who saw this yesterday, you can see that

6 | we're trying to be fleet-of-foot and enhance this

7 | diagram as we learn things.

8 | So I think the CGA is going to talk

9 | about their DIRT database today. But we have a

10 | huge opportunity to also hear about how they

11 | evolved from where they started in the late '90s

12 | I believe it was to where they are today and

13 | really learn from that in a big picture sense as

14 | well. And we also have the standards developing

15 | organizations of NACE and API and ASNT and others

16 | and AGA develops standards as well. So those

17 | organizations play a key role in what we do

18 | today.

19 | And then across the bottom just real

20 | quickly we've laid out that pitch-and-catch

21 | relationship that really exists under a framework

22 | of API 1163 which is all about validation and

1   really sharing of information to improve and

2   validate the ILI process. So if you go to the

3   next diagram.

4   Then what we tried to do was really

5   look at, how can we take the lessons learned --

6   and this is really just a depiction -- from each

7   of these sources of lessons learned and discrete

8   data and bring these into what we call the

9   voluntary information-sharing hub? And this is

10   in your package, so you can read the small words

11   that exist in that circle there. Somebody

12   reminded me yesterday that really looks like a

13   PDCA, a plan-do-check-act or a plan-do-check-

14   adjust circle that we often see in an SMS system.

15   So that's the visual way to think

16   about how we might start thinking about this hub.

17   And when you do that, there's a lot of different

18   kinds of data. There's a lot of different

19   sources of data. And so it really -- but we felt

20   as though it provided a means to have discussions

21   and to push this work along. And if you go to

22   the next slide.

1   So that's inputs, then the next thing

2   we did -- and we definitely heard this loud and

3   clear from members of our subcommittee as well as

4   in the main committee -- that we have

5   stakeholders -- and I show binoculars here

6   because we have stakeholders who want to have a

7   view where they can also see what we're learning

8   and then what they might want to learn out of

9   this process.

10   And so we've got the public of which

11   our most prominent members are PST and EDF. But

12   as I've talked about with Kate this morning, we

13   want that public to be bigger and more robust in

14   terms of what they see and how they see it.

15   We've got pipeline operators, assessment

16   providers, PHMSA and their state partners are a

17   really key part of this, Congress and the states

18   and local officials.

19   And again, this is a draft. It's a

20   work in progress. It's been improved twice over

21   the past two days, and we'll look for continual

22   input. So this is just food for thought. It's a

1   way to think about this, and we'll be writing

2   around this in the process sharing group, so it

3   certainly helps us. And we'll stop and ask if

4   there's any questions or comments.

5   CHAIR BURMAN: Any questions? Dan?

6   MEMBER COTE: Mark, I love these

7   illustrations. Just a friendly amendment. In

8   the way on the first on the drawing that you

9   showed, across the bottom you had API RP 1163,

10   just sort of illustrate where we are today in

11   terms of regulatory processes.

12   I looked at the second slide, the next

13   one down right there. Across the bottom, if you

14   put a box that illustrated SMS RP 1173 and the

15   interconnection with that state that would very

16   much have with SMS. In my mind, that's a

17   critical connection that we identified this

18   morning and will continue to be important to the

19   committee.

20   MEMBER HERETH: Thank you, Dan. And

21   Eric, you were right. Somebody would raise that

22   this morning.

1   (Laughter.)

2   MEMBER HERETH: I'm saying that half

3 in jest, but we really appreciate that. Of

4 course, that builds on the presentation that we

5 just heard from the gentleman from American.

6 Absolutely. Thank you.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else on the

8 phone, at the table, in the audience? Okay,

9 great. Okay. Now, we go to Mission and

10 Objectives. And just so you know, we're going to

11 also come back at the end to sort of how do we

12 wrap up all of the different working groups and

13 any takeaways among them. So Mark?

14   MEMBER HERETH: Sorry, I wanted to add

15 one other comment. When I see that task

16 statement come up on that other group, we did not

17 change our task statement since the last meeting.

18 So I wanted to report on that.

19   The other comment I wanted to make is

20 in the types of data that we're going to be

21 cataloging, developing, and then tying

22 stakeholders to those, one of the things that I

1 think that came out of our discussion in

2 technology group yesterday is we're not only

3 going to be focused on lessons learned but we're

4 going to focus on what needs do we have that are

5 really critical over the next few years.

6 And that will include things like

7 crack-like features in the body of the pipe and

8 then long seam dents with metal loss and

9 particularly where we have the ability to look at

10 apexes. These are areas where there's billions

11 of dollars of work to be done and the tools, if

12 we can make the tools better, we're going to be a

13 whole lot more effective in the work that we do

14 and the selections of digs that we make

15 corresponding to what the ILI tools tell us.

16 We have a huge opportunity there, and

17 I wanted to make sure that we talked about that

18 and brought forth that we're going to focus on

19 that as well.

20 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Okay.

21 Mission and Objectives? Dan?

22 MEMBER COTE: Thank you. Most of this

1   nominally, Mission and Objectives did not have a

2   plan to meet during this session because our task

3   statement was approved last time and we had

4   pretty much completed all the components of that.

5   So there was not going to be a lot to discuss.

6   But following up on the discussion

7   that Mark had identified regarding governance and

8   organization, we did have that discussion. And

9   again, Mark stated it well. We saw just a

10   structural flaw in our plan, and that was not

11   identified. And so on that basis, Mission and

12   Objectives is going to propose to alleviate that

13   problem.

14   And again, just starting, you can see

15   our members. We discussed that last time.

16   Nancy, unfortunately -- who's just been excellent

17   support for our subcommittee -- was unable to be

18   here today. But certainly this work represents a

19   lot of her good thought and hard work as well.

20   All right. If you would go to the next page,

21   please.

22   In terms of the task statement, what

1   we are going to propose as a result of that

2   deficiency that Mark's team identified is that

3   Mission and Objectives will be assigned the task

4   of developing an organizational structure and

5   governance rules for the proposed VIS.

6   In addition -- because it's hard to

7   separate the way the -- what that structure in

8   governance rules looks like in the way we

9   communicate with the stakeholders -- we're also

10   going to include in that the recommendation that

11   we at least offer some possible structures around

12   data sharing amongst the organizational structure

13   members including the members who we're defining

14   -- if you think about the PHMSA model -- as the

15   people feeding data into the system and people

16   routinely extracting data from the system.

17   In addition, there are likely to be

18   participants in the industry who are not

19   providing data and not actually members of the

20   VIS who we will likely want to push data out to

21   as we create findings as a result of our own

22   analysis and simply give people a heads up on the

1   various risks and various concerns that are

2   identified through the process even if they have

3   elected not to be members.

4   And obviously, the last group, the

5   challenge will be what is shared publically in

6   the context of that. Because clearly to Mark's

7   point, the public and many stakeholders are very

8   interested in this. So we'll have to define

9   that.

10   And so essentially, what we will be

11   looking for -- "we" being Mission and Objectives

12   -- is a resolution from this committee today

13   voting to include or allow the inclusion of those

14   recommendations into our task statement. And so

15   Madam Chairman, perhaps we ought to stop here and

16   discuss that piece because if the committee

17   decides that isn't the approach they want to

18   take, then there's no reason to do the rest.

19   CHAIR BURMAN: Does anybody want to

20   have discussion at this time on that? Perhaps

21   it's appropriate at this time to make a motion

22   and someone can second and then we can have a

1   discussion if appropriate.

2   MEMBER COTE: Madam Chairman, I'd like

3   to make a motion that Mission and Objectives be

4   given the assignment of developing

5   recommendations related to organizational

6   structure and governance rules, develop

7   recommendations on data sharing among the

8   organizational structure members.

9   CHAIR BURMAN: Do I hear a second?

10   PARTICIPANT: Second.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Any discussion?

12   Hearing no discussion, all those in favor, please

13   say, aye.

14   (Chorus of aye.)

15   CHAIR BURMAN: Any opposed? Any

16   abstentions? The motion passes unanimously.

17   MEMBER COTE: Thank you, Committee.

18   Thank you, Madam Chairman.

19   Therefore, what we envision our

20   deliverables to be obviously are recommendations

21   on how to develop an organizational structure

22   including roles and responsibilities of those

1   various organizational structure members and

2   governance rules around that.

3   Further, what we envision as

4   recommendations on how to develop data sharing

5   among the organizational structure members and we

6   just discussed that. And lastly, recommendations

7   on how to vet that structure once it's developed

8   and approved, if and when the overall

9   recommendations are implemented.

10   And so our targeted milestones, again,

11 we got the resolution that we had hoped for

12 today. And so by August 1st, we plan on having

13 clear recommendations on the governance rules,

14 organizational structure, the data sharing

15 recommendations, and the governance vetting.

16   CHAIR BURMAN: Leif?

17   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you, Dan. I

18 think those are outstanding deliverables to

19 achieve. On behalf of the Training and

20 Qualification Subcommittee, there is a lot of

21 correlation with respect to onboarding

22 participants with respect to their roles and

1   responsibilities. So I'd like to request to

2   participate with your group as you develop how

3   you're going to achieve those deliverables.

4   MEMBER COTE: Absolutely. We'd love

5   to have you.

6   CHAIR BURMAN: Thanks. When we have

7   our planning call, we'll also incorporate that as

8   well.

9   MEMBER COTE: Thank you. And again,

10   we've received a full committee. I mean, so in

11   terms of where we go from here, if we can go to

12   Slide, I think, 4. Right.

13   Yes, we intend to meet with the FAA to

14   continue discussions on governance. As we've

15   looked at the various models of voluntary

16   information sharing, so far, the FAA model looks

17   like it's probably a pretty close fit for a good

18   deal of what we will need.

19   We want to continue to expand our

20   understanding of that across other industries.

21   But for right now, that'll be our surrogate until

22   we can firm up our recommendation and

1 understanding of possible models.

2 And so obviously, we'd like FAA

3 participation in our deliberations. We'd also

4 like to have a meeting with the Bureau of Safety

5 and Environmental Enforcement. Because again,

6 they spoke to us very early on in terms of their

7 program. And again, there are some correlations.

8 I'm not sure they're quite as good as the FAA in

9 terms of our industry, but we want to understand

10 that better.

11 In addition, we need to cast a wider

12 net across to other industries. There are

13 probably industries out there that do this that

14 we haven't even thought about. And so we need to

15 figure out what that looks like over the

16 relatively short term so we can pull those in.

17 And lastly, in order to make what I'll

18 call measured decisions on how to proceed, what

19 we would like to do is map the various

20 organizational structures against our future

21 organizational needs as we see it. And honestly,

22 I hope to present that to the overall committee

1   in terms of our assessment because I think that

2   process will lend itself to figuring out which

3   organizational structure will best meet our needs

4   going forward.

5   And so we see those to be steps that

6   need to be completed, would like to have at least

7   a strawman to present to this committee at our

8   next meeting.

9   CHAIR BURMAN: Any thoughts or

10   comments? Leif?

11   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you. And once

12   again, Leif Jensen with Sunoco Pipeline. Last

13   meeting and even part of some of the

14   subcommittees this week, we had PRCI in

15   attendance. And PRCI also has a third party

16   administrator of their data to de-identify same.

17   And so in addition to the BSEE and the Bureau of

18   Transportation Statistics, I think it would be

19   worthwhile exploring their structure --

20   MEMBER COTE: That's a great idea.

21   MEMBER JENSEN: -- as a third party.

22   MEMBER COTE: Thank you. And if any

1 of you are familiar with any other industry

2 organizations that have, again, an industry

3 structure, perhaps a third party, information

4 sharing that needs to be anonymous and you'd like

5 to throw their names in the hat, please do so.

6 Again, it's critical in my mind that we really

7 delve more deeply into those possibilities.

8 CHAIR BURMAN: And Leif, are you still

9 -- okay. Before Mark, one of the things I think

10 sort of my takeaway is we have heard from a

11 number of different folks, the FAA as well as

12 others. And I know one of the other outside

13 groups that we've talked about before is the

14 nuclear folks in developing and now we're hearing

15 on PRCI.

16 One of the things I think we have to

17 do a little homework also before we have people

18 come to the fuller committee meeting is also

19 drilling down into the written materials as well

20 and doing some of the technical clunkiness of

21 working through some of that material so that we

22 can get a lot of more bang for the buck out of

1   the presentations as well, especially since we're

2   going to be looking to write our own and needing

3   to go through that and parse through a lot of

4   that and be able to delve more deeply into it.

5   And that may help us facilitate more

6   robust discussion and target it more with the

7   presentation. So I'd like to see some of that

8   happening with the PHMSA staff as well so that we

9   could maybe get through some of that clutter and

10   target some of the specific issues. So that

11   would be, I think, helpful and maybe see what's

12   maybe some of the best models or specific issues

13   we can look at.

14   Mark, do you have a comment?

15   MEMBER HERETH: Mark Hereth from

16   Blacksmith. Dan, another one is a lessons

17   learned repository that we have within the INGAA

18   Foundation that we've operated since 2011. And

19   that's where members of our organization of which

20   there are 220 members covering not only operators

21   but service providers as well. And we spent a

22   lot of time building that structure, having a

1   legal framework, having a confidentiality that is

2   operated is also by an independent third party.

3   MEMBER COTE: Mark, I assume where

4   you're carrying that, I can reach out to you

5   directly for --

6   MEMBER HERETH: Yes, and I'll get you

7   connected with staff that can come and present

8   and give you all the details.

9   MEMBER COTE: Perfect.

10   MEMBER HERETH: Yes.

11   MEMBER COTE: Madam Chairman, to your

12   point -- and thank you for that -- what we'd

13   envisioned is, again, we'll look across as many

14   similar industries and situations as we can find.

15   I suspect in the course of vetting those, we'll

16   find some that are better than others.

17   What I hope to be able to bring back

18   to the committee, though, is a list of industries

19   we've examined. Rather or not those get included

20   in the final analysis and information sharing

21   will be a function of how robust we see them to

22   be and how close a connection we have. But we'll

1   show you what we rejected as well as what we

2   propose to analyze. Is that fair?

3   CHAIR BURMAN: That's perfect. Thank

4   you. Anyone on the phone have any comments?

5   Anyone else at the table, in the audience?

6   MEMBER COTE: Just the last area that

7   we would like to discuss. Clearly with this

8   change in the scope of the Mission and

9   Objectives, we're going to need more people and

10   so in very short order.

11   Clearly, we're going to need someone

12   from FAA as we discussed. We're likely to need

13   legal counsel because there is clearly going to

14   be a number of governance issues that will impact

15   legal structure or legal structure will impact

16   governance as the case may be.

17   We're interested in getting a

18   representative from one of the state programs.

19   Because again, we see that state interaction to

20   be very important as well in terms of

21   stakeholders as this rolls across the industry,

22   particularly for the distribution pipeline

1   operators.

2   And lastly, we do not today -- and it

3   was simply because, for whatever reason, we

4   didn't get any public volunteers -- I would be

5   grateful for, first of all, anyone on our

6   committee that would like to join this effort

7   where the scope has changed. Please throw your

8   name in the hat. We'd love for you to join us.

9   The four of us certainly were adequate

10   for our mission statement. I'm not so sure they

11   will be with this changed scope. So I think a

12   few more people would be helpful from the main

13   committee.

14   But in addition, again, public

15   representation in our mind is important. I'm not

16   sure exactly how we could back that. Christie, I

17   think we'll wind up working with you on how to go

18   about doing that. But we see that to be

19   important.

20   Any questions or comments on that

21   proposal or intent?

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

1   MEMBER COTE: There being none --

2   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you very much.

3   MEMBER COTE: -- that concludes the

4 presentation.

5   CHAIR BURMAN: And now we'll listen,

6 Laurie, from the AGA.

7   MS. SAMES: Close, Christina Sames,

8 AGA.

9   CHAIR BURMAN: I'm sorry.

10   MS. SAMES: That's okay. We're

11 interchangeable at times. Two additional pieces,

12 Dan, for the safety sharing. AGA has a safety

13 information-sharing center which I think was

14 probably developed around the same time as

15 INGAA's. Also, a lot of legal behind it.

16   I know that Mark already mentioned the

17 Plastic Pipe Database Committee. Max, who's not

18 in the room right now, is an expert on that.

19 That's co-chaired between PHMSA and AGA. They

20 collect plastic pipe failures, and I think there

21 is 50 or 60,000 at this point. And then I do

22 believe that the chemical industry also collects

1   information.

2   I know that RCP did a report for the

3   various trade associations. It's probably eight

4   to ten years ago. And they analyzed a lot of the

5   different industries, and there was some good

6   information that came out of it.

7   MEMBER COTE: Do you still have that

8   report?

9   MS. SAMES: I'm not sure.

10   MEMBER COTE: Okay.

11   MS. SAMES: With the moves and

12   housecleaning, I'm not sure. But Bill Byrd was

13   the individual that worked closely with us on

14   that.

15   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you so much.

16   MEMBER COTE: Thank you, Christina.

17   And I will be reaching out to you to continue

18   those discussions as well. Thank you.

19   MS. SAMES: Any time.

20   MEMBER COTE: You bet. Madam

21   Chairman, that concludes Mission and Objectives.

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Great, thank you. Does

1   anybody else have any comments before we move to

2   the next subcommittee? Okay. Thank you.

3   And so now we'll move on to Best

4   Practices. Eric? Oh, no, sorry, Regulatory,

5   Funding, and Legal, Randy. Eric, you're next

6   then.

7   MR. PARKER: Sorry about that, Eric.

8   Okay. This is Randy Parker. I'm the chair of

9   the Regulatory, Funding, and Legal Subcommittee.

10   Oh, thank you. Our subcommittee members, you can

11   see up there, and --

12   DR. MURRAY: And Randy, could you

13   speak up a little?

14   MR. PARKER: I want to thank Michelle

15   Freeman, our ADFO who's done a great job keeping

16   us on track and doing research and also

17   coordinating various parties who have provided

18   information to the subcommittee.

19   Yesterday we were honored to have

20   Cindy Dominik who's the Deputy Assistant Chief

21   Counsel for Enforcement at FAA. We wanted Cindy

22   to come in and talk to us about the history and

1   development of the statutory, regulatory, and

2   policy developments that supported the

3   information-sharing programs at FAA.

4   She's worked there as an enforcement

5   lawyer and also supporting the voluntary

6   information-sharing program since the '90s. And

7   it was a very good day. As a matter of fact, we

8   went over our time and we all agreed we could've

9   gone till midnight asking questions. Cindy

10   brought along with her Alexandra Randazzo who is

11   an expert FOIA, and she's in the general law

12   section at FAA.

13   And so we went through what the FAA

14   had to do in order to incentivize airlines to

15   participate in the voluntary sharing safety

16   information. And the two key incentives were --

17   that they recognized early on at FAA was that the

18   airlines needed protection from enforcement

19   action based on the shared information.

20   And also, they needed protection from

21   FAA's release of shared information through the

22   FOIA process. So they started developing a way

1   to build these two incentives. And they utilized

2   various tools in their toolbox -- including

3   policy, regulatory, and statutory approaches --

4   to create those incentives.

5   So in the enforcement program for

6   ASAP, they developed policies which is

7   interesting because they used advisory circulars.

8   And they developed those policies as they went

9   along and learned more about how to make the

10   incentives work. And one advantage of this

11   process is that they can change their enforcement

12   protection rules as they developed the program

13   without doing a notice of proposed rulemaking or

14   going to Congress for statutory authority.

15   Under the FOQA program, however, they

16   ran into some problems using that approach

17   because of the black boxes that were a subject of

18   that particular program. And Department of

19   Justice was not happy about that very important

20   piece of evidence being subject to a policymaking

21   approach.

22   So the FAA decided to produce

1   regulations for the FOQA program. So you have a

2   policy approach for ASAP and a regulatory

3   approach for FOQA. But they both work. They

4   both create the necessary incentives for airlines

5   and all their employees and manufacturers to

6   participate without fear of retribution.

7   So moving on to the second incentive

8   about FOIA protection. In 1996, they passed a

9   statute that created an Exemption No. 3 for

10   voluntary shared information. And you see the

11   statutory reference there, and that statute

12   needed implementing regulations.

13   So it took them a long time, from '96

14   to 2000, to develop those regulations. and they

15   finally issued those and they were workable. But

16   they learned a lot from that process. And in

17   2012, they sought another statute which is the

18   Safety Information Protection Act which provides

19   a much broader list of areas that are exempt from

20   FOIA, sort of like blanket exemption.

21   And when you see the list, you'll see

22   what I'm talking about. So all of the voluntary

1   information-sharing programs are listed, and it's

2   a self-executing statute which means that you

3   don't have issue regulations. So as those

4   programs themselves change, the FOIA protection

5   still attaches to the revised programs which is

6   extremely valuable in the FOIA context. So

7   there's some things we can learn from these

8   experiences.

9   We had a host of questions for Cindy

10   which she is taking back and will be providing

11   answers for us and is willing to have future

12   meetings with us. And we've decided we want to

13   recommend that she join the RFL Subcommittee as

14   an external member because we see that the

15   parallels between the FAA and what we are trying

16   to do are powerful and their success is powerful.

17   So we want to not cut and paste and

18   but we want to go along with their development to

19   see how we would develop it for our industry. So

20   we think she would be a very valuable part of

21   that process.

22   By the way, we will also be looking at

1   a host of other industries as Dan explained. Not

2   just the FAA, the airline industry, but other

3   industries for the information-sharing

4   protections and also the funding mechanisms that

5   they use.

6   So a couple of questions that came up

7   yesterday in our discussion was, what about

8   confidential proprietary information that

9   companies want to protect? I mean, they want

10   incentive to protect those things as well if

11   they're going to voluntarily share their

12   information.

13   And also there are national security

14   and critical information infrastructure issues

15   including cyber issues that we need to make sure

16   that we create protection so that people will not

17   be reluctant to share voluntary information. So

18   we're going to undertake further study on those

19   issues.

20   We've also been discussing funding

21   issues with the FAA staff. And we would like to,

22   if it's acceptable to everyone, present a couple

1   of FAA persons to talk about the funding, how

2   they initially started their funding and the

3   history of their funding efforts and what it's

4   like today so that we can learn from that, ask

5   questions, and perhaps that will advise us on

6   forming our own approach. And so what we'd like

7   to do is bring those people to our joint session

8   for the subcommittees on June 19th.

9   So that's all I have. If you have

10   questions, I'm happy to take them.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Any questions or

12   comments at the table? Not even from you?

13   MS. BATTAMS: This is Ahuva Battams.

14   I do have one suggestion for when the

15   subcommittee is drafting its part of the report.

16   I think that it is extremely helpful to have that

17   FAA statutory language either attached as an

18   addendum or redlined as a proposal for what we

19   recommend as part of -- sorry, there's an

20   Arlington emergency alert. That's why

21   everybody's phone is --

22   MR. PARKER: Yes, I'm getting that

1   too.

2   MS. BATTAMS: -- going off. But

3   that's something that I encourage the group to

4   consider because I think that getting that

5   statutory language is very important for

6   protecting the information.

7   And it's also something that, as a

8   legal matter, unless this is subject to an

9   Exemption 3 -- it's called an Exemption 3

10   statute. That's what the FAA statute is,

11   Exemption 3, which is one of the exemptions from

12   FOIA. And without that, we cannot guarantee that

13   certain records won't be subject to FOIA. It's

14   not a guarantee that they'll be released. But on

15   the other side, we can't guarantee that it'll be

16   withheld. And so I think that having proposed

17   language will be very, very helpful.

18   MR. PARKER: Yes, we will definitely

19   include an index with all of these statutes. And

20   also, we will be recommending certain

21   recommendations to the full committee. As we go

22   along, we're writing those now so that we take it

1   piece by piece, baby steps in terms of what we

2   might recommend so that the full committee can be

3   considering those things as we go.

4   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Anyone on

5   the phone, at the table? Holly?

6   MEMBER PEAREN: Randy did a great job

7   explaining the dialogue on the Regulatory, Legal,

8   and Funding Committee.

9   We wanted to make sure that the

10   incentives addressed by the FAA were consistent

11   with the incentives you all expect for the

12   pipeline industry. We think that an enforcement

13   incentive or relaxation might address some

14   concerns about punitive measures taken as a

15   result of disclosed information. We think that

16   the FOIA statutory language would address

17   concerns regarding release of that information.

18   And then Randy also addressed

19   potential national security or cyber security

20   concerns and the confidential business

21   information.

22   Are those all of the sort of

1   conceptual barriers to disclose voluntarily

2   disclosing sensitive information that we would

3   need to address through a regulatory or legal

4   frame? And this is truly designed to pick the

5   brains of the experts in the industry here at the

6   table.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you for that

8   question. I'm going to turn it over to our

9   counsel.

10   MS. BATTAMS: So especially in our

11   current administration, there's a heightened

12   concern for making sure that policies and

13   guidance are not a substitute for rulemakings and

14   regulatory work.

15   And so along those lines, I would

16   suggest that any -- I, too, support enforcement,

17   detailed language about how enforcement will be

18   used to make sure this is not a punitive process.

19   But I would suggest that -- and I believe that

20   FAA has this in their regulations -- that we put

21   -- rather than depending on a policy that we

22   consider putting that into actual -- a suggestion

1   for regulatory language that is subject to all of

2   the public notice and comment of rulemaking.

3   Because I think that that's a stronger

4   tool, especially with the concerns that policies

5   and guidance not be a substitute for the public

6   being able to comment. Does that answer your

7   question?

8   MEMBER PEAREN: I think that's a very

9   good recommendation and we'll certainly discuss

10   it. It does not answer the question.

11   My question was more targeted at the

12   industry and other stakeholders that may have

13   reservations about disclosing voluntarily very

14   sensitive information and making sure we

15   understand all of the potential sensitivities

16   around that so that we can address it.

17   MS. BATTAMS: I understand. Let me

18   target my comment a little more. I think that

19   one thing to consider is that regulatory language

20   that can give those assurances to the

21   stakeholders that there is an incentive to

22   participate in the voluntary information sharing

1 because it won't be used with a caveat that if

2 it's criminal activity, we can do any kind of

3 enforcement exemption. You're still subject.

4   But there can definitely be a non-

5 punitive treatment of information that is shared.

6 And the framework for that just needs to be

7 developed to make sure that everyone can feel

8 comfortable sharing but also still retain

9 enforcement for, like I said, something like

10 criminal activity.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone

12 else -- Leif and then Dan or Dan then Leif?

13 Okay. I am sorry. I didn't say. So thank you

14 for your honesty.

15   MEMBER JENSEN: A layman's perspective

16 of trying to address that answer is from a

17 pipeline perspective, there are several

18 jurisdictional authorities out there that have

19 authority over pipelines: OSHA, EPA, DOJ, NTSB,

20 PHMSA, even the Chemical Safety Board. Although

21 they don't penalize, per se, they do publish a

22 lot of safety videos that will highlight a

1   particular company.

2   So in the aspect of protecting the VIS

3   with FOIA, that's one avenue. But each one of

4   those jurisdictional authorities can exercise

5   their inspection rights to come in and

6   investigate any accident or do an inspection

7   routine. And there's already legislation in

8   place that authorizes them to apply penalty and

9   enforcement.

10   So I don't know that we'll be able to

11   legislate that away, and I don't think that's in

12   our best interest to do that in the first place.

13   What's important is that when we consider the

14   aggregate data that we will publish, that it's

15   not used by anti-pipeline advocates, that it's

16   not used by the media or any another associations

17   out there that want to keep it in the ground or

18   that want to restrict pipeline construction. And

19   not just new pipeline construction but the

20   refurbishment of aged infrastructure that is

21   improperly maintained and may warrant

22   replacement.

1   So it's a convoluted question in

2   respect. It's complicated, but I don't know that

3   this group will be able to exempt all types of

4   enforcement is my point.

5   MEMBER PEAREN: Well, I totally

6   disagree with your assessment that your

7   contribution was from a layman's perspective.

8   (Laughter.)

9   MEMBER PEAREN: That was incredibly

10   insightful. And you raised a really important

11   issue. There are no sort of additional

12   jurisdictions with competing enforcement

13   priorities. FAA has preemptive authority over

14   the commercial airline industry. So that was an

15   issue we addressed yesterday.

16   Is it appropriate to add states to the

17   list of additional jurisdictions that may have

18   inspection and enforcement?

19   MEMBER JENSEN: Oh, yes. My list was

20   not meant to be comprehensive.

21   MEMBER PEAREN: Okay, perfect. That

22   was so helpful. And then I think just to repeat

1   to make sure I heard clearly, you also mentioned

2   it would be potentially beneficial to consider

3   limitations on the use of the aggregate data to

4   prioritize where restricted to safety only.

5   MEMBER JENSEN: Well, I think the --

6   and that's yet to be determined what data we will

7   publish to the public out of this VIS. My

8   statement was based on the comment we heard

9   yesterday from Warren where there are certain

10   aggregate metrics and Pareto charts that they do

11   put out to the public and some media catches it.

12   Other media does not.

13   The era that we're in right now with

14   so many media and anti-pipeline advocates out

15   there, people are going to search for that

16   information and twist it and try to prohibit

17   companies from refurbishing our infrastructure.

18   And none of us want that.

19   So I think my point -- well, I know my

20   point is that we just have to be careful about

21   what data and information we're going to submit

22   out of the hub, per se, and then that's my point.

1   CHAIR BURMAN: Dan?

2   MEMBER COTE: Just a couple of broad

3   observations and one specifically for Randy. The

4   broad observations are this conversation over the

5   last few minutes has illustrated some of the

6   reasons people might not want to volunteer

7   because we've talked about the obvious

8   possibility that they would be exposed to

9   regulatory sanction as a result of their having

10 volunteered to participate.

11   That'll be nonstarter for a lot of

12 operators if we don't find a way at least to make

13 everything we do neutral or better than neutral.

14 That's number one.

15   The second observation is that they

16 have to see the value in the product of

17 information sharing as being worthy of any

18 sacrifice made and that includes any risk. Now

19 things like incidents, I mean, clearly, we're not

20 going to impede the regulatory process on

21 incidents or regulatory sanctions that we would

22 encounter today for routine inspections.

1   That's clearly, I don't see any way

2   the industry insulates itself from that. And to

3   your point, Leif, I don't think it should be

4   insulated from that. We all have to be

5   accountable. At the same time, to the extent

6   we're trying to take actions that improve our

7   systems and improve our safety profiles, that

8   can't be punitive. And so we need to crack that

9   code.

10   And lastly -- and Randy, for the

11   committee, I mean, I appreciate you're casting

12   really broad net around the issue of funding.

13   Because again, a lot of operators will perceive

14   any -- I mean, if this simply is pay-to-play,

15   then they'll perceive that as potentially not

16   worth the benefits that they've derived,

17   particularly early on the process when they're

18   not going to see very many benefits. This is

19   going to take a while.

20   And so to the extent that we can think

21   of alternative or unorthodox measures of funding,

22   even if they have sunset provisions. In my mind,

1 five years from now, if the industry sees quality

2 data flowing out of this process, they'll

3 recognize the value. They'll recognize how it

4 fits into the SMS and be willing to pay for it at

5 some level if that's necessary.

6 At the same time, particularly during

7 startup, I see that to be one of those two or

8 three absolutely critical needs for this to be

9 successful and actually get off the ground. So

10 appreciate the way you're approaching that.

