

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
 SAFETY ADMINISTRATION (PHMSA)

+ + + + +

VOLUNTARY INFORMATION-SHARING SYSTEM
 WORKING GROUP

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
 JUNE 30, 2017

+ + + + +

The Working Group met in the Gallery Ballroom, Hilton Arlington, 950 North Stafford Street, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., Diane Burman, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT

DIANE BURMAN, New York State Public Services
 Commission; Chair

ERIC AMUNDSEN, Energy Transfer Partners

KATE BLYSTONE, Pipeline Safety Trust

BRYCE BROWN, The ROSEN Group

ROBERT BUCHANAN, Seal for Life Industries

DAN COTE, NiSource Gas

JASON CRADIT, TRC Oil and Gas

YIMING DENG, Ph.D., Michigan State University

SHERINA MAYE EDWARDS, Illinois Commerce
 Commission*

MARK HERETH, Process Performance Improvement
 Consultants

LEIF JENSEN, Sunoco Logistics*

WALTER JONES, Laborers' Health and Safety Fund
of North America
JOHN MacNEILL, Utility Workers Union of America*
ALAN MAYBERRY, Associate Administrator for
Pipeline Safety, PHMSA
SIMONA PERRY, Ph.D., Pipeline Safety Coalition*
JOE SUBSITS, Washington Utilities and
Transportation Commission*
MICHELLE THEBERT, Georgia Public Services
Commission
CHRISTOPHER WARNER, Mears Group, Inc.
MARK ZUNIGA, UniversalPegasus International,
Inc.

PHMSA STAFF PRESENT

CHRISTIE MURRAY, Designated Federal Official
HUNG NGUYEN
CAMERON SATTERTHWAITE
CHERYL WHETSEL

ALSO PRESENT

TOBY FORE, Kinder Morgan

* via telephone

CONTENTS

Roll Call and Call to Order.	4
Opening Remarks.	8
Recap.	10
Committee Business	
Operator Challenges with IM/ILI/	
Data Sharing	18
Committee Management	
Committee Agreement on Co-Chair	
Selection.	84
Need of Additional Expertise on	
the Committee.	147
Subcommittee Planning/Formation	
Alternate DFO Update	154
Future Meeting Planning.	158
Action Item Recap and Closing.	174

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

2 8:37 a.m.

3 CHAIR BURMAN: Hello everyone. Thank
4 you for joining us today, the second day of the
5 Voluntary Information-Sharing System Working
6 Group.

7 Can those on the phone hear us? Maybe
8 there's no one on the phone.

9 MEMBER JENSEN: Yes. You are live.

10 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you.
11 We're going to first do roll call. I'm going to
12 actually use the working group member list so
13 that people can also see the different folks
14 under the representation on the stakeholders.

15 I think that maybe helpful when we
16 talk about committee representation. So I'm just
17 going to go down, and I'll read the category as
18 well as the person's name.

19 And so, PHMSA Representative, Alan
20 Mayberry?

21 MR. MAYBERRY: Present.

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Industry

1 stakeholders, the first is Operators of Pipeline
2 Facilities. Leif Jensen?

3 MEMBER JENSEN: I'm present on the
4 telephone.

5 CHAIR BURMAN: All right. Dan Cote?

6 MEMBER COTE: Present.

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Eric Amundsen?

8 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Amundsen, present.

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Now under
10 Inspection Technology Vendors. Bryce Brown?

11 MEMBER BROWN: Present.

12 CHAIR BURMAN: Jason Cradit?

13 MEMBER CRADIT: Present.

14 CHAIR BURMAN: Alicia Farag?

15 (No audible response.)

16 CHAIR BURMAN: Mark Zuniga?

17 MEMBER ZUNIGA: Present.

18 CHAIR BURMAN: The next is Coating,
19 Cathodic Protection Vendors. Robert Buckingham?

20 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Buchanan. Present.

21 CHAIR BURMAN: Christopher Warner?

22 MEMBER WARNER: Present.

1 CHAIR BURMAN: Pipeline Inspection
2 Organizations. Mike Lamont?

3 (No audible response.)

4 CHAIR BURMAN: Industry General. Mark
5 Hereth?

6 MEMBER HERETH: I am present.

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Under Safety Advocacy
8 Groups, Kate Blystone?

9 MEMBER BLYSTONE: Present.

10 CHAIR BURMAN: Dr. Simona Perry?

11 MEMBER PERRY: Yes. Yes.

12 CHAIR BURMAN: Research Institutions.
13 Dr. Yiming Deng?

14 MEMBER DENG: Present.

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Michael Keller?

16 (No audible response.)

17 CHAIR BURMAN: State Public Utility
18 Commissioners/State Officials. Diane Burman?
19 Present. Sherina Edwards?

20 MEMBER EDWARDS: Present.

21 CHAIR BURMAN: State Pipeline Safety
22 Inspectors. Joe Subsits?

1 MEMBER SUBSITS: I'm here.

2 CHAIR BURMAN: Michelle Thebert?

3 MEMBER THEBERT: Present.

4 CHAIR BURMAN: Labor Representatives.

5 John MacNeill?

6 MEMBER MacNEILL: Present.

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Eric Sherman?

8 (No audible response.)

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Walter Jones?

10 MEMBER JONES: Here.

11 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And then
12 under Other Entities, Holly Perrin, which is with
13 Environmental Defense Fund.

14 (No audible response.)

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you. So
16 we currently have a quorum. And our official
17 meeting is called to order.

18 I'm going to turn it over now to
19 Christie. Actually I'm just going to remind
20 everyone that the meeting is being recorded. And
21 a transcript will be produced for the record.

22 And the transcript on the

1 presentations will be available on the PHMSA
2 website and on the eGov docket at
3 www.regulations.gov. And again, the docket
4 number for this meeting is PHMSA-2016-0136.

5 Also a reminder to folks that when you
6 speak, please introduce yourself when you speak
7 each time, stating your name and organization.
8 So that your comments can be acknowledged in the
9 meeting transcript.

10 And set your tent-a-card on its side
11 if you care to make a comment. We're not going
12 to turn it over to Christie to review the agenda
13 for the day.

14 Again, remember that we are focused on
15 the pathway forward and the next steps. So we
16 should also be cognizant of trying to get to that
17 in short order. Thank you.

18 DR. MURRAY: Well good morning
19 everyone. Thank you for joining us for day two.

20 As indicated on the screen, we will
21 have a brief recap in just a moment of
22 yesterday's activities and some of the key take-

1 always.

2 Then we'll have two operator
3 challenges -- presentations from Energy Transfer
4 and Kinder Morgan. And then we'll move into some
5 of our Committee management work where we will
6 introduce our alternate PHMSA designated federal
7 officials.

8 We will raise the question of a co-
9 chair to the Committee. Potentially for a vote.
10 And then we will move into some of the report
11 outs from the homework assignments.

12 Following that, we will discuss
13 planning for future meetings. And what that may
14 look like. And what the needs of the Committee
15 will be.

16 And then we will discuss any remaining
17 Action Items and recap the day. And adjourn.

18 CHAIR BURMAN: I also just want to
19 recognize that when we do do the discussions,
20 especially when it gets to operator challenges,
21 there was a recognition that ILIs is not
22 necessarily the be all and end all for what we're

1 discussing.

2 So to the extent that I'll warn you
3 now, when you do your presentations that the
4 focus really is on trying to get to where folks
5 have been discussing. So, you don't need to go
6 into detail on those aspects.

7 And if other folks want more
8 information on that, we can also have that in
9 some more of a planning meeting or a webinar that
10 will -- might go deeper in that.

11 So, it's really about where we end up
12 today. Knowing that we also have a hard stop at
13 noon. Thank you.

14 DR. MURRAY: Okay. So I wanted to
15 give a brief recap and highlight some of the key
16 take-aways from a very robust conversation we had
17 yesterday.

18 Our Acting Deputy Administrator,
19 Howard McMillan came in and shared his thoughts
20 on our voluntary information-sharing efforts.

21 And he mentioned that, you know,
22 there's really a need for one mission, one focus

1 in the work that we're doing. And I think we
2 share those sentiments.

3 And then Alan Mayberry shared some of
4 his opening thoughts as well. And he talked
5 about safety, infrastructure, and the future.

6 And that safety and infrastructure is
7 good for business. Safety infrastructure is good
8 for business.

9 And he talked about the future in
10 terms of ways that we can still continue to
11 improve pipeline safety.

12 Then we had a discussion on
13 subcommittee requirements, Federal Advisory
14 Committee Act requirements. And a couple of key
15 take-aways from that conversation is, the
16 subcommittees can only provide advice to the
17 parent committee.

18 And that they cannot provide advice or
19 recommendations directly to PHMSA. And there was
20 a good question raised regarding the subcommittee
21 work related to how others outside of the
22 committee, i.e., the media may actually want

1 information about what subcommittees are working
2 on.