11 Thank you, Madam Chairman.

12 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone

13 have any other comments or questions at the

14 table, on the phone, in the audience? Christie?

15 DR. MURRAY: I just wanted to

16 piggyback off of Dan's point around the funding.

17 I think that that's going to be an excellent

18 integration across all of the subcommittees as we

19 start thinking about what that next step would

20 look like in terms of short-term development and

21 long-term sustainability of whatever solution is

22 talked about.

1   So in all of the subcommittees, I

2   would recommend that you give consideration to

3   the funding implications of your particular

4   topical areas so that that can be a direct

5   feedback to the Regulatory, Funding, and Legal

6   Subcommittee.

7   Thank you.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. And then we have

9   a question or a comment from the audience.

10   MR. STOODY: Thank you. John Stoody

11   from Association of Oil Pipelines. Thanks for

12   your report and the comments made.

13   A regulatory path, we would be

14   supportive of that. Obviously, it has the

15   benefits of public notice and comment rulemaking

16   but also provides that certainty to know that

17   whatever guideposts and rules established will

18   continue and not be subject to future policy

19   changes or future changes of administration or

20   leadership and provide that certainty over time.

21   And indeed the FAA, through

22   rulemaking, established some of the boundaries,

1   what is in, what is out of any type of

2   enforcement discretion. And people became

3   comfortable with the lines that they drew through

4   that process, so that's good.

5   I'd encourage the coordination between

6   the legal team and then the newly expanded role

7   of the Mission-Objectives team that talked about

8   sharing information out to other groups which

9   would be subject to some of the concerns and

10   solutions provided by the enforcement regulation

11   team to make sure that the intended information,

12   as Leif put it at the end there, from the

13   information hub followed the rules and was of the

14   type and in the form allowed by the

15   recommendations of the legal team given their

16   view of what it would take for this to be

17   successful.

18   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And I do

19   believe, Randy, you talked about having someone,

20   an external member added to the subcommittee.

21   You do have to make a formal motion for that. So

22   before you end, if you want to make that formal

1 motion, and then you can second it or someone can

2 second it.

3   MR. PARKER: Yes, Madam Chair. I'd

4 like to make a formal motion that the RFL

5 Subcommittee invite Cynthia A. Dominik of the FAA

6 to join as an external member.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone second it?

8   MEMBER PEAREN: Second.

9   CHAIR BURMAN: Any discussion?

10 Hearing no discussion, all those in favor, please

11 say, aye.

12   (Chorus of aye.)

13   CHAIR BURMAN: Any noes? Any

14 abstentions? The motion passes unanimously.

15   And I do believe that there is one

16 more member of the public that wants to talk.

17 You can feel comfortable sitting there or coming

18 up. And this time, I'll call you Kyle.

19   (Laughter.)

20   MS. SAMES: I'll consider both

21 compliments. Christina Sames, American Gas

22 Association.

1   Randy, I appreciate you bringing up

2   cyber security. I know that PHMSA is tied into

3   physical and cyber security and they have experts

4   that are linked with the Department of Homeland

5   Security. I would say engage those individuals.

6   If not, AGA is very involved with Department of

7   Homeland Security, happy to give connections.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

9   MR. PARKER: Thank you very much.

10   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Randy, are you

11   done, or do you -- you're done with your --

12   MR. PARKER: Yes, I'm --

13   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, okay.

14   MR. PARKER: -- finished now unless

15   others have questions or comments.

16   CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone have any? Okay.

17   So now, I think we're going to move on to the

18   next which is Best Practices. Eric?

19   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Thank you and good

20   morning.

21   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

22   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen,

1   Energy Transfer. I'd like to start out by

2   thanking Max Kieba, our PHMSA support, and all of

3   our subcommittee members for participation

4   yesterday as well as in some phone meetings we've

5   had since our last in-person meeting. And I

6   think we've made some really good progress.

7   We'll start out with kind of -- go to the next

8   slide, please. I have control? Okay.

9   So again, subcommittee members here on

10   the screen. So the first thing we did yesterday

11   was review our task statement. And I'll just

12   read the first part of it which is evaluate

13   existing processes including other industry VIS

14   models and practices and make recommendations on

15   best practices that will promote the sharing of

16   data and information that accomplishes these

17   things.

18   And again, Dr. Murray kind of

19   highlighted the notion that really is our task is

20   to look at what are other industries, what are

21   other organizations within the pipeline industry

22   doing in terms of best practice around voluntary

1   information sharing? So we're always going to

2   kind of refocus on that whenever we need to. In

3   reviewing our task statement, we did not

4   recognize, just in general, any need to make any

5   changes. So there will be none forthcoming

6   today.

7   We started out our meeting yesterday

8   just again, a review of kind of the visionary

9   model that Mark Hereth and myself and others have

10   participated on. So I won't go into that.

11   We did kind of catch up with some of

12   the comments that were made during the meeting.

13   So we added Common Ground Alliance to the current

14   state picture, labor, workforce, and contractors

15   as well as standards, developmental organizations

16   to this current state picture.

17   Again, another view or another option

18   graphically for the model. And so I added arrows

19   to this to kind of indicate that especially in

20   the case of our NGOs and state partners, Congress

21   and others that hopefully they'll be getting more

22   out of the VIS model than they'll be putting in.

1   And I kind of guessed at some of these other

2   ones. But again, the notion is that one plus one

3   equals three or four or maybe more in this case

4   in terms of what we put in and what we get out.

5   The center of the hub, I did want to

6   spend a little bit of time on this. I kind of

7   envision this as we talked about different types

8   of data and information that are going to be the

9   subject of this effort.

10   And so I kind of would envision -- and

11   for those of us that are old enough to back to

12   the 45 record days where you've got a stack of

13   them on a turntable and you play those. I kind

14   of view the sharing hub as a stack of records

15   with different records representing different

16   types of data and information.

17   So one record would be, like, ILI data

18   and in-the-ditch data and comparing those.

19   Another record could be related to a specific

20   threat or interacting threats. And the turntable

21   works on, how do we perfect our ability to

22   discover, characterize, and mitigate those types

1   of threats?

2   So again, not a one size fits all for

3   types of data and information that we're talking

4   about sharing. Different part of the PDCA cycle

5   will always work, but there may be more intensive

6   efforts on de-identification as an example or

7   analytics or evaluation. So again, depending on

8   the type of data, it will really drive these

9   different parts of that cycle.

10   I also wanted to comment on some

11   outputs from this. So we're doing all this for a

12   reason. So we're doing this to either -- as one

13   example of outputs and improvement resolution

14   outputs, R&D projects to address gaps. So part

15   of the process would be identify current gaps in

16   technology or capability or understanding. And

17   then an output would be a request to a GTI or a

18   PRCI or INGAA Foundation to conduct some research

19   and fill that gap.

20   It probably is not well stated here,

21   but corrective or consent actions, again, really

22   the notion here is to help PHMSA maybe develop

1 more consistent, corrective in consent types of

2 actions in the context of an enforcement

3 activity. Certainly, best practices and

4 procedures, we would see that coming out of

5 engineering standards and performance metrics.

6 So just some different thoughts on different

7 types of information sharing and potential

8 outputs from those.

9 From the context of that discussion,

10 again, we reviewed the VIS strawman concept and

11 again felt like there was no changes needed to

12 our task statement. It's still appropriate in

13 that context.

14 We did identify some key -- talked

15 about some key interdependencies with other

16 subcommittees. And we wanted to establish a

17 clear view of the current path for the report

18 writing.

19 To that point, the BP Subcommittee,

20 again, is focused on learning from past

21 experiences and existing processes. We've

22 identified that there's clear overlap with our

1   Process Sharing and Technology Subcommittees and

2   kind of a clear emergence here is that the CAST

3   ASIAS model is one that I think we're all kind of

4   gravitating towards as a model that we want to

5   emulate.

6   So to that point -- and we talked a

7   little bit about it with Warren yesterday in our

8   general session as well as in our subcommittee

9   meetings -- that we really wanted to pursue some

10   of those initiating documents or studies or

11   reports that had been done to establish CAST and

12   establish ASIAS. And what can we learn from

13   those as well as -- and probably equally or even

14   more important -- the governing documents that

15   were developed along the way.

16   So again, trying to prevent from us

17   from recreating the wheel. How can we really

18   leverage existing documents? Whether they were

19   in their early stages or even as they exist

20   today, how can we leverage how CAST ASIAS are

21   being governed today? And procedurally, how can

22   we take advantage of that?

1   In the context of researching existing

2   best practices, Holly made this great

3   recommendation about we should look at kind of

4   these common elements of any fundamental process.

5   One would be governance.

6   So as we go and we probe CAST and

7   ASIAS and other industry efforts on information

8   sharing, we should look at how those are governed

9   and what documents that they have that

10   established that policy.

11   In a policy format, how do they manage

12   quality assurance and quality control of the

13   information and the data that they share? How

14   did they secure that data and information? How

15   did they overcome barriers to participation. And

16   again, how have they procedurally, regulatorily

17   mitigated some of those barriers? And then

18   lastly, communication of results. What are best

19   practices in regards of communicating results,

20   performance metrics and the like?

21   So we had launched into a discussion

22   about the need to -- or the potential need to

1   establish subteams or work groups to interrogate

2   kind of three -- we kind of grouped these into

3   three kind of buckets within the industry and

4   other outlying industries or appropriate

5   industries to probe for best practices.

6   And the first work group that we

7   landed on was ILI data and in-the-ditch data

8   management. And Cliff, Bryce, and Jason

9   volunteered to work on that subcommittee or that

10   subgroup.

11   And within each one of these, then we

12   identified sources of where those kinds of

13   activities are occurring today and might be a

14   source of best practice. So again, individual

15   operator processes and procedures.

16   So as individual operators, we all

17   have these kinds of procedures embedded in our

18   organization and to the extend we can probe those

19   and come up with governing documents that will

20   prove beneficial. Mark mentioned 1163 which is

21   an existing process between ILI service providers

22   and, indeed, service providers as well and

1   operators.

2   PRCI ILI Data Analytics Project,

3   again, we had a presentation on that. But again,

4   how did that come to be and what documents

5   control that and is there a final report that we

6   can leverage? And also, I already mentioned the

7   ASIAS data standards effort.

8   The next bucket was Pipeline Safety

9   and Integrity Management Process Improvement. So

10   again, in general, just safety related process

11   improvement. And again, myself, Mike, Mark, Joe,

12   and Max will undertake that effort.

13   And so we'll be engaging with INGAA,

14   API, the other industry associations. Each one

15   of them, I think, has a voluntary information

16   sharing process set up. In fact, I think there's

17   even one proposed to be stood up between -- kind

18   of a joint effort between AOPL and API, focused

19   on information sharing. So that one is just

20   getting going, so we'll see what we can learn

21   from that.

22   There's other PRCI R&D programs that

1   we can probe as well and the list of others that

2   we've considered here. So we've got a lot of

3   targeted current best practices that we think

4   we're going to be able to learn a lot from and

5   hopefully come back with a lot of written

6   documents as opposed to just verbal

7   communication.

8   And the last one is communication and

9   stakeholder outreach. So Kate, John, Leif, and

10   Warren volunteered for that one. And it'll focus

11   on Common Ground Alliance which I think the

12   presentation later today is going to be very

13   beneficial and timely for that as well as looking

14   at performance metrics, annual reporting, and

15   leveraging those activities.

16   Just some other notes from our -- and

17   I've already, I think, kind of touched on most of

18   this. Again, how did the Commercial Airline

19   Safety Team and ASIAS come to be? So again,

20   we're going to leverage all of that information.

21   And to the extent we can gain access

22   to written documents, I think that's going to go

1   a long way towards us having a much richer and

2   deeper understanding of all the things and all

3   the considerations that they went through in that

4   formation. And hopefully, Warren will be able to

5   provide those to us.

6   Kind of next steps and action items

7   that were discussed. We recognize that Cynthia

8   Dominik has been a valuable resource for Randy

9   and his subteam. And not that we will ask for

10   her to be an official member of ours, but we'll

11   reach out to her as is appropriate from the best

12   practice standpoint.

13   AGA staff, we had considered adding an

14   AGA staff member for the Best Practice

15   Subcommittee team. I think in reconsideration of

16   that, we're going to just reach out to AGA on an

17   as needed basis for presentation purposes or

18   maybe as to participate on one of the work

19   groups. And so we'll not do that at this point.

20   I've mentioned that we developed and

21   we'll deliver a best practice workgroup charter.

22   So I've assigned myself that. So back on the

1   other slide, we're going to -- for each of those

2   charter workgroups that we've developed, I'll

3   kind of lay out some expectations and some

4   guidance for each of those work teams and deliver

5   that to them by the middle of next week.

6   As well as develop a meeting schedule

7   for the Best Practice Subcommittee team for the

8   next couple of months leading up to kind of a

9   final draft of our part of the report. And then

10   as we hopefully get reports from Warren on the

11   CAST and ASIAS, we'll deliver those to not just

12   our subcommittee but probably the entire

13   committee.

14   I think that's that for my report.

15   And I'll ask for any questions.

16   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Mark. Oh,

17   sorry, Dan and then Mark.

18   MEMBER COTE: Yeah, Eric, if I may

19   just lobby your committee a bit, first on the

20   notion of having an AGA, or at least a

21   distribution company represented among the

22   committee. I would urge you to reconsider that

1 if possible, because I mean as we look at

2 federally reportable incidents in the United

3 States, the vast majority are on distribution.

4 And if this doesn't have an equal

5 weight of distribution pipeline safety

6 recommendations in my mind, we kind of missed the

7 boat on what we're trying to do here. That's

8 number one, I guess.

9 Number two, you know, just in terms of

10 that role, if you decide not to recruit an AGA

11 member on your committee, then would urge you, at

12 least during the pipeline safety and integration

13 management process improvement, to engage them in

14 that.

15 Because AGA is very active right now

16 in identifying, has any number of initiatives

17 underway around pipeline safety and pipeline

18 safety information and tracking. And I think

19 maybe we'd benefit from that. Thank you.

20 CHAIR BURMAN: Mark.

21 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Thank you, Dan,

22 we'll certainly take that under advisement. You

1 know, that's not to say that you know, absence of

2 an AGA member on the committee, you know, that we

3 won't interrogate or seek out AGA best practices.

4 We certainly will.

5 They're certainly on that diagram of,

6 you know, recognize that they have a very viable

7 and pretty robust program right now for lessons

8 learned processes. So we're definitely going to

9 interrogate that.

10 MEMBER HERETH: Mark Hereth with the

11 Blacksmith Group. Eric, can you bring up that

12 slide that showed the different types of data.

13 Yes.

14 So this one right here, I just want to

15 point out that those that we met with yesterday

16 jointly between the Technology Committee and the

17 Process Sharing Committee, I think one of the

18 things we talked about was having defined initial

19 buckets of data that would help the group then

20 focus on where you would go from architecture.

21 I'm going to offer that this is a

22 first cut at those buckets. So don't feel like

1   you're having to wait. And of course our group

2   is going to continue to work on fleshing these

3   out. But Eric, this is a great job of taking a

4   first cut at that. And so I wanted to make sure

5   we pointed that out. We'll continue to fill it

6   out. Thank you.

7   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Thank you. You

8   know, maybe some commentary there. You know,

9   early on in this effort, we talked about, or I

10   talked about, you know, maybe the early efforts

11   would be more focused around information as

12   opposed to data. And that information being in

13   the context of lessons learned and specific

14   improvements that one company or another has

15   evolved to, and sharing that for the benefit of

16   all.

17   And in that sharing, would be very

18   deliberate, you know, between the one or more

19   parties, at minimum. So again, I think the

20   desire is to jump to where CAST and ASIAS is

21   today, because it's such a robust, such a, you

22   know, successful program. But I think we've got

1   a lot of steps to take before we get there.

2   And so I think starting small or

3   starting in a way that we can assure success is

4   going to be very, very important. And again, I

5   think that we'll want to encourage, you know, at

6   least a minimal, a critical amount of

7   participation, and then grow it from there.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Yes, okay. Leif.

9   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you, Leif

10   Jensen, Sunoco Pipeline. With that slide still

11   up there, I fully support and agree with all the

12   intents and the objectives as the way you

13   outlined them.

14   Under Improved resolution outputs, the

15   second line item there, Corrective and consent

16   actions, in the spirit of you know, wanting to

17   woo as many participants as we can, you know, I

18   understand exactly what you said. It'd be ideal

19   to have consistent enforcement by any agency

20   across all their regions relative to all 50

21   states in which, you know, operators operate.

22   But in the spirit of wooing

1   participants in this voluntary program, we need

2   to be careful how we author that aspect in the

3   final recommendation.

4   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: And let me, thanks

5   for that comment, Leif, and maybe just some

6   clarification and some context around those

7   words. You know, I think we've got to realize

8   that, you know, an incident, you know, with an

9   incident comes an opportunity to learn and

10   improve.

11   And you know, so again, I think the

12   data to be shared again is the fifth bullet down,

13   Incident-based RCFA recommendations. You know,

14   kinds of leads to appropriate and consistent

15   improvement or corrective actions. You know, so

16   those two are, have to be tied together.

17   So I think if we're going to include

18   incident-related data and information in process

19   improvement in, as a layer of data, then what

20   comes out of that, you know, naturally is going

21   to be corrective actions, whether they're forced

22   or enforced upon the industry, or voluntarily

1   implemented. But so I think they kind of go

2   hand-in-hand, and so I think you cannot separate

3   the two.

4   MEMBER JENSEN: Fully agree. Just

5   let's be careful how we author that so we don't

6   create an environment where people are going to

7   repel this program.

8   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: I think the key is

9   how we describe that.

10   MEMBER JENSEN: Right.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

12   MS. BORENER: Sherry Borener, I'm the

13   ADFO for Process Sharing. I just want to comment

14   in addition, as you discuss the kind of data

15   that's shared, that one of the reasons that broad

16   protections are required is because context for

17   data is so critical.

18   So, many times, it's not the event but

19   the context in which it happened, the frequency

20   of that exposure, the type of operation that's

21   underway, the environment in which it happens.

22   By that I mean, you know, whether or not it's,

1 what the terrain is like, what the traffic is

2 like, etc.

3 Those things are extremely important

4 in understanding the risk associated with the

5 events. And one of the reasons that protection

6 is necessary is because context can be very

7 important to the financial performance of the

8 entity.

9 So it may not be that it's a legal

10 risk, but more of an economic risk to the

11 operator if they're sharing context information.

12 But it's critical to understanding their real

13 risk exposure.

14 So that's, I think, in addition to

15 these events, we have to think about the

16 denominator, you know, how often does this happen

17 per event or per operation. And is it rare, or

18 is it normal, etc. That's how you decide that

19 something's an anomaly, and it comes out to be

20 dealt with. So we need those broader protections

21 because of that.

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

1   MS. WHETSEL: This is Cheryl Whetsel.

2   I just wanted to remind the group there was a

3   gentleman that gave a presentation at the very

4   first meeting. His name was Brian Riley with the

5   FRA. And I think he might be a really good

6   contact for your communication with stakeholders,

7   and also with the T&Q Committee.

8   I just thought he had really good

9   perspective on how they reached out to the rail

10   community. So you might want to reach out to

11   him.

12   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Any other

13   comments or questions at the table? On the

14   phone? In the audience? Don't be shy. And just

15   state your name, your title, and who you're with.

16   MR. SAULTERS: Okay. Stuart Saulters,

17   Policy Advisor for API. So Eric mentioned 1163.

18   I just wanted to make it, you know, known to you

19   guys on the Committee that that document is going

20   under revision right now. So good timing for you

21   guys to offer input to that committee.

22   Along those same lines, I know, Bryce,

1 you're involved in some of that, but encourage an

2 operator from that group to be involved in the

3 ditch a la Data Subcommittee you got there, Eric.

4 So, happy to help coordinate that if that's, you

5 know, the will of that group.

6   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you very much.

7 Anyone else in the audience? Okay, great, thank

8 you. All right, and you're done, you're good?

9   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Yes.

10   CHAIR BURMAN: And I don't think

11 anything in your presentation needed a vote at

12 all.

13   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: No, Madam Chair.

14   CHAIR BURMAN: So you're good, thank

15 you very much. And now we're on to number five,

16 which is the Technology and R&D with Bryce.

17   Oh, she tells me that I should ask if

18 people want a break. But I think we're good,

19 right, we can kind of? So hearing that no one

20 wants a break, we'll keep going. Okay.

21   This actually is not for the

22 transcript.

1   Now we can go back on the record,

2   thank you.

3   MEMBER BROWN: Thank you and good

4   morning. Bryce Brown, Chair of the Technology

5   and R&D Subcommittee. We as well had a very

6   fruitful discussion yesterday as our second

7   official Subcommittee meeting coming our

8   February, our last session in February.

9   Just acknowledge the team members

10   here. Chris McLaren, who's absent this week.

11   Max stepped in and helped us greatly. And I must

12   say that without Chris here to hear this, but

13   Chris has been driving us very, very much from

14   his side as our Designated Federal Officer, and

15   we really appreciate that.

16   As mentioned, back in February and

17   here with us today, Cliff Johnson was approved,

18   as well as Jason Skow. Both are here with us

19   yesterday and here today. We are, Dr. Murray,

20   we're still reaching out to Sean Keane, and that

21   is pending.

22   I bring up the Task Statement just as

1 a high-level review. Not to read through it, but

2 you know, again, from the original mandate,

3 Technology R&D, we have the obligation to look,

4 to recommend secure systems, development in

5 architecture, as well as consider the development

6 of advanced technologies, where also continuous

7 improvement comes into. And that is covered in

8 the Task Statement as approved by our

9 subcommittee and approved by this main committee.

10 So that is in the notes for, again, you

11 reflection.

12   From our meeting in February, we did

13 decide to break up into a minimum of three work

14 groups. Those are listed here. One of those is

15 exactly what we've been talking about this

16 morning is, what are some of the assumptions that

17 we need to understand between the different

18 subcommittees and how we might have in fact some

19 overlap and some integration needs.

20   We also formulated a work group of

21 Architecture/IT, and finally Continuous

22 Improvement/R&D.

1   Yesterday we discussed of course all

2   three subjects as it relates to progress being

3   made since February. We've had some offline

4   meetings by conference call, as well referenced,

5   where persons like myself and Mark have had

6   discussions offline to align ourselves. And in

7   the assumptions subject yesterday, we did have

8   both Mark and Eric in the group.

9   And we discussed basically that

10   Process Sharing will look at the basis for the

11   taxonomy, and that basis would then be further

12   elaborated by ourselves as needed. Also,

13   Architecture/IT, it was not clear that that would

14   be covered in process-sharing. But we also

15   realized that pieces of the Architecture/IT will

16   come from Best Practices Process, but mainly be

17   focused upon by our work group. Sorry, our

18   subcommittee.

19   Some of the what and the how. As we

20   saw it yesterday in our discussions, you know,

21   there are the people aspects, the process aspects

22   of such an Architecture/IT, as well as the

1   technology. So that we see all of us being, you

2   know, kind of connected a bit in the subject

3   where our team is going to take the lead to bring

4   together this recommendation.

5   Going into that discussion around

6   Architecture/IT, you know, as pointed out, is, by

7   Jason, Jason's leading that for us. And you

8   know, knowing the inputs and the outputs will

9   drive what that Architecture/IT is going to look

10 like and feel like.

11   Mark, you said it earlier about the

12 buckets and types of information. I think we do

13 have a good assumption of what is needed. But of

14 course the more detailed that that becomes, the

15 better that that overall needs assessment starts

16 to look for this architecture.

17   We know that there are some options

18 out there for the Architecture/IT. We've heard

19 some really good examples, and as Eric's pointed

20 out, the ASIAS approach with MITRE, and then the

21 CAST kind of to review the outputs of such a

22 database, that that seems to be something that

1 makes sense.

2 But there are decentralized

3 approaches, as pointed out to me by Jason,

4 referred to as an application program interface.

5 That puts a little bit more onus on

6 those that are sharing the data, making sure that

7 the data, before you do share it, is in the right

8 formats and the right, following the right

9 standards. De-identified accordingly, I guess,

10 as well prior to putting into the database.

11 Where the centralized is that ASIAS model,

12 together with the CAST oversight.

13 So we did agree yesterday that, and

14 just pointed out by Eric, that we need to start

15 and look at maybe something that is evolving over

16 time, something that helps us seek some first,

17 you know, winds, if you will, of some of the

18 lessons learned data that will be shared.

19 And then as we progressively evolve,

20 you know, we're going to move towards, and

21 hopefully sooner than maybe what FAA did if

22 that's our aspiration, to something like the

1 ASIAS MITRE approach. So we did agree that we

2 need to start with something, and something that

3 makes sense early on.

4 This de-identification, we do realize

5 that that's a challenge, and it's been discussed

6 already here this morning around governance, non-

7 punitive, etc. You know, many operators, service

8 providers, technology providers, different types

9 of data sets, things like that.

10 So we did recognize in our discussions

11 that de-identification is major challenge, and we

12 need to think about that in this recommendation.

13 It was also pointed out by MITRE

14 yesterday that by de-identifying, you might lose

15 a bit of understanding of the true meaning of

16 some of that data. And also, Dan Cote's not in

17 the room, but he pointed that out yesterday, that

18 if you learn something, can I not pick up the

19 phone and just talk to that operator that had

20 that experience.

21 So the idea here is that what we come

22 from out of this subcommittee is going to be a

1   recommendation that talks about maybe some

2   options and specifically looks at, you know,

3   progressive evolution based on these

4   inputs/outputs.

5   Continuous Improvement/R&D, headed up

6   by Chris Warner I've taken from the some of the

7   information that has been fleshed out by his

8   working group. And from the three working

9   groups, they're probably the ones that have been

10   more progressive in meeting over the last few

11   weeks.

12   This is a big part of what's going to

13   turn out to be our start of our straw man

14   document for our recommendation. But you know,

15   it speaks to and they've put together this few-

16   page document that talks about the different

17   stakeholders that were talked about this morning

18   and the need for this data. The different

19   aspects of continuous improvement and what are

20   being addressed by VIS.

21   You know, for example, if we talk

22   about tools or assessment methods and

1 technologies, you know, what are their

2 effectiveness towards certain types of threats or

3 data capture opportunities. With that, you know,

4 we're talking about, for example, improved PODs,

5 POIs.

6 This phrase here, virtuous cycle, was

7 introduced by Chris and Michael Bellamy of

8 Continuous Improvement, where as you do a

9 plan/do/act, that you're continually progressing

10 your knowledge and your improvement cycles moving

11 to advanced technologies and methodologies.

12 There are varied integrity assessment

13 methodologies, tools, technologies.

14 We talked yesterday about, Mark

15 actually asked us a question, can we think about

16 making the recommendation a bit technology-

17 independent. I think that has a, you know, makes

18 a lot of sense. Because as we like to see

19 technology be advanced and new technologies be

20 introduced in our needs and wants, then maybe

21 this technology independence and this

22 recommendation would help us.

1   You know, benefits of participation by

2   a large number of operator service providers, I

3   think all of us have that on our mind as how to

4   encourage the participation. So Cliff has

5   drafted, as part of our subcommittee and work

6   groups, some language there that we will review,

7   together with Best Practices and Process Sharing

8   as well. But I think that covers most all

9   subcommittees.

10   And you know, how to encourage that

11   participation, that's what I was speaking of as

12   well. And then, you know, foundational

13   requirements for success. KPIs, metrics, you

14   know, what's out there that we need to really

15   consider as we start to think about how data's

16   shared today.

17   Are there maybe a few different levels

18   of sharing that we might envision? What is it

19   today? You know, what is a level one, what is a

20   level two, up to a MITRE-type of approach of

21   discrete data, understanding that quality very,

22   very much in detail.

1   So those foundational requirements

2   that we might need to recommend need to be

3   focused upon, and that's covered in this side.

4   Visualizations are good, we've seen

5   some good visualizations already. And I think,

6   you know, visualizing the subject that we're

7   headed towards here in this recommendation surely

8   makes sense. And this is one cut at it from

9   Chris Warner and Michael Bellamy around this

10   virtuous cycle.

11   Not to go through it in detail, but

12   basically it's iterative, that you start with an

13   inspection. You validate data, you compare

14   accuracy. And with that, you might do another

15   step. You identify improvements, you may do some

16   research in development.

17   And then you go back through that

18   cycle again. You step up to the next level of

19   implementation and you go through it again. And

20   you constantly go through this cycle to

21   continuously improve.

22   But that is where we are. We will

1 continue to meet over the coming weeks, up until

2 early June, as individual work groups. And we

3 will schedule, with the minutes of the meeting

4 that come out in the next few days, we'll

5 schedule our next conference between now and next

6 in-person meeting.

7   Any questions, comments?

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Any questions or

9 comments? Your tent's up. Okay. Anyone on the

10 phone? In the audience? Okay, great. And I

11 don't think there's any voting item on that.

12 Okay.

13   MEMBER BROWN: No, ma'am.

14   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you so much. So

15 then the next is the Training and Qualification.

16 And then we're at the sixth subcommittee, and the

17 seventh, the last one is the Reporting. And

18 without the break, we're on track.

19   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you, Madam

20 Chair, Leif Jensen, Sunoco Pipeline, Chairperson

21 for the T&Q Subcommittee.

22   Our ADFO, Dr. Doug White, was absent

1   yesterday. So thank you, Dr. Murray, for serving

2   as our DFO yesterday during our meeting. We were

3   close to a quorum, there was about four of us in

4   attendance and about four not in attendance.

5   Our Task Statement was not revised,

6   but the slides you're about to see flow along the

7   same messages that are in the Task Statement.

8   We're basically breaking down the

9   training requirements into three categories. And

10   the first one, as we've heard already through

11   many of the subcommittee reports, motivating and

12   compelling stakeholders to participate. And

13   really encouraging them that this is the right

14   thing to do and they'll gain a lot from this.

15   The second category is training and

16   qualifying participants. And the focus here is

17   really the participants inside the hub. They'll

18   be some training requirements for those who

19   input, and you know, for output. But for the

20   most part, the training is focused on those that

21   are in the hub.

22   And then the third category is, you

1 know, output to stakeholders. You know, what are

2 the findings and what are the recommended

3 actions. And I put the last line item up in

4 there, required actions, with a little

5 trepidation, from the standpoint that this is

6 voluntary program, and why would a voluntary

7 program actually require anything by the

8 participants.

9   But I left it up there from the

10 context that in earlier, whether it was nuclear

11 or airline, you know, some of those programs are

12 so robust that if a recommended action comes out,

13 that the participants 100% agree that they're

14 going to apply it. And that may be the case

15 here. So I put that word up there with some

16 trepidation for further deliberation as we move

17 on.

18   So the first category, next two

19 slides, motivating and compelling stakeholders to

20 participate, members of the TQ Steering

21 Committee, or Subcommittee, excuse me, did a lot

22 of listening the last day, and even the last

1   couple of sessions.

2   So these are the tenets and content

3   that are coming out of what we've heard. And the

4   way this flows in many respects, with our end

5   game in mind, will be the content within our

6   recommendation or our portion of the

7   recommendation to the report. So I think by the

8   next meeting we're going to be in draft mode for

9   that recommendation.

10   Yesterday we heard loud and clear that

11   two primary tenets are trust and leadership.

12   We're all leaders in this endeavor, everyone at

13   this table and beyond. And then what are the key

14   aspects to building trust. We have to emphasize

15   the data security criteria. And then also

16   emphasize that the data analysis algorithm, the

17   data, and the systems are preserved and secure.

18   If we're going to onboard

19   participants, people have to trust that that

20   environment is truly secure.

21   I think it's worth describing process

22   flows, including the data encryption protocol,

1   whether it's static data, or even data in motion,

2   so people understand how that data is moving

3   through the system. And also, to be very

4   deliberate with respect to who sees identified

5   data.

6   All the stakeholders that participate

7   in this VIS want to know the credentials and the

8   qualifications of the people that are actually

9   seeing their data as they scrub it. Hence, the

10   people inside the hub.

11   I think from an operator perspective,

12   even an ILI vendor perspective or an NDE

13   perspective, we're going to want to know how that

14   risk is going to be categorized and described.

15   To my earlier comments, you know, as

16   we submit published data outside of the venue of

17   the hub, we want to know how that risk is going

18   to be categorized and described so that it

19   doesn't put any pipeline operators at risk. And

20   then of course preservation of intellectual

21   property.

22   The second main bullet there is this

1   is really a signature SMS initiative. And we

2   ought to think of that as we broadcast this and

3   market this program to others who participate.

4   Second slide, just a few comments

5   here. You know, as a group, and when I say

6   group, it's all the stakeholders, not just the

7   people in this room, but all the stakeholders.

8   We need to raise the industry safety bar, and do

9   it together.

10   I think it's important, someone

11   mentioned this earlier as an addendum to the

12   actual recommendation that we submit to the

13   Secretary. I think it's important that we

14   include in that recommendation, whether it's a

15   summary of all their metrics. But if you recall

16   yesterday, you know, back in the 90s, they had

17   three accidents in four months, I think it was.

18   And in 2017, they actually had zero. What an

19   incredible achievement.

20   And we've had the benefit of listening

21   to the FAA in this group, but the people who are

22   going to read this recommendation may not. And

1   so we ought to include that.

2   And when you reflect about the

3   environment that pipelines are in today, you

4   know, the FAA was not only at threat from

5   regulation, but they were at threat from the

6   passengers. They were getting, their customers

7   were upset with them. And so it's analogous to

8   the anti-pipeline environment in which we are in

9   today, so let's embrace it.

10   Another opportunity is for operators

11   to benchmark their company relative to the

12   aggregate data. There are programs that exist

13   today. I know years ago there used to be a

14   program within the AGA, and Solomon Group and a

15   few others do some benchmarking efforts. This is

16   another opportunity for members to participate

17   and have a benchmarking opportunity.

18   I think it's going to be important

19   for us to identify the barriers that prohibit us

20   from sharing information today, and how this

21   program is going to safeguard those barriers.

22   And perhaps the best way to do that is a

1   frequently asked and answered questions document.

2   Identifying actions that we can take

3   proactively rather than retroactively. I recall

4   our very first meeting, and he's not here today,

5   but you know, when Alan Mayberry was sitting at

6   the table and he said what was his most primary

7   objective, preventing the next accident. And so

8   we need to get ourselves in that mode.

9   There's a lot we can learn from past

10   incidents, but we need to get this data and work

11   it like ASIAS is. Find those precursors and stop

12   the next accident.

13   I think it's important as we onboard

14   people that we clearly communicate the governance

15   process, the policies, the procedures, the rules

16   of the game so people know what they're getting

17   into. And emphasize that this is a partnership

18   and non-punitive and a de-identified environment

19   with PHMSA and industry. It's an opportunity for

20   us to take action before regulation, or even in

21   the absence of regulation.

22   So on to the second category. If you

1 think about people inside the hub, not

2 necessarily everyone in our industry, what VIS

3 training and qualification is not. It is not

4 operator qualification, and it's not vocational

5 training. It's training on how to actually use

6 the rules that we implement and apply with the

7 confidentiality requirements.

8 And we heard yesterday the hiring

9 criteria that ASIAS and MITRE use. We ought to

10 be looking for very high level, high degreed

11 statisticians, mathematicians, and just like

12 MITRE did. Consider using a third party as well.

13 And then, you know, one of the key

14 points that we heard Warren say yesterday is that

15 these statisticians and mathematicians don't

16 speak pilot, right. And so we should anticipate

17 the same thing, in that whoever we hire into this

18 environment may not speak the vernacular and

19 vocabulary that we do in Pipeline. So we'll have

20 to put the domain SMEs coupled with them within

21 the hub.

22 We ought to establish a code of

1   conduct for handling data, both identified and

2   de-identified, and have the robust rules with

3   degrees of separation to preserve anonymity. And

4   then possibly develop training modules and give

5   people certificates, and you know, showing that

6   they have the credentials to get entry into that

7   data room.

8   A little bit more on training and

9   qualifying. Ensure that the data entry accuracy

10   is in place with QA/QC protocols. We need to

11   have data submitted in a consistent format. One

12   of the recommendations from Chris, from PRCI

13   yesterday, was maybe at first we ought to do a

14   data pull, as opposed to asking operators to push

15   the data to us.

16   And then as we ultimately develop this

17   training, it behooves us to have a qualified

18   instructional designers for actually creating

19   that curriculum. And part of the training

20   material will have to include glossaries,

21   definitions, acronyms to clarify our taxonomy.

22   So the third category is output. What

1   does the hub actually produce? First of all, our

2   vision is vulnerability discovery. That's what

3   we heard yesterday, and that's the precursors to

4   events, so that we can prevent the next accident.

5   That's predictive maintenance at its best.

6   We need to recognize that we want to

7   include small operators in addition to large

8   operators. And I think it was Dan who mentioned

9   yesterday that there's as many as 3,000 small

10   operators in the natural gas distribution world.

11   So it's a large audience. More.

12   It's already been mentioned, but we

13   need to recognize we have to categorize and tier

14   the information for the applicable audience. If

15   you recall the graphic that Process Sharing put

16   up before where, I'm thinking here is the

17   different binoculars on the bottom of that

18   graphic and the data that particular audiences

19   want to see.

20   And someone already mentioned this

21   both yesterday and today, that is, the data is

22   being reviewed. There may be opportunities that,

1 you know, could signal that one, two, or maybe

2 three operators have a systemic issue going on.

3 But in order to publish that, it wouldn't allow

4 it to be aggregated enough to de-identify them.

5   So instituting some protocol that

6 would allow a trigger or some initiator to allow

7 those two operators to be contacted and go

8 benchmark with one another and talk about their

9 common scenarios.

10   And then lastly, how to interpret the

11 reports that we produce.

12   So that's basically the content of

13 what we're going to start offering as our

14 recommendations. Future business, how are we

15 going to provide this training? How are we going

16 to onboard people into these various three

17 categories?

18   So the ideas we've thought about, you

19 know, all the trade associations have very

20 efficient and effective graphics departments that

21 can produce very good brochures. Each state and

22 of course the fed has their websites. There's

1   all sorts of conferences that go on, both with

2   the trade associations and the labor unions.

3   PHMSA inspection or excuse me, the

4   PHMSA Inspector Team Q Center in Oklahoma, that's

5   an example. And I emphasize for an example,

6   because with respect to the funding that we

7   discussed earlier, they do have limited funding.

8   And if indeed we were to expand the scope of that

9   facility, it would require legislative action in

10   order to grant them more funding.

11   Industry has training venues. And

12   then ultimately, you know, how are we going to

13   market this. We want to look at the various

14   sources to advocate this. NTSB came to mind,

15   CSB, OSHA, EPA, Pipeline Safety Trust, and the

16   other advocacy groups that could really, you

17   know, suggest that this is the path forward to

18   raise our plateau of safety is how we envision

19   marketing this.

20   I did not have anything to make

21   motions.

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Holly.

1   MEMBER PEAREN: Holly Pearen,

2   Environmental Defense Fund. I thought it was a

3   great idea to summarize the context in which the

4   FAA program was developed and draw some analogies

5   between the two industries.

6   And really just loved the idea of

7   framing the report or using the report to

8   demonstrate the leadership in the industry and

9   the leaders in this room.

10   I just, I think there are different

11   ways to approach challenges. And you know,

12   almost no industry is immune from public

13   criticism and its own challenges.

14   And you know, just think that using

15   the report and the development of a great VIS

16   program to show that the industry and the leaders

17   in this room are really coming together and

18   stepping up to address the challenges in a

19   proactive way, to, you know, to make the nation's

20   pipeline system safer and more robust is, could

21   be such a good outcome.

22   And just wanted to, you know,

1   acknowledge that you brought that to the table,

2   and I wanted to you know, just vocally, you know,

3   throw my support and the support of the other

4   group that I represent on the Committee. And

5   just really applaud that effort and initiative.

6   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

8   MEMBER WARNER: Chris Warner from

9   Mears Group. I really appreciate the depth to

10   which you've gone to this. Because when I

11   initially saw Training and Qualifications, I

12   thought it would be a fairly quick and easy

13   committee. But it's obvious that you've gone to

14   a level of depth that I didn't envision.

15   One of the things that's, to me, in

16   that depth as you were going through that, and I

17   think you've covered it but I want to make sure,

18   is when I was thinking security concerns, I was

19   thinking about outside people breaking in and

20   getting to the data. But it became apparent as

21   you talked about it that there could also be a

22   security concern in terms of the analysts that

1   are handling the data.

2   So I think it is very key that we

3   consider how do we minimize that security threat

4   if the analysts are dealing with de-identified

5   data in case a, I'll say overly enthusiastic

6   analyst decides that I see all this data about

7   so-and-so pipeline, I'm going to collect this and

8   then take this and distribute it, you know, to

9   the media or some other aspect.

10   So that aspect of a security threat

11 internal to the whole thing probably needs to be

12 a key part of that. But I think you addressed in

13 there.

14   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you for saying

15 that, and you articulated that issue very well.

16 It was part of our thinking as we defined what I

17 wrote up there as the credentials for someone

18 within the hub. So the confidentiality

19 expectations. Thank you.

20   CHAIR BURMAN: Alicia then Dan.

21   MEMBER FARAG: Alicia Farag,

22 LocusView. I'd like to take an opportunity to

1   restate something that I had brought up in the

2   R&D Subcommittee, because I see it as kind of

3   emerging trend amongst multiple of the

4   subcommittee groups.

5   It seems like we've identified two

6   distinct buckets, I'll call them, and maybe

7   that's not the right word to use because we're

8   using the term buckets for other things. But one

9   of them is data related to ILI and inspection

10   data. And that's a very distinct bucket. And

11   then the other one is the process and people

12   aspect related to near misses and close calls.

13   And each one of those is very

14   different, and they have different inputs,

15   different outputs. They will probably each need

16   to have different IT security architectures. And

17   there could be different de-identification

18   schemes associated with each one of them.

19   As for a specific example, the sharing

20   of data from the ILI and tool vendors with the

21   dig data. There could need to be a different

22   level of de-identification associated with that

1   than what we're talking about for the near misses

2   and close calls.

3   And so I think we just need to keep

4   that in mind as we're developing the

5   recommendations and the report, that we perhaps

6   consider looking at both of those things

7   distinctly and individually, because they will

8   have different recommendations associated with

9   them. Thank you.

10   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Dan.

11   MEMBER COTE: Just a couple of things,

12   if I may. First, Alicia, I agree with everything

13   you said. But I hope the data capture and data

14   sharing is far more robust than those two

15   buckets. I agree, ILI is a critical one,

16   certainly near misses are critical ones.

17   But there's enormous statistical data

18   available in the industry that's available on

19   risks that I hope you share very liberally as

20   well. So as long as the Committee does not

21   isolate those two buckets, I'm comfortable and

22   agree with your statement.

1   And Lief, a question. As you were

2   giving your presentation, and again, I applaud

3   you and the Committee. I though you cast a very

4   wide net on what constitutes training and

5   qualification, for which I'm grateful. But when

6   you were talking about trust, and the recognition

7   that our participants have to be comfortable with

8   the process and see benefit in it, I couldn't

9   agree more.

10   But a thought occurred to me that I

11   haven't heard discussed yet. And Madam Chairman,

12   if I may, just a little bit of liberty. In order

13   to encourage operators, there needs to be a

14   reason.

15   And one possible model I could see

16   evolving is the recognition during routine

17   inspections and sort of routine pipeline safety

18   reviews that people are participating, have a

19   fully active SMS and are participating in this

20   program.

21   That, and that recognition could take

22   the form of it I know I have regular, a

1   deficiency somewhere, maybe it's historic MAOP

2   data, maybe it's, you know, it could be any one

3   of any number of things. But I submitted that

4   through this process, I recognized it as a risk,

5   I'm working on it through my SMS.

6   Therefore, if a regulator comes by and

7   happens to find it, then I'm working the process,

8   it's part of my SMS. I don't get an entire hall

9   pass, but I do maybe avoid a fine. So instead of

10   an open enforcement action with a penalty, I get

11   a warning letter.

12   That sort of program, if PHMSA would

13   consider that and particularly make that

14   recommendations to the states, that would

15   dramatically encourage operators. It would be a

16   tangible recognition that participating in these

17   programs is recognized as the action of a

18   responsible operator.

19   And therefore when something is found

20   not as a result of illegal action or any of the

21   other stipulations, but simply an error which

22   happens, then that gets recognized in the

1   enforcement process.

2   And I don't know is the Committee

3   looking at that. I, you know, Leif, when you

4   were going through your material, I thought

5   that's where you were going with the, you know,

6   sort of consent, corrective and consent actions.

7   I thought that was going to be that kind of

8   proposal.

9   It was clear in the discussion it

10   didn't evolve, but the more I thought about it

11   here this morning, it's an area that I'm not sure

12   is covered, Madam Chairman. Recommend someone be

13   given the task to at least examine that as a

14   possibility. Because it would materially move

15   the ball in terms of operators recognizing the

16   benefits of participation.

17   And it also, in my mind, just for a

18   little sales pitch for the Committee, as I think

19   about the FAA model, the FAA got there through

20   this program before there was a regulatory

21   construct or an active regulatory construct for

22   enforcement actions.

1   And they did a lot of this, I think,

2   to prevent that, where we've had enforcement and

3   a pretty active regulatory environment for 45

4   years, that's not possible. But it would be a

5   way to recognize that in way the FAA does, in my

6   mind. So, just a little bit of lobbying.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Does anyone

8   have any thoughts on that? Does anyone see a

9   natural place for their subcommittee embracing?

10   Chris.

11   MEMBER WARNER: It seems like that

12   might be something that would be appropriate for

13   Regulatory and Funding to address, so that would

14   be my recommendation.

15   MEMBER PARKER: I agree with you. As

16   a matter of fact, we spoke about these issues

17   with Cindy Dominik and Alexandra yesterday. And

18   the FAA realizes that the balance is you have to

19   have trust by the operators that if they spit out

20   these reports regularly that improve safety for

21   the industry, that what they get in return is no

22   enforcement action on those reports.

1   And the only thing that the FAA does

2   is they make the operators recognize that the FAA

3   cannot aggregate or ignore its statutory mandate

4   to protect the public. So they have certain

5   things like alcohol, drug usage, criminal, gross

6   negligence, you know, recklessness, things like

7   that that are carved out from the protection.

8   But otherwise there's full protection,

9   including when they do inspections. It's part of

10   the Voluntary Information Sharing Program, and

11   there's no enforcement. So I think, Dan, we

12   could work toward that goal of getting there, you

13   know. It's just that we're in a very complex

14   regulatory situation already,

15   so how do you build those protections into the

16   inspection process.

17   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, great, I don't

18   think we need a formal vote on that. I do

19   believe that that can be incorporated by

20   reference, and we can just put that on your

21   action plan for looking at. And if for some

22   reason it doesn't seem to fall naturally in

1   there, we can look at it for the next meeting.

2   But in between we can deal with those

3   issues, so, substantively. So I think that's the

4   way we'll handle it.

5   From a, Chris, you had had your tent

6   up, tent card up before. Are you still -- you're

7   good now? Before we move on to Reporting, Dan, I

8   do believe that when you did report on your

9   Mission and Objectives Subcommittee, you did have

10   a few folks that you had recommended as

11   potentially being on your subcommittee as formal

12   members, external members.

13   So you do have to make a formal

14   motion. I know that you don't know necessarily

15   who they would be, and it's not necessarily

16   specific organization, etc. So to the extent

17   we're providing you some flexibility in that, if

18   you can make that motion, someone can potentially

19   second it, and then we can discuss it, so.

20   MEMBER COTE: Is this a good time,

21   Madam Chair?

22   CHAIR BURMAN: This is a good time,

1   before we move on to the Reporting.

2   MEMBER COTE: Very well then. I make

3   a motion that the Mission and Objectives

4   Subcommittee be allowed to recruit a member of

5   the public, an FAA member, legal counsel, and a

6   representative from a state pipeline safety

7   program to participate on our committee.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Do I hear a second?

9   MEMBER JENSEN: Second.

10   CHAIR BURMAN: Any discussion?

11   Hearing no discussion, all those in favor, please

12   say aye.

13   (Chorus of aye.)

14   CHAIR BURMAN: Any opposed? Any

15   abstentions? Hearing none, the motion passes

16   unanimously. Great. Now we're going to move on

17   to the Reporting Subcommittee. Oh, I'm sorry,

18   Mike.

19   MEMBER LAMONT: Mike LaMont, Integrity

20   Plus. Hey Randy, I just wanted to point out, and

21   you're probably aware there's a number of states

22   that have audit privilege, you know, programs.

1   And basically you submit a notice of self-audit

2   and you get immunity from penalty.

3   And the state will say okay, here's

4   what you found, here's a corrective action order.

5   But there's no monetary fines that goes along

6   with that. So I've participated with the Texas

7   program and I think it's a really good example.

8   So you all might take a look at that.

9   MEMBER PARKER: I agree the, yeah, the

10   Texas program is a good example. And Holly and I

11   were discussing this yesterday, that we need to

12   look at all the states and what's available there

13   as a model.

14   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Does anybody

15   have any other comments or questions before we

16   move on? Now, we're going to do the Reporting

17   Subcommittee. I will point out that this is

18   really getting into the sort of the meat and

19   potatoes of the reporting structure of the report

20   itself.

21   We'll probably come back to this

22   aspect of it, probably come back to this -- I

1   think it's picking up my electronics. We'll

2   probably come back to this aspect of it later

3   this afternoon too, so keep in mind some of these

4   slides if we need to refer to it.

5   But I do think this is important. And

6   then we'll go to lunch afterwards. So the

7   Reporting Subcommittee. And I do believe that we

8   have a PHMSA staff member reporting. Thank you

9   so much.

10   MS. LYNCH: Good morning.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: And don't be shy. We

12   are still, we do still have a vacancy for someone

13   who might want to be chair of this. We do have I

14   think five members on the Subcommittee. So any

15   of you can become a chair of it.

16   But also anyone who's not a member of

17   the Subcommittee who's dying to have a chair role

18   can come onto the Subcommittee as well. It's a

19   really good one, because you have control of the

20   pen too, so. It's a plug. All right, sorry, go

21   on.

22   MS. LYNCH: Good morning. My name is

1   Karen Lynch, I'm the Alternate Designated Federal

2   Official for the Reporting Subcommittee. We do

3   have five members, which I have listed here.

4   Since the last meeting, we did have one member

5   that left the Subcommittee because of competing

6   priorities.

7   We had no changes to our Task

8   Statement. And for the most part, we are serving

9   in a integration role where we're trying to

10   ensure that we can receive everyone's comments,

11   recommendations, documents, and incorporate them

12   into the final report.

13   Another one of our goals is to develop

14   a web-based tool where the subcommittees can

15   share information, collaborate, as well as have a

16   place to load all of their final documents.

17   Our recent activities. Since the last

18   meeting, we have drafted subcommittee guidance

19   and templates for submissions at the various

20   sections and documents for the report. We have a

21   report template that we're continuing to fine-

22   tune and work on. We've also researched and

1 collected several sample Advisory Committee

2 reports that we use to develop a template for the

3 VIS report.

4   We have worked together to develop a

5 framework and mockup of a web-based collaboration

6 tool for the Subcommittee use. So we're going to

7 be moving forward with the bulletin, which is a

8 tool where you can do messaging and communicate,

9 collaborate, share information, share documents.

10   We also finalized dates that the

11 Reporting Subcommittee will meet and have

12 teleconferences as well. So our goal is to meet

13 as frequently as we can.

14   Some of our action items are we're

15 planning to finalize the guidance and templates

16 for the Subcommittee use by April 13. We're also

17 planning to finalize the report template that

18 we've developed. And again, our due date is

19 April 13.

20   We are currently updating the report

21 outline so that it aligns with the Subcommittee

22 Task Statements. Again, we've set a target for

1   April 13. And our goal is to provide this

2   guidance, templates, and the report samples to

3   the Subcommittee by April 14.

4   And we're working with PHMSA's IT

5   Office to finalize the vBulletin web-based

6   collaboration tool. So we're hoping to finalize

7   that sometime in April. We've set a goal for

8   April 20. One of the challenges that we have is

9   that PHMSA is transitioning this tool to a more

10   modern format. So we wanted to hold off and wait

11   until that transition happened.

12   We're planning to schedule a web-based

13   webinar or demo with the subcommittees, hopefully

14   by the end of April. So those are goals that

15   we've set.

16   We're also working with PHMSA to host

17   a kickoff meeting with editors and writers that

18   are going to be working with the Reporting

19   Committee, and all the subcommittees, to help

20   draft the report. So that date is to be

21   determined, but fingers are crossed that it's

22   going to happen soon.

1   Dr. Murray provided the outline of the

2   report that we're pulling together. So this is

3   really your baseline. I know that several of the

4   subcommittees are interested in how the report is

5   going to look and what's going to be included in

6   the report.

7   But again, we are trying to fine-tune

8   the outline that's been developed. And all of

9   the Subcommittee members do have that outline.

10   And again, we'll be aligning that with the Task

11   Statements and providing that fairly soon,

12   hopefully in a week.

13   But if you've started to pull

14   information together that you want incorporated

15   in the report, you can really start sending that

16   information to the Reporting Committee. For

17   example, we do have the mission and objective

18   statement from that subcommittee. So we're

19   holding that until we start the actual writing

20   process. But we can start incorporating some of

21   that information in.

22   Again, we've provided the report

1 timeline. Dr. Murray talked about it earlier

2 today. I think the key thing that we want to

3 keep in mind is that we're really going to try to

4 have a report drafted in the August and September

5 time frame, with the final draft report,

6 hopefully we'll be able to present it to the full

7 Committee in December.

8 So that's the goal and those are time

9 frames that are not, that are static, that we

10 definitely want to try to stick with. So from

11 the February through June, from February to June,

12 the subcommittees are really working on content

13 and pulling information together.

14 So we do have one recommendation. I'm

15 not quite sure if it will require approval by the

16 full Committee, but we wanted to present it

17 before this body. But we are recommending that

18 each VIS working group subcommittee chair

19 designate one of their members to serve as the

20 liaison and primary point of the contact to the

21 Reporting Subcommittee.

22 And we feel that this will ensure that

1   consistency, for one, within the report. But

2   that your reports sections and recommendations

3   are conveyed accurately and reflected

4   appropriately within the report.

5   And other than that one

6   recommendation, that's really all we have for

7   today.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, great, and Dr.

9   Murray.

10   DR. MURRAY: Thank you, Karen, for

11   that very informative update. To your latter

12   point with the recommendation, if you could go

13   back to that slide. I just want to emphasize the

14   importance of the liaison as a contact back with

15   the Reporting Committee.

16   There are some members currently on

17   the Reporting Committee that are also members of

18   other subcommittees, so that may be an easier

19   recommendation for those. But for other

20   committees that aren't represented currently, we

21   recommend doing so.

22   One of the initial challenges we have

1   with this reporting group is, based on how we

2   meet in the Subcommittee, some subcommittees meet

3   concurrently, and so it's difficult for

4   Subcommittee members to be in two places at one

5   time. So because the other subcommittees are

6   doing more substantive work right now, reporting

7   is kind of in the background.

8   So having the liaison would mean that

9   they wouldn't necessarily have to be at every

10   Reporting Subcommittee meeting, but Karen would

11   be able to identify the critical ones that they

12   need to participate in.

13   That'll give them the opportunity to

14   stay connected with some of the other

15   subcommittees, but also liaison back at

16   appropriate times to help with review and vetting

17   of the content to make sure it reflects what the

18   other subcommittees' wishes are.

19   So I just wanted to make that

20   connection between the two.

21   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. And I also think

22   some of the clunkiness will have to get worked

1   out. Because I do think that we'll have to sort

2   of walk through, because obviously when we start

3   looking at some of what we're doing, people will

4   have significant either desire to be a part of

5   conversation, or desire to not be a part of it.

6   Or just decide they don't need to be

7   as long as it, you know. So to the extent that

8   we work through that and also utilize our

9   planning calls as an opportunity to gain

10   information. And also to work through what we

11   need to do substantively.

12   I think yesterday worked well in that

13   we planned ahead of time what committees,

14   subcommittees needed to work together. And

15   having the agendas and worked people in the room,

16   so that it worked out, similar to with the

17   governance. You didn't plan on meeting, but when

18   we identified that as a gap, it worked out well

19   to be able to utilize that. Holly.

20   MEMBER PEAREN: Thanks, Holly Pearen,

21   Environmental Defense Fund. One thing I learned

22   yesterday in the Reporting Committee that I would

1   like to share with everyone is that PHMSA is

2   providing writers and editors. So if your

3   hesitation in participating or liaising to that

4   committee is workload-related, totally

5   understandable, mine too, I just wanted that fact

6   to be known.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Does anybody

8   else have any comments or questions at the table?

9   On the phone? In the audience? Okay. I also do

10 realize that, you know, one of the things that's

11 important is the time to review and to think

12 about it and provide feedback.

13   So that's also one of the reasons it's

14 important to me that we, you know, look to keep

15 to the timeline, so that we have that ability.

16 Because that's going to be critical to our work

17 and to making sure that we facilitate the careful

18 thoughts and analysis that's necessary, so.

19   I do think that on this, and I think

20 Dr. Murray is right, I do think we should make a

21 formal vote for this. So if someone wants to

22 make a motion and for this recommendation.

1   Despite your tent card falling.

2   MEMBER BLYSTONE: I would like to make

3   said motion to recommend that each, the

4   subcommittee chair designate one of their members

5   to serve as a liaison and primary point of

6   contact to the Reporting Subcommittee, so that

7   would be my motion.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

9   MEMBER COTE: I second that, Madam

10   Chairwoman.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. And discussion?

12   The only discussion that I would like to say is

13   that you can also designate yourself. I think

14   that's fine. So, unless someone disagrees, I

15   just want to make that clear. All right, any

16   further discussion? All right, all those, and

17   hearing none, all those in favor, please say aye.

18   (Chorus of aye.)

19   CHAIR BURMAN: Any opposed? Any

20   abstentions? Hearing none, the motion passes

21   unanimously. And with that, unless anyone else

22   has any other comments or -- sure.

1   DR. MURRAY: And just a quick point

2   since this vote passed unanimously. Karen will

3   work through the subcommittee chairs to identify

4   the liaison.

5   CHAIR BURMAN: All right. What we're

6   going to do now is we're going to take that break

7   that we were supposed to take. But then we're

8   going to lead right into lunch.

9   We should try to be back here at one

10   o'clock so that we can, from 1:00-1:15, lay out

11   our agenda for the afternoon, make sure we're all

12   on track on what we're doing, and see what we

13   need to accomplish, and have a, you know, sort of

14   a more digestible what time we plan on ending.

15   As, and tee up our next steps.

16   Also during the lunch, if you can also

17   think about what you're thinking about in terms

18   of future meetings and the in-between, so that we

19   can start planning what we need to do as soon as

20   the meeting ends today.

21   All right, so thank you, and we'll see

22   you back here, everybody, at one o'clock. Is

1   there anyone who's leaving now that won't be

2   back? Okay, good, I'll see you all back here at

3   one o'clock. Thank you very much.

4   (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

5   went off the record at 11:39 a.m. and resumed at

6   1:09 p.m.)

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, so we are going

8   to get started. I just want to do a little

9   recap. I know some people are leaving a little

10 early.

11   We are going to in just a minute turn

12 it over to Dr. Murray to introduce our guest

13 speaker today from the Common Ground Alliance,

14 but we are going to do Agenda Item 4, a truncated

15 version, because I think we took care of the

16 governance part but we do have some pieces of the

17 IT architecture scope, so we're going to look at

18 that.

19   And then we are also going to do a

20 little recap on the preparatory discussion, which

21 I also think can be a little bit shortened

22 because we did a lot of that in the subcommittee

1   group and then the next phases in the planning

2   stages.

3   So we are very much good to go and

4   recap and closing remarks can really be short and

5   sweet, hello, good-bye stuff, so we're all good

6   there.

7   Right now I am going to turn it over

8   to Dr. Murray unless anyone has any comments or

9   questions on our brief recap. I hope everyone

10 enjoyed their lunch. I know some people were

11 talking about the subcommittees and other things,

12 so I appreciate that.

13   Right now I am going to turn it over

14 to Dr. Murray. Thank you very much.

15   DR. MURRAY: All right. Thank you,

16 Diane. So I want to introduce an esteemed guest,

17 Erica Lee. She is the Vice President of Programs

18 and Administration with the Common Ground

19 Alliance.

20   One of the recommendations we heard

21 from a public member, I think it was Andrew Lew

22 (phonetic)

1   at our last meeting in February, he suggested,

2   and I thought it was an excellent idea, that we

3   take a look at what CGA has instituted with the

4   DIRT reporting aspect related to damage

5   prevention and to a) understand more about it,

6   and b) really have an opportunity to hear how it

7   was formed, what is some of the similarities or,

8   you know, what path it took to having its members

9   provide information in a voluntary fashion that

10   we might be able to learn from as well.

11   So with that being said I will turn it

12   over to Ms. Lee.

13   MS. LEE: Thank you and thanks so much

14   for having me here. This is an interesting topic

15   and definitely a presentation that we haven't

16   done in a while, which is how we established DIRT

17   and how we were able to successfully get it

18   moving and collect the data that we have today.

19   So I'll walk through a few things, but

20   if you have any questions, it sounds like there

21   are quite a few questions kind of about the

22   process that we used, feel free to jump in and

1   ask at any point.

2   So first I am going to go over the

3   background on the Common Ground Alliance. I

4   recognize a lot of your organization and company

5   names and know that you are somewhat familiar,

6   but I think the way that the Common Ground

7   Alliance was established is pretty fundamental in

8   how we established DIRT and why it was

9   successful.

10   We'll give a little bit of information

11   on DIRT development and what DIRT looks like

12   today. We'll talk about challenges and lessons

13   learned and then I'll give you some slides from

14   our DIRT report so you can see what information

15   we are publishing from the data we have

16   collected.

17   So to go all the way back to 1998 the

18   Common Ground Alliance was, originally it stems

19   from a study of best practices in place

20   nationwide that was conducted and brought

21   together for the first time, all the different

22   stakeholder groups who play a part in preventing

1   excavation damage.