3 And the group talked about that
4 subcommittee work is not subject to public
5 disclosure. And discussed various ways of
6 handling that.

7 Then we talked a bit about forming
8 subcommittees. And what that might look like
9 with six committees proposed.

10 And in that robust discussion, it was
11 noted that two buckets emerged for one of the
12 committee members. One focused on protecting
13 information. The other was sharing information
14 more generally or in a broader sense.

15 And then that was followed up by, I
16 want to say a third bucket that highlighted the
17 needs for information to be shared internally
18 with service providers. Even information shared
19 after pipeline incidents.

20 We also had discussions on how our
21 efforts should focus on how to prevent the next
22 accident. That this work that we're doing in the

1 committee or the committee is doing, is going to
2 be challenging.

3 But, there was a clear sentiment that
4 clear guidance on the purpose, the task
5 descriptions, and a mission statement that will
6 advise and inform the work of this committee were
7 very important to put some initial focus on.

8 Then there was another good point
9 raised about the committee considering who we
10 will share the data with. Is it operators? Is
11 it regulators? Is it the public?

12 And each piece of the data or
13 information could look different to different
14 stakeholders. So the question will, you know,
15 still looms, who should we be sharing information
16 with?

17 Also there was sentiment that ILI
18 technology or assessment focus was not the only
19 focus. Although that might have been highlighted
20 in the mandate. There certainly needs to look at
21 what the work of this committee is doing.

22 And really look for other areas such

1 as direct assessment and other technologies for
2 distribution operators, et cetera. And that
3 there was a recommendation to add more focus, or
4 increase the scope of what this committee will
5 work on.

6 There was also a take away that this
7 committee could leverage opportunities to learn
8 from the airline industry. Also, in terms of the
9 discussion around additional expertise that maybe
10 needed on the committee.

11 Members of the public highlighted that
12 legal representation on the committee to help
13 with some of the sensitive data-sharing issues
14 and security issues was a value. And that the
15 committee needed to be clear on our ultimate
16 objectives.

17 It was also a recommendation that
18 there may need -- there may need to -- the
19 committee may need to put focus on the
20 programmatic aspects of this effort as well.

21 Then there was a discussion over the
22 data and information. It should be relevant,

1 appropriate, and in real time.

2 Then we had various operator
3 presentations. Some that were geospatial related
4 in conversation. Others tied the geospatial
5 aspects of their business with their integrity
6 management aspects.

7 One of the operators highlighted that
8 their ILI data extends beyond just their data.
9 They actually input that information into their
10 GIS system to provide a holistic view of their
11 risk.

12 And used that to leverage. Be more
13 strategic in leveraging what they may do next.

14 Amy Nelson provided a great
15 presentation. And one of the key take-aways was
16 to think spatially. And look at how information
17 can be connected geospatially with other aspects
18 and other parts of the organization, even in
19 government.

20 Also, there was a lot of discussion on
21 the mission statement. David Nemeth, I think he
22 actually raised a good point that they put their

1 -- their GIS puts the where in everything else
2 they do.

3 There was some conversation about the
4 challenges they face with bandwidth, more data
5 integration needs, and the fact that words count.
6 And there was a key word, I think he had a
7 mission statement that stuck out that maybe of
8 interest to the committee that I heard emerge.

9 Promoting safety through data
10 integration and information. Integration is just
11 about all the information energy transfer gets.

12 Let's see, and then we had Michael
13 Stackhouse share with us. He talked about front
14 end loading their data questionnaire with
15 information.

16 And what you really put in is really
17 going to inform what you get out of any system.
18 And I think that's a relevant point to consider
19 when this group thinks about what kind of
20 information needs to be shared. Variations
21 affect the overall data quality.

22 There was another key point raised

1 about cognitive integrity management. And that
2 is where you focus on -- you try to answer the
3 question, what to share, data or learning, in
4 terms of algorithms.

5 The ability to learn and capture
6 threats, share the knowledge in a way that you
7 may not necessarily need to share all the data.
8 Surface and leverage business intelligence to act
9 on threats.

10 Look at it as more than just an
11 integrity management focus, but as a complete
12 holistic system. And there maybe value in
13 sharing facts about incidents earlier then after
14 -- then maybe a five-year period.

15 So there's a gap between when some may
16 have access to post-accident information, and
17 making it available to the whole industry.

18 Thank you very much.

19 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. I just want
20 to also acknowledge that when we get to the
21 committee management and the action item recaps
22 before, we're going to also have Mark with two

1 slides that he has, help us with setting the
2 stage.

3 Right now we're going to go to the --
4 are you okay with that Mark? Okay.

5 (Off microphone comment.)

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Right. Yes. That's
7 what we're going to do.

8 So, right now next, we're going to go
9 now to the operator challenges. And we're going
10 to have Eric and then Toby.

11 And just again, Eric and Toby, just,
12 you know, keep in mind in terms of focusing so
13 that we can get to the next steps. Thanks.

14 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Okay. Good morning
15 again. Eric Amundsen with Energy Transfer. And
16 I've taken, I think, some liberty with my topic
17 here this morning.

18 After all the great presentations and
19 a pretty rich discussion yesterday, I really kind
20 of went back and recalibrated, you know, what I
21 needed to do here. And so this is going to
22 probably take the form of a proposition or a

1 proposed framework as opposed to more challenges.

2 You know, I think what we don't need
3 right now is how difficult this is going to be.
4 But rather just trying to move in a positive
5 direction and what might this look like.

6 So, our presentation is really going
7 to focus on that. And it's really only a couple
8 of slides.

9 And so with that, I'll get started.
10 And we talked yesterday about some context. And
11 Dan brought this up and I think I reinforced
12 that.

13 And Mark made some comments as well.
14 But I think the context that we're talking about
15 here is, you know, integrity management processes
16 and technology improvements.

17 So, you know, before something bad
18 happens, or an incident happens, what can we be
19 doing as an industry, and all of our
20 stakeholders, you know, the regulators, the
21 service providers, and the operators, to get
22 better at what we do, you know, day in and day

1 out?

2 And so the sharing should occur kind
3 of in this context of, you know, how are we
4 getting better as operators? Identification of
5 current gaps that the operators or the technology
6 providers have identified.

7 You know, sharing in that context will
8 probably be primarily between operators and those
9 providers in trying to solve those problems.
10 Sharing of enhanced processes and practices,
11 i.e., solutions to known problems, or just
12 getting better within an operator context at
13 doing data analytics.

14 Capturing data that we didn't capture
15 before. Or doing that in a different way.

16 Training and education of lessons
17 learned with respect to execution of the various
18 integrity management process. So again, not just
19 ILI centric, but DA and hydro testing and the
20 whole scope of integrity management.

21 How do we again, how are we as
22 operators getting better at executing those

1 different processes? And how do we share that
2 with others?

3 Post-incident related RCFAs and
4 subsequent company regulator learning. So again,
5 we as operators always learn something from every
6 incident.

7 And I think the regulators learn
8 something from every incident. And what we don't
9 do very well is share that amongst the operators
10 and the industry.

11 So again, those things manifest
12 themselves in, you know, systemic or acute
13 process improvements. You know, cultural
14 improvements. We talked a lot about safety
15 culture. And you know, that's the root of a lot
16 of the issues that we discover.

17 And then technology or technology
18 deployment improvements. So again, do we have a
19 gap in technology? Or is there just a gap in the
20 understanding of the technology and where it's
21 applicable or not? And how can we close those
22 gaps?

1 And then lastly, communication to
2 stakeholders. Again I think we could do a better
3 job at describing and communicating, you know,
4 share how we do share.

5 You know, I think we do a lot of the
6 things that I just talked about fairly well.
7 But, are we doing them, you know, systematically
8 and in an integrated fashion? And how do we
9 share that with the stakeholder community?

10 In terms of framework, you know, this
11 might take the approach as this is kind of our
12 test, if you will. You know, so what would this
13 framework look like?

14 You know, one, high value. I think
15 what we would target at least initially, are high
16 value learning opportunities.

17 So an opportunity that would result in
18 an increase in knowledge, process improvement, or
19 best practice at a company level. You know, and
20 to the same, we've talked a lot about, you know,
21 kind of the data of value change if you will, or
22 information value change which goes from, you

1 know, data information to knowledge to
2 understanding to wisdom.

3 I think what we're talking about
4 sharing here are the things on the right side of
5 this value chain. It's, you know, the knowledge,
6 understanding and wisdom as opposed to the value.

7 I think a lot of the work has to get
8 done, you know, on the data and information side
9 by those that are closest to it. And then we
10 share what we've learned from that process.

11 As opposed to getting, you know, the
12 entire industry looking at data and trying to
13 make sense of it when -- and I think that's just
14 where we're going to spin our wheels doing that.