2   So this goes way back to the beginning

3   of the Common Ground Alliance. One hundred sixty

4   stakeholders participated in the study and we

5   published 132 best practices and in 2000 a group

6   of people got together and decided to develop the

7   Common Ground Alliance so the report didn't sit

8   on a desk and we were able to continue to promote

9   the best practices.

10   And from that process, that group,

11   identified multiple different areas that they

12   wanted to focus on from the best practices in

13   committee form, and we will talk a lot about one

14   of those committees, which is the Data Reporting

15   and Evaluation Committee.

16   So one thing that makes us unique at

17   the Common Ground Alliance is that we have many

18   different stakeholder groups that participate

19   together. We are also a consensus-driven

20   organization.

21   So that particularly played a big part

22   in the best practices but continues to really be

1   a fundamental part of all of our committees and

2   how we are able to bring forward products that

3   are embraced by all of these different groups.

4   So you can see we have regulators,

5   one-call centers, locators, equipment, facility

6   owners, and excavators all participating in the

7   process.

8   So what do we look like today? We

9   have over 1700 members, so that's individuals

10   that participate. We have 240 member

11   organizations and companies, we have sponsors,

12   over 70 sponsors, we have 16 stakeholder groups,

13   we still only have six staff, so we're very small

14   as far as staff goes, seven working committees,

15   and 20 board members.

16   And we have a series of core programs

17   that I am sure many of you are familiar with. We

18   promote the 811 Campaign through our educational

19   programs, we still actively promote the best

20   practices and continue to work through

21   development of new practices, and then DIRT has

22   definitely grown to be one of our fundamental and

1   core products.

2   And I want to talk a little bit about

3   the best practices. How many here are familiar

4   with our best practices? A lot of you. So as I

5   mentioned early on they are consensus-based best

6   practices, we have about 170 in the book at this

7   time, so this is Version 15.

8   We distribute -- This is still our

9   primary product on our website. We have 50,000

10   page views annually. It's something that

11   continues to grow and continues to be a premiere

12   resource.

13   And the reason I touch on this, as you

14   can see back in 1998 when the original study was

15   established there were nine chapters that were

16   outlined for the best practices and one of those

17   is the emphasis on reporting and evaluation.

18   So way back when the Common Ground

19   Alliance was started this was a fundamental area

20   of focus and all of the members that were

21   involved really wanted to makes sure that we were

22   measuring the success and we are able to look

1   back and see if we were being successful with our

2   programs.

3   So looking at Chapter 9, this is an

4   important part of the eventual development of

5   DIRT because you can see that prior to even

6   starting the process the people that worked on

7   the original Common Ground study had really

8   outlined what it would take to have a successful

9   process so they wanted all stakeholders to report

10   information.

11   Prior to the Common Ground Alliance

12   specific industries may have collected data on

13   excavation damage, but there was no single

14   location where all stakeholders could submit

15   information.

16   Standardized information is reported.

17   They also saw the need for multiple different

18   industries to follow the same format. I think 9-

19   7 is interesting and something that we focused

20   on, which is the form is simple, so really making

21   sure that, you know, it's something that

22   everybody can understand across the industries

1   and that it's as simple as possible.

2   This also emphasizes training. I

3   think 9-9 is something that you'll see was

4   fundamental in the process of getting this

5   started, which was flexibility on completing the

6   form.

7   When this was originally written it

8   could have been a paper form, it eventually ended

9   up being the tool itself, which is, obviously, a

10   web-based form, and that all stakeholders, all

11   different vantage points are able to complete the

12   same form.

13   So this was all outlined during the

14   Common Ground study and when the organization was

15   created there were six subcommittees that were

16   established for the Common Ground Alliance and

17   one of those was the Data Reporting and

18   Evaluation Committee.

19   And this is the committee that

20   eventually worked on and worked through the

21   development of the tool itself and still to this

22   day is responsible for reviewing the data that is

1 submitted, reviewing any requests for

2 modifications to the form, ensuring that the

3 report is reflective of the industries that are

4 participating.

5   So, again, the committee was

6 established way back in 2001 and you can see this

7 is the original mission of the committee, that

8 they will look at currently available data, gaps

9 where additional data is needed, and how data for

10 various underground infrastructure components can

11 be gathered and published.

12   So back in 2001 when they first met,

13 I actually have heard stories about some of these

14 first meetings, people brought stacks of paper

15 and they were really trying to get their arms

16 around how are we going to put all of this

17 information into one location, you know, kind of

18 getting an idea of who is collecting information.

19   So particularly when you are looking

20 at multiple different industries and stakeholder

21 groups some are required to report to some

22 entity, some don't collect information at all,

1   and it is in a variety of different formats, so

2   there was a lot of literal paper to work through

3   and a lot of hurdles to discuss early on.

4   But by 2002 they adopted and approved

5   the data collection field form which is based on

6   the best practices and it still appears in the

7   best practices, it's Form 9-1.

8   And one thing that really helped move

9   the group forward was that in the State of

10   Colorado they had mandatory reporting that they

11   were able to implement around that same time and

12   so the Utility Notification Center of Colorado

13   had developed and finalized a web-based tool for

14   collecting data within their State.

15   So shortly after that and receiving a

16   demonstration from Colorado the group decided to

17   take that as kind of a basis for developing a

18   national tool and looked at that as an

19   opportunity to say, okay, well if this is working

20   successfully in Colorado let's try to take what

21   they have learned and develop a national tool

22   based on the State-based system.

1   So in 2003 the secure web application

2   was developed and it was launched. We collected

3   data, again, from all stakeholder groups. It was

4   completely voluntary.

5   And we had an approved registration

6   process that included company verification by

7   staff, so there were a few key things that kind

8   of helped us move forward, but before we moved

9   too far forward let's look at what data was

10   collected.

11   So we had a variety of different

12   fields, some of this may be familiar to you who

13   are familiar with the DIRT report. A lot of this

14   is very similar to what we collect today.

15   I think there have been a couple minor

16   modifications. We just went through an update

17   recently, but by and large it's been a very

18   consistent model over time.

19   So today, and our last report was on

20   2016 data, we just closed the reporting period

21   for 2017, so we always have March 31st as a

22   deadline.

1   So for 2016 the last report was based

2   on 391,000 records and that's approximately 500

3   companies submit data into DIRT, over 110 submit

4   more than 100 records, and it continues to grow

5   as a premiere resource.

6   You heard me say earlier that the best

7   practices remains the most accessed resource on

8   the site but the DIRT report is a close second.

9   And one of the things that I know you all are

10   interested in is maybe some of the challenges and

11   then the lessons learned that we went through

12   early on.

13   So I went back through and talked a

14   little bit with some of my colleagues about what

15   they remember from early meetings and some of the

16   members that have participated for many years and

17   I think one of the things that was definitely

18   talked about very early on and almost seen as an

19   impossible hurdle was that not all stakeholders

20   are collecting the same data, particularly when

21   you are talking about, you know, the locating

22   industry, excavators, facility owners.

1   Even within the facility owner

2   community there was concern over not collecting

3   the same data. So that was one of the reasons

4   that early on there was a standardized field form

5   adopted.

6   And one thing that particularly on

7   this committee we struggle with and continue to

8   struggle with is kind of the paralysis of

9   analysis, right.

10   So we could see all of the problems

11   that might exist in the future, but I remember

12   early on everybody said we have to just draw a

13   line in the sand, this is our standardized form,

14   we are going to promote this.

15   We gained consensus from the

16   stakeholder groups that were participating and

17   said this is what we are going to include, this

18   is what we are going to collect.

19   We wanted to make it one physical page

20   so that if you were out in the field if somebody

21   were collecting that information they could have

22   it on one page, it was the front and back, but we

1 felt like we still were accomplishing the one

2 page.

3   It was as simple as we could make it,

4 and that there was some flexibility in submitting

5 information, this was pretty important. And,

6 again, we had to say, you know, it might not be

7 the most ideal but how do we get the ball

8 rolling.

9   We had data not collected and

10 unknown/other offered for almost all of the

11 fields, except for things like contact

12 information, location, stakeholder group.

13   So we recently went through a minor

14 modification where we removed data not collected

15 and have just gone to unknown/other, but in the

16 beginning that was an important nuance because

17 people felt like they didn't want to say that

18 they didn't know they just wanted to let you know

19 they didn't collect it.

20   So there was a bit of a difference

21 there at the beginning. We also didn't make all

22 fields required. So, again, at the very

1 beginning there were a handful of fields that

2 were required.

3   We wanted to gain confidence of the

4 user community and let them know that, you know,

5 how the data was going to be used and help them

6 build that confidence over time.

7   We provided additional options like

8 root cause not listed. So if there was something

9 that somebody submitting a report felt like was

10 not included in our list of root causes they were

11 able to put that as an option and then there was

12 a comment required.

13   Another area that we had found

14 challenging and still is challenging today is

15 that some stakeholders don't collect data at all

16 and/or they don't see value in sharing the data.

17   So, again, particularly when you are

18 looking at -- Some of our industries are

19 regulated, some are not, some are required to

20 collect data internally, some are not, some are

21 small businesses, some are major corporations,

22 there is a wide range of differences here, so we

1 have tried to remove barriers where we can to

2 encourage the broadest possible number of people

3 to submit.

4   So we worked a lot on our messaging

5 and our marketing and our education, and one of

6 the things that I looked back, and if you see in

7 our early documentation and promotional

8 materials, we wanted everybody to submit, and

9 it's similar to kind of being involved in the

10 Common Ground Alliance in general, if you are not

11 here, if you're not submitting, your voice is not

12 being heard.

13   So particularly for some of the groups

14 that aren't currently submitting or currently

15 collecting data that was, you know, one of the

16 main things we said is, you know, if you're not

17 there, if you're not submitting, you're not being

18 heard.

19   We also documented successful case

20 studies, so showing how people have used data

21 internally in their own companies and been able

22 to kind of compare that to the national dataset

1   and what they have been able to do and accomplish

2   internally because of that.

3   We also tried to remove additional

4   barriers for those who maybe don't currently

5   collect. One of those is we developed something

6   called Virtual Private DIRT.

7   So if an organization or a small

8   business or a trade association wants to collect

9   data for their industry but they don't have a

10   system Virtual Private DIRT allowed them to

11   collect it and have their own separate instance

12   and that data can then be annually loaded into

13   the national DIRT database, but they have some

14   additional control over the data that is

15   submitted directly to them.

16   They can perform additional reports on

17   that data, they can actually customize the fields

18   a little bit. So if there is things that they

19   want to collect, and this has been important for

20   groups like the National Telecommunications

21   Damage Prevention Council, they wanted to collect

22   aboveground incidents.

1   We don't want any aboveground

2   incidents in the DIRT data, but this allowed them

3   to add that to the field form. They can collect

4   additional data but when it is pulled into the

5   national database it's scrubbed out and we don't

6   include that in the report.

7   We also have multiple ways to submit

8   data. So there are, again, small businesses,

9   small organizations, or some large that may have

10   one, two, three, four, five incidents a year that

11   they want to submit into DIRT, and we also have

12   some that submit thousands of incidents into the

13   system.

14   So there is a bulk upload option that

15   people can use and we have people on staff and

16   developers that have worked closely with

17   companies getting their staff up to speed when

18   you are loading a massive amount of data versus

19   those who are using it in a single form and want

20   to be able to submit, you know, their data as the

21   incidents are occurring.

22   We also have worked a lot with

1   national associations, the National Utility

2   Contractors Association, the American Gas

3   Association, we have talked and worked with a lot

4   of those groups and their members to encourage

5   additional participation.

6   Additional challenge, the data is not

7   collected through a uniform system or a process.

8   So this has been, you know, and this continues to

9   be a question and one of the things that we try

10   to address through education, but not everybody

11   is going through the same process in the field

12   when they are collecting this information, that

13   was one concern.

14   So we have a user's guide that is

15   intended to provide that background so that

16   everyone has a common understanding on what the

17   fields represent.

18   We also continuously do webinars, we

19   have updated documentation and we provide one-on-

20   one consultation. So we have been very open to,

21   you know, from the early days some of the

22   developers themselves who worked on the system

1 working one-on-one with people in various

2 companies trying to get their data loaded to

3 today where we have new members joining all the

4 time and new users who talk to our program

5 manager specifically to get additional

6 information.

7 One thing that popped up a lot early

8 on, and this is one of those where when I

9 mentioned that we almost had to draw a line in

10 the sand and say let's tackle those problems when

11 they come to us, the quality of data was a

12 concern partially because it was voluntary

13 submissions.

14 So there is nobody saying you have to

15 do this, nobody saying you have to do it this

16 way, it's all voluntary. So we knew that it

17 would take a little time and we were also

18 anticipating problems that weren't yet a problem.

19 These are things people talked about before we

20 ever had data in the system.

21 So a couple things that we did to

22 alleviate concerns prior to getting started and

1   that what we have done over time, we had an

2   approved registration process and this was, you

3   know, some of the concerns people had early on

4   were how do we know it's real company, what if

5   someone wants to, you know, join the DIRT tool

6   and submit fake data, how do we make sure that's

7   not happening.

8   So we had a pretty lengthy approval

9   process for the registration and even still when

10   you register as a user a staff member will review

11   your profile, ensure that there isn't a duplicate

12   company or representative from your company in

13   the system, and reach out by phone, if necessary,

14   to confirm that your company is, indeed, you

15   know, we have consultants sometimes that will, I

16   think they are interested in learning more about

17   the tool, we have a variety of organizations that

18   may try to get into the system and they are not

19   necessarily rejected, they are pointed to the

20   sandbox, which is our test site, and that has

21   helped a lot.

22   So people who are interested in

1   learning more about the tool they are not

2   actually getting registration, they're not

3   getting past registration, they are actually

4   being forced to go to a test site so that they

5   can take a look and get the information that they

6   need without kind of muddying the water.

7   We had duplicate data detection

8   incorporated early on. This has, you know,

9   really been more for those bulk upload

10   situations, so if somebody accidently bulk

11   uploads twice that's a big shift in data.

12   Agreed to monitor, this is one of

13   things that early on people were concerned about

14   and only more recently became something that we

15   built into the process to address.

16   So because we have data coming from

17   multiple different sources there was concern that

18   we would have many reports on the same event and

19   how would we account for that.

20   So, you know, if the locator, the

21   excavator, and the facility owner are all

22   reporting does that count as three incidents, how

1   does that play into the estimate of total damages

2   in the U.S.

3   So early on we really only -- We got

4   most of our data from facility owners. They were

5   already collecting it. It wasn't really an issue

6   early on.

7   In recent years we have received an

8   increasing number of reports from the locating

9   industry and from the excavating industry. So we

10   worked with an outside consultant to develop, you

11   know, essentially a way for us to, it's kind of a

12   fuzzy match, so you could look at a variety of

13   fields, you are able to see that there is a 90

14   percent confidence that this is, you know, this

15   is the same event.

16   And then with that what do we do?

17   Well, we're not going to throw anything out, but

18   the information that can have different answers,

19   so root cause, you may have a different root

20   cause from the locating industry than from the

21   facility owner, and that's okay.

22   So that information is taken into

1 account, but we weight it. So 50 percent, if

2 it's two different people submitting on the same

3 event 50 percent would be weighted to one root

4 cause, 50 percent for the other.

5   You would still have multiple

6 different records but you are able to kind of

7 whittle down and see what is the best estimate

8 for total damages using that methodology.

9   So that is something that really took

10 us many years to get to the point where it was

11 statistically significant enough that we needed

12 to take a step in that direction.

13   We also have a data quality index

14 score for our users and we use that overall so we

15 can see, and by quality I mean how much of the

16 data is an organization actually submitting.

17   So early on, particularly when we were

18 trying to reduce the barriers to the bare minimum

19 to get people to submit we would get somewhere,

20 maybe they only had one or two fields that were

21 substantive beyond contact information that they

22 were submitting into the system.

1   As time went on we wanted to let

2   people know the quality of what you are

3   submitting is fairly low at this point. We want

4   you to work on increasing that quality.

5   And that has helped us in, you know,

6   really reaching out to the user community and

7   making sure that they understand what the ideal

8   information is that we are looking for.

9   So, again, one of the big questions we

10   had early on was, you know, how do I know this

11   data is secure and how do we know it's

12   confidential.

13   So at CGA we have always kept the data

14   confidential, so we don't report out on who, we

15   don't let people know who is reporting unless

16   they choose to let people know.

17   We don't include any of that in the

18   actual report itself so much so that, you know,

19   early on particularly we wouldn't report out

20   anything on a state level because of those

21   companies that are primarily the only operator in

22   a specific stakeholder group for a state.

1   So there was a lot of ways that we

2   tackled being as confidential and as secure as we

3   possible could. With that being said, when we

4   were first getting started, you know, CGA was

5   new.

6   So there wasn't a brand or trust level

7   there that there is now with the Common Ground

8   Alliance. So we did quite a few things to try to

9   alleviate concerns over what we may or not do

10   with the data that we are asking for.

11   One was the security whitepaper. So

12   this is written specifically from really the

13   developer standpoint, so the people that we

14   worked with developed the system, pretty detailed

15   information that could be handed off to an

16   internal, you know, expert in a particular

17   company to say this is what the Common Ground

18   Alliance has put in place to make sure that your

19   data is secure, very specific information on how

20   the data is stored, you know, what processes are

21   in place to ensure the actual data itself is

22   secure.

1   Then there is the issue of

2   confidentiality and a lot of concerns over, well,

3   if we're giving our data to CGA what if CGA is

4   subpoenaed for that information and they have to

5   provide it.

6   So we had our attorney at the time

7   draft a memo or a confidentiality policy to

8   review really what our stance is, so we are not

9   planning to report out and we kind of went

10   through details on we don't plan to provide

11   names, we're not going to report out on specific

12   information by company, and then went through,

13   you know, what the process would be that we would

14   take if we were, if this data was requested by a

15   third party.

16   So if it's a third party that just

17   says, hey, I want to have access to that data,

18   you know, that's a no. And the subpoena issue is

19   interesting and it has been a long time now, you

20   know, we've gone through many, many years of this

21   system and this report and that hasn't happened,

22   and the real, you know, the way that our attorney

1   used to explain it was if somebody wants this

2   data and you are collecting it we are not the

3   best source for that information.

4   So what we really agreed to do is we

5   are not going to put that information out and

6   then he worked on alleviating the concerns that

7   really the Common Ground Alliance isn't going to

8   be the best source of this information anyways.

9   So it was a two-part effort. I think

10   we had a handful of teleconferences early on

11   where our attorneys spoke to a lot of our members

12   and was able to answer those questions and we

13   still make that information available to the user

14   community.

15   We also had some key members and

16   sponsors that although it was confidential early

17   on went out, promoted the tool, endorsed kind of

18   their use of DIRT and talked about the value, so

19   that helped a lot.

20   And then again we had a lot of

21   education. I don't know how many of you know Bob

22   Kipp who was our previous President, but he spent

1 a lot of time in the early years of the DIRT tool

2 one-on-one talking to companies, talking to

3 organizations, making them feel comfortable about

4 what the CGA's intent was in using the data.

5 And that brings us to kind of the

6 limited confidence in how the data would be used

7 or reported. So, again, before we started this

8 process people weren't sure if we were going to

9 compare one company to another.

10 They weren't sure if we were going to

11 rank states by, you know, which ones were doing

12 better than others. So we relied a lot on first

13 of all the growing view of Common Ground

14 Alliance.

15 So at the time, again, as CGA kind of

16 grew as a trusted source so did the DIRT tool.

17 We also hired an outside consultant to draft the

18 report and analyze the data.

19 So we worked, you know, we worked

20 through a very transparent RFP process. We had a

21 lot of member companies who encouraged people

22 that they had worked with in the past to submit

1   proposals.

2   We ended up we worked with multiple

3   different consultants throughout the years, we

4   have worked with PhDs, university, people with

5   the university backgrounds.

6   In the last couple rounds we have

7   worked with consultants that are specifically

8   working on analyzing reporting out on data

9   similar to our DIRT data.

10   I also think that our process, and one

11 of the reasons I talked about best practices in

12 our committee process, I think that helped a lot.

13 You know, the Data Reporting and Evaluation

14 Committee was made up of members of all of these

15 different industries.

16   They came together, they voiced their

17 concerns, a lot of those concerns were similar to

18 their peers and we were able to address a lot of

19 those at the committee level and come out with a

20 consensus-based process, product, and then

21 eventually a report that all of those groups, you

22 know, hopefully could agree to, and then we, you

1 know, published our report.

2 So I think, you know, this was

3 probably the number one thing we could do to gain

4 confidence of the industry of our member

5 community and our users was actually starting to

6 report out.

7 So before, you know, we knew that we

8 had very limited data that first year but we knew

9 we had to start reporting on it so that people

10 could see that we were telling the truth and that

11 we were going to report out on trends and overall

12 information based on the data.

13 So we published the first report in

14 2004. By 2015 -- So we published a print report

15 for each of the years in between and then in 2015

16 we added an interactive dashboard, we used

17 Tableau with the consultant we were working with

18 at the time, and you are able to interact a

19 little bit more with the data than in previous

20 years, and as of 2016 we have over 390,000

21 damages submitted into DIRT.

22 I put this up mainly so that -- It's

1   a pretty complicated slide, but I wanted to show

2   you that line toward the bottom where it talks

3   about 2004 through 2016 and you can see where we

4   started.

5   We had about 20,000 -- Oops, I have

6   done something. I can't seem to get back to --

7   Is there a way to hit escape maybe or -- It's

8   not, the clicker is not working. There we go.

9   So you can see that yellow line that

10   is there. That shows the increase in data that

11   we have received over time. So we have

12   consistently been able to collect more and more

13   data.

14   The kind of wide band is our estimate

15   of total U.S. damages based on the data we have.

16   So we have always -- We still don't have every

17   single report on every single incident that

18   occurs throughout the country so our consultants

19   work through a variety of methods to identify

20   what they believe the total estimate to be and

21   then the band or range that they think is

22   accurate, and you can see that as we collect more

1   data we are getting closer to what may be the

2   total damages in the U.S.

3   And then here you can see we have

4   really a large number of reports coming from the

5   locator stakeholder group, a lot from natural

6   gas, an increasing number from excavators, and

7   then the remainder there you can see smaller

8   numbers from the other stakeholder groups.

9   If you look at the facilities damage

10   that are submitted into the system it is still

11   primarily telecom followed by natural gas.

12   This is some of the information that

13   we have provided year-over-year. We have a

14   damage root cause group. So we have a variety of

15   different root causes that are in the system but

16   we kind of roll them into one overarching

17   category.

18   So excavation practices not sufficient

19   may have six or seven actual root causes within

20   that, and so we have seen over time originally

21   notification not made was a much larger piece of

22   the pie and we have been able to reduce that

1　　　pretty significantly over the last decade or so,

2　　　and now excavation practices not sufficient is

3　　　the largest piece.

4　　　　　　This is the front of that interactive

5　　　dashboard, and you can't really see but at the

6　　　top there are various tabs so you are able to go

7　　　to each tab and kind of slice and dice

8　　　information within the tool based on reporting

9　　　stakeholder facility affected and give the user a

10　　　lot more opportunity to look at the data as a

11　　　whole.

12　　　　　　We have also found it very valuable to

13　　　report out not only the actual written report,

14　　　which provides a lot of the basis for the

15　　　analysis, but some more information that, you

16　　　know, figuring out how to use this data in ways

17　　　that are helpful to our membership.

18　　　　　　So a lot of this really trying to

19　　　emphasize, you know, how are we quantifying the

20　　　information that we have received and how can we

21　　　use this to better educate your members, your

22　　　consumers.

1   And so, you know, in looking at the

2 key takeaways and what we learned from this whole

3 process I think an important component again is

4 that it stemmed from our consensus-based best

5 practices.

6   So there was a really strong

7 understanding of what we wanted to collect, how

8 we wanted to do it, and the importance of that

9 data early on.

10   I think the committee input and the

11 participation of the different stakeholder groups

12 throughout the process was really valuable. I

13 think anonymity and confidentiality were always

14 very important and it was important that we took

15 some of the right steps early on to make sure

16 that we alleviated those fears and concerns.

17   We had some flexibility in data

18 submission, just enough so that we could

19 encourage, kind of get the ball rolling, and we

20 could get data into the system, and then over

21 time we have reduced some of that flexibility but

22 we do still allow people to, you know, we allow

1 for some of those differences in data collection

2 methods.

3   Stakeholders began to see value in the

4 report. So as the report has grown and we have

5 been able to, you know, increase references to

6 the DIRT report, use of the DIRT report, we have

7 seen an increase in people submitting data, and I

8 think users continue to trust CGA and the

9 process.

10   So we have been very transparent about

11 how the data is collected, we have encouraged

12 participation across all stakeholder groups, and

13 I think that is evident in the success that we

14 continue to have. Any questions?

15   CHAIR BURMAN: Dan?

16   MEMBER COTE: Yes, in terms of the

17 people that submit data, they do so voluntarily,

18 obviously, but does that also imply that they may

19 selectively submit data or is there any sort of

20 agreement that says once I participate and submit

21 data then I need to submit my entire universe of

22 damages?

1   So could I choose, for example, as a

2   member to only report to CGA those damages that

3   were caused by excavators at fault, either

4   failure to call or failure to practice safe

5   digging practices around a utility, but not

6   report my own poor locates or poor records or any

7   quality issues I have?

8   MS. LEE: There is no requirement. So

9   it could be entirely selective.

10   MEMBER COTE: Got you.

11   MS. LEE: We haven't seen that. I

12   would say that, you know, one thing we have seen

13   is if, you know, if it's an incident that has

14   resulted in a fatality or injuries we tend not to

15   get that information. I think those are, they

16   are the more rare instances when we are not

17   getting the information.

18   I think we are getting a lot, you

19   know, if you look at the facilities affected, for

20   example, it's a lot of telecommunications, we're

21   getting a lot of information from the locating

22   stakeholder group who often times is conducting

1	an evaluation or they are going out into the

2	field and doing it on behalf of their clients.

3	So we are getting it from a variety of

4	different sources. Our hope originally along

5	those lines was that if we are encouraging all

6	the stakeholder groups to submit that we are

7	getting kind of a more balanced look.

8	But, no, we have no way to enforce or

9	require that people submit all of their data.

10	MEMBER COTE: I understand. Thank

11	you.

12	CHAIR BURMAN: Can you go back to the

13	slide with the nine minutes?

14	MS. LEE: Mm-hmm.

15	CHAIR BURMAN: So it says every nine

16	minutes a utility line is hit because someone

17	didn't call 811. So I have seen the statistic

18	every nine minutes, but I have also seen every

19	six minutes. Where do we get these numbers?

20	MS. LEE: So every six minutes was

21	previously and then as we have reduced the number

22	of incidents the estimate of total damages in the

1   U.S. we have increased the number of minutes.

2   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. So we have

3   actually -- It's gotten better --

4   (Simultaneous speaking)

5   CHAIR BURMAN: It's gotten better,

6   yes.

7   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, all right.

8   That's important. All right, thank you. And

9   then can you go back to the pie chart?

10   MS. LEE: Mm-hmm.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Yes, this one. So

12   excavation practice is not sufficient

13   notification, actually notification not made, the

14   16 percent I think that is --

15   MS. LEE: Yes.

16   CHAIR BURMAN: -- when you look at

17   that do you look at the state's, like out of that

18   16 percent maybe homeowners, right, so state's --

19   I'm just curious if you look at where

20   notification wasn't required?

21   MS. LEE: We so somewhat. We are --

22   Particularly we just added a field to the tool

1   that talks a little bit about exceptions, asking

2   if people were exempt from calling.

3   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

4   MS. LEE: And then we have done some

5   in the past where we are looking at state-by-

6   state information, especially as we have gained

7   additional data we are able to look more closely

8   at those states where we have a really, we feel

9   we have a saturated amount of data, we have a lot

10 of data from a particular state.

11   We are able to better compare what's

12 going on in those states to, you know, laws,

13 things that might be different by state, legal

14 issues, exemptions, enforcement.

15   So those are the types of things that

16 each year as the data gets better and as we get

17 more data from more states more comprehensively

18 we are able to take a look at that.

19   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, thank you.

20   MS. LEE: Mm-hmm.

21   CHAIR BURMAN: Just for me it is

22 important also to understand where the education

1   is necessary and where the training is necessary.

2   MS. LEE: Right.

3   CHAIR BURMAN: So that's why when I

4   look at this I wonder, so thank you very much.

5   MS. LEE: Yes.

6   CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone -- Oh, I'm

7   sorry, Mark, and then we'll go down. Thanks.

8   MEMBER HERETH: Mark Hereth. Thank

9   you for the presentation. You know, you guys

10   have done a great job of getting data out so that

11   we can see the big picture and then really focus

12   on areas like the importance of maintaining

13   marks, the importance of considering long

14   projects and duration of tickets and things like

15   that.

16   What do you think about this new

17   effort, looking at Gold Shovel, which also uses

18   metrics and where does that go relative to where

19   you guys are?

20   MS. LEE: Well I think Gold Shovel,

21   you know, we're different, we're not a standards

22   organization. We have really a different area of

1   focus.

2   The Common Ground Alliance continues

3   to really look at what are, you know, identified

4   best practices, what are -- and we focus on our

5   consensus-based, you know, look at things.

6   I think, you know, we continue to

7   monitor and look at what Gold Shovel is focused

8   on. I think that they are filling a need that a

9   lot of, that some of our stakeholders, some of

10   our members feel is important, but, you know, we

11   are very different. We are not in the business

12   of identifying or establishing standards.

13   MEMBER HERETH: Okay. And if I can

14   ask a follow-up there?

15   MS. LEE: Yes.

16   MEMBER HERETH: Does what they are

17   doing concern you at all in terms of the positive

18   impact you are having, especially the de-

19   identification and the work there, because Gold

20   Shovel is clearly a place where it's identified

21   between operator and contractor and it's actually

22   made a part of a process and it seems so

1 different than yours, do you think that has --

2 What kind of impacts will it have on DIRT or is

3 it none at all? Just curious.

4   MS. LEE: I am not sure if I see there

5 being an impact on DIRT, you know, in the near

6 term, but I do, you know, there is quite a lot

7 of, there are people that are involved in Gold

8 Shovel that are also involved in the Common

9 Ground Alliance so I think the important thing is

10 we are keeping kind of open communication and

11 monitoring what they are working on.

12   And really a lot of, you know, what

13 they are doing we feel is in a different vein, a

14 different category, and serves a different

15 purpose, particularly for our facility owner

16 members.

17   CHAIR BURMAN: Kate?

18   MEMBER BLYSTONE: Thank you so much

19 for your time. One of the things that we are

20 grappling with as a group is how to make the

21 information that we are gathering, how to have

22 some sort of interaction with the public, or

1   allow the public to interact with it in a way

2   that is logical and protects that anonymity and

3   all of that.

4   So that's just something that we

5   really talked about and I am really interested in

6   how you have gone about doing this with Tableau

7   an the online, I've been playing with it as you

8   were talking.

9   I was paying attention, but I was also

10   playing a little bit. I am just curious how, it

11   looks like you have done this for a couple of

12   years now, I am curious how this is happening,

13   like what kind of reaction you are getting from

14   people, how many people touch this audit, whether

15   you have statistics on how many people actually

16   dig into it?

17   And then, also, if you could touch a

18   little bit more on the evolution of how you see

19   this progressing, because it looks like it's

20   reported every, you know, there is a set of data

21   that comes out of 2016 in August of 2017, right,

22   so presumably in August of 2018 we'll get 2017

1   data.

2   I am wondering if there is a situation

3   where CGA is considering allowing that data to

4   come out on a quarterly basis or as something

5   more frequent.

6   So those are my -- It's a lot, but

7   whatever you remember is fine.

8   MS. LEE: I think I got it. No, I'll

9   start with the Tableau.

10   MEMBER BLYSTONE: Okay.

11   MS. LEE: That's a good point. I

12   think that was a, you know, that was definitely

13   part of an evolution, so I think early on that

14   would not have been something people would have

15   felt comfortable with.

16   I think over time we have, again,

17   shown that we are interested in trends, we're

18   interested in helping people have a better way to

19   target educational, you know, focus to identify

20   areas where they can, you know, increase, enhance

21   damage prevention.

22   So I think over time because of that

1 we have been able to move in the direction to

2 provide a little bit more granular information,

3 which is what Tableau provided.

4 I do think there is a lot of

5 opportunity for us to grow in that area. I think

6 because we just started working in the kind of

7 interactive dashboard area, we are working with a

8 new contractor this year, and I think there are a

9 lot of different ways that we can display the

10 information that is more user friendly and may

11 increase those numbers you are talking about.

12 We have had about, since the report

13 was published, I think last I looked it was 3000

14 page views, you know, so not amazing, but not,

15 you know, it's definitely being used.

16 I do think, you know, one of the

17 challenges is with the system we have, you have

18 to be at a computer, you can't be on your phone.

19 We are kind of streaming, or we are embedding

20 information directly from Tableau because we

21 aren't a Tableau, you know, we don't have an

22 account ourselves so we pull it directly from

1   their site and embed it in our site.

2   So there are some technical issues

3   there, but I will say that once we are able to

4   get people involved in looking at the data I

5   think when you talk about where we are going I

6   think that's really important.

7   I think people now see, now that we

8   have passed those, and, again, you've got to

9   remember when we first started we didn't have, we

10   hadn't been around that long, so now that we have

11   this, you know, I think people see the value of

12   data more and more.

13   I think that there is a lot of

14   opportunity for us to provide even more granular

15   information, again still protecting the anonymity

16   of the companies, but more granular information

17   so that people are better able to compare.

18   You know, I think in an ideal world

19   you would be able to look at your own information

20   and compare it to your region, compare it to what

21   you have on a national level, and you'd be able

22   to take a look.

1   But, again, it wouldn't be something

2   we would report out on but you as a company might

3   be able to get that value of seeing, okay, how am

4   I compared to all the other companies in this

5   stakeholder group in this region, give people

6   some more tools so that they can use that

7   themselves.

8   MEMBER BLYSTONE: Thank you so much.

9   MS. LEE: Yes.

10   CHAIR BURMAN: Dan?

11   MEMBER COTE: We certainly appreciate

12   your time and patience with us. Thank you.

13   MS. LEE: Oh, yes.

14   MEMBER COTE: This has been very

15   interesting. Just one additional question on the

16   data, as you know there are any number of states

17   that have very vigorous state programs to collect

18   and capture data, and in many cases it's

19   mandatory, and so while it's probably not 100

20   percent perfect, it's pretty darn good.

21   I mean New York comes to mind, for

22   example, and a number of other states that I can

1   think of easily. Now do you extract that data

2   and insert it to the extent that it's publically

3   available anyway?

4   MS. LEE: In many of those cases that

5   data is being submitted into DIRT. So in states

6   where, without pulling up too many examples, in

7   states where the is a data reporting requirement

8   there are a couple states that actually use

9   Virtual Private DIRT as their system of choice to

10   collect information from the stakeholders in

11   their state.

12   Start with Colorado since that was the

13   one that we started with long ago, but they

14   actually, that's a seamless process. There are

15   other instances where we have a single, you know,

16   an extraction once per year that the entity sends

17   over to us, and that makes it even more important

18   to kind of go back to that process that I

19   outlined where if we are getting reports from

20   multiple different groups in the same state it is

21   important for us to be able to quantify how many

22   if we are getting duplicates.

1   So that's something that we have had

2   to go through, but for those who have been

3   working on the committee for a long time they see

4   that as a positive.

5   I mean I think the more data that we

6   get, you know, there are a lot of ways around the

7   analysis side. It's physically getting the data

8   in our hands, which we seem to be getting, you

9   know, more and more of, so now we are making sure

10   that we are tackling all of the other questions

11   and issues.

12   MEMBER COTE: Thank you.

13   MR. KIEBA: Max Kieba, PHMSA. Can you

14   give more insight on who all is involved with

15   reviewing and analyzing the data?

16   MS. LEE: So we have had multiple

17   consultants over the years who help with the data

18   analysis and review. We worked with FMI for

19   about five or six years.

20   We are now working with a group called

21   Green Analytics, they had done some analysis and

22   reporting in Canada, and really went through,

1   again, a pretty open RFP process to ensure that

2   we got responses back, so we feel comfortable

3   with the consultants that we are working with.

4   And then separately we have a DIRT

5   program manager who works directly with the

6   stakeholders and ensures, answers questions, kind

7   of helps move the project forward, and then we

8   have probably 40 plus people that are very active

9   on the data committee, and it ranges, I mean I

10   think we have representation from probably 12 out

11   of the 16 different stakeholder groups that serve

12   on the Reporting Task Team.

13   So those people, and I didn't mention

14   this earlier, but I think this has been

15   important, is they actually interact directly

16   with the consultant.

17   So it's not like, you know, I'm a

18   staff person, I talk to the consultant, I go back

19   to the committee, I tell them what the consultant

20   said, we have calls where everybody is on the

21   same call.

22   So they are able to get their

1   questions answered and they are really able to

2   act as, you know, they are going back out to

3   their stakeholder groups and able to communicate

4   to their constituents, you know, what is

5   happening within the Common Ground Alliance.

6   So it's people who are really using

7   the data, I think that has been important. So

8   they see how they want to use the data, they are

9   from member companies, and they are able to

10 contribute and provide questions and potential

11 ways for the consultant to look at that data.

12   MR. KIEBA: So is it just member

13 companies that are part of that committee?

14   MS. LEE: It's just member companies,

15 yes.

16   MR. KIEBA: Okay.

17   MS. LEE: But we have non-members that

18 submit to DIRT. So DIRT, the system itself, you

19 do not have to be a member of the organization to

20 report, but it is just member companies that

21 participate in the data committee.

22   MR. KIEBA: Has there ever been

1   thought of having regulators as part of that

2   group?

3   MS. LEE: We do have state regulators

4   that are part of the CGA. So, in fact, you know,

5   we have, that's one group that is represented on

6   the committee.

7   MR. KIEBA: The actual committee that

8   is reviewing the data?

9   MS. LEE: The Data Reporting

10 Evaluation Committee, yes.

11   MR. KIEBA: Okay. Because that is one

12 thing we are kind of also talking is the whole

13 trust factor going both ways --

14   MS. LEE: Right.

15   MR. KIEBA: -- that if you start

16 introducing regulators into some kind of

17 information sharing how do you get that trust

18 going and all that.

19   MS. LEE: Now even at -- I should

20 point out the committee doesn't see, so the

21 Reporting and Evaluation Committee and the Task

22 Team members don't see who submitted the data.

1   So the developers scrub the data.

2   They only people --

3   MR. KIEBA: So it's de-identified by

4   that point?

5   MS. LEE: Exactly.

6   MR. KIEBA: Okay.

7   MS. LEE: So the only people that see

8   the data really, I mean I have access to the

9   data, staff, there is like six of us, there is

10   three staff members that actually have access,

11   the developers and the consultants.

12   But really the consultants almost

13   have, I don't think that there has been an

14   instance where they have had to look. So if

15   there were ever a situation where there was a

16   question about, for example, we have had

17   situations where a company submitted, you know,

18   50 fatalities and the consultant says this

19   doesn't seem right, we go back as staff and look

20   and say, oh, that's definitely not right, there

21   was an error here in the submission.

22   So there have been things where we

1   look back but the consultant itself does not

2   really even have to see the submitters.

3   MR. KIEBA: Okay, thank you.

4   MS. LEE: Mm-hmm.

5   MEMBER JENSEN: Thank you. Leif

6   Jensen with Sunoco Pipeline.

7   MS. LEE: Yes.

8   MEMBER JENSEN: A two-part question.

9   Given what you have just answered do you have

10   governance documents or policy documents or

11   workflow documents that you would be willing to

12   share with us to help us formulate what we need

13   to develop?

14   MS. LEE: Yes.

15   MEMBER JENSEN: And then the second

16   part, the six or seven people you identified that

17   handled the data, even with the consultants, do

18   you have provisions in place that outline their

19   expectations to maintain confidentiality?

20   MS. LEE: We do, yes, particularly in

21   the contracts with the consultant. For staff

22   it's part of our, you know, that's kind of part

1   of our working mantra in general. We don't have

2   -- We have a lot of information about members

3   that we wouldn't share with the public at large.

4   MEMBER JENSEN: Thanks.

5   CHAIR BURMAN: Any other questions at

6   the table?

7   (No audible response)

8   CHAIR BURMAN: On the phone?

9   (No audible response)

10   CHAIR BURMAN: In the audience?

11   MS. SAMS: Erika, not a question but

12   just a comment, I know that when the DIRT reports

13   first started coming out we all found them very

14   beneficial, but you even upped that even more by

15   putting out very specific industry reports which

16   then allows me, for like the natural gas

17   industry, to compare the natural gas industry

18   with other industries to see where I need to

19   focus education, resources, so I found that very

20   beneficial. I just wanted to give you kudos.

21   MS. LEE: Awe, thanks. Yes, we did

22   that, I don't remember the first year, but we did

1   a gas distribution specific report. So we have

2   come out, and now with Tableau even more so you

3   are able to really look at your industry and see

4   how it compares to the other industries that are

5   in the system.

6   CHAIR BURMAN: Great. Well thank you

7   very, very much. This was very helpful. I

8   appreciate it, thank you.

9   MS. LEE: You're welcome.

10   (Applause)

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. So I don't

12   think, unless someone is needing to take a break

13   I think we can go -- Okay. See, I am sensitive

14   to that.

15   All right, so now we are going to go

16   right now to Agenda Item 4. I think we have the

17   IT Architecture Scope issues. I believe -- Hmm?

18   Yes?

19   DR. MURRAY: It's just really an open

20   discussion. So I know there has been a lot of

21   conversation around data and IT, architecture, so

22   we're just opening it up, and I think this came

1   out of subcommittee conversations, et cetera,

2   that it might be useful to have some time to just

3   talk in general.

4   CHAIR BURMAN: Mark, I think you had

5   been someone who had expressed some interest in

6   this topic, so --

7   MEMBER HERETH: Yes.

8   CHAIR BURMAN: Sorry, I don't mean to

9   put you on the spot.

10   MEMBER HERETH: No, that's okay, thank

11   you. I was going to wait until it was the

12   appropriate time, so, thank you. Mark Hereth.

13   So Bryce and I had an offline

14   discussion and then I spoke with two of his world

15   class experts over there, Mark and Jason, and I

16   think there could be some value if we had at the

17   committee level a presentation on data

18   architecture looking at where that science and

19   practice is today.

20   I think we got a little bit of a

21   glimpse yesterday with the MITRE folks and then I

22   appreciate the comments today about the use of

1   Tableau, and particularly in the visualization

2   side, but I think we could use what I'll call

3   some level setting, that is get -- so we all

4   don't need to have the depth of expertise that

5   these guys have, but I think to appreciate the

6   value and the importance that architecture plays

7   if we could have a presentation, and I'll let

8   Bryce and these guys weigh in, but they suggested

9   maybe bringing it, they could do it or they could

10   bring in Google or Amazon and talk about the

11   various aspects of this that I think give us a

12   lot of flexibility and a lot of open kind of

13   thinking that we didn't have five or ten years

14   ago.

15   So I think it would be helpful to have

16   that kind of discussion. And, Bryce, you may

17   want to weight in, or I guess he's out, but --

18   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

19   MEMBER CRADIT: Jason Cradit, TRC.

20   No, I echo Mark's sentiment that we could

21   certainly provide a discussion to the broad

22   committee on data architecture and modern data

1   science and data structures as they exist in

2   2018.

3   CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. And, I guess for

4   me it's also looking at in terms of information

5   but also to how it fits.

6   So, in to the extent that we're

7   looking at it, not just from, okay, here's

8   information but now why is this important in the

9   larger context and how we move forward.

10   (Off microphone comment)

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Right. But also beyond

12   the report.

13   And so even, I know Alicia left and I

14   know Michael Bellamy are probably also people

15   that would be very helpful to the discussion on

16   that. And, you know, from the technology

17   perspective weighing in and looking back at some

18   of the conversations we had.

19   I know Holly has talked about

20   predictive analytics and just other things that

21   may help formulate why it is important and how it

22   might fit in the larger context I think would be

1 helpful. So that's something we can look at.

2 And then who would be the right folks

3 to have here but also needing to do a little

4 homework so that we can be well prepared when it

5 comes to the larger group for that discussion.

6 So thank you.

7 Okay, is there anything else? Thanks.

8 MR. KIEBA: Yes, until Bryce, or maybe

9 Bryce is here now, but I sat in on ADFO with the

10 R&D Technology.

11 But interesting discussion or thoughts

12 that I heard were, part of possible designs of

13 that architecture there could be different

14 layers.

15 You could have the really, really

16 fancy system but it's going to be really

17 expensive. Or you can have something that maybe

18 gets started but it's going to be cheaper but

19 maybe not work as well.

20 So, with the end goal being some

21 options or recommendations and still keeping

22 funding in the back of the mind, which I think

1   also goes to Randy's group is, what's the sense

2   of what those boundaries are.

3   CHAIR BURMAN: So, Bryce, you walked

4   out of the room, your name was mentioned 20 times

5   and you had 50 homework assignments. No, I'm

6   just kidding.

7   But we were talking about, just so you

8   know what we were talking about, IT Architecture,

9   and the discussion around having a fuller

10   conversation as a Committee and working with your

11   subcommittee as well as the technology vendor

12   gurus. There are four or five of them on the

13   fuller committee to bring a fuller presentation

14   to the larger group and keeping in mind where we

15   want to go with those issues.

16   MEMBER BROWN: Okay.

17   CHAIR BURMAN: So, Holly.

18   MEMBER PEAREN: Holly Pearen,

19   Environmental Defense Fund. I think this is an

20   excellent idea.

21   In addition to sort of data industry

22   leaders perhaps someone from NASA could shed some

1 light on how they've done their holding programs

2 for their agencies.

3   I also want to just repeat what Alicia

4 said earlier about two seemingly separate flows

5 of information and perhaps two separate platforms

6 for the ILI technology information and user or

7 stakeholder more qualitative information.

8   I think those two tracks have become

9 very evident and I want to make sure that we

10 continue to align them in all aspects of

11 committee work. But that would be something to

12 particularly request that presenters address with

13 the description of various benefits and drawbacks

14 of the technology options.

15   CHAIR BURMAN: Very good points, thank

16 you.

17   Okay, so that will be something that

18 we'll have on our to do list when we work on the

19 Panel conference call. So it's a, we'll work

20 through those issues and just have it as, I know

21 Dr. Murray has wrote down that so we'll work

22 through it, okay. Okay, thank you.

1   So now we're done with Agenda Item 4,

2   really now we're into the Agenda Item 5 which is

3   the Committee Preparatory Discussion. And again,

4   I don't necessarily think this is going to be the

5   next, a long discussion.

6   I'm going to turn it over to Dr.

7   Murray. She wants to talk, sort of a little bit

8   about sort of the next meetings and some of the

9   other issues and then get into sort of the heart

10   of where we're going. But I do expect that we'll

11   end relatively early today.

12   DR. MURRAY: All right, thank you.

13   So, one of the things that I wanted to do is talk

14   about planning, of course, for the next meeting.

15   And I wanted to get some feedback from the

16   Committee.

17   What we did in the Subcommittee

18   meetings yesterday, how we organized them, we

19   broke them up so that we had small, fewer

20   subcommittees meeting at one time. And I wanted

21   to get feedback to see how well that worked this

22   time from the way we did it in February and if

1   there are any additional tweaks we might want to

2   make? So that's my first question for the

3   Committee.

4   CHAIR BURMAN: Dan.

5   MEMBER COTE: Just to get the

6   discussion started. I thought yesterday was an

7   improvement on the February process, I thought it

8   was much more fluid.

9   I was impressed with the way the

10   individual sub-team chairs determined

11   unilaterally, or between themselves, when they

12   needed to combine and when they didn't. Clearly,

13   we'll need to drive those interactions and those

14   links.

15   And I think we've made a lot of

16   progress here with the discussions we had between

17   the various teams and sort of doing a lot of ad

18   hoc joining or offering data.

19   And so, the more fluidity that we

20   build into that process, and I think the, and the

21   more robust the communication between the sub-

22   teams, I think ultimately that will translate

1   into less drafting or less revisions to our final

2   product documents. And so all of this has moved

3   us along pretty darn well.

4   I'm not sure it's quite perfect yet or

5   we've perfected it, but I think the fact that

6   we're doing that ourselves without making it a

7   formal discussion process and requiring a meeting

8   I think speaks to the, again, the flexibility

9   everyone is showing and the recognition that this

10   needs. The final product has to be utterly

11   interlinked among the various sub-team processes

12   to make it work.

13   So for all of those reason I feel like

14   we're going pretty rapidly in the right

15   direction.

16   DR. MURRAY: Thank you.

17   CHAIR BURMAN: Mark.

18   MEMBER HERETH: I'm Mark Hereth. I

19   agree with Dan, I think it was really helpful to

20   be able to have, with the shorter time frames it

21   made it tough to get stuff done but it made you

22   really be focused.

1   And I think the other thing is it

2   enabled us to meet with the technology

3   subcommittee in a way that we had not been able

4   to in our prior meeting. And that was really,

5   really helpful yesterday.

6   So I would say I liked that format.

7   And I think our committee found it helpful

8   because we were able to participate as well in

9   best practices, which is also really helpful.

10   DR. MURRAY: Okay.

11   CHAIR BURMAN: Mike.

12   MEMBER LAMONT: Mike Lamont, Integrity

13   Plus. Yes, I want to echo what Dan and Mark had

14   said.

15   For my perspective, it seemed like it

16   was much more collaborative and the committee

17   chairs are clearly coordinated amongst each other

18   and that was great and that was obvious.

19   Being able to attend multiple sessions

20   was really helpfully for me to kind of get my

21   arms around what was going on in other sessions.

22   So I think it was really well done.

1   CHAIR BURMAN: I'm sorry, Eric.

2   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen,

3   Energy Transfer. The only, I guess comment or

4   thoughts I would offer is that the timing of this

5   next meeting would almost require that we have at

6   least a rough draft by a subcommittee pretty well

7   along.

8   And having a rough draft pretty well

9   along means that that time would be spent doing a

10   pretty high-quality review of the draft. So, I

11   just offer that.

12   I think that's where we need to be, as

13   subcommittees, at that point at least have an

14   initial draft. That really only gives us another

15   month to get from initial draft to final, so I

16   would offer that for consideration.

17   DR. MURRAY: So you're saying by the

18   June meeting, wow.

19   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: I mean, if we're

20   looking at July 1 to have drafts to start

21   consolidation, that process, I think, I mean,

22   that's kind of what I sketched out on paper this

1 morning for the best practices subcommittee is

2 that we would have a, at that point, we'd be to

3 our second draft. So.

4   DR. MURRAY: Now, keep in mind that

5 the timeline says that initial recommendations

6 and findings be documented by July. The July

7 time frame.

8   It is not until September, October,

9 for the initial report itself. But I think I see

10 what you're saying, in order to have the initial

11 report --

12   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: I think that

13 recommendation, at least for me, is in the form

14 of a draft report.

15   DR. MURRAY: Okay, I see what you're

16 saying.

17   MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Yes.

18   DR. MURRAY: Got it.

19   CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else have any

20 comments or questions? At the table? On the

21 phone? In the audience? Okay.

22   DR. MURRAY: Okay, so my next

1 question. I have a couple of questions and then

2 we'll get more specific about the planning.

3   In terms of the documents that we're

4 able to provide, a couple of things. One, I

5 appreciate everybody's patience with our ability

6 to provide you with pre-reads and documents.

7   Two, with that, we also have been

8 printing hard copies of agendas, all kind of

9 documents, in advance of the meetings. And I

10 wanted to get feedback to see if the hard copy

11 documents are necessary or if we can go green,

12 provide electronics.

13   And I notice there are many laptops

14 out usually at the meetings and if we can provide

15 them, will you be able to, would that work well

16 for your style, because I know sometimes I have

17 to write, I need to have something to take notes

18 on, but I wanted to get some feedback.

19   CHAIR BURMAN: Holly.

20   MEMBER PEAREN: Holly Pearen,

21 Environmental Defense Funds.

22   (Laughter)

1   PARTICIPANT: We know where this is

2   going.

3   (Laughter)

4   MEMBER PEAREN: Electronic meeting

5   documents would work fine for me, thanks.

6   (Laughter)

7   DR. MURRAY: Thank you for that.

8   MS. WHETSEL: Cheryl Whetsel, who has

9   to administratively prepare these things, I

10   second that.

11   (Laughter)

12   CHAIR BURMAN: Eric, your tent card

13   now.

14   (Off microphone comment)

15   DR. MURRAY: So, are there any

16   objections to going paperless, for the most part?

17   I mean, we may be able to still print an agenda

18   or something that we really think is critical

19   that you might want to have your hands on, but

20   we're printing several things that we've been

21   providing every meeting and I want to, before we

22   change that, I wanted to get some input. Okay,

1 so we'll say the silence gives concurrence.

2 Chair?

3 CHAIR BURMAN: Yes, that sounds great.

4 Thank you.

5 DR. MURRAY: Okay, so my next point,

6 this is just a reminder, in our efforts to go

7 green, we'd like to recycle the tent card and

8 your badges.

9 So after the session today, before I

10 forget to mention it, because we'll be excited to

11 leave, if you could just attach your badge back

12 to the tent card and leave them at your desk

13 we'll be happy, if you can do that now, we'd be

14 happy to recollect these so that we don't have to

15 reprint again. Want to be environmentally

16 friendly.

17 So next I will talk a little bit

18 about, up here on the screen, our next meeting

19 and get into the planning. So just a reminder,

20 the subcommittee meeting will be on the 19th of

21 June and the 20th will be the full advisory

22 committee meeting.

1   As Eric mentioned, if writing parts of

2   the report are going to be underway it's going to

3   be pretty aggressive to really use this time

4   between now and mid-June to make a lot of

5   progress. So we'll certainly be here to support

6   and help facilitate that from PHMSA standpoint to

7   the committee as much as possible.

8   So the next question I have, and I

9   tried to capture what I think I heard from the

10   subcommittee discussions and report outs, I want

11   to talk about topics for future meetings. So two

12   areas.

13   One, the full committee meeting and

14   then, two, any joint subcommittee presentations.

15   So those four bullets, starting with four to five

16   presentations, I thought I heard the process

17   sharing group talk yesterday about wanting some

18   full committee presenters, but I wasn't clear on

19   who or what topics.

20   (Off microphone comment)

21   DR. MURRAY: You guys can use the

22   microphone.

1   MEMBER HERETH: Yes, Mark Hereth. I

2   think we were going to advise that you might

3   consider having a presentation on 1163 --

4   DR. MURRAY: Okay.

5   MEMBER HERETH: -- which we'll have in

6   our subcommittee.

7   And if you would prefer that we do it

8   offline and make it open to everybody, when we do

9   a WebEx, we can certainly do that as well. It's

10   really up to you all.

11   But we think there's a lot of value in

12   that to have everybody have a good understanding

13   of where that standard is and how it works. And

14   then the one we mentioned, which you have

15   captured up there, is the data architecture

16   presentation.

17   DR. MURRAY: Okay, great. And the

18   other ones I think I heard, well, one, we

19   mentioned that Mr. John DeLeeuw will be back to

20   speak to us in person regarding his SMS and

21   aviation experience.

22   And then of course, just a few minutes

1 ago, Mark Hereth brought up the idea of data

2 architecture presentations. So, those were all

3 the ones that I think that I captured, but are

4 there other full committee presentations?

5   CHAIR BURMAN: Dan.

6   MEMBER COTE: Thank you. Before we

7 get to that, this is more a process

8 recommendation.

9   DR. MURRAY: Okay.

10   MEMBER COTE: What I believe is

11 important. To the extent, to pick up on Mark's

12 recommendation, to the extent that we can do

13 these offline from the meetings, if by June in my

14 view, each one of the subcommittees isn't

15 prepared to substantively discuss where it is in

16 its recommendations, and those are pretty mature

17 and pretty well developed, we're never going to

18 make the August timeline.

19   And therefore, we need to free up as

20 much of that day as possible to have very, very

21 structural concept discussions on where we really

22 stand with, if not final recommendations from the

1   subcommittees, pretty darn firm, this is where

2   we're going fellows and we don't want to surprise

3   anybody.

4   And so without that kind of feedback,

5   I don't see us making that July, August sort of

6   completion date target. At least for our

7   concepts.

8   Therefore, there isn't going to be a

9   lot of time, in my mind, for what I will call

10   conceptual education. That needs to take place

11   sooner rather than later. Just a recommendation

12   for the committee.

13   DR. MURRAY: So, if I think I heard

14   you correctly, what you're recommending is, we

15   can have some of the informational presentations

16   done offline, maybe in a conference call, demo

17   sort of environment, and then use the day, full

18   day advisory committee day, to go through the

19   conceptual recommendations?

20   MEMBER COTE: Exactly.

21   DR. MURRAY: Got you. Very helpful.

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Sherry.

1   MS. BORENER: Okay. So, in

2   anticipation of that, I am scheduling, trying to

3   schedule the meetings that our subcommittee

4   wanted to have offline, as online meetings. And

5   I've got two of them sort of in process.

6   You'll always be cc'd so if you would

7   like to make that a general invitation to the

8   committee that's fine and we can always, I think

9   it's just generally helpful if we know that these

10   meetings are coming up, to schedule them so that

11   others can participate because --

12   So we'll be asking Drew to give us,

13   that is process sharing, a presentation soon,

14   this month, as well as a presentation on direct

15   assessment. Which we've already scheduled for

16   the 17th of April.

17   CHAIR BURMAN: And just, since there

18   will be no deliberations, we can do so without

19   violating any legal rules. So I just want to

20   make sure that we're clear. Yes. Okay.

21   DR. MURRAY: Okay, yes. We're fine,

22   we're clear on that. Okay, so we will take that

1   recommendation back and we will work with our

2   ADFOs who may be helping to schedule presenters

3   and make a, we'll probably come up with a

4   schedule of presentations and we'll make that

5   available to all the subcommittees to be able to

6   participate in.

7   Or at least have representatives from

8   your subcommittee if the full, all subcommittee

9   members can't, make sure you have

10   representatives, if it's of interest to you,

11   participate and bring that feed back to your

12   subcommittee.

13   And as far as joint subcommittee

14   presentations at the June 19th meeting, those,

15   thinking out loud, those may also be

16   presentations that we'll need to have sooner than

17   June as well. So I can take a look at this whole

18   list of topics.

19   Okay, so that takes care of all the

20   items I had there. And so the next thing I had

21   was just to recap some of the high level action

22   items I heard over the last two days.

1   One, we'll need to definitely

2   identify, all the subcommittees really need to

3   solidify and identify any additional external

4   members that they need to get vetted and

5   approved. The sooner the better so that you can

6   use them over the next few months to help with

7   your reports.

8   Also, I think Warren Randolph with FAA

9   is going to provide information on their

10   distributed national archives. I think it was a

11   report. Some sort of a report document.

12   It was brought to my attention that it

13   would be great to have graphic design resource

14   capabilities to help with the graphics that might

15   be used for the report itself. So PHMSA will

16   take that back to see what we can do to support

17   that.

18   We'll also make sure that we send all

19   the presenter PowerPoint presentations from the

20   last two days to the committee. And we'll also

21   be posting those that presented today on the

22   meeting registration page for the public.

1   And then as Chairman Diane mentioned,

2   that we would be working to schedule a process

3   meeting. More of an ongoing process meeting with

4   the ADFOs and chairs so that we can work to

5   process things, make sure we can address their

6   questions and use it as a coordination

7   opportunity.

8   And then we didn't mention it during

9   the, and I don't remember, Karen, if you

10   mentioned it during your reporting report out,

11   but one of the things we talked about was

12   creating a PHMSA inbox email address for the VIS

13   working group.

14   So as we get sections of the report

15   drafted, that we would have a central place to

16   send those into. So we're working to get that

17   setup.

18   Are there other action items that are

19   really critical that we want to make sure that we

20   don't overlook?

21   CHAIR BURMAN: Leif.

22   MEMBER JENSEN: Yes, just one point of

1   clarification on the second bullet item up there.

2   If I heard Warren correctly, I think he made the

3   statement that he needed a formal request from

4   this group in order to pursue those documents.

5   MS. BORENER: Yes. Sherry Borener.

6   Yes, I think what he said is that they would be,

7   a science executive board might share information

8   but that all of those documents have to be

9   requested through the Board.

10   So I think that via Warren, you could

11   just send him the message that you would like him

12   to get access to their, probably their archive or

13   their, those are those governance documents, not

14   the archives themselves.

15   And then the, just for clarification,

16   that is Flight Operational Quality Assessment,

17   that's a FOQA data.

18   DR. MURRAY: FOQA.

19   MS. BORENER: Yes, FOQA.

20   DR. MURRAY: Thank you.

21   MS. BORENER: Sure.

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Dan.

1   MEMBER COTE: Just one more

2   administrative recommendation. You had

3   mentioned, or we discussed earlier that there is

4   a template or a format for the report that goes

5   to the, I'm blank now.

6   (Off microphone comment)

7   MEMBER COTE: Secretary, thank you.

8   Wow, that was painful.

9   (Laughter)

10   MEMBER COTE: Anyhow, to the

11 Secretary. If you could send that to the

12 committee chairs within the next couple of weeks,

13 I think there were pieces we can begin to

14 populate now. And the more work we do on that

15 now, just, again, money in the bank folks. So,

16 thank you.

17   DR. MURRAY: We'll do. And that's a

18 good point that I don't have up here. We're

19 going to finalize several templates to your point

20 and send that back out to the Committee. So

21 we'll add that.

22   (Off microphone comment)

1   (Laughter)

2   CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else have any

3   other comments or questions? At the table? On

4   the phone? In the audience? Okay.

5   DR. MURRAY: And just for my closing

6   purposes, we will proceed with planning for the

7   June 19th and 20th meeting. This hotel and the

8   Westin we went to previously aren't available, so

9   it is very likely that we will be meeting at a

10   new location that's unidentified at this point,

11   but we'll be sharing that information as we learn

12   more.