15 And I think the other thing that we've
16 got to guard against too is we've talked about
17 the identification of data and so it doesn't go
18 back to a specific operator. I think that just
19 devalues that information even further.

20 You've moved to the left instead of to
21 the right if we take that approach. So again,
22 it's got to be high value.

1 And I think again, we focus on, you
2 know, the wisdom, understanding and knowledge
3 pieces of that. I think the process of the
4 system has to be deliberate.

5 You know, what I mean by that is the
6 sharing process has to be engaged -- it has to be
7 an engagement, you know, of one or more
8 operators.

9 So again, there's got to be a pitch-
10 catch relationship. An operator with knowledge,
11 understanding or wisdom is sharing with another
12 operator or operators or service providers that
13 wisdom for the benefit of that audience.

14 And I think that has to be very
15 deliberate and not just by chance. We just don't
16 -- we don't want to just put things out there and
17 hope somebody picks up on it and uses it.

18 So again, I think the deliberate
19 nature of this framework is a key component. And
20 that goes hand in hand with the next piece, which
21 is actionable.

22 I think you've got to take what you've

1 learned and put it in action. That action has to
2 be manifested in, you know, an improved process
3 or an improved practice within that company.

4 And that should be measurable. And
5 you know, not just taking that and making it,
6 turning it into action, but as well as the safety
7 value of that.

8 So that's the last piece, is
9 measurable. You know, so I think this whole
10 process can be measured, you know, from a sense
11 of how valuable is the information to be shared?

12 You know, was it deliberate? Was it
13 a pitch-catch? Did it result in an action? And
14 did those actions result in improved safety?

15 So again, I think if we take this and
16 kind of use this as a yard stick or a test
17 against whatever it is we come up with, we'll be
18 moving the ball forward.

19 And in that context, I didn't make
20 this up yesterday, okay? So I'm not going to
21 take any credit for that.

22 This kind of represents a system that

1 we've had in place in our company for a number of
2 years. We instituted this as part of a safety
3 learning just culture initiative many, many years
4 ago.

5 And we established this system within
6 a software system, a management system, to manage
7 what we called unwanted events. You know, just
8 really a check -- you know, a continuous
9 improvement process where an unwanted event,
10 whether it was an actual incident or a near miss
11 was identified.

12 That was, analyzed by SMEs within the
13 company. They came up with action items. And
14 those action items result in, again, improved
15 practices or process or just awareness within our
16 company.

17 Within that, we had a high value
18 learning opportunity, you know, that we
19 identified. And those got elevated to a --
20 again, to a much higher level in the company
21 where very deliberate action was required at
22 every step of that process.

1 So again, I think what we want to
2 focus on here again is to at least get started is
3 the very high -- you know, the highest value
4 learning opportunities that there are before us.

5 So any questions about that or any
6 comments?

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Dan?

8 MEMBER COTE: First of all Eric, thank
9 you. That is an excellent piece of work. And at
10 a strategy level, I support everything that you
11 said.

12 Just one question though, just to
13 drill in a bit. You know, it's clear in this
14 there are aspects of a company-specific program.

15 And the one area that I just wanted to
16 ask you about was the notion of that pitch-catch
17 relationship. In order for this to be scalable,
18 I can see a couple of different formats.

19 I think at its very best, it is what
20 you've described, a pitch-catch relationship that
21 stands actually between two companies, one
22 learning and the other offering learnings based

1 on their experience.

2 I think that's about perfect. But
3 recognizing the size and scope of the industry,
4 I'm not sure that's always possible.

5 Could you also as a corollary to that
6 envision a repository of those learnings? So for
7 example, if I'm doing ILI and I have a technical
8 question on the best way to analyze seam welds
9 for example, that should be available to me and
10 accessible.

11 Almost like a library of excellence if
12 you will.

13 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Um-hum. Yes.

14 MEMBER COTE: Can you envision that in
15 combination? I mean, I like the -- at it's best
16 I like the notion of the pitch-catch.

17 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Yes.

18 MEMBER COTE: But I'm not sure that's
19 going to be possible in many cases. And so I
20 want to make valuable information and learning
21 available to the industry as readily as possible.

22 Do you take issue with any of that?

1 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: I don't. In fact
2 that's kind of a good segue into a couple more
3 slides I have here.

4 But I think the, you know, the notion
5 of being, you know, a deliberate and active
6 process, I mean, it could take place between one
7 or more operators in the form of just a
8 discussion and a deliberation.

9 It could take the form of a seminar or
10 a workshop where multiple companies are involved.
11 You know, hosted by an operator and a service
12 provider, you know, however.

13 Or it could take the form of Dan,
14 exactly what you mentioned, is a repository, a
15 compendium of best practices, best way to do
16 things. And that leads me kind of to, and I
17 don't mean this to be a PRCI pitch, okay.

18 But that's kind of what PRCI, that's
19 kind of their mission statement. That's why they
20 exist. Is to kind of provide industry research,
21 industry best practices, industry knowledge base.

22 And one of the things that they've

1 done recently, and I bring this up because this
2 is a project that was initiated in 2014 that
3 really very acutely addresses the -- kind of the
4 mandate in the legislation, which is compare ILI
5 measured data to field measured data.

6 I mean, this project does that. And
7 so it established a database to collect all of
8 that, those measurement data. Established a
9 database to house that information and analyze
10 that information.

11 And collected over 50 thousand crack
12 features within that database. And then set up
13 some analytics around that whole process.

14 And that's available. I mean, the
15 results of this project is available in a report
16 that I've talked to Cliff that we can make
17 available to the committee.

18 So again, it goes into 160 pages of,
19 you know, in excruciating detail about how this
20 was done. But again, I think this provides kind
21 of to your point Dan, a model for if we want to
22 do, you know, this type of analysis or this type

1 of data sharing. This is a way to do it.

2 Specifically if we want to really go
3 down the path of collecting and sharing ILI
4 measured data versus fuel measured data. This is
5 a way to do it.

6 We don't have to create this. This is
7 already done. So again, just some more
8 information about this project.

9 Next is the TDC. So, several years
10 ago PRCI developed the Technology and Development
11 Center in Houston. And it is -- its intent is
12 really purpose built to be an information
13 technology sharing center.

14 And again, don't need to go through
15 all the details. But it is really -- it focuses
16 on all of the assessment technologies, not just
17 ILI.

18 But at the Center we've collected, you
19 know, over a thousand pipe samples that include
20 just about every possible defect type and threat
21 type. It's got the means to pull ILI tools
22 through samples of those types of defects. Both

1 in a closed loop and an open loop.

2 It's got the means in the space to
3 conduct qualification testing for NDE
4 professionals and tools. So it does all of these
5 things already.

6 So again, we've got a -- we've got
7 brick and mortar in place to facilitate the
8 sharing that we've kind of talked about here.

9 So again, just some quick information.
10 This is the sample inventory that's there.

11 So again, I think -- and to your
12 point, yes. I mean, this can take a lot of
13 different forms as the need dictates. Okay.

14 And that's what I have to share this
15 morning.

16 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Really
17 appreciate it. Especially for you changing up
18 your presentation from yesterday.

19 Does anyone have any questions on the
20 phone?

21 (No audible response.)

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else at the

1 table? Oh, sorry, Alan?

2 MR. MAYBERRY: I like how you
3 articulated framework.

4 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: That was for you.

5 MR. MAYBERRY: Yes. I was just
6 curious. Okay, so your internal system was
7 developed as part of your initiative the way just
8 culture. That's cool.

9 And so you shifted from that to more
10 of the PRCI initiative was just really more
11 focused on ILI. I was curious, on your internal
12 system, how did you address, you know, prevent, I
13 guess, developing a system that's basically a rat
14 out your boss system?

15 Because that's a concern I've heard
16 on, you know, it's a pitfall.

17 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Um-hum. Yes.

18 MR. MAYBERRY: You know, of systems of
19 like this.

20 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Well, you hit on a
21 great point. And then you know, a part of our
22 initiative was called, you know, I mentioned the

1 word just.

2 You know, so the intent was to kind of
3 take the personal aspect out of the equation.
4 And really focus on, you know, how do we make our
5 systems better? How do we improve our culture?

6 You know, and you don't improve a
7 culture by punishing those that come forth and
8 tell on themselves and tell on others. So, that
9 was the just piece of it.

10 And I will say, we don't tolerate, you
11 know, just blatant disregard either. You know,
12 so that had to be an aspect of the, you know, the
13 cultural development.

14 But we really focused on a way from
15 the individual and more on, you know, the root
16 issue and solutions to that. So, you bring up a
17 great point.

18 And it's not easy to do that. It's
19 not easy to change a culture where people have
20 been punished, you know, for a vehicle accident
21 or a personal injury or worse, so.