13   Also, we will, we'll be electronic, as

14   we talked about earlier, and we will be working

15   to setup the V bulletin, which I think might be

16   helpful for some other report collaboration. So

17   we'll be communicating primarily through the ADFO

18   and chairs for the subcommittees specific items.

19   At the next meeting in June, the full

20   parent committee meeting, it probably will look

21   different in terms of how much time, based on

22   what we've talked about today, and Eric's point

1 to really focus on recommendations and getting

2 ready for the report writing.

3   We will probably use most of the full

4 committee time to vet through each subcommittee

5 and some of those conceptual recommendations. So

6 we won't have many out, external presenters, but

7 we will be planning to allot more time to the

8 subcommittees.

9   So think about that as you design

10 your, as you're coming up with your

11 recommendations and as you consider how you will

12 design the conversation to get your points

13 across, the rationale that underpin them, in a

14 concise way. Thank you.

15   CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. I just want

16 to really thank everyone. I also want to remind

17 people that it is April and it is national safe

18 digging month.

19   Just on a personal level, I never was

20 a Twitter person and my first tweet was a few

21 years ago and it was for Call 811. It took me

22 nearly two hours to figure out how to do it with

1 a lot of help, but it really was that important

2 to me that my first one be one that was

3 significant.

4   And so I do every April, every day, do

5 a tweet on it. But for me, just from an

6 impactful point of view on my own personal life,

7 I experienced education from, with my kids and my

8 husband, you know, I go out and speak a lot about

9 the importance of pipeline safety and they hear

10 me a lot and they listen to my speeches as I

11 practice and they listen to the sessions.

12   And I guess they tune me out a lot

13 because for me, I thought they understood it.

14 And then it turns out that they really did not

15 focus on it at all.

16   And we had an incident where my

17 husband hired somebody to put in a basketball

18 hoop and they, I made him call, get someone who

19 was going to Call 811 and my husband was insisted

20 that he got someone on the cheap and they didn't

21 need to. And luckily, I came home and cancelled

22 it and made sure that they did.

1   And really, for us, we realized just

2   how serious it could have been when he saw all

3   the markings and the flags and realized that it

4   really would, it really was a near miss.

5   And then recently we had our driveway

6   redone and, again, similar, we made sure that we

7   got someone who made it a part of their practice

8   to Call 811 and had it in our contract.

9   And just, I think, even the neighbors

10   sort of seeing just the markings and seeing just

11   how much on our driveway it really was an issue,

12   I think sends a message. And it's just the

13   importance of it.

14   And again, it's the things that you

15   don't really appreciate it until you are sort of

16   called upon. And so I just really, for me, just

17   want to convey that on very much the importance

18   of us educating ourselves to and continually

19   doing it and working towards that.

20   So that's why I spend as much time as

21   I can on it on trying to figure out how we can

22   improve each year in getting better. And that's

1   why I asked you about the nine minutes and the

2   six minutes because it is something that's

3   important to me in looking about what we can do.

4   So, thank you. With that, I think

5   we're done, unless anyone has any other questions

6   or, Mark.

7   MEMBER HERETH: I would just like to

8   add to what you said because the example you give

9   of a driveway is really important. If you look

10   at one of the big contributors today, because the

11   failure to calls are down and other things is,

12   people that are doing grading work, they think

13   they're working on the surface and they're

14   actually removing soil. And not all of our

15   infrastructure is not at great depth.

16   And so reminding ourselves that

17   grading is one of the big contributors to hits on

18   lines and failures. And the PHMSA data shows

19   that for both oil and gas.

20   I appreciate you raising that because

21   we should really keep that one in our sights.

22   CHAIR BURMAN: Yes. So, all right,

1   thank you. So have a very good rest of the day

2   and safe travels wherever you're going. Okay,

3   thanks.

4   (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

5   went off the record at 2:36 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

31:3,14 32:17 33:12
33:20 251:21
avoid 158:9
aware 19:8 163:21
Awe 233:21
awesome 31:20
aye 74:13,14 106:11,12
163:12,13 175:17,18

B

b 179:6
baby 94:1
back 7:4,10 16:6 19:3
28:6 31:2 32:4 42:12
44:11 45:9 46:9 50:3
55:15 60:16 69:11
81:17 83:16 90:10
110:11 117:5 118:22
129:1,16 138:17
144:16 164:21,22
165:2 171:13,14
172:15 176:9,22
177:2,2 180:17 181:2
183:14,18 184:1
186:6,12 189:13
190:22 193:6 209:6
215:12 216:9 226:18
228:2,18 229:2
231:19 232:1 237:17
238:22 249:11 251:19
255:1,11 256:16
259:20
background 14:11 29:9
29:19 30:17 31:21
52:22 55:2 172:7
180:3 196:15
backgrounds 207:5
badge 249:11
badges 249:8
balance 160:18
balanced 215:7
ball 15:15 27:2 159:15
191:7 212:19
Ballroom 1:19
band 209:14,21
bang 79:22
bank 259:15
banquet 21:21 22:13
bar 144:8
bare 201:18
barriers 49:12 95:1
114:15,17 145:19,21
193:1 194:4 201:18
based 87:19 100:8
135:3 172:1 187:5,22
189:1 208:12 209:15
211:8 260:21
baseline 169:3

bashful 16:1
basic 52:19
basically 131:9 138:12
140:8 150:12 164:1
basis 71:11 118:17
131:10,11 187:17
211:14 222:4
basketball 21:21 22:6
262:17
Battams 2:13 10:2,2
49:4,15 92:13,13 93:2
95:10 96:17
began 63:13 213:3
beginning 181:2 191:16
191:21 192:1
behalf 75:19 215:2
behooves 148:17
believe 65:12 84:22
95:19 105:19 106:15
161:19 162:8 165:7
209:20 234:17 252:10
Bellamy 136:7 138:9
237:14
benchmark 145:11
150:8
benchmarking 145:15
145:17
beneficial 100:2 115:20
117:13 233:14,20
benefit 23:15 120:19
122:15 144:20 157:8
benefits 102:16,18
104:15 137:1 159:16
240:13
best 11:5 16:18 48:2
58:8 59:12 63:12 78:3
80:12 86:3 98:12
107:18 108:15,22
112:3 114:2,18 115:5
115:14 117:3 118:11
118:14,21 119:7
121:3 131:16 137:7
145:22 149:5 180:19
181:5,9,12,22 182:19
183:3,4,5,16 187:6,7
189:6 201:7 205:3,8
207:11 212:4 219:4
244:9 246:1
bet 85:20
better 40:19 41:4 47:21
60:5 70:12 77:10
81:16 101:13 132:15
206:12 211:21 216:3
216:5 217:11,16
222:18 224:17 256:5
263:22
beyond 26:19 142:13
201:21 237:11

big 20:8 30:21 38:9
39:18 65:13 135:12
181:21 199:11 202:9
218:11 264:10,17
bigger 67:13
biggest 34:16
Bill 85:12
billions 70:10
binoculars 67:5 149:17
bit 8:10 27:13 29:8,14
30:4 37:14 51:10
52:17 53:11 56:5 57:8
59:17 110:6 113:7
119:19 132:2 133:5
134:15 136:16 148:8
157:12 160:6 177:21
180:10 183:2 189:14
191:20 194:18 208:19
217:1 221:10,18
223:2 235:20 241:7
249:17
black 88:17
Blacksmith 10:13 38:15
57:20 80:16 121:11
blank 259:5
blanket 89:20
blue 63:16
Blystone 2:3 11:10,10
175:2 220:18 222:10
225:8
board 27:17 32:20
37:22 97:20 182:15
258:7,9
boat 120:7
Bob 205:21
body 21:14 70:7 170:17
bogged 17:13
book 183:6
Borener 2:14 10:10,10
125:12,12 254:1
258:5,5,19,21
boss 40:17
bottom 65:19 68:9,13
149:17 209:2
boundaries 24:15
104:22 239:2
box 68:14
boxes 63:17 88:17
boy 59:2
BP 112:19
brains 95:5
brand 203:6
break 128:18,20 130:13
139:18 176:6 234:12
breaking 140:8 153:19
Brian 127:4
brief 3:2 13:17 178:9
bring 24:9 47:6 55:22

64:10 66:8 81:17 92:7
121:11 129:22 132:3
182:2 236:10 239:13
255:11
bringing 22:11,21
55:15 107:1 236:9
brings 206:5
broad 101:2,4 102:12
125:15 236:21
broadcast 144:2
broader 89:19 126:20
broadest 193:2
brochures 150:21
broke 241:19
broken 36:12
brought 51:13 70:18
87:10 153:1 155:1
180:20 186:14 252:1
256:12
brown 2:3 10:22,22
64:19 129:3,4 139:13
239:16
Bryce 2:3 10:22 60:6
115:8 127:22 128:16
129:4 235:13 236:8
236:16 238:8,9 239:3
BSEE 37:17 78:17
buck 79:22
bucket 116:8 155:10
buckets 115:3 121:19
121:22 132:12 155:6
155:8 156:15,21
build 60:18,20 88:1
161:15 192:6 242:20
building 80:22 142:14
builds 69:4
built 34:11 45:15 58:18
199:15
bulk 195:14 199:9,10
bullet 124:12 143:22
258:1
bulletin 167:7 260:15
bullets 250:15
bunch 64:22
Bureau 37:17 77:4
78:17
business 3:6 16:11
19:4 58:10 61:20
94:20 150:14 194:8
219:11
businesses 192:21
195:8
buy-in 47:9
buying 39:22 40:2
Byrd 85:12

C

California 30:10

call 3:4 12:3 21:2 27:9
  31:9,14 33:8 36:7
  37:13 49:19 50:3 66:8
  76:7 77:18 106:18
  131:4 155:6 214:4
  215:17 228:21 236:2
  240:19 253:9,16
  261:21 262:18,19
  263:8
called 31:2 93:9 194:6
  227:20 263:16
calling 217:2
calls 155:12 156:2
  173:9 228:20 264:11
Campaign 182:18
Canada 227:22
cancelled 262:21
capabilities 256:14
capability 111:16
capitalize 64:4
Captain 28:18 32:7
capture 136:3 156:13
  225:18 250:9
captured 251:15 252:3
car 34:11
card 12:16 162:6 175:1
  248:12 249:7,12
care 12:17 19:22
  177:15 255:19
careful 20:14 100:20
  124:2 125:5 174:17
carried 59:13
carrier 31:15,17
carriers 32:22 33:3
carrying 81:4
carved 161:7
case 48:2 82:16 109:20
  110:3 141:14 154:5
  193:19
cases 225:18 226:4
cast 77:11 113:2,11,20
  114:6 119:11 122:20
  132:21 133:12 157:3
casting 102:11
cataloging 69:21
catalyst 15:11
catch 109:11
catches 100:11
categories 140:9
  150:17
categorize 149:13
categorized 143:14,18
category 140:15,22
  141:18 146:22 148:22
  210:17 220:14
cause 192:8 200:19,20
  201:4 210:14
caused 214:3

causes 32:13 192:10
  210:15,19
caveat 97:1
cc'd 254:6
center 64:20 84:13
  110:5 151:4 187:12
centers 182:5
central 62:5 257:15
centralized 133:11
certain 93:13,20 100:9
  136:2 161:4
certainly 5:3 35:7 37:11
  41:10 68:3 71:18 83:9
  96:9 112:3 120:22
  121:4,5 156:16
  225:11 236:21 250:5
  251:9
certainty 104:16,20
certificate 35:14
certificates 148:5
cetera 53:4 235:1
CGA 65:8 179:3 202:13
  203:4 204:3,3 206:15
  213:8 214:2 222:3
  230:4
CGA's 206:4
chairman 10:14 13:15
  16:6 57:20 61:8 62:3
  73:15 74:2,18 81:11
  85:21 103:11 157:11
  159:12 257:1
Chairperson 139:20
chairs 20:20 176:3
  242:10 244:17 257:4
  259:12 260:18
Chairwoman 175:10
challenge 73:5 134:5
  134:11 196:6
challenges 17:4 152:11
  152:13,18 168:8
  171:22 180:12 189:10
  223:17
challenging 192:14,14
change 18:14 31:10,11
  34:22 38:10 39:10
  40:18 41:12 52:14
  56:13 69:17 82:8
  88:11 90:4 248:22
changed 30:21 83:7,11
changes 40:21 41:3
  46:8 55:18,18,19
  56:20 104:19,19
  109:5 112:11 166:7
Chao's 14:7
Chapter 184:3
chapters 183:15
characterize 110:22
charge 13:2

chart 216:9
charter 118:21 119:2
charts 100:10
chat 31:1
cheap 262:20
cheaper 238:18
chemical 84:22 97:20
Cheryl 2:18 10:8 127:1
  248:8
Chevrons 37:5
Chief 9:13 49:5 86:20
China 30:19
choice 226:9
choose 60:7 202:16
  214:1
Chorus 74:14 106:12
  163:13 175:18
Chris 9:5 62:12,21
  129:10,12,13 135:6
  136:7 138:9 148:12
  153:8 160:10 162:5
Christie 1:21 2:12 4:5
  5:12 9:21 83:16
  103:14
Christina 84:7 85:16
  106:21
CHRISTOPHER 2:10
Cindy 86:20,21 87:9
  90:9 160:17
circle 66:11,14
circulars 88:7
clarification 124:6
  258:1,15
clarify 59:22 148:21
clarity 17:6
class 235:15
clear 20:11 67:3 75:13
  112:17,22 113:2
  131:13 142:10 159:9
  175:15 250:18 254:20
  254:22
cleared 51:17
clearer 53:14
clearly 73:6 82:7,11,13
  100:1 101:19 102:1
  146:14 219:20 242:12
  244:17
click 25:10,14
clicker 209:8
clients 215:2
Cliff 115:8 129:17 137:4
close 76:17 81:22 84:7
  140:3 155:12 156:2
  189:8
closed 23:16 188:20
closely 85:13 195:16
  217:7
closer 210:1

closing 3:16 21:1 178:4
  260:5
clunkiness 79:20
  172:22
clutter 80:9
co-chaired 84:19
co-presented 28:20
code 102:9 147:22
cognizant 20:10
collaborate 166:15
  167:9
collaboration 6:20
  14:15,17 21:17 167:5
  168:6 260:16
collaborative 8:2
  244:16
collaboratively 13:3
colleague 43:9
colleagues 189:14
collect 84:20 154:7
  179:18 186:22 188:14
  190:18 191:19 192:15
  192:20 194:5,8,11,19
  194:21 195:3 209:12
  209:22 212:7 225:17
  226:10
collected 60:14 167:1
  180:16 184:12 188:2
  188:10 191:9,14
  196:7 213:11
collecting 60:14 186:18
  187:14 189:20 190:2
  190:21 193:15 196:12
  200:5 205:2
collection 7:18 187:5
  213:1
collective 24:6
collects 84:22
Colorado 187:10,12,16
  187:20 226:12
colors 64:19
combine 242:12
come 13:18 15:18 17:9
  22:19 28:6 29:10
  42:12 45:14 46:9 47:5
  47:14 50:20 54:17
  59:9 60:3 61:22 62:10
  62:14 69:11,16 79:18
  81:7 86:22 98:5
  115:19 116:4 117:5
  117:19 131:16 134:21
  139:4 164:21,22
  165:2,18 197:11
  207:19 222:4 234:2
  255:3
comes 49:17 124:9,20
  126:19 130:7 141:12
  158:6 221:21 225:21

describing 142:21
description 240:13
design 23:19 42:2
  256:13 261:9,12
designate 170:19 175:4
  175:13
designated 1:22 2:12
  5:13 48:12 61:2
  129:14 166:1
designed 42:6 95:4
designers 148:18
designs 238:12
desire 55:20 122:20
  173:4,5
desk 181:8 249:12
Despite 175:1
detail 28:7 39:15 44:20
  53:10 64:15 137:22
  138:11
detailed 95:17 132:14
  203:14
details 23:7 81:8
  204:10
detection 199:7
determined 26:11
  100:6 168:21 242:10
determining 39:8
develop 18:3 46:14
  63:13 74:6,21 75:4
  76:2 89:14 90:19
  111:22 119:6 148:4
  148:16 166:13 167:2
  167:4 181:6 187:21
  200:10 232:13
developed 7:8 23:13
  50:8 75:7 84:14 88:6
  88:8,12 97:7 113:15
  118:20 119:2 152:4
  167:18 169:8 187:13
  188:2 194:5 203:14
  252:17
developer 203:13
developers 195:16
  196:22 231:1,11
developing 24:3 50:22
  62:22 65:14 69:21
  72:4 74:4 79:14 87:22
  156:4 187:17
development 6:19 7:16
  15:5 17:8 18:2 64:16
  64:20 87:1 90:18
  103:20 130:4,5
  138:16 152:15 180:11
  182:21 184:4 185:21
developmental 109:15
developments 87:2
develops 65:16
devices 6:1

DFO 9:22 51:20 140:2
diagram 65:7 66:3
  121:5
dial 27:11,14
dialed 27:10
dialogue 42:13 94:7
Diane 2:2 9:19 57:1
  178:16 257:1
dice 211:7
difference 36:8 191:20
differences 192:22
  213:1
different 19:14,14,16
  34:21 38:1 42:22
  46:11 47:2 53:12 60:4
  62:9 66:17,18 69:12
  79:11 85:5 110:7,15
  110:15 111:4,9 112:6
  112:6 121:12 130:17
  134:8 135:16,18
  137:17 149:17 152:10
  155:14,14,15,16,17
  155:21 156:8 180:21
  181:11,18 182:3
  184:17 185:11 186:20
  187:1 188:11 199:17
  200:18,19 201:2,6
  207:3,15 210:15
  212:11 215:4 217:13
  218:21,22 219:11
  220:1,13,14,14 223:9
  226:20 228:11 238:13
  260:21
difficult 23:20 172:3
dig 23:6 155:21 221:16
digestible 176:14
digging 214:5 261:18
digs 70:14
direct 62:14,17 104:4
  254:14
direction 201:12 223:1
  243:15
directly 45:20 81:5
  194:15 223:20,22
  228:5,15
director 9:3,12 10:13
  37:17
DIRT 3:11 65:9 179:4
  179:16 180:8,11,11
  180:14 182:21 184:5
  188:13 189:3,8 194:6
  194:10,13 195:2,11
  198:5 205:18 206:1
  206:16 207:9 208:21
  213:6,6 220:2,5 226:5
  226:9 228:4 229:18
  229:18 233:12
disagree 99:6

disagrees 175:14
discipline 35:15
disclose 95:1
disclosed 94:15
disclosing 95:2 96:13
discover 110:22
discovery 149:2
discrete 66:7 137:21
discretion 105:2
discuss 17:9 30:4
  41:11 59:14 62:2 71:5
  73:16 82:7 96:9
  125:14 162:19 187:3
  252:15
discussed 58:20 71:15
  75:6 82:12 118:7
  131:1,9 134:5 151:7
  157:11 259:3
discussing 91:20
  164:11
discussion 3:8,10,12
  3:15 7:11 15:13 17:7
  20:2,5,16 44:15 59:5
  59:10,12,15 60:6 70:1
  71:6,8 73:20 74:1,11
  74:12 80:6 91:7 106:9
  106:10 112:9 114:21
  129:6 132:5 159:9
  163:10,11 175:11,12
  175:16 177:20 234:20
  235:14 236:16,21
  237:15 238:5,11
  239:9 241:3,5 242:6
  243:7
discussions 24:10
  50:17 61:8 66:20
  76:14 85:18 131:6,20
  134:10 242:16 250:10
  252:21
displaced 14:14
display 223:9
disrupting 64:4
disruptions 6:2
distances 15:19
distinct 155:6,10
distinctly 156:7
distribute 154:8 183:8
distributed 256:10
distribution 7:21 82:22
  119:21 120:3,5
  149:10 234:1
ditch 128:3
diversity 58:20
docket 6:10 12:10,11
document 54:2 127:19
  135:14,16 146:1
  256:11
documentation 193:7

196:19
documented 40:22
  41:1 193:19 246:6
documents 25:3,6
  113:10,14,18 114:9
  115:19 116:4 117:6
  117:22 166:11,16,20
  167:9 232:10,10,11
  243:2 247:3,6,9,11
  248:5 258:4,8,13
doing 14:5 15:14 19:19
  22:4,16,19 24:22 28:2
  50:1 54:21 62:5 64:5
  79:20 83:18 86:16
  88:13 108:22 111:11
  111:12 171:21 172:6
  173:3 176:12 206:11
  215:2 219:17 220:13
  221:6 242:17 243:6
  245:9 263:19 264:12
DOJ 97:19
dollars 37:8 70:11
domain 147:20
Dominik 86:20 106:5
  118:8 160:17
doors 5:17 8:9,9,14
DOT 15:9
Doug 139:22
Dr 4:4,6,14 5:1,10 9:21
  13:16 20:19 21:11
  22:10 29:5 32:1 42:10
  43:19 44:3,8,10 49:22
  61:8,16,21 62:2 86:12
  103:15 108:18 129:19
  139:22 140:1 169:1
  170:1 171:8,10
  174:20 176:1 177:12
  178:8,14,15 234:19
  240:21 241:6,12
  243:16 244:10 245:17
  246:4,15,18,22 248:7
  248:15 249:5 250:21
  251:4,17 252:9
  253:13,21 254:21
  258:18,20 259:17
  260:5
draft 46:14 47:4,15,20
  48:5 55:14 56:15,20
  67:19 119:9 142:8
  168:20 170:5 204:7
  206:17 245:6,8,10,14
  245:15 246:3,14
drafted 55:6,8 137:5
  166:18 170:4 257:15
drafting 47:15 92:15
  243:1
drafts 245:20
dramatically 158:15

evolved 65:11 122:15
evolving 133:15 157:16
exactly 83:16 123:18
  130:15 231:5 253:20
examine 159:13
examined 81:19
example 51:22 64:6
  111:6,13 135:21
  136:4 151:5,5 155:19
  164:7,10 169:17
  214:1,20 225:22
  231:16 264:8
examples 39:14 53:12
  132:19 226:6
excavating 200:9
excavation 181:1
  184:13 210:18 211:2
  216:12
excavator 199:21
excavators 182:6
  189:22 210:6 214:3
excellent 71:16 103:17
  179:2 239:20
exceptional 22:22
exceptions 217:1
exchange 14:20
excited 22:8,12,13
  42:20 249:10
exciting 27:4
excuse 141:21 151:3
executive 258:7
exempt 89:19 99:3
  217:2
exemption 89:9,20 93:9
  93:9,11 97:3
exemptions 93:11
  217:14
exercise 98:4
exist 48:19 66:11
  113:19 145:12 190:11
  237:1
existing 108:13 112:21
  113:18 114:1 115:21
exists 65:21
exit 8:8,9
expand 76:19 151:8
expanded 105:6
expect 94:11 241:10
expectation 60:10
expectations 62:11
  119:3 154:19 232:19
expecting 54:16
expensive 238:17
experience 134:20
  251:21
experienced 262:7
experiences 28:7,8
  90:8 112:21

expert 84:18 87:11
  203:16
expertise 50:11 51:12
  236:4
experts 24:21 95:5
  107:3 235:15
explain 205:1
explained 91:1
explaining 94:7
exploring 78:19
exposed 101:8
exposure 125:20
  126:13
expressed 60:10 62:17
  235:5
extend 115:18
extensive 59:21 64:15
extent 102:5,20 117:21
  162:16 173:7 226:2
  237:6 252:11,12
external 44:14 50:10
  51:11 52:1,11 90:14
  105:20 106:6 162:12
  256:3 261:6
extract 226:1
extracting 72:16
extraction 226:16
extremely 22:12,13
  90:6 92:16 126:3
Exxons 37:5
eye 59:3

F

FAA 28:12,21 32:20
  35:13 50:18 58:14
  76:13,16 77:2,8 79:11
  82:12 86:21 87:3,12
  87:13,17 88:22 90:15
  91:2,21 92:1,17 93:10
  94:10 95:20 99:13
  104:21 106:5 133:21
  144:21 145:4 152:4
  159:19,19 160:5,18
  161:1,2 163:5 256:8
FAA's 87:21
face 29:11,11 42:13,13
face-to-face 49:8 50:6
  50:14
facilitate 8:4 13:8 17:16
  18:9 80:5 174:17
  250:6
facilitation 17:21
facilities 210:9 214:19
facility 151:9 182:5
  189:22 190:1 199:21
  200:4,21 211:9
  220:15
fact 20:10 34:18 40:2

  48:1 87:7 116:16
  130:18 160:16 174:5
  230:4 243:5
factor 230:13
failure 214:4,4 264:11
failures 84:20 264:18
fair 82:2
fairly 153:12 169:11
  202:3
fake 198:6
fall 161:22
falling 175:1
falls 33:9
familiar 79:1 180:5
  182:17 183:3 188:12
  188:13
fancy 238:16
fantastic 24:8 43:19
far 76:16 156:14 182:14
  188:9 255:13
Farag 2:5 8:22,22
  154:21,21
fashion 179:9
fatalities 31:16,19
  231:18
fatality 214:14
fault 214:3
favor 74:12 106:10
  163:11 175:17
fear 36:10 38:7 89:6
fears 212:16
feasibility 48:20
features 70:7
February 46:3,3 50:4,7
  54:10 129:8,8,16
  130:12 131:3 170:11
  170:11 179:1 241:22
  242:7
fed 150:22
federal 1:22 2:12 5:11
  5:14 48:12 61:3
  129:14 166:1
federally 120:2
feed 47:2 255:11
feedback 104:5 174:12
  241:15,21 247:10,18
  253:4
feeding 72:15
feel 36:10 40:9 49:19
  53:9 97:7 106:17
  121:22 132:10 170:22
  179:22 206:3 217:8
  219:10 220:13 228:2
  243:13
feeling 23:18
fellows 253:2
felt 58:19 66:19 112:11
  191:1,17 192:9

  222:15
few- 135:15
fewer 241:19
field 187:5 190:4,20
  195:3 196:11 215:2
  216:22
fields 188:12 191:11,22
  192:1 194:17 196:17
  200:13 201:20
fifth 124:12
figure 24:10 64:8 77:15
  261:22 263:21
figuring 78:2 211:16
fill 111:19 122:5
filling 219:8
final 55:15 56:8 61:1
  81:20 116:5 119:9
  124:3 166:12,16
  170:5 243:1,10
  245:15 252:22
finalize 167:15,17 168:5
  168:6 259:19
finalized 167:10 187:13
finalizing 27:3
finally 32:20 89:15
  130:21
financial 126:7
find 14:1 25:3 31:8 35:5
  39:5,10 41:6,8 81:14
  81:16 101:12 146:11
  158:7
finding 48:1
findings 53:3 54:17
  72:21 141:2 246:6
fine 5:6,8 158:9 175:14
  222:7 248:5 254:8,21
fine- 166:21
fine-tune 169:7
fines 164:5
fingers 168:21
finished 107:14
fire 8:13
firm 76:22 253:1
first 13:16 16:12 21:11
  35:20 47:20 50:2,6
  57:12 68:8 83:5 98:12
  108:10,12 115:6
  119:19 121:22 122:4
  127:4 133:16 140:10
  141:18 146:4 148:13
  149:1 156:12 180:2
  180:21 186:12,14
  203:4 206:12 208:8
  208:13 224:9 233:13
  233:22 242:2 261:20
  262:2
fit 32:10 45:5 76:17
  237:22

fits 19:13 103:4 111:2 237:5
five 6:8 28:2 30:8 52:9 103:1 128:15 165:14 166:3 195:10 227:19 236:13 239:12 250:15
fix 36:11
fixing 36:4
flags 263:3
flaw 71:10
fleet-of-foot 65:6
fleshed 135:7
fleshing 122:2
flexibility 18:7,15 23:12 162:17 185:5 191:4 212:17,21 236:12 243:8
flight 28:1,9 258:16
flipping 5:9
float 49:9
floaters 49:6
floating 49:1
floor 6:6 13:11
flow 140:6
flowed 33:16
flowing 103:2
flows 142:4,22 240:4
fluid 242:8
fluidity 242:19
flushed 44:21 54:13
fly 30:18 42:9
flying 35:4
FMI 227:18
focus 46:7 70:4,18 117:10 121:20 140:16 181:12 183:20 218:11 219:1,4 222:19 233:19 261:1 262:15
focused 20:13 70:3 112:20 116:18 122:11 131:17 138:3 140:20 184:19 219:7 243:22
FOIA 87:11,22 89:8,20 90:4,6 93:12,13 94:16 98:3
folks 12:13 79:11,14 162:10 235:21 238:2 259:15
follow 5:9 53:3 184:18
follow-up 219:14
followed 105:13 210:11
following 71:6 133:8
food 67:22
FOQA 30:4 88:15 89:1 89:3 258:17,18,19
forced 124:21 199:4
forget 249:10
form 105:14 157:22

181:13 184:20 185:6 185:8,10,12 186:2 187:5,7 190:4,13 195:3,19 246:13
formal 105:21,22 106:4 161:18 162:11,13 174:21 243:7 258:3
formalized 33:20 39:17 41:8
formally 41:1,1,11
format 114:11 148:11 168:10 184:18 244:6 259:4
formation 118:4
formats 133:8 187:1
formed 179:7
forming 92:6
formulate 17:3 19:17 232:12 237:21
formulated 130:20
formulating 19:11
forth 53:8 70:18
forthcoming 109:5
fortunately 34:10
forum 14:19
forums 15:16
forward 13:4 14:1 15:14 15:15 18:4 21:18 23:5 28:22 29:10 42:12 43:22 44:1 46:18,20 47:5 51:13 54:17 55:22 59:13 78:4 151:17 167:7 182:2 187:9 188:8,9 228:7 237:9
found 158:19 164:4 192:13 211:12 233:13 233:19 244:7
Foundation 10:14 80:18 111:18
foundational 137:12 138:1
four 8:8 27:12 33:5,8 52:9 83:9 110:3 140:3 140:4 144:17 195:10 239:12 250:15,15
four-step 63:1
FRA 127:5
frame 44:18,19 47:14 54:15 55:7 95:4 170:5 246:7
frames 170:9 243:20
framework 23:9 24:4 45:7,11 47:17 48:6 65:21 81:1 97:6 167:5
framing 152:7
free 36:10 49:19 179:22 252:19

Freeman 2:15 10:20,20 86:15
frequency 125:19
frequent 222:5
frequently 146:1 167:13
freshman 21:21 22:6
friendly 68:7 223:10 249:16
front 8:14 52:21 190:22 211:4
fruitful 129:6
fulfill 6:14 13:4
full 12:21 46:16 47:10 76:10 93:21 94:2 161:8 170:6,16 249:21 250:13,18 252:4 253:17 255:8 260:19 261:3
fuller 20:2 79:18 239:9 239:13,13
fully 123:11 125:4 157:19
function 81:21
Fund 10:16 152:2 173:21 239:19
fundamental 32:13 114:4 180:7 182:1,22 183:19 185:4
funding 16:18 86:5,9 91:4,20 92:1,2,3 94:8 102:12,21 103:16 104:3,5 151:6,7,10 160:13 238:22
Funds 247:21
further 17:8 75:3 91:18 131:11 141:16 175:16
future 60:22 61:9,20 77:20 90:11 104:18 104:19 150:14 176:18 190:11 250:11
fuzzy 200:12

G

gain 117:21 140:14 173:9 192:3 208:3
gained 190:15 217:6
game 142:5 146:16
gap 111:19 173:18
gaps 17:15 24:7 50:16 59:5 61:14 111:14,15 186:8
gas 7:20,21 11:14 30:12 30:14 37:3 38:4 106:21 149:10 196:2 210:6,11 233:16,17 234:1 264:19
gathered 186:11

gathering 220:21
gelled 34:8
general 7:4 21:8 26:3 58:17 87:11 109:4 113:8 116:10 193:10 233:1 235:3 254:7
generalizing 6:17
generally 29:8 254:9
gentleman 69:5 127:3
getting 17:7,13 22:14 35:6 36:4 48:3 55:1 82:17 92:22 93:4 109:21 116:20 145:6 146:16 153:20 161:12 164:18 185:4 186:18 195:17 197:22 199:2 199:3 203:4 210:1 214:17,18,21 215:3,7 218:10 221:13 226:19 226:22 227:7,8 261:1 263:22
give 19:7 28:16 38:17 52:16 57:8 72:22 81:8 96:20 104:2 107:7 148:4 172:13 180:10 180:13 211:9 225:5 227:14 233:20 236:11 254:12 264:8
given 74:4 105:15 159:13 232:9
gives 245:14 249:1
giving 157:2 204:3
glad 22:5
glimpse 235:21
glossaries 148:20
goal 13:8 14:8 15:3 18:10 40:7 161:12 167:12 168:1,7 170:8 238:20
goals 17:5 166:13 168:14
Gold 218:17,20 219:7 219:19 220:7
good-bye 178:5
Google 236:10
gospel 37:12
gotten 216:3,5
governance 3:13 19:20 59:7 71:7 72:5,8 74:6 75:2,13,15 76:14 82:14,16 114:5 134:6 146:14 173:17 177:16 232:10 258:13
governed 113:21 114:8
governing 113:14 115:19
government 40:3
grading 264:12,17

154:18
huge 65:10 70:16
hundred 181:3
Hung 2:17 10:4
hurdle 189:19
hurdles 187:3
husband 262:8,17,19

I

ICAO 32:20
idea 39:3 41:4 78:20
 134:21 152:3,6 179:2
 186:18 239:20 252:1
ideal 123:18 191:7
 202:7 224:18
ideas 14:20 15:10 22:19
 150:18
identification 219:19
identified 39:5,18 41:6
 50:10 68:17 71:7,11
 72:2 73:2 112:22
 115:12 143:4 148:1
 155:5 173:18 181:11
 219:3,20 232:16
identify 39:4 50:16
 61:14 111:15 112:14
 138:15 145:19 172:11
 176:3 209:19 222:19
 256:2,3
identifying 24:8,14 52:6
 120:16 146:2 219:12
ignore 161:3
ILI 64:21 65:2 66:2
 70:15 110:17 115:7
 115:21 116:2 143:12
 155:9,20 156:15
 240:6
illegal 158:20
illustrate 68:10
illustrated 68:14 101:5
illustrations 68:7
immediately 5:17 8:8
 8:15
immune 152:12
immunity 164:2
impact 82:14,15 219:18
 220:5
impactful 262:6
impacts 220:2
impede 101:20
implement 147:6
 187:11
implementation 34:4
 138:19
implemented 23:13
 75:9 125:1
implementing 89:12
implications 104:3

imply 213:18
importance 59:16
 171:14 212:8 218:12
 218:13 236:6 262:9
 263:13,17
important 14:3 15:20
 15:21 22:3 38:18 55:4
 58:21 63:22 68:18
 82:20 83:15,19 88:19
 93:5 98:13 99:10
 113:14 123:4 126:3,7
 144:10,13 145:18
 146:13 165:5 174:11
 174:14 184:4 191:5
 191:16 194:19 212:3
 212:14,14 216:8
 217:22 219:10 220:9
 224:6 226:17,21
 228:15 229:7 237:8
 237:21 252:11 262:1
 264:3,9
impossible 189:19
impressed 242:9
improperly 98:21
improve 6:21 23:11
 66:1 102:6,7 124:10
 138:21 160:20 263:22
improved 67:20 123:14
 136:4
improvement 111:13
 116:9,11 120:13
 124:15,19 130:7
 135:19 136:8,10
 242:7
Improvement/R&D
 130:22 135:5
improvements 122:14
 138:15
improving 7:1,20 13:8
in-between 176:18
in-line 62:16
in-person 108:5 139:6
in-the-ditch 110:18
 115:7
inbox 257:12
incentive 35:17 89:7
 91:10 94:13 96:21
incentives 87:16 88:1,4
 88:10 89:4 94:10,11
incentivize 87:14
incident 124:8,9 209:17
 214:13 262:16
Incident-based 124:13
incident-related 124:18
incidents 15:4 36:7
 37:5 101:19,21 120:2
 146:10 194:22 195:2
 195:10,12,21 199:22

215:22
include 70:6 72:10
 73:13 93:19 124:17
 144:14 145:1 148:20
 149:7 190:17 195:6
 202:17
included 30:3 81:19
 169:5 188:6 192:10
includes 101:18
including 18:13 72:13
 74:22 88:2 91:15
 108:13 142:22 161:9
inclusion 73:13
incorporate 18:19,21
 19:12,16 20:15 76:7
 166:11
incorporated 161:19
 169:14 199:8
incorporating 169:20
increase 209:10 213:5
 213:7 222:20 223:11
increased 216:1
increasing 200:8 202:4
 210:6
incredible 144:19
incredibly 99:9
independence 136:21
independent 81:2
 136:17
index 93:19 201:13
indicate 109:19
individual 85:13 115:14
 115:16 139:2 242:10
individually 47:7 156:7
individuals 23:21 52:4
 107:5 182:9
industries 38:1 41:10
 76:20 77:12,13 81:14
 81:18 85:5 91:1,3
 108:20 115:4,5 152:5
 184:12,18,22 186:3
 186:20 192:18 207:15
 233:18 234:4
industry 6:21 8:5 11:2
 14:15 22:16 23:11
 27:19 30:12 31:4,12
 32:8 37:3,4 38:3,4,5
 42:3,15,19,21 72:18
 77:9 79:1,2 82:21
 84:22 90:19 91:2
 94:12 95:5 96:12
 99:14 102:2 103:1
 108:13,21 114:7
 115:3 116:14 124:22
 144:8 146:19 147:2
 151:11 152:8,12,16
 156:18 160:21 189:22
 194:9 200:9,9,20

208:4 233:15,17,17
 234:3 239:21
ineffective 60:2
inform 23:1 45:18
information- 63:14
 64:10
information-sharing
 1:4,18 4:8 6:13,19
 12:4 23:10 25:4 26:1
 32:9 38:19 42:16 46:1
 50:19 51:1 53:2 63:19
 66:9 84:13 87:3,6
 90:1 91:3
informational 253:15
informative 171:11
infrastructure 6:15
 50:21 91:14 98:20
 100:17 186:10 264:15
INGAA 10:14 64:7
 80:17 111:18 116:13
INGAA's 84:15
initial 54:16 55:5,7
 60:12 121:18 171:22
 245:14,15 246:5,9,10
initially 32:3 58:11 92:2
 153:11
initiating 46:11 113:10
initiative 42:17 144:1
 153:5
initiatives 120:16
initiator 150:6
injuries 37:11 214:14
input 67:22 127:21
 140:19 212:10 248:22
inputs 67:1 132:8
 155:14
inputs/outputs 135:4
insert 226:2
inside 140:17 143:10
 147:1
insight 49:13 52:17
 227:14
insightful 28:21 99:10
insights 29:1 43:2
insisted 262:19
inspection 6:21 7:19
 11:2 62:16 98:5,6
 99:18 138:13 151:3
 155:9 161:16
inspections 14:21
 101:22 157:17 161:9
Inspector 151:4
instance 194:11 231:14
instances 214:16
 226:15
instituted 40:15 179:3
instituting 150:5
institution 15:8

176:8
leaders 142:12 152:9
152:16 239:22
leadership 104:20
142:11 152:8
leading 119:8 132:7
leads 124:14
learn 65:7,13 67:8 90:7
92:4 113:12 116:20
117:4 124:9 134:18
146:9 179:10 260:11
learned 42:3,5 64:9
66:5,7 70:3 80:17
88:9 89:16 121:8
122:13 133:18 173:21
180:13 187:21 189:11
212:2
learning 67:7 112:20
198:16 199:1
leave 59:14 249:11,12
leaving 177:1,9
Lee 2:16 178:17 179:12
179:13 214:8,11
215:14,20 216:10,15
216:21 217:4,20
218:2,5,20 219:15
220:4 222:8,11 225:9
225:13 226:4 227:16
229:14,17 230:3,9,14
230:19 231:5,7 232:4
232:7,14,20 233:21
234:9
left 5:18,20 8:8 21:20
49:5 53:17 141:9
166:5 237:13
legal 16:18 49:16 81:1
82:13,15,15 84:15
86:5,9 93:8 94:7 95:3
104:5 105:6,15 126:9
163:5 217:13 254:19
legislate 98:11
legislation 98:7
legislative 151:9
Leif 2:6 9:7 75:16 78:10
78:12 79:8 97:12,12
102:3 105:12 117:9
123:8,9 124:5 139:20
159:3 232:5 257:21
lend 78:2
lengthy 198:8
lessons 42:3 64:9 66:5
66:7 70:3 80:16 121:7
122:13 133:18 180:12
189:11
let's 41:5,5,6 54:4 125:5
145:9 187:20 188:9
197:10
letter 56:16 158:11

letting 29:17
level 23:18 42:18,19
53:10 62:4 103:5
137:19,20 138:18
147:10 153:14 155:22
202:20 203:6 207:19
224:21 235:17 236:3
255:21 261:19
levels 14:17 137:17
leverage 113:18,20
116:6 117:20
leveraging 117:15
Lew 178:21
liaising 174:3
liaison 170:20 171:14
172:8,15 175:5 176:4
liberally 156:19
liberty 157:12
Lief 157:1
life 262:6
light 240:1
liked 244:6
limitations 100:3
limited 151:7 206:6
208:8
line 4:15 5:2 20:8 27:11
54:4 56:8 123:15
141:3 190:13 197:9
209:2,9 215:16
lines 15:12 20:14 95:15
105:3 127:22 215:5
264:18
link 25:9,10,15
linked 107:4
links 242:14
list 64:21 81:18 89:19
89:21 99:17,19 117:1
192:10 240:18 255:18
listed 51:21 90:1
130:14 166:3 192:8
listen 84:5 262:10,11
listening 141:22 144:20
listing 57:22 60:12
literal 187:2
literally 23:19
little 15:2 21:4,7 27:13
29:8,14 30:4 41:16
51:10 52:16 53:11
56:5 57:8 59:17 79:17
86:13 96:18 110:6
113:7 133:5 141:4
148:8 157:12 159:18
160:6 177:8,9,20,21
180:10 183:2 189:14
194:18 197:17 208:19
217:1 221:10,18
223:2 235:20 238:3
241:7 249:17

load 166:16
loaded 194:12 197:2
loading 195:18
lobby 8:14 119:19
lobbying 160:6
local 67:18
located 5:17
locates 214:6
locating 189:21 200:8
200:20 214:21
location 26:10,14
184:14 186:17 191:12
260:10
locator 199:20 210:5
locators 182:5
LocusView 9:1 154:22
logical 221:2
long 15:19 36:18 70:8
89:13 118:1 156:20
173:7 204:19 218:13
224:10 226:13 227:3
241:5
long-term 103:21
longer 38:6 39:11
look 14:1 15:14 19:20
25:13 35:9 40:4 41:5
41:12 42:12 43:22
44:1 53:12 57:9 61:5
66:5 67:21 70:9 80:13
81:13 103:20 108:20
114:3,8 120:1 130:3
131:10 132:9,16
133:15 151:13 162:1
164:8,12 169:5
174:14 177:17 179:3
182:8 183:22 186:8
188:9 199:5 200:12
210:9 211:10 214:19
215:7 216:16,17,19
217:7,18 218:4 219:3
219:5,7 224:19,22
229:11 231:14,19
232:1 234:3 238:1
255:17 260:20 264:9
looked 59:22 64:13
68:12 76:15 187:18
193:6 223:13
looking 17:2,14,21
18:22 19:15 28:22
29:10 37:15 38:2
42:21 55:6 63:11
73:11 80:2 90:22
117:13 147:10 156:6
159:3 161:21 173:3
184:3 186:19 192:18
202:8 212:1 217:5
218:17 224:4 235:18
237:4,7,17 245:20

264:3
looks 66:12 72:8 76:16
77:15 135:2 180:11
221:11,19
LOSA 30:4
lose 134:14
loss 70:8
lot 7:11 15:1,18 22:18
23:3,17 24:19 37:5
44:20 48:1 54:9,12
55:9 64:2,15 66:17,18
70:13 71:5,19 75:20
79:22 80:3,22 84:15
85:4 89:16 97:22
101:11 102:13 117:2
117:4,5 123:1 136:18
140:14 141:21 146:9
160:1 177:22 180:4
181:13 183:4 187:2,3
188:13 193:4 195:22
196:3 197:7 198:21
203:1 204:2 205:11
205:19,20 206:1,12
206:21 207:12,17,18
210:5 211:10,14,18
214:18,20,21 217:9
219:9 220:6,12 222:6
223:4,9 224:13 227:6
233:2 234:20 236:12
236:12 242:15,17
250:4 251:11 253:9
262:1,8,10,12
loud 67:2 142:10
255:15
love 41:20 42:8 68:6
76:4 83:8
loved 152:6
low 202:3
luckily 262:21
lunch 19:1 165:6 176:8
176:16 178:10
lying 35:11
Lynch 2:17 10:6,6
165:10,22 166:1

M

ma'am 139:13
MacNEILL 2:8 9:2,2
Madam 13:14 16:6
73:15 74:2,18 81:11
85:20 103:11 106:3
128:13 139:19 157:11
159:12 162:21 175:9
main 7:2 8:11,14 14:3,8
62:13 67:4 83:12
130:9 143:22 193:16
maintain 232:19
maintained 98:21

maintaining 218:12
maintenance 149:5
major 55:18 134:11
 192:21
majority 120:3
making 13:9 32:22
 41:13 56:20 95:12
 96:14 133:6 136:16
 174:17 184:20 202:7
 206:3 227:9 243:6
 253:5
man 135:13
manage 39:2,17,20
 40:4,10,16 114:11
managed 58:21
management 28:14,17
 29:15 32:11,19 35:3
 38:21 39:1,3 40:3
 64:22 115:8 116:9
 120:13
manager 11:11 28:1
 30:1 43:9,10,13 197:5
 228:5
manages 58:13
Managing 10:12
mandate 45:15 130:2
 161:3
mandatory 187:10
 225:19
mantra 233:1
manufacturers 89:5
MAOP 158:1
map 60:20 77:19
maps 60:20
March 33:1 188:21
Mark 2:5,10 9:13 10:12
 38:13,14 57:19 68:6
 69:13 71:7,9 79:9
 80:14,15 81:3 84:16
 109:9 115:20 116:11
 119:16,17 120:20
 121:10 131:5,8
 132:11 136:14 218:7
 218:8 235:4,12,15
 243:17,18 244:13
 251:1 252:1 264:6
Mark's 72:2 73:6 236:20
 252:11
market 11:1 144:3
 151:13
marketing 151:19 193:5
markings 263:3,10
marks 218:13
massive 195:18
match 200:12
material 7:22 25:20
 79:21 148:20 159:4
materially 159:14

materials 1:2 79:19
 193:8
mathematicians 147:11
 147:15
matter 37:21 48:5 52:21
 87:7 93:8 160:16
 177:4 265:4
matters 45:12
mature 252:16
Max 2:16 11:4 84:17
 108:2 116:12 129:11
 227:13
Mayberry 49:1 146:5
McLaren 129:10
mean 35:21 37:7 76:10
 91:9 101:19 102:11
 102:14 120:1 125:22
 172:8 201:15 225:21
 227:5 228:9 231:8
 235:8 245:19,21
 248:17
meaning 134:15
means 17:21 66:20
 90:2 245:9
meant 99:20
Mears 9:6 62:13 153:9
measurable 7:22
measured 77:18
measures 94:14 102:21
measuring 183:22
meat 164:18
Mechanical 11:19
mechanisms 91:4
media 98:16 100:11,12
 100:14 154:9
medical 38:3
meet 49:7 59:18 71:2
 76:13 78:3 139:1
 167:11,12 172:2,2
 244:2
meeting 1:9 4:9 5:14
 8:15 12:3,6,11,15
 20:19 25:8,15 26:6,7
 26:8,13,15,17,19,20
 26:21,22 27:16 28:6
 29:11 46:3,3 50:6,14
 55:16 56:7 59:4 60:19
 69:17 77:4 78:8,13
 79:18 108:5 109:7,12
 119:6 127:4 129:7
 130:12 135:10 139:3
 139:6 140:2 142:8
 146:4 162:1 166:4,18
 168:17 172:10 173:17
 176:20 179:1 241:14
 241:20 243:7 244:4
 245:5,18 248:4,21
 249:18,20,22 250:13

 255:14 256:22 257:3
 257:3 260:7,9,19,20
meetings 13:21 20:17
 20:18 23:16 25:7,11
 25:12,14,17 26:11,19
 46:17,20 48:21 49:8,9
 62:8 90:12 108:4
 113:9 131:4 176:18
 186:14 189:15 241:8
 241:18 247:9,14
 250:11 252:13 254:3
 254:4,10
members 44:14 48:17
 50:10 51:7 52:1,2,11
 58:1,7,7 59:18 67:3
 67:11 71:15 72:13,13
 72:19 73:3 74:8 75:1
 75:5 80:19,20 86:10
 108:3,9 129:9 141:20
 145:16 162:12,12
 165:14 166:3 169:9
 170:19 171:16,17
 172:4 175:4 179:8
 182:9,15 183:20
 189:16 196:4 197:3
 205:11,15 207:14
 211:21 219:10 220:16
 230:22 231:10 233:2
 255:9 256:4
membership 51:12
 61:17 211:17
memo 56:20 57:1,1
 204:7
men's 5:19
mention 228:13 249:10
 257:8
mentioned 50:5 84:16
 100:1 115:20 116:6
 118:20 127:17 129:16
 144:11 149:8,12,20
 183:5 197:9 239:4
 250:1 251:14,19
 257:1,10 259:3
message 258:11
 263:12
messages 140:7
messaging 167:8 193:4
met 1:19 16:20 37:16
 42:12 121:15 186:12
metal 70:8
method 36:13
methodologies 136:11
 136:13
methodology 201:8
methods 135:22 209:19
 213:2
metrics 100:10 112:5
 114:20 117:14 137:13

 144:15 218:18
Mexico 30:15 37:19
Michael 2:7 136:7 138:9
 237:14
Michelle 2:15 10:20
 86:14
microphone 237:10
 248:14 250:20,22
 259:6,22
mid-June 250:4
middle 119:5
midnight 87:9
Mike 2:7 4:13,15,16 5:2
 9:15 11:18 116:11
 163:18,19 244:11,12
milestones 75:10
military 29:19
million 37:8
mind 68:16 79:6 83:15
 102:22 120:6 137:3
 142:5 151:14 156:4
 159:17 160:6 165:3
 170:3 225:21 238:22
 239:14 246:4 253:9
mine 174:5
minimal 123:6
minimize 6:1 154:3
minimum 45:12 122:19
 130:13 201:18
minor 55:17,19 188:15
 191:13
minute 37:8 177:11
minutes 6:8 27:12 57:8
 101:5 139:3 215:13
 215:16,18,19,20
 216:1 251:22 264:1,2
missed 120:6
misses 155:12 156:1,16
missing 19:10 59:8
mission 7:12 16:17
 52:12 59:9,13 69:9
 70:21 71:1,11 72:3
 73:11 74:3 82:8 83:10
 85:21 162:9 163:3
 169:17 186:7
Mission-Objectives
 105:7
mistakes 42:4,5
mitigate 24:10 39:6
 41:7 110:22
mitigated 114:17
MITRE 50:20 58:12
 59:20 132:20 134:1
 134:13 147:9,12
 235:21
MITRE-type 137:20
mobile 6:1
mockup 167:5

168:5
officer 9:14 61:3 129:14
official 1:22 2:12 5:14
  25:22,22 48:12
  118:10 129:7 166:2
officials 67:18
offline 46:19 131:3,6
  235:13 251:8 252:13
  253:16 254:4
oil 30:12,14 37:3,19
  38:4 104:11 264:19
Oklahoma 49:2 151:4
old 110:11
onboard 142:18 146:13
  150:16
onboarding 75:21
once 30:11 39:4 47:3
  75:7 78:11 213:20
  224:3 226:16
one-call 182:5
one-on- 196:19
one-on-one 197:1
  206:2
ones 110:2 135:9
  156:16 172:11 206:11
  251:18 252:3
ongoing 63:18 257:3
online 221:7 254:4
onus 133:5
Oops 209:5
open 1:9 3:4 4:18 6:6
  15:12 26:16 158:10
  196:20 220:10 228:1
  234:19 236:12 251:8
opening 3:5 59:3
  234:22
operate 37:9 123:21
operated 80:18 81:2
operation 125:20
  126:17
Operational 258:16
operations 11:14 28:10
  50:8
operator 115:15 126:11
  128:2 134:19 137:2
  143:11 147:4 158:18
  202:21 219:21
operator's 63:4
operators 15:8 67:15
  80:20 83:1 101:12
  102:13 115:16 116:1
  123:21 134:7 143:19
  145:10 148:14 149:7
  149:8,10 150:2,7
  157:13 158:15 159:15
  160:19 161:2
opinion 34:19 38:2
opportunities 13:22

19:18 64:3 136:3
  149:22
opportunity 13:20 19:7
  20:2 42:21 43:7 65:10
  70:16 124:9 145:10
  145:16,17 146:19
  154:22 172:13 173:9
  179:6 187:19 211:10
  223:5 224:14 257:7
opposed 74:15 117:6
  122:12 148:14 163:14
  175:19
option 109:17 192:11
  195:14
options 18:6 132:17
  135:2 192:7 238:21
  240:14
order 3:4 12:5 77:17
  82:10 87:14 150:3
  151:10 157:12 164:4
  246:10 258:4
orders 13:17
organization 39:13
  71:8 80:19 115:18
  162:16 180:4 181:20
  185:14 194:7 201:16
  218:22 229:19
organizational 42:18
  72:4,12 74:5,8,21
  75:1,5,14 77:20,21
  78:3
organizations 41:10
  53:7 63:20 65:15,17
  79:2 108:21 109:15
  182:11 195:9 198:17
  206:3
organize 50:8
organized 45:8 53:10
  241:18
original 130:2 183:14
  184:7 186:7
originally 180:18 185:7
  210:20 215:4
OSHA 97:19 151:15
ought 73:15 144:2
  145:1 147:9,22
  148:13
outcome 152:21
outcomes 8:6 60:9
outline 45:10 167:21
  169:1,8,9 232:18
outlined 123:13 183:16
  184:8 185:13 226:19
outlying 115:4
output 111:17 140:19
  141:1 148:22
outputs 111:11,13,14
  112:8 123:14 132:8

132:21 155:15
outreach 11:11 117:9
outs 3:9 4:20 16:15
  17:2 20:1 44:8 250:10
outside 79:12 143:16
  153:19 200:10 206:17
outstanding 58:12
  75:18
overall 75:8 77:22
  132:15 201:14 208:11
overarching 210:16
overcome 114:15
overlap 60:2,3 63:11
  112:22 130:19
overlook 257:20
overly 154:5
oversight 133:12
owner 190:1 199:21
  200:21 220:15
owners 182:6 189:22
  200:4

P

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
  4:1
p.m 177:6 265:5
package 66:10
page 25:8 58:4 71:20
  135:16 183:10 190:19
  190:22 191:2 223:14
  256:22
painful 259:8
Panel 240:19
papa 40:6
paper 47:21 185:8
  186:14 187:2 245:22
paperless 248:16
parallel 54:18,21
parallels 90:15
paralysis 190:8
parent 45:1,5,22 46:10
  46:16 47:6 48:15,18
  48:21 51:6 55:11,16
  56:1 260:20
Pareto 100:10
Parker 2:8 11:7,7 86:7,8
  86:14 92:22 93:18
  106:3 107:9,12,14
  160:15 164:9
parse 80:3
part 14:19 17:16 23:3
  28:13 31:14 33:4,12
  34:13 38:22 54:1
  67:17 78:13 90:20
  92:15,19 108:12
  111:4,14 119:9
  135:12 137:5 140:20
  148:19 154:12,16

158:8 161:9 166:8
  173:4,5 177:16
  180:22 181:21 182:1
  184:4 219:22 222:13
  229:13 230:1,4
  232:16,22,22 238:12
  248:16 263:7
partially 197:12
PARTICIPANT 74:10
  248:1
participants 4:10 6:3
  44:16 72:18 75:22
  123:17 124:1 140:16
  140:17 141:8,13
  142:19 157:7
participate 62:19 76:2
  87:15 89:6 96:22
  101:10 118:18 140:12
  141:20 143:6 144:3
  145:16 163:7 172:12
  181:18 182:10 213:20
  229:21 244:8 254:11
  255:6,11
participated 109:10
  164:6 181:4 189:16
participating 157:18,19
  158:16 174:3 182:6
  186:4 190:16
participation 6:5 12:20
  77:3 108:3 114:15
  123:7 137:1,4,11
  159:16 196:5 212:11
  213:12
particular 18:8 39:6
  48:5 88:18 98:1 104:3
  149:18 203:16 217:10
particularly 30:14 37:4
  38:20 70:9 82:22
  102:17 103:6 158:13
  181:21 186:19 189:20
  190:6 192:17 193:13
  201:17 202:19 216:22
  220:15 232:20 236:1
  240:12
parties 86:17 122:19
partners 67:16 109:20
partnership 146:17
parts 111:9 250:1
party 58:13 78:15,21
  79:3 81:2 147:12
  204:15,16
pass 158:9
passed 89:8 176:2
  224:8
passenger 31:16,19
passengers 145:6
passes 74:16 106:14
  163:15 175:20

paste 90:17
path 104:13 112:17
    151:17 179:8
patience 225:12 247:5
pay 103:4
pay-to-play 102:14
paying 221:9
PDCA 66:13 111:4
Pearen 2:9 10:15,15
    94:6 96:8 99:5,9,21
    106:8 152:1,1 173:20
    173:20 239:18,18
    247:20,20 248:4
peers 207:18
pen 47:21 165:20
penalize 97:21
penalty 98:8 158:10
    164:2
pending 129:21
people 11:22 14:14
    24:20 27:6 35:6 36:9
    43:15 52:6 72:15,15
    72:22 79:17 82:9
    83:12 91:16 92:7
    100:15 101:6 105:2
    125:6 128:18 131:21
    142:19 143:2,8,10
    144:7,21 146:14,16
    147:1 148:5 150:16
    153:19 155:11 157:18
    173:3,15 177:9
    178:10 181:6 184:6
    186:14 191:17 193:2
    193:20 195:15,15
    197:1,19 198:3,22
    199:13 201:2,19
    202:2,15,16 203:13
    206:8,21 207:4 208:9
    212:22 213:7,17
    215:9 217:2 220:7
    221:14,14,15 222:14
    222:18 224:4,7,11,17
    225:5 228:8,13 229:6
    231:2,7 232:16
    237:14 261:17 264:12
perceive 102:13,15
percent 200:14 201:1,3
    201:4 216:14,18
    225:20
perfect 29:5,16 81:9
    82:3 99:21 110:21
    225:20 243:4
perfected 243:5
perform 194:16
performance 112:5
    114:20 117:14 126:7
period 29:21 188:20
person 43:5 228:18

251:20 261:20
personal 261:19 262:6
personalities 23:22
persons 92:1 131:5
perspective 15:20,21
    17:1,14 48:14 56:19
    63:5 97:15,17 99:7
    127:9 143:11,12,13
    237:17 244:15
perspectives 27:17
    58:14 60:4 64:17
petroleum 37:3,15
phases 178:1
PhDs 207:4
phenomenal 22:21
PHMSA 2:13,13,14,15
    2:16,17,17,18 7:9
    9:18,22 10:2,5,7,9,11
    10:21 11:4 12:9 13:11
    13:19 14:1,10 15:9,14
    25:11,20 45:20 48:11
    51:7 56:3,9,12,13
    64:12,14,16 67:16
    72:14 80:8 84:19
    97:20 107:2 108:2
    111:22 146:19 151:3
    151:4 158:12 165:8
    168:9,16 174:1
    227:13 250:6 256:15
    257:12 264:18
PHMSA's 25:7 48:13
    56:14,14,22 168:4
PHMSA-2016- 12:11
PHMSA-2016-0128
    6:11
phone 4:11 11:17,21
    63:4 69:8 82:4 92:21
    94:5 103:14 108:4
    127:14 134:19 139:10
    174:9 198:13 223:18
    233:8 246:21 260:4
phonetic 178:22
phrase 136:6
physical 107:3 190:19
physically 227:7
pick 24:17 95:4 134:18
    252:11
picking 165:1
picture 65:13 109:14,16
    218:11
pie 210:22 216:9
piece 73:16 88:20 94:1
    94:1 210:21 211:3
pieces 84:11 131:15
    177:16 259:13
piggyback 103:16
pillars 33:8
pilot 27:21 29:20 30:18

147:16
pipe 70:7 84:17,20
pipeline 1:2 6:21 7:1,20
    9:8 10:3,5,7,9,11,21
    11:5,11 13:8 23:10
    38:5 42:15 67:15
    78:12 82:22 94:12
    97:17 98:18,19
    108:21 116:8 120:5
    120:12,17,17 123:10
    139:20 143:19 147:19
    151:15 152:20 154:7
    157:17 163:6 232:6
    262:9
pipelines 6:15 7:22
    97:19 104:11 145:3
pitch 159:18
pitch-and-catch 65:20
place 4:17 8:15 24:5,13
    26:9 41:2 46:19 54:10
    55:10 98:8,12 148:10
    160:9 166:16 180:19
    203:18,21 219:20
    232:18 253:10 257:15
places 172:4
plan 55:22 71:2,10
    75:12 161:21 173:17
    176:14 204:10
plan-do-check- 66:13
plan-do-check-act
    66:13
plan/do/act 136:9
plane 42:9
planes 41:21
planned 61:1 173:13
planning 20:19 26:12
    76:7 167:15,17
    168:12 173:9 176:19
    178:1 204:9 241:14
    247:2 249:19 260:6
    261:7
plans 43:5
plastic 84:17,20
plateau 151:18
platforms 240:5
play 65:17 110:13
    180:22 200:1
played 181:21
playing 221:7,10
plays 28:13 236:6
please 5:22 6:7 14:5
    15:17,21 48:3 57:22
    58:3 71:21 74:12 79:5
    83:7 106:10 108:8
    163:11 175:17
pleased 13:1
plenty 39:14
plug 165:20

plus 9:16 110:2 163:20
    228:8 244:13
PODs 136:4
point 41:18 61:15 73:7
    81:12 84:21 99:4
    100:19,20,22 102:3
    103:16 112:19 113:6
    118:19 121:15 163:20
    164:17 170:20 171:12
    175:5 176:1 180:1
    201:10 202:3 222:11
    230:20 231:4 245:13
    246:2 249:5 257:22
    259:18,19 260:10,22
    262:6
pointed 122:5 132:6,19
    133:3,14 134:13,17
    198:19
points 147:14 185:11
    240:15 261:12
POIs 136:5
policies 88:6,8 95:12
    96:4 146:15
policy 33:5 39:9 87:2
    88:3 89:2 95:21
    104:18 114:10,11
    127:17 204:7 232:10
policymaking 88:20
poor 214:6,6
popped 197:7
populate 259:14
portion 142:6
positive 219:17 227:4
possibilities 79:7
possibility 101:8
    159:14
possible 59:5 72:11
    77:1 120:1 157:15
    160:4 185:1 193:2
    203:3 238:12 250:7
    252:20
possibly 8:12 148:4
posting 25:17 256:21
potatoes 164:19
potential 46:14 63:11
    94:19 96:15 112:7
    114:22 229:10
potentially 59:6 100:2
    102:15 162:11,18
powerful 90:16,16
PowerPoint 5:4 25:9
    53:15 256:19
PowerPoints 4:18,19
    4:22
practice 30:19 48:2
    108:22 115:14 118:12
    118:14,21 119:7
    214:4 216:12 235:19