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

1 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: And I will tell you
2 just from a -- from a systems standpoint, you
3 know, it's not easy either.

4 So a system we put in place was termed
5 HARRC. And the acronym stood for hazard and risk
6 reduction culture. Okay?

7 And so it was a software system that
8 we purchased. And it was deployed. And you
9 know, it became known in the field as hard and
10 really, really, complicated.

11 So the field didn't view it quite the
12 way that the way that the management team did.
13 But, so again, there's difficulties in rolling
14 out a system like that, you know, that we have to
15 be cognizant of.

16 But I think that's maybe a piece that
17 it might be missing on the committee is, you
18 know, people with knowledge about how to, you
19 know, design, or develop, or deploy those kind of
20 systems. Because I think at the end of day we're
21 going to need some sort of management system, you
22 know, that's deployed to the industry to

1 facilitate what we're talking about here.

2 And I think that's maybe an area that
3 might be missing right now in the discussion.

4 MR. MAYBERRY: Yes. I would agree
5 that we need to make sure. And I think Mark, the
6 preview I saw of your slides, this maybe a
7 connection to SMS.

8 And I think there's definitely, we
9 talked a little bit about it yesterday. But
10 there's definitely a connection between what
11 we're doing here and SMS.

12 This is really, you know, would
13 support SMS.

14 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Yes.

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. Mark?

16 MEMBER HERETH: I just want -- this is
17 Mark Hereth. I just want to reinforce the
18 presentation that Eric made. And particularly
19 the importance of understanding the context in
20 which you're looking at data and information.

21 I don't think we can under estimate
22 the challenges that relate to understanding

1 context. That the way in which the data exists,
2 the way in which it's collected, the involvement
3 of the human factor side of that I think is very,
4 very important.

5 And I really like the structure of
6 your four points. High value, actionable, I
7 mean, those are really, really key points.

8 And I just want to reinforce those.
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And then
11 next we're going to have -- oh, Jason?

12 MEMBER CRADIT: Yes. Eric, thank you.
13 I appreciated it. And I agree with you as well.

14 And I think that you started down with
15 your framework. And you got to that point where
16 it was measurable at the end.

17 And I think that's a really important
18 point to understand what are we measuring? And
19 how do we measure success at the end?

20 But I was hesitant at first when you
21 started talking about, you know, kind of the
22 operator owned managed system. And I thought you

1 were going to stop there, and you didn't, which I
2 like.

3 One of the things I read in my
4 research last night about MITRE was how not --
5 MITRE and the FAA with the ASIAs, however you
6 pronounce that acronym.

7 One of the advantages of moving
8 towards a central model for database was they
9 could have been aggregated with other data sets.
10 In their case, weather and wind and radar and air
11 space and other things that made it relevant.

12 And I think that's where you were
13 headed with PRCI. Is that it's not just about
14 the data that we have today, but what else can we
15 aggregate it with to get the measurable effect at
16 the end.

17 So, I appreciate that. And I think
18 you're right.

19 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you. Then
20 next -- does anyone have any questions on the
21 phone?

22 (No audible response.)

1 CHAIR BURMAN: At the table? Mark?
2 You still have a question or no? Okay. That's
3 all right.

4 And anyone in the audience? Okay. Do
5 we have a mic? You can come up here. Because I
6 think we have a mic up here for you.

7 MR. BOSS: Okay. Terry Boss with
8 INGAA. Really appreciate the dialog this
9 morning.

10 Eric's pitch-catch where, you know,
11 analogy that it was using there, and trying to
12 expand this beyond a certain district, a certain
13 company, getting across companies, getting across
14 from gas to liquids is very, very difficult.

15 The PRCI project that he was
16 mentioning was actually done back in the mid 90's
17 with GRI to share some of this information. But,
18 getting the culture set up, getting the focus on
19 these things, is very important.

20 And I think the effort that we've got
21 going on with the realization of safety
22 management systems, and realizing everybody's

1 accident that it is everybody's accident, I think
2 is helping change the culture so that we can get
3 these wider solutions out there.

4 Because what -- and Eric did this
5 correctly by saying value at the top. Because if
6 you see value individually on this thing, it's
7 going to help your job.

8 You're going to want to have this
9 happen. And we've got to get that communication
10 across to folks that -- and on the systems that
11 we put together or the process that will do that.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you very much.
14 Now we're going to go to Toby for the next
15 segment.

16 MR. FORE: Okay. Good morning. I
17 appreciate the opportunity to come before you
18 guys this morning.

19 Toby Fore with Kinder Morgan, Pipeline
20 Integrity Director. Here's the outline of what
21 I'm going to discuss.

22 I'll try to, this is my best attempt

1 in a single slide, to summarize Section 10 of the
2 PIPES Act. I'm going to discuss some of the
3 Kinder Morgan practices related to Section 10 and
4 how we go about some of these things.

5 ILI dig verification, data sharing,
6 some of the challenges with that. And then some
7 general data sharing concerns.

8 My best one slide attempt, Section
9 10(c)(1) and 10(c)(3), are explicit about data
10 sharing of dig verification between ILI service
11 provider. We had extensive discussions yesterday
12 about that.

13 Unfortunately, my presentation was
14 developed some time back. I'll try to be
15 efficient with that part of it.

16 In 10(c)(2) and (4) rather, speak to
17 encouraging development of advanced technologies,
18 enhanced risk analysis, and exchange of pipeline
19 information. And so I'll -- I think I'll be able
20 to talk about the advanced technologies piece and
21 certainly the exchange of pipeline information.

22 Other considerations, collaborative,

1 proprietary, sensitive, voluntary, confidential,
2 so some other considerations for achieving that.
3 I won't try to beat this too much. I know this
4 was again, hit pretty hard yesterday.

5 But, the who is sharing what data, who
6 is the data shared with, what is the explicit in
7 sharing the data, what is pipeline information,
8 those are some of the ambiguities in the statute
9 that I know this Committee is working through.
10 And we'll answer the coming weeks.

11 So the data sharing piece of ILI and
12 in-line inspection, dig verification information,
13 I want to speak to that just a little bit. As
14 Drew mentioned yesterday, Kinder Morgan performs
15 about 160 to 200 segments in one given year.

16 That's piggable ILI segments.
17 Typically we use three to six technologies per
18 segment. And typically six to eight thousand
19 miles of pipeline.

20 And so we have a great deal of ILI dig
21 verification information at our disposal. And we
22 have robust internal processes. We use the

1 application of advanced technologies such as
2 laser scanning profilometry.

3 We train our NDE vendors on our
4 specific procedures. We test them. If they
5 don't pass the test or make a very high grade,
6 it's not a passing level. It's a very high level
7 of testing, they don't get to go out on our
8 pipeline and perform the in-ditch examinations.

9 We have in field audits for the
10 technicians that the -- it's a standard checklist
11 that says, are you following our procedures and
12 processes. Then we have a robust QA/QC review of
13 all the documentation.

14 And I highlight all that just to say
15 that we gather a lot of dig information. And the
16 data we capture in the dig verification, the ILI
17 service providers can count on the quality of
18 that information and leverage it.

19 And finally, what I want to emphasize
20 is, we share, Kinder Morgan shares all dig
21 verification information with all the ILI vendors
22 that perform the ILI surveys.

1 So that part of the initiative at
2 least I can speak for, Kinder Morgan, we
3 certainly leverage that data for the advancement
4 of the technology.

5 In terms of technology development, we
6 have over the years collaborated and are
7 continuing to, ongoing and active collaboration
8 with ILI service providers to develop, advance,
9 refine, and validate technologies.

10 We've done some similar things to
11 validate and refine NDE technologies. I again
12 will echo the Pipeline Research Council
13 international efforts that are ongoing.

14 The intent here is to -- with this
15 slide is really to emphasize some of the efforts
16 that are already actively underway. There's some
17 tendency when a Statute or mandate comes out like
18 this that we've got to start from scratch.

19 And really, there's a lot of activity,
20 a lot of organizations out there, and I think we
21 need to take credit for that one. But also
22 leverage it in what we're doing going forward.

1 I think there's certainly
2 opportunities for improvements in how we share
3 this information. But, I think we can leverage a
4 lot of the efforts that are ongoing.

5 Joint industry projects, those are
6 typically industry initiated projects. Not
7 exclusively. But typically pipeline operator
8 initiated.

9 And the object of those is to address
10 kind of threats that don't have a well-defined
11 standard or procedure. And discuss the emerging
12 technologies or the latest state of the art
13 technologies to address those threats.

14 Case in point, we have -- we're just
15 wrapping up a joint industry project on
16 management of ground movement hazards. We're
17 looking to publish that report.

18 That discussion's ongoing. We're
19 doing reviews of that report. And so there's a
20 lot of those activities that take place. And
21 that will be shared with the industry.