58:14 61:16 66:20
86:17 105:10 169:1
169:22 192:7 210:13
223:3
providers 11:3 67:16
80:21 115:21,22
134:8,8 137:2
provides 58:4 64:16
89:18 104:16 211:14
providing 53:6 72:19
90:10 162:17 169:11
174:2 248:21
provisions 102:22
232:18
PST 67:11
public 1:9 9:20 11:12
14:15 18:8 23:15
25:11 26:6,22 44:16
67:10,13 73:7 83:4,14
96:2,5 100:7,11
104:15 106:16 152:12
161:4 163:5 178:21
220:22 221:1 233:3
256:22
publically 73:5 226:2
publish 97:21 98:14
100:7 150:3
published 143:16 181:5
186:11 208:1,13,14
223:13
publishing 180:15
pull 53:12 77:16 148:14
169:13 223:22
pulled 195:4
pulling 169:2 170:13
226:6
punitive 94:14 95:18
97:5 102:8 134:7
purpose 6:12 28:4
220:15
purposes 7:1 118:17
260:6
pursue 113:9 258:4
push 66:21 72:20
148:14
pushing 33:19 38:11
put 21:18 47:21 54:4
60:15 68:14 95:20
100:11 105:12 110:4
135:15 141:3,15
143:19 147:20 149:15
161:20 186:16 192:11
203:18 205:5 208:22
235:9 262:17
puts 133:5
putting 95:22 109:22
133:10 233:15

Q

Q&A 58:18
QA/QC 148:10
qualification 16:20 58:9
75:20 139:15 147:3,4
157:5
qualifications 52:13
143:8 153:11
qualified 148:17
qualifying 140:16 148:9
qualitative 240:7
quality 28:10 103:1
114:12,12 137:21
197:11 201:13,15
202:2,4 214:7 258:16
quantify 226:21
quantifying 211:19
quarterly 222:4
question 32:7,16 34:12
36:19 41:15 49:20
95:8 96:7,10,11 99:1
104:9 136:15 157:1
196:9 225:15 231:16
232:8 233:11 242:2
247:1 250:8
questions 22:21 25:2
32:2 37:1 43:17 49:10
49:10,11 52:15 68:4,5
83:20 87:9 90:9 91:6
92:5,10,11 103:13
107:15 119:15 127:13
139:7,8 146:1 164:15
174:8 178:9 179:20
179:21 202:9 205:12
213:14 227:10 228:6
229:1,10 233:5
246:20 247:1 257:6
260:3 264:5
quick 26:12 29:13
51:16 153:12 176:1
quickly 21:4 49:15
65:20
quite 14:22 30:11 37:14
59:21 64:15 77:8
170:15 179:21 203:8
220:6 243:4
quorum 8:19 12:3
140:3

R

R&D 16:19 111:14
116:22 128:16 129:5
130:3 155:2 238:10
Raaz 28:18
rail 127:9
railroad 14:12
raise 68:21 144:8
151:18

raised 59:6 99:10
raising 264:20
ran 30:7 88:16
Randazzo 87:10
Randolph 28:20 256:8
Randy 2:8 11:7 86:5,8
86:12 94:6,18 101:3
102:10 105:19 107:1
107:10 118:8 163:20
Randy's 239:1
range 192:22 209:21
ranges 228:9
rank 206:11
rapidly 243:14
rare 126:17 214:16
rationale 261:13
RCFA 124:13
RCP 85:2
reach 27:21 81:4
118:11,16 127:10
198:13
reached 127:9
reaching 85:17 129:20
202:6
reaction 221:13
read 7:13 48:10 52:2
53:14 66:10 108:12
130:1 144:22
ready 62:1 261:2
real 13:9 18:1 20:8 53:1
65:19 126:12 198:4
204:22
realize 124:7 134:4
174:10
realized 131:15 263:1,3
realizes 160:18
reason 14:4 22:10
36:15 73:18 83:3
111:12 157:14 161:22
183:13 243:13
reasons 101:6 125:15
126:5 174:13 190:3
207:11
reassess 39:12
recall 144:15 146:3
149:15
recap 3:16 21:1 177:9
177:20 178:4,9
255:21
receive 166:10
received 35:19,22
76:10 200:7 209:11
211:20
receives 36:1
receiving 187:15
recklessness 161:6
recognition 157:6,16
157:21 158:16 243:9

recognize 103:3,3
109:4 118:7 121:6
134:10 149:6,13
160:5 161:2 180:4
recognized 87:17 158:4
158:17,22
recognizing 56:9
159:15
recollect 249:14
recommend 90:13
92:19 94:2 104:2
130:4 138:2 159:12
171:21 175:3
recommendation 7:3,8
27:3 45:18 47:6 55:5
55:14 56:21 72:10
76:22 96:9 114:3
124:3 132:4 134:12
135:1,14 136:16,22
138:7 142:6,7,9
144:12,14,22 160:14
170:14 171:6,12,19
174:22 246:13 252:8
252:12 253:11 255:1
259:2
recommendations 7:4
7:15 17:17 23:12 45:7
45:20,22 46:14,21
47:1 50:15 53:8 54:16
73:14 74:5,7,20 75:4
75:6,9,13,15 93:21
105:15 108:14 120:6
124:13 148:12 150:14
156:5,8 158:14
166:11 171:2 178:20
238:21 246:5 252:16
252:22 253:19 261:1
261:5,11
recommended 27:20
141:2,12 162:10
recommending 93:20
170:17 253:14
reconsider 119:22
reconsideration 118:15
record 12:8 31:20
110:12,17,19 129:1
177:5 265:5
recorded 12:7
records 93:13 110:14
110:15 189:2,4 201:6
214:6
recreating 113:17
recruit 120:10 163:4
recycle 249:7
redlined 92:18
redone 263:6
reduce 201:18 210:22
reduced 212:21 215:21

similar 30:13 81:14
   173:16 188:14 193:9
   207:9,17 263:6
similarities 179:7
simple 184:20 185:1
   191:3
simply 57:22 72:22
   83:3 102:14 158:21
Simultaneous 216:4
single 184:13 195:19
   209:17,17 226:15
sit 181:7
site 26:15 189:8 198:20
   199:4 224:1,1
sitting 49:5 51:5,5
   106:17 146:5
situation 8:13 161:14
   222:2 231:15
situations 81:14 199:10
   231:17
six 182:13 185:15
   210:19 215:19,20
   227:19 231:9 232:16
   264:2
sixth 13:19 139:16
sixty 181:3
size 19:13 111:2
sketched 245:22
Skip 2:13 9:17
Skow 129:18
Skype 5:2
slant 28:16
sleeves 24:1
slice 211:7
slide 57:22 61:19 63:9
   66:22 68:12 76:12
   108:8 119:1 121:12
   123:10 144:4 171:13
   209:1 215:13
slides 5:4,9 140:6
   141:19 165:4 180:13
slipping 20:13
small 66:10 123:2 149:7
   149:9 182:13 192:21
   194:7 195:8,9 241:19
smaller 210:7
smart 14:22
smarter 40:15
SMEs 147:20
SMS 16:14 30:9 32:18
   32:22 33:4,5,8,12,13
   33:17,20 34:4,6,11,14
   34:17 36:14 39:7
   40:13,13,20 41:9 42:2
   42:17,18,22 43:9,10
   43:13 66:14 68:14,16
   103:4 144:1 157:19
   158:5,8 251:20

SMS/Aviation 3:7
so-and-so 154:7
soil 264:14
solidify 256:3
solidifying 26:13
solo 16:21
Solomon 145:14
solution 24:3 103:21
solutions 105:10
somebody 40:17,18
   41:13 66:11 68:21
   190:20 192:9 199:10
   205:1 262:17
something's 126:19
somewhat 23:18 180:5
   216:21
son 22:5
soon 26:14 47:14 49:21
   168:22 169:11 176:19
   254:13
sooner 133:21 253:11
   255:16 256:5
sorry 69:14 84:9 86:4,7
   92:19 97:13 119:17
   131:17 163:17 165:20
   218:7 235:8 245:1
sort 20:5 40:9 68:10
   69:11 79:10 89:20
   94:22 99:11 157:17
   158:12 159:6 164:18
   173:1 176:13 213:19
   220:22 239:21 241:7
   241:8,9 242:17 253:5
   253:17 254:5 256:11
   263:10,15
sorts 151:1
sought 89:17
sounds 179:20 249:3
source 115:14 205:3,8
   206:16
sources 66:7,19 115:12
   151:14 199:17 215:4
Southern 30:10
Southwest 36:1
speak 12:14 86:13
   147:16,18 251:20
   262:8
speaker 16:13 177:13
speakers 22:22
speaking 137:11 216:4
speaks 21:17 135:15
   243:8
specific 41:16 80:10,12
   110:19 122:13 155:19
   162:16 184:12 202:22
   203:19 204:11 233:15
   234:1 247:2 260:18
specifically 45:14

101:3 135:2 197:5
   203:12 207:7
spectrum 15:7
speeches 262:10
speed 195:17
spend 110:6 263:20
spent 12:22 80:21
   205:22 245:9
spirit 123:16,22
spit 160:19
spoke 62:11 77:6
   160:16 205:11 235:14
spoken 61:21
sponsors 182:11,12
   205:16
spot 235:9
stack 110:12,14
stacks 186:14
staff 3:3 51:7 64:14
   80:8 81:7 91:21
   118:13,14 165:8
   182:13,14 188:7
   195:15,17 198:10
   228:18 231:9,10,19
   232:21
Stafford 1:20
stage 27:13 29:6 45:6
stages 113:19 178:2
stairs 8:11
stakeholder 117:9
   180:22 181:18 182:12
   186:20 188:3 190:16
   191:12 202:22 210:5
   210:8 211:9 212:11
   213:12 214:22 215:6
   225:5 228:11 229:3
   240:7
stakeholders 60:17,21
   67:5,6 69:22 72:9
   73:7 82:21 96:12,21
   127:6 135:17 140:12
   141:1,19 143:6 144:6
   144:7 181:4 184:9,14
   185:10 189:19 192:15
   213:3 219:9 226:10
   228:6
stance 204:8
stand 38:19 252:22
standard 251:13
standardized 184:16
   190:4,13
standards 25:21 63:1
   65:14,16 109:15
   112:5 116:7 133:9
   218:21 219:12
standpoint 5:15 8:7
   118:12 141:5 203:13
   250:6

start 4:3 8:19 21:12
   34:6,7 37:15 47:14,18
   54:17 57:17 66:16
   103:19 108:1,7
   133:14 134:2 135:13
   137:15 138:12 150:13
   169:15,19,20 173:2
   176:19 208:9 222:9
   226:12 230:15 245:20
started 4:5 31:2 32:18
   32:21 33:19 34:5,12
   35:18 50:7 54:10
   65:11 87:22 92:2
   109:7 169:13 177:8
   183:19 185:5 197:22
   203:4 206:7 209:4
   223:6 224:9 226:13
   233:13 238:18 242:6
starting 37:20 54:8,9,14
   71:14 123:2,3 184:6
   208:5 250:15
starts 132:15
startup 103:7
state 8:20 9:20 10:19
   67:16 68:15 82:18,19
   109:14,16,20 127:15
   150:21 163:6 164:3
   187:9,14 202:20,22
   217:6,10,13 225:17
   226:11,20 230:3
state's 216:17,18
State-based 187:22
state-by- 217:5
stated 71:9 111:20
statement 3:4 7:12 46:6
   46:6,9 69:16,17 71:3
   71:22 73:14 83:10
   100:8 108:11 109:3
   112:12 129:22 130:8
   140:5,7 156:22 166:8
   169:18 258:3
statements 50:9 167:22
   169:11
states 1:1 19:14 31:17
   67:17 99:16 120:3
   123:21 158:14 163:21
   164:12 206:11 217:8
   217:12,17 225:16,22
   226:5,7,8
static 18:12,12 143:1
   170:9
statistic 215:17
statistical 156:17
statistically 201:11
statisticians 147:11,15
statistics 78:18 221:15
status 61:17
statute 13:5 89:9,11,17

90:2 93:10,10
statutes 93:19
statutory 87:1 88:3,14
  89:11 92:17 93:5
  94:16 161:3
stay 54:6 172:14
staying 23:17
Steering 141:20
stemmed 212:4
stems 180:18
step 103:19 138:15,18
  201:12
stepped 129:11
stepping 152:18
steps 17:3,20 20:7 78:5
  94:1 118:6 123:1
  176:15 212:15
stick 170:10
sticking 20:11 57:9
stipulations 158:21
stood 21:16 116:17
Stoody 104:10,10
stop 21:6 57:3 68:3
  73:15 146:11
stored 203:20
stories 186:13
straight 5:18
strategic 7:12
Strategy 11:1
straw 135:13
strawman 78:7 112:10
streaming 223:19
street 1:20 8:16
strong 34:3 212:6
stronger 96:3
structural 71:10 252:21
structure 52:19 54:22
  57:14 72:4,7,12 74:6
  74:8,21 75:1,5,7,14
  78:3,19 79:3 80:22
  82:15,15 164:19
structured 59:1
structures 72:11 77:20
  237:1
struggle 190:7,8
Stuart 127:16
studies 48:2 113:10
  193:20
study 91:18 180:19
  181:4 183:14 184:7
  185:14
stuff 36:4 178:5 243:21
style 247:16
sub- 242:21
sub-team 242:10
  243:11
subcommittee's 24:15
subcommittees 13:1

16:16 24:14,21 44:13
  44:17,22 45:17,19
  46:5,9,12,18 47:4,12
  48:9,18 49:7,13 50:2
  50:3 51:8,11 52:6,10
  55:10 57:5 60:1 63:13
  78:14 92:8 103:18
  104:1 112:16 113:1
  130:18 137:9 166:14
  168:13,19 169:4
  170:12 171:18 172:2
  172:5,15 173:14
  178:11 185:15 241:20
  245:13 252:14 253:1
  255:5 256:2 260:18
  261:8
subcommittees' 172:18
subgroup 115:10
subject 88:17,20 93:8
  93:13 96:1 97:3
  104:18 105:9 110:9
  131:7 132:2 138:6
subjects 131:2
submission 212:18
  231:21
submissions 166:19
  197:13
submit 100:21 143:16
  144:12 164:1 184:14
  189:3,3 193:3,8 195:7
  195:11,12,20 198:6
  201:19 206:22 213:17
  213:19,20,21 215:6,9
  229:18
submitted 6:10 7:8 56:3
  148:11 158:3 186:1
  194:15 208:21 210:10
  226:5 230:22 231:17
submitters 232:2
submitting 191:4 192:9
  193:11,14,17 201:2
  201:16,22 202:3
  213:7
subpoena 204:18
subpoenaed 204:4
Subsits 2:9 10:17,17
substance 35:10
substantial 21:15
substantive 44:20
  49:10 53:1 54:1,12
  56:20 172:6 201:21
substantively 20:9,15
  20:22 162:3 173:11
  252:15
substitute 95:13 96:5
subteam 118:9
subteams 115:1
success 56:6 90:16

123:3 137:13 183:22
  213:13
successful 16:4 31:5
  103:9 105:17 122:22
  180:9 184:1,8 193:19
successfully 179:17
  187:20
sufficient 210:18 211:2
  216:12
suggest 95:16,19
  151:17
suggested 59:12 179:1
  236:8
suggestion 92:14 95:22
summarize 152:3
summarizing 6:17
summary 58:4 144:15
Sunoco 9:7 78:12
  123:10 139:20 232:6
sunset 102:22
support 48:12 51:7,7
  56:16 71:17 95:16
  108:2 123:11 153:3,3
  250:5 256:16
supported 47:9 87:2
supporting 87:5
supportive 104:14
supposed 176:7
surely 138:7
surface 264:13
surprise 22:7 253:2
surprised 22:1
surrogate 76:21
survey 40:10
survive 34:19
suspect 46:22 51:4
  54:10 81:15
sustainability 103:21
sweet 178:5
system 1:4,19 4:8 6:20
  7:17 8:1 12:4 19:6,9
  19:12 23:10,19 28:17
  32:19 39:1 42:16
  43:16 50:19 51:1
  58:14 60:15 64:11
  66:14 72:15,16 143:3
  152:20 187:22 194:10
  195:13 196:7,22
  197:20 198:13,18
  201:22 203:14 204:21
  210:10,15 212:20
  223:17 226:9 229:18
  234:5 238:16
systemic 150:2
systems 28:14 29:15
  32:11 38:21 102:7
  130:4 142:17

T

T&Q 127:7 139:21
tab 211:7
table 23:22 69:8 82:5
  92:12 94:5 95:6
  103:14 127:13 142:13
  146:6 153:1 174:8
  233:6 246:20 260:3
Tableau 208:17 221:6
  222:9 223:3,20,21
  234:2 236:1
tabs 211:6
tackle 197:10
tackled 203:2
tackling 227:10
takeaway 79:10
takeaways 69:13 212:2
taken 19:22 26:9 37:13
  94:14 135:6 200:22
takes 255:19
talk 16:14 28:4,7 29:13
  42:17 43:8 50:18,20
  56:5 59:16 61:1,22
  62:10,14 65:8 86:22
  92:1 106:16 134:19
  135:21 150:8 180:12
  181:13 183:2 197:4
  224:5 228:18 235:3
  236:10 241:7,13
  249:17 250:11,17
talked 23:17 28:12
  53:22 58:22,22 60:18
  61:11 62:8 67:12
  70:17 79:13 101:7
  103:22 105:7,19
  110:7 112:14 113:6
  121:18 122:9,10
  135:17 136:14 153:21
  170:1 189:13,18
  196:3 197:19 205:18
  207:11 221:5 237:19
  257:11 260:14,22
talking 23:8 27:14 44:1
  57:4 61:13 89:22
  111:3 130:15 136:4
  156:1 157:6 178:11
  189:21 206:2,2 221:8
  223:11 230:12 239:7
  239:8
talks 135:1,16 209:2
  217:1
tan 64:18
tangible 47:5 158:16
target 80:6,10 96:18
  167:22 222:19 253:6
targeted 75:10 96:11
  117:3
task 46:5,6,8 50:9 69:15

69:17 71:2,22 72:3
73:14 108:11,19
109:3 112:12 129:22
130:8 140:5,7 159:13
166:7 167:22 169:10
228:12 230:21
taxonomy 60:12 131:11
148:21
teach 30:9
team 22:6 72:2 105:6,7
105:11,15 117:19
118:15 119:7 129:9
132:3 151:4 228:12
230:22
teams 119:4 242:17,22
technical 23:21 79:20
224:2
technological 8:4
technologies 130:6
136:1,11,13,19
technology 9:12 11:3
14:21 15:6 16:19
18:16 58:7 59:19
64:19 70:2 111:16
113:1 121:16 128:16
129:4 130:3 132:1
134:8 136:19,21
237:16 238:10 239:11
240:6,14 244:2
technology- 136:16
tee 176:15
teeth 48:4
telecom 210:11
telecommunications
194:20 214:20
teleconference 2:7,15
20:18
teleconferences
167:12 205:10
tell 42:1,9,14 70:15
228:19
telling 208:10
tells 128:17
template 166:21 167:2
167:17 259:4
templates 166:19
167:15 168:2 259:19
ten 85:4 236:13
tend 214:14
tendency 23:6
tenets 142:2,11
tent 162:5,6 175:1
248:12 249:7,12
tent's 139:9
term 77:16 155:8 220:6
terms 22:15 32:7 42:22
51:11 52:21 54:19
60:14 61:20 67:14

68:11 71:22 76:11
77:6,9 78:1 82:20
94:1 103:20 108:22
110:4 120:9 153:22
159:15 176:17 213:16
219:17 237:4 247:3
260:21
terrain 126:1
test 198:20 199:4
Texas 164:6,10
thanking 108:2
thanks 4:22 15:17
29:17 42:7 76:6
104:11 124:4 173:20
179:13 218:7 233:4
233:21 238:7 248:5
265:3
things 14:12 18:14,18
18:22 19:9,10,11,14
23:7 24:2,9 35:5
36:11 37:9 38:18
47:11 52:14,18 56:18
60:4 61:11 62:9 64:1
64:2 65:7 69:22 70:6
79:9,16 90:7 91:10
94:3 101:19 108:17
118:2 121:18 126:3
134:9 153:15 155:8
156:6,11 158:3 161:5
161:6 174:10 178:11
179:19 188:7 189:9
189:17 191:11 193:6
193:16 194:18 196:9
197:19,21 199:13
203:8 217:13,15
218:14 219:5 220:19
231:22 237:20 241:13
247:4 248:9,20 257:5
257:11 263:14 264:11
third 58:13 78:15,21
79:3 81:2 140:22
147:12 148:22 204:15
204:16
thought 22:15 59:8
67:22 71:19 77:14
127:8 150:18 152:2
153:12 157:10 159:4
159:7,10 179:2 230:1
242:6,7 250:16
262:13
thoughts 13:12 38:17
78:9 112:6 160:8
174:18 238:11 245:4
thousands 195:12
threat 110:20 145:4,5
154:3,10
threats 110:20 111:1
136:2

three 52:9 103:8 110:3
115:2,3 130:13 131:2
135:8 140:9 144:17
150:2,16 195:10
199:22 231:10
throw 79:5 83:7 153:3
200:17
THURSDAY 1:13
tickets 218:14
tied 107:2 124:16
tier 149:13
till 87:9
timeline 170:1 174:15
246:5 252:18
timely 117:13
times 84:11 125:18
172:16 214:22 239:4
timing 29:6 127:20
245:4
title 8:20 127:15
today 12:21 13:12,13
13:18 14:4 16:10 28:4
38:16 42:11 49:2
63:19 65:3,9,12,18
68:10 71:18 73:12
75:12 83:2 92:4
101:22 109:6 113:20
113:21 115:13 117:12
122:21 129:17,19
137:16,19 145:3,9,13
145:20 146:4 149:21
170:2 171:7 176:20
177:13 179:18 180:12
182:8 188:14,19
192:14 197:3 235:19
235:22 241:11 249:9
256:21 260:22 264:10
today's 4:7 5:14
tool 41:9 96:4 155:20
166:14 167:6,8 168:6
168:9 185:9,21
187:13,18,21 198:5
198:17 199:1 205:17
206:1,16 211:8
216:22
toolbox 88:2
tools 70:11,12,15 88:2
135:22 136:13 225:6
top 63:16 211:6
topic 179:14 235:6
topical 45:11 53:2,21
53:22 63:7 104:4
topics 45:16 250:11,19
255:18
total 200:1 201:8
209:15,20 210:2
215:22
totally 34:5 99:5 174:4

touch 60:22 183:13
221:14,17
touched 25:5 117:17
tough 243:21
TQ 141:20
track 20:21 54:6 86:16
139:18 176:12
tracking 120:18
tracks 240:8
traction 37:20
trade 63:20 85:3 150:19
151:2 194:8
traffic 126:1
training 16:19 52:13
58:9 75:19 139:15
140:9,15,18,20 147:3
147:5,5 148:4,8,17,19
150:15 151:11 153:11
157:4 185:2 218:1
transcript 12:7,8,16
25:16 128:22
transcripts 25:17
Transfer 11:15 108:1
245:3
transition 168:11
transitioning 168:9
translate 242:22
transmission 7:21
transparent 206:20
213:10
transpire 21:19
Transportation 1:1 7:5
7:16 10:18 27:16
45:21 56:4 78:18
travels 265:2
TRC 9:12 236:19
treatment 97:5
trend 155:3
trends 208:11 222:17
trepidation 141:5,16
tried 66:4 193:1 194:3
250:9
trigger 150:6
tripped 17:7
trouble 35:6
true 134:15
truly 40:10 95:4 142:20
truncated 177:14
trust 11:11 18:19,20
142:11,14,19 151:15
157:6 160:19 203:6
213:8 230:13,17
trusted 206:16
truth 208:10
try 100:16 170:3,10
176:9 187:20 196:9
198:18 203:8
trying 13:4,6 18:11 40:8

65:6 90:15 97:16
102:6 113:16 120:7
166:9 169:7 186:15
197:2 201:18 211:18
254:2 263:21
Tulsa 11:19
tune 166:22 262:12
turn 4:4 13:10 16:6
29:12 44:8 57:3,4
95:8 135:13 177:11
178:7,13 179:11
241:6
turns 59:7 262:14
turntable 110:13,20
tweaks 242:1
tweet 261:20 262:5
twice 67:20 199:11
twist 100:16
Twitter 261:20
two 34:8 43:15 50:17
52:10 67:21 84:11
87:16 88:1 103:7
120:9 124:16 125:3
137:20 141:18 142:11
150:1,7 152:5 155:5
156:14,21 172:4,20
195:10 201:2,20
235:14 240:4,5,8
247:7 250:11,14
254:5 255:22 256:20
261:22
two-part 205:9 232:8
tying 69:21
type 14:14 30:13,15
48:2,9 105:1,14 111:8
125:20
types 59:2 60:13,20
69:20 99:3 110:7,16
110:22 111:3 112:1,7
121:12 132:12 134:8
136:2 217:15
typically 30:18

U

U.S 200:2 209:15 210:2
216:1
ultimately 8:5 39:2
55:14 56:3 148:16
151:12 242:22
unable 71:17
unanimously 74:16
106:14 163:16 175:21
176:2
underground 186:10
underpin 261:13
understand 17:12 61:7
77:9 96:15,17 123:18
130:17 143:2 179:5

184:22 202:7 215:10
217:22
understandable 174:5
understanding 17:15
17:18 18:2,4,14 76:20
77:1 111:16 118:2
126:4,12 134:15
137:21 196:16 212:7
251:12
understood 262:13
undertake 91:18 116:12
undertaken 63:19
undertaking 42:15
underway 120:17
125:21 250:2
unfortunately 71:16
unidentified 260:10
uniform 196:7
unilaterally 242:11
Union 9:4
unions 63:21 151:2
unique 42:20 181:16
United 1:1 31:17 120:2
UniversalPegasus 9:14
universe 213:21
university 11:19 30:9
207:4,5
unknowable 39:20
unknown/other 191:10
191:15
unorthodox 102:21
unprecedented 23:9
unstructured 59:1
upcoming 26:17
update 61:17 171:11
188:16
updated 48:8 196:19
updates 14:2
updating 53:18 55:13
167:20
upload 195:14 199:9
uploads 199:11
upped 233:14
UPS 31:18
upset 145:7
urge 24:3 119:22
120:11
usage 161:5
use 47:22 48:3 91:5
100:3 147:5,9 155:7
167:2,6,16 195:15
201:14 205:18 211:16
211:21 213:6 225:6
226:8 229:8 235:22
236:2 250:3,21
253:17 256:6 257:6
261:3
useful 235:2

user 192:4 198:10
202:6 205:13 211:9
223:10 240:6
user's 196:14
users 197:4 201:14
208:5 213:8
uses 218:17
usually 247:14
Utilities 10:18
utility 9:3 187:12 196:1
214:5 215:16
utilize 173:8,19
utilized 19:11 88:1
utterly 243:10

V

V 260:15
vacancy 165:12
validate 66:2 138:13
validation 65:1,22
valuable 90:6,20 118:8
211:12 212:12
value 59:21 62:6 101:16
103:3 192:16 205:18
213:3 224:11 225:3
235:16 236:6 251:11
vantage 185:11
varied 136:12
variety 187:1 188:11
198:17 200:12 209:19
210:14 215:3
various 22:3 24:14
60:17 73:1,1 75:1
76:15 77:19 85:3
86:17 88:2 150:16
151:13 166:19 186:10
197:1 211:6 236:11
240:13 242:17 243:11
vast 120:3
vBulletin 168:5
vein 220:13
vendor 143:12 239:11
vendors 155:20
venue 143:16
venues 151:11
verbal 117:6
verification 188:6
vernacular 147:18
version 177:15 183:7
versus 195:18
vet 75:7 261:4
vetted 52:5 256:4
vetting 51:16 75:15
81:15 172:16
viable 121:6
Vice 9:6,15 11:1,7,14
178:17
videos 97:22

view 25:22 63:13 67:7
105:16 109:17 110:14
112:17 206:13 252:14
262:6
views 183:10 223:14
vigorous 225:17
violating 254:19
Virginia 1:21
Virtual 194:6,10 226:9
virtuous 136:6 138:10
VIS 25:11 72:5,20 98:2
100:7 108:13 109:22
112:10 135:20 143:7
147:2 152:15 167:3
170:18 257:12
visibility 51:10 52:9
vision 149:2
visionary 109:8
visit 25:20
visual 66:15
visualization 236:1
visualizations 138:4,5
visualizing 138:6
vocabulary 147:19
vocally 153:2
vocational 147:4
voice 58:22 193:11
voiced 207:16
voices 18:5
voluntarily 35:2 91:11
95:1 96:13 124:22
213:17
voluntary 1:4,18 3:11
4:8 6:12,19 7:17 12:3
19:5,12 23:9 25:4
26:1 32:8,9 33:13,22
34:7,17 38:19 42:22
45:22 50:19 60:15
63:14,18 64:10 66:9
76:15 87:5,15 89:10
89:22 91:17 96:22
108:22 116:15 124:1
141:6,6 161:10 179:9
188:4 197:12,16
volunteer 101:6
volunteered 101:10
115:9 117:10
volunteers 48:14 83:4
vote 128:11 161:18
174:21 176:2
voted 7:11 44:22 47:7
50:9 56:1
voting 27:2 73:13
139:11
vulnerability 149:2

W
---

wait 47:19 122:1 168:10

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
                  System Working Group Meeting

Before: USDOT/PHMSA

Date: 04-05-18

Place: Arlington, VA

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under

my direction; further, that said transcript is a

true and accurate record of the proceedings.

_____
Court Reporter