22 And then Kinder Morgan, and I know a

1 lot of other companies are doing the same thing,
2 we're working with advanced engineering companies
3 to focus on solving problems that don't have a
4 well-defined solution to study the mechanisms of
5 certain threats.

6 And then to develop innovative
7 solutions. And again, I know other companies are
8 doing the same.

9 Ultimately, some of that type of
10 information is shared with industry through
11 various conferences. And I'll speak to that just
12 a little bit later.

13 But, the IPC conference in Canada is
14 one of those. And I'll speak to that again just
15 a little bit later.

16 With regard to the development or
17 advancement of technologies, I just wanted to,
18 since we've gotten at Kinder Morgan an extensive
19 amount of that in the past years, and have an
20 ongoing effort certainly on the ILI side.

21 This speaks to advancement of
22 technologies piece. Not just the sharing of dig

1 information, but how do you advance technologies.
2 And I just wanted to share a recipe that's worked
3 well for Kinder Morgan.

4 One of the things that we have found
5 key in advancing those technologies is the
6 relationship between the pipeline operator and
7 the ILI service provider. That relationship of
8 trust, transparency, confidentiality, is a key
9 component of being able to have that interaction
10 with the service provider and have it be a
11 productive interaction.

12 We have also found that interaction
13 between the ILI service provider and the pipeline
14 operator is a key element. We work
15 collaboratively to educate one another on our
16 respective areas of expertise.

17 So, that's one of the key areas of
18 interaction that's been necessary to advance from
19 these technologies. As an example, the pipeline
20 operator might have expertise in the mechanisms
21 for stress corrosion cracking, the morphology of
22 stress corrosion cracking.

1 The ILI service provider certainly has
2 the expertise and the technologies. And we marry
3 those together. And then we are able to come
4 together and develop a solution.

5 It's also an iterative process. In
6 other words the vendor either develops a
7 technology, or they're working on refining an
8 existing technology.

9 We get a report. We do digs.
10 Depending on the results of those digs, we
11 provide feedback to the ILI service provider.

12 They may perform adjustments through
13 the analysis process. They may perform
14 adjustments to the tool itself.

15 We may rerun the tool if it's a
16 developing technology. And do some more digs.
17 And then there may be some more adjustments.

18 So it's an iterative process. So that
19 relationship with the vendor, the ability to work
20 collaboratively and have that interaction, has
21 been a key component for us in being able to move
22 technology forward.

1 And then finally, ultimately if the
2 ILI service provider is to leverage the data,
3 they've got to have full confidence in the data.
4 And that speaks back to robust QA/QC processes.

5 And really, what we found is, the
6 relationship with the vendor has been a key
7 component as they understand that we have those
8 robust processes and procedures.

9 And the culture of our company and the
10 way we go about doing our work, it's enhanced our
11 ability. They have the confidence in the work
12 product that they are getting from our dig data
13 has grown.

14 So existing industry collaboration,
15 again, I want to -- I just want to highlight some
16 of the efforts that are already going on. The
17 collaboration that's already going on in the
18 industry.

19 And I think there's a real opportunity
20 to leverage a lot of the work that's been
21 ongoing. I referenced earlier the International
22 Pipeline Conference. I think that's a good one,

1 one of the better ones in fact that happens every
2 other year.

3 There's research that's shared in that
4 conference. There's best practices, et cetera.
5 And the operators leverage that information in
6 those papers to their own benefit.

7 And you can see, there's a number of
8 other major conferences that occur on a regular
9 basis. NACE International Regional and National
10 Conferences aimed predominantly at corrosion
11 control. I think we certainly need to be
12 leveraging those efforts.

13 Joint industry projects, I've spoken
14 to that. PRCI, I've spoken to that. Major
15 consensus standards organization, certainly
16 there's a lot of stakeholders there between
17 pipeline operators, between regulators that are
18 involved.

19 Many stakeholders are involved in
20 developing these consensus standards. We
21 leverage those standards to the benefit of the
22 industry.

1 And to emphasis, these are some of the
2 ongoing efforts that I think we need to leverage
3 in context of this mandate.

4 Major associations, I'm going to
5 highlight. Southern Gas Associations, annually
6 they have roundtables where operators sit around
7 the table and we discuss challenges, best
8 practices. And we leverage those as well.

9 One of the things I want to highlight
10 with INGAA is directly associated with this
11 effort of exchange of pipeline information. Is
12 annually, we have a lessons learned among the
13 member companies.

14 We have a lessons learned meeting so
15 that operators share information among each other
16 about pipeline incidents, lessons learned. And
17 the operators that are part of that meeting are
18 able to take that back and leverage it to their
19 benefit.

20 I like that model. We over the years,
21 I've received a lot of information, valuable
22 information that we've been able to put into

1 action.

2 I think we've provided some
3 information ourselves that others have been able
4 to put into action. And I certainly like that
5 kind of forum for exchange of pipeline
6 information, improvement of pipeline safety.

7 This is an ILI process. We've pretty
8 much went through that thoroughly yesterday. So,
9 I'll move on from there.

10 In context of a data repository for
11 ILI data, improving ILI, I just wanted to mention
12 some of the challenges there with having a
13 repository and leveraging that data.

14 Part of that I've already spoken to
15 earlier with the slide that talked about the
16 importance of a relationship of interaction with
17 the vendor. But I want to highlight just some of
18 the challenges that need to be considered with
19 regard to a repository.

20 There are more than 30 ILI vendors
21 globally. They all have their own unique tool
22 designs, their own unique processes, their own

1 unique algorithms.

2 And based on the tool designs,
3 processes, algorithms, et cetera, they all have
4 their own essential variable. So, what's
5 important to one ILI service provider in being
6 able to leverage actionable data may be different
7 from another ILI service provider.

8 So ultimately they've got to have
9 confidence in the data in a repository to be able
10 to utilize it.

11 Examples of uniqueness in tool design
12 that would need to be considered in any
13 repository is sensor density, sensor footprint,
14 specific technologies used on a tool. In other
15 words, one in for the same technology an axial
16 MFL tool that might have different types of
17 sensor technology, coil sensors versus hall
18 sensors.

19 Some might use -- some tools might use
20 eddy current sensors or eddy current technology.
21 And so the technology that's being used on the
22 tool that are specific to any ILI service

1 provider, is important in terms of the service
2 provider being able to leverage that information
3 and advance the technology.

4 Obviously you have emerging
5 technologies. And one of the challenges with a
6 data repository is the technology is rapidly
7 advancing. So, as you have existing technologies
8 that are improving, a repository or database
9 based on the continuous improvement could get
10 dated fairly quickly.

11 In terms of new technologies,
12 certainly they're developing at a much more rapid
13 pace. So, where a tool might have been a year
14 ago, it may be dramatically different from where
15 it's at today.

16 And we've experienced that through
17 collaboration, development of technologies with
18 service providers. We've experienced that
19 ourselves. We -- I could list specifically, but
20 will avoid doing so in this forum, some
21 technologies that have advanced substantially
22 over the last couple of years and even the last

1 year -- over the last year.

2 Certainly difference in performance
3 specifications. One of the concerns I have with
4 the repository is painting a technology with a
5 broad brush. Because every vendor's tool is
6 uniquely designed and the capabilities are
7 unique.

8 Further to that is the ILI analysis
9 piece. I consider the analysis as or maybe more
10 important than the tool design itself.

11 So, examples of differences from an
12 ILI service provider perspective, you have the
13 analysis processes are different. The maturities
14 of algorithms.

15 And they can be developed further
16 along or less -- not as developed in terms of
17 maturity, in terms of the time on the market.
18 There's vendors that are coming on the market all
19 the time.

20 There's vendors that have been in the
21 market for a long time that have had -- that have
22 much greater maturity with their technology today

1 then maybe some vendors that are coming in the
2 market.

3 And even some vendors that have been
4 in the market, what are the available resources
5 to move those technologies forward? And what
6 level of focus have they had on any given
7 technologies?

8 Many vendors have a suite of
9 technologies that they offer. And they may have
10 a disproportionate focus on one technology or
11 another. So that affects the level of maturity
12 for their technology.

13 There's differences in analysis
14 software, differences in user interfaces. So
15 there's a lot of differences out there from one
16 tool to the next.

17 And again, it makes it challenging to
18 put anyone ILI technology in the same bucket
19 because of the uniqueness of the tools,
20 uniqueness of the analysis processes, and the
21 maturity and development of those associated
22 processes from one vendor to the next.

1 During the last meeting I wasn't here.
2 But I read a lot of the transcript. And I saw
3 that somebody mentioned what's too much
4 information? What's too little information?

5 And it's really not about too much or
6 too little as much as it's about the right data
7 with all those different variables and
8 uniquenesses of the ILI service provider.

9 A thousand pages of data can be too
10 little information if it's not the right
11 information. And two pages might be perfectly
12 sufficient if it's the right data.

13 Different tools have different
14 essential variables. We've talked about that
15 sensor type, sensor density, unique flux
16 directions in some cases that are unique to a
17 specific tool vendor.

18 Wall thickness saturation
19 capabilities, all these things are challenges
20 again, based on the uniqueness of vendors, their
21 technologies, and maturity level.

22 Ultimately, I echo what Eric said. As

1 we've got to have actionable data at the end of
2 the day.

3 Here's some typical considerations
4 that underscore this relationship piece between
5 the ILI service provider and the pipeline
6 operator. This interaction is critical for the
7 ILI service provider to have actionable data.

8 Question number one. You will always
9 get from a service provider if there's any
10 significant deviation between the published call
11 on the ILI's report.

12 And the verification information is,
13 were you in the right place? Are you sure you're
14 in the right place? Did you measure the right
15 anomaly?

16 So that exchange of information, what
17 did you do to verify that you're in the right
18 location, again interaction critical was the
19 evaluated anomaly the one that was referenced in
20 the report?

21 And one example I would give for that
22 is, we have conservative what's called clustering

1 rules or sometimes they're called interaction
2 rules. So the size of how interaction, how one
3 defect interacts with another in terms of how you
4 call that the length of a given cluster of
5 individual areas of corrosion.

6 So an example is, they may say you
7 have -- they may report, the ILI service provider
8 may report that you have a six-inch anomaly when
9 -- at 30 percent deep.

10 When you get out to the field, you
11 actually establish that it's three anomalies that
12 are an inch and a half long each that have been
13 tied together through the analysis process.

14 So now you have that one depth at 30
15 percent. And the NDE examination technician
16 that's in the field is breaking that out. And
17 they're -- one of those might be 30 percent.

18 Now you have two more anomalies that
19 may be at 15 percent. But we're comparing the 30
20 percent to the 15, because it's been broken up
21 into three anomalies.

22 And so again, that's the type of

1 interaction that clarification that's required
2 between the operator and ILI service provider.
3 And one of the challenges of a repository for
4 that -- those kind of reasons.

5 General data sharing concerns. Just
6 beyond ILI service provider data, advanced
7 technologies, et cetera.

8 Obviously this is fundamental. It's
9 got to be credible, reliable, consistent,
10 complete. Any compromise of that data can yield
11 an inaccurate conclusion.

12 Obviously the data that you -- that is
13 stored in a data repository has a specific
14 purpose and intent. And that purpose and intent,
15 the use of that data has to be consistent with
16 that purpose and intent. Or again, you might
17 yield an inaccurate or invalid conclusion.

18 And then third, it's important in the
19 analysis of that data to understand how all the
20 technical components or variables relate to each
21 other so that you can come out with a -- come up
22 with a good conclusion based on the technical

1 interaction of all the variables that you gather.

2 And the general data analysis
3 pitfalls, confirmation bias, where you're looking
4 for a certain pattern to support a hypothesis or
5 philosophy point of view, these are just common
6 to whatever you're analyzing.

7 And these are some of the challenges
8 you see from taking a database and trying to
9 derive a conclusion from a set of data. And data
10 irrelevancy. A focus on data not relevant to the
11 analysis or data not connected to the analysis
12 goal.

13 Causation without correlation.
14 Correlation without cause and effect,
15 relationship not in common. And then apples
16 versus oranges where you compare unrelated data
17 sets and inferring a relationship.

18 So these are the standard data
19 analysis pitfalls. In conclusion, what I would
20 just summarize is the relationship is important.
21 Or we've seen that the -- a critical piece of
22 advancing technologies for ILI.

1 We're already doing a lot of things in
2 terms of developmental research, exchanging best
3 practices. I think it would be wise to leverage
4 a lot of that.

5 Maybe we can do it in a more
6 systematic method or way. And I think there's
7 certainly some considerations if we're looking at
8 a repository that would have to be looked at in
9 terms of how do you use that data and make it
10 actionable.

11 Any questions? Comments?

12 CHAIR BURMAN: Any questions on the
13 phone?

14 (No audible response.)

15 CHAIR BURMAN: At the table?

16 MEMBER DENG: Great presentation. I
17 just -- I really appreciate you mentioning all
18 those like data analysis pitfalls, you know,
19 current -- a very good summary.

20 And I really appreciate you mentioning
21 the raw data. So when you mentioned the raw data
22 rather than volume, which I think when you hear a

1 lot of terms here like data information and
2 sometimes we use exchangeably.

3 But to me, I think that is ultimately
4 different from information. Because you can have
5 a lot of data, but with very little information.
6 Or you can have a small amount of data, but
7 critical information is there.

8 So what I -- my take away from here
9 when you mention that there are more than 30 ILI
10 vendors, they have unique tool designs, process
11 algorithms, yes they might call and talk about
12 mission learning, and then talk about not just
13 ILI data or dig data.

14 We should actually focus on the
15 information, not just the data. So probably
16 that's the reason we're an information sharing
17 system, not a data system work group.

18 Right, so you know, so a little bit of
19 follow on about data analysis and mission
20 learning. I think what we should do is extract
21 useful information out of the data.

22 And then I really, you know, I

1 appreciate what Eric mentioned, the high value of
2 it. From data to information. Then from
3 information to knowledge.

4 How we advance those knowledge during
5 research and development. And then go to
6 understanding and the wisdom. Yes thanks.

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay, great. Does
8 anyone else have any questions? Comments?

9 (No audible response.)

10 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. In the audience?

11 MS. KELLER: Hi. This is Heidi Keller
12 with API. I just wanted to comment on the
13 content regarding best practices sharing.

14 And I wanted to offer that API and
15 AOPL would be happy to assist in sharing some of
16 the practices that we have. We recently just
17 released a strategic plan for the next three
18 years where best practices sharing is one of our
19 key strategic initiatives.

20 And we have a number of ways in which
21 we share learnings from incidents through our
22 PIPES Portal, through in person information

1 exchanges, and through webinars.

2 So, if there's any information that we
3 can offer to assist, we'd be happy to do so.

4 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Bryce and
5 then Alan.

6 MEMBER BROWN: Yes. Bryce Brown here
7 with the Rosen Group. Thank you Toby.

8 You've actually explained quite a bit
9 exactly around what we provide to pipeline
10 operators. And specifically I appreciate the
11 highlight on relationship partnership.

12 Just a quick thing just so that people
13 don't get uncomfortable with some of the things
14 that you mentioned. And the fact that there are
15 a lot of ILI providers out there.

16 You know, a lot of the things that
17 Toby just mentioned were, in fact, questioned
18 going back in time many years. I've been with
19 this company for going on 26 years.

20 And I remember, you know, an operator
21 would come to me early on in my career, and I was
22 an analyst at the time, and say, well, you bring

1 your black box out here. You run it. You go
2 away.

3 You send me a report in the mail. And
4 I never hear back from you. And that was kind of
5 -- I didn't understand that concept at the time
6 because I was new to the industry.

7 And if you think about where
8 inspections come from, the mid '60s and up until
9 that time in early 1991, a lot has changed. And
10 I think going back to 2001, bringing up INGAA,
11 you know, pre the 2003 IMP, INGAA brought
12 together some of the major service providers at
13 the time, ILI service providers.

14 And recognized some of the things that
15 Toby's just mentioned, and said look, we need to
16 think about what it is you provide to us as a
17 service provider, to our industry. And wrap our
18 arms around developing industry standards best
19 practices. Because if we look at operator
20 qualification, everything that you do for us is
21 really not covered.

22 And so we worked together tirelessly

1 in a group of about 45 people to develop API 1163
2 with the assistance of API. Which is an ILI
3 systems qualification.

4 From that we started talking about it
5 as peers in our service provider community. And
6 said well, it's not just a tool that is solving
7 the problem.

8 It is a system. And it is a set of
9 hardware. It is a set of software. And it's
10 also the people. The qualification of those
11 individuals.

12 Thus, we invoked ASMT to develop
13 ILIPQ. NASE had the best practice around ILI
14 processes, it was RP0102. It was first published
15 in 2002. And then updated to SP0102 in 2010.

16 These three documents are a best
17 practice that we invoke on a daily basis. And
18 it's something that we all have adopted as a
19 service provider industry to look at the high
20 level view of a system.

21 And I think it's interesting that it
22 is not specific to any one given technology, be

1 it an MFL, an ultrasonic, or an EMAT. For that
2 matter, it's open to any system into the future.

3 But it provides a framework on what to
4 do to qualify an ILI system. Not necessarily how
5 to do it based on those points that Toby has just
6 brought up.

7 And it enables companies like Kinder
8 Morgan and the rest represented in the room and
9 in the industry to come into a service provider
10 shop and audit that company to make sure that
11 they have the best practices in place to then
12 provide that confidence back to that operator in
13 a very transparent way of what it is there about
14 to invoke and go down that path and that
15 pipeline.

16 And I just want to make sure that
17 that's clear. And because Toby brought up a lot
18 of points that could be questioned by a few.

19 But I want to make sure they
20 understand that there is a best practice that we
21 utilize. It's wrapped up in three standards.

22 And we strongly believe in those. And

1 those are being audited by pipeline operators
2 today.

3 So back to sharing of information, we
4 are being audited according to those three
5 standards. And that is something that is open
6 for many to come in and see how we do this.

7 So, once again Toby, thank you for
8 that information. It's very much -- very
9 transparent as to the relationship we have with
10 the pipeline operators. Thank you.

11 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Alan?

12 MR. FORE: Can I respond? Yes. Toby
13 Fore. Hey Bryce, I really appreciate that
14 clarification on what you said there.

15 With regard to the standards, we do at
16 Kinder Morgan, employ the API1163 approach. And
17 in fact that is one of the points I intended to
18 highlight.

19 Was with all those variables and the
20 uniqueness of each tool and service provider, one
21 of the keys is in being able to roll that up is
22 application of 1163 process to validate a tool.

1 So that no matter what technologies
2 vendors use and no matter their tool assigned, no
3 matter their analysis processes, algorithms,
4 you're validating based on the reported
5 information relative to the findings on your
6 pipeline.

7 And that's a way to establish really
8 the performance on that tool, that vendor. And
9 so leveraging industry standards that are out
10 there like API is really a significant component
11 of making sure that we have performance out of
12 the tools that we're expecting.

13 MEMBER BROWN: I agree. I agree
14 totally. And it wasn't to, you know, question
15 what you do there.

16 Just to make sure that the audience
17 understood. And the members of the committee
18 know that that specificity that we have with a
19 pipeline operator in that relationship to look at
20 that pipeline with that technology, is backed by
21 best practice.

22 And one might look at a best practice

1 and say, well, you've got that in place. But,
2 you know, as you mentioned as well, very well
3 Toby, in this dynamic industry that we all
4 operate within, is that things do change over
5 time. And sooner more than later.

6 And we have that flexibility within a
7 best practice to review that practice as they do
8 every five years. Maybe sometimes sooner.

9 And try to get those lessons learned
10 into that best practice. And use that as our
11 backbone to move forward.

12 So, I totally agree with exactly what
13 you said. And completely agree. So, appreciate
14 that. Thank you.

15 MR. MAYBERRY: I don't know. But I
16 guess I have maybe part comment and part
17 question.

18 But related to best practices, we're
19 really talking about data inputs that go into the
20 program. And then tool performance. It seems to
21 be sort of a between the operator and the vendor
22 function.

1 And of course we're trying to move on
2 beyond that to, okay, we're trying to measure
3 outcomes, compare notes on safety outcomes. You
4 know, what actually happens out there.

5 Yes. What would have been the
6 challenges related to the proprietary issue to
7 doing that?

8 Because I know there's probably a
9 sensitivity to, you know, well GE performs this
10 way and, you know, ROSEN's this way. And here's
11 that information before us that we're sharing to
12 the world.

13 What are the -- how is that being
14 addressed as far as being -- which is really what
15 we're after, for safety outcomes to ensure, you
16 know, measure performance.

17 You know, how do we get around that?
18 Or how have you gotten around it?

19 MR. FORE: Do you want to speak to
20 that Bryce, or you want me to?

21 MEMBER BROWN: No. I'll just say,
22 with regard to that specific question and where

1 we are here today sitting and thinking about this
2 whole subject is, we've really not been faced
3 with that question before.

4 How do we get around it? So, I think
5 that's where we are is to exploit the situation
6 and see how we can try to work together.

7 What Toby's just pointed out is
8 exactly very transparent as to the variables and
9 the essential variables specifically that need to
10 be considered when sharing, you know, this
11 information.

12 And you know, if you think about, and
13 you know, I'm one small type of puzzle piece of
14 an IMP, right? So, it's -- out of all due
15 respect, we see that maybe API 1163 and as it was
16 stated back in '01 when we first started to think
17 about developing these three standards or further
18 fleshing these out, is one of these days they
19 could be referenced in regulation.

20 And it looks like that could happen.
21 And in what we do in this operator to service
22 provider relationship as a day by day business

1 then becomes if API gets referenced in your CFRs,
2 API then becomes something that Toby in this case
3 would have to adhere to.

4 And in that regard, our relationship
5 actually would increase. And the information
6 that we would exchange in that situation or that
7 part of the best practice, which is IMP, our best
8 practice is API, becomes auditable very clearly.

9 Right? And it has to be transparent
10 at that point to those regulators that come in
11 and do that audit.

12 So, the next step is what valuable
13 information and lessons learned can we bring out
14 of that into arenas such as PRCI or INGAA or API
15 or AGA or Southern Gas. One of the biggest
16 things that we've talked about in the last day
17 and a half so far is how to communicate.

18 In each of the sessions that I've set
19 in, my experience in listening to APIs and INGAA's
20 and PRCIs is how to get these information out
21 into the market, out into the public domain
22 around what are the good things that are going on

1 in this pipeline industry.

2 And I think that's something that we
3 really need to strongly consider on this
4 committee as well. Is how do we market
5 ourselves? And how do we market this information
6 out to the public?

7 But I agree, we've not had to have
8 this discussion just yet until now. But, that's
9 my comment. Toby?

10 MR. FORE: Would you like me to speak?

11 MR. MAYBERRY: Feel free.

12 MR. FORE: Okay. I think Bryce summed
13 it up well.

14 Pointing to again, the use of a
15 process or a system is a better approach than
16 maybe a repository. Just because that system or
17 approach such as API 1163 inherently allows you
18 to consider differences in all those variables
19 and the performance of the vendors on that
20 pipeline system inherently.

21 So, I think maybe the focus on the
22 process and the system and at least in that case

1 is a good one.

2 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you. Does
3 anyone else -- oh, Dan?

4 MEMBER COTE: Just a couple of
5 observations. In my mind to link the two
6 presentations we had, strategically I thought
7 Eric really set the stage well with his
8 discussion this morning on that focusing on the
9 highest value information that we can derive.

10 Which tended to be on the right hand
11 side of his curve. A little less on the detail
12 data.

13 I think what we've seen in the
14 presentations is both sides of that. In order to
15 produce meaningful learnings, you need that
16 detailed interactive data between the specific
17 issues that you're dealing with, the specific
18 tools you use, the specific quality control
19 process you scrub that with.

20 All of that in my mind produces
21 effective information or learnings. And from a
22 committee perspective, it's that right side

1 rather than those detailed actions that you
2 described that I think are essential to produce
3 those learnings that are more the focus of this
4 committee.

5 And so one thing we may want to vet a
6 bit over the course of the committee's work is
7 when does specific detailed data become a more
8 general learning? And how might that process
9 work?

10 Because that's really the value of the
11 industry. If every operator has to go through
12 exactly that same process to duplicate the
13 learning, then we haven't made a difference in
14 terms of our communication.

15 Because one of the keys to this, as we
16 heard yesterday, and I agreed with fully, for
17 this to be effective, it needs to be quick and
18 nimble. And in order to do that, everyone can't
19 do the same data analysis that was done at the
20 actual outset of the discovery, or again, we
21 haven't changed anything.

22 So the question in my mind is, and I

1 think we've identified the separation pretty
2 clearly now. And I'm hoping we're coalescing
3 around the purpose of the committee in terms of
4 sharing that -- those high value learnings and
5 data.

6 The question is now, how do you pull
7 that integration off? And how do you make it
8 quick?

9 Thank you madam Chairman.

10 MR. BURMAN: Thank you. I'm not sure
11 who was first, so.

12 MEMBER JONES: Well, this question
13 goes way back I guess when you were just talking.
14 How often is the API 1163 updated? And when was
15 the last time it was updated?

16 MR. FORE: 2013 is the latest version.

17 MEMBER JONES: Thank you.

18 MEMBER WARNER: Chris Warner from the
19 Mears Group. Just some quick observations. I've
20 really appreciated the two presentations because
21 it's coalesced a little bit for me around some of
22 the improvements that the direct assessment

1 industry can move towards.

2 I think it's a lot more robust and
3 mature in the ILI operator interaction. I
4 haven't seen that much interaction between the DA
5 service providers and the operators.

6 It's more provide the information and
7 the operator does the digs. And there isn't that
8 much feedback that occurs.

9 So I really appreciate that. But what
10 really strikes me, I think we're all kind of
11 hitting on this, is that the data aggregation is
12 going to be the key part of this.

13 So how are we going to aggregate that
14 data so that operators can compare their
15 performance towards what they're seeing in the
16 rest of the industry or seeing from other ILI
17 service providers?

18 And that does not mean you have to
19 name the operators or name the ILI or the DA
20 service providers.

21 But I think the aggregation and the
22 value from this in addition to the lessons

1 learned on incidents and otherwise could be
2 operators being able to evaluate their own
3 programs and processes against performance that
4 they're seeing in the industry.

5 And saying okay, I'm behind the curve
6 or I'm ahead of the curve. And if they're ahead
7 of the curve, they could be then people that
8 other operators come to to learn what's different
9 about your process that's getting you there.

10 So, I'm beginning to see that this
11 could provide a lot of value. And it has to have
12 that value, I think, for operators or service
13 providers to voluntarily submit data.

14 Otherwise we're not going to spend the
15 time or put in the detail that's going to be
16 valuable to anybody. So, thank you both for the
17 presentations.

18 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. And I
19 think there's someone on the phone that just
20 needs to mute. Because we are hearing some
21 background noise.

22 Okay. All right. Now I think just

1 from a time check perspective, it's 10:00.

2 Originally this part of the program
3 was supposed to be done at 11:00. Which I think
4 is good. Because it opens now for a longer
5 discussion on next steps.

6 We still are going to have a hard stop
7 at noon. So, shall we take a five minute break.
8 And we'll be back.

9 I know, ten minutes. But, I feel like
10 10 minutes become 15. So.

11 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
12 went off the record at 9:59 a.m. and resumed at
13 10:14 a.m.)

14 CHAIR BURMAN: Welcome back. We're
15 right now going to do a quick committee
16 management focus. We're going to turn it to
17 Christie just for some of the stuff that we can
18 get out of the way and then we're going to go to
19 Mark and then we'll focus on next steps and what
20 we need to accomplish that.

21 So I'm going to turn it over to
22 Christie for some of the technical stuff that we

1 can get out of the way.

2 DR. MURRAY: Okay. The first thing I
3 wanted to do is to -- since we talked yesterday
4 about the concept of eventually making good use
5 of subcommittees, just consider as we talk about
6 that work engaging the subcommittees about might
7 be premature, but planning for subcommittees is
8 not. So there may be a distinction between we're
9 ready, we have work for them to do and the
10 planning, because oftentimes when you need them,
11 you don't want the planning to lag. You want to
12 kind of have that in place so that they can be
13 ready to move into action as the committee needs
14 them to do so.

15 To support our subcommittee efforts
16 moving forward we heard yesterday that the
17 designated federal official would need to be
18 present at each subcommittee meeting, which means
19 unless -- Alan, are you willing to approve my
20 cloning?

21 (Laughter.)

22 DR. MURRAY: Okay. Not? No.

1 MR. MAYBERRY: It's impossible.

2 DR. MURRAY: Okay. So that won't
3 happen probably in the lifetime of this
4 committee, so what we'll do is we are offering to
5 introduce -- let's see if I have a slide in there
6 on it. I apologize. I made some changes
7 yesterday. Okay. I don't see it.

8 But what we will do is we want to
9 introduce two additional alternate DFOs for the
10 committee and the subcommittee work that is to
11 come. So I just want to reintroduce Chris
12 McLaren, who will be joining the ranks and
13 serving on several subcommittees and also -- I
14 think Nancy, she's on -- taking a phone call --
15 Nancy White. We'll get her to wave when she
16 rejoins us, but she will also be serving as an
17 alternate DFO as we move forward.

18 Depending on how we flesh out with the
19 subcommittees, the final committee's need for
20 subcommittees and what that count looks like, we
21 may actually introduce an additional one. So I
22 wanted to touch base on that.

1 Next Chairman Burman and I will talk
2 a little bit about a proposal to also for
3 continuity purposes and availability purposes
4 propose a co-chair to serve with this committee
5 as well. Our proposal is to nominate or
6 introduce Sherina Edwards, Commissioner Sherina
7 Edwards, who I think she just recently had to
8 drop off the line, so we would have her introduce
9 herself. So we will pull up her bio just to kind
10 of refresh you. She was here yesterday in person
11 sitting to the right of Chairman Burman. But she
12 actually would be a phenomenal co-chair and is
13 brought forward as a recommendation to this
14 committee.

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Sherina and I have
16 worked very well together through NARUC. She's
17 on the Committee on Gas and she chairs the
18 Subcommittee on Supplier Diversity, as well as
19 she has served -- had served a short stint as the
20 chair of the Subcommittee on Pipeline Safety. I
21 think it's really good for me to have a co-chair
22 so that we can make sure that we are well

1 representing all aspects and touch base with our
2 counterparts with NARUC and all the different
3 state regulators. So for me it's helpful to have
4 that. Especially if one of us can't be here in
5 person I think it makes sense and in light of my
6 airplane to -- just easier for me. So I think
7 Sherina would be excellent.

8 And just looking, one, I guess we have
9 to take for the first, the additional DFOs a vote
10 on that, if someone wants to make a motion to
11 take a vote on approval of the alternative DFOs,
12 then we can take care of that. Then we can get
13 to approving -- taking a vote on the co-chair.
14 Do I hear anyone make a motion on the DFOs?

15 MEMBER COTE: So moved.

16 MEMBER HERETH: I'll second.

17 CHAIR BURMAN: And I know that PHMSA
18 does select them, but just like with the charter
19 and the bylaws, I think it's important for us to
20 formally vote on that even if it's not necessary.

21 So with that, all those in favor of
22 the additional DFOs?

1 (Chorus of aye.)

2 CHAIR BURMAN: Any opposition?

3 (No audible response.)

4 CHAIR BURMAN: All right. With that
5 they're approved.

6 Do we have a motion for approval of
7 the co-chair Sherina Edwards?

8 MEMBER BLYSTONE: So moved.

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Second?

10 MEMBER COTE: Second.

11 CHAIR BURMAN: All those in favor?

12 (Chorus of aye.)

13 CHAIR BURMAN: Opposition?

14 (No audible response.)

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Abstentions?

16 (No audible response.)

17 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. Sherina,
18 congratulations.

19 All right. Now we will move to --
20 we're going to give it back to Christie.

21 DR. MURRAY: All right. Next what I
22 wanted to do, I was going to introduce the

1 planning for the next meeting last, but I suspect
2 when the committee gets into the report out all
3 the passion will come out, and that may take up
4 most of the time we have remaining. So I want to
5 go ahead -- and it will be quick, but I want to
6 -- let's see, hopefully -- let's pass this and
7 we'll come back to those items.

8 Okay. So I wanted to give you a save
9 the date, and I stress tentative save the date.
10 We still need to get through some planning
11 efforts and make sure that we align with our
12 department's processes and policies in terms of
13 planning meetings, but we want to certainly
14 invite you to save the date for September 13 and
15 14. We will send you a meeting invitation or an
16 email confirming our plans and also as a save the
17 date coming out of this meeting for September
18 13th and 14th here in the D.C. area.

19 Also, as you are talking amongst
20 yourselves as a part of your report out work and
21 I think that you -- here we just tossed up some
22 topics that were discussed at the previous

1 meeting and the administrative meeting, and so we
2 wanted to -- unfortunately we weren't able to get
3 to every topic that was teed up previously, so we
4 didn't lose track of those. And so we have those
5 here proposed for the committee.

6 We will likely refine what those
7 topics are outside of this meeting, but if there
8 are additional topics, please consider those and
9 bring those up today or see me after the meeting,
10 whatever is appropriate, and we'll be happy to
11 add those to the list to make sure that the
12 committee has an opportunity to weigh in on the
13 topics, review the agenda and provide input
14 before we meet again.

15 And also the committee management
16 piece with the subcommittee formation, I'm sure
17 we'll hear more about that as a part of the
18 homework report out. Thank you.

19 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. So does
20 anyone have any questions or comments?

21 MEMBER BROWN: Are we to comment on
22 potential topics or -- is that what's in play

1 here? Are we to comment on that later or --

2 CHAIR BURMAN: I think we can comment
3 on that later as we get to really the next step,
4 which is the heart of what we had talked about
5 yesterday getting to. I will just say on the
6 tentative date we have a -- I'm not looking to
7 change things because it doesn't work for me, but
8 September 14th is my formal New York session, so
9 I wouldn't be able to be here for that. And it
10 does make it hard the day before to focus on
11 things other than session. So again, I'm not
12 looking to change it if it works for the
13 majority, but I do just want to point out that I
14 probably wouldn't be able to be here those dates.

15 Okay. So with that we should look now
16 -- I think that we can send this out later and
17 keep it in mind when we go to our next step. I
18 think we're going to now turn it over -- unless
19 anyone has any comments or questions, we'll turn
20 it over now to Mark with his slides and sort of
21 tee up our next steps and looking at the homework
22 assignments that we did and focus on all that we

1 heard so that we can figure out where we need to
2 be to accomplish the goals of the committee, the
3 working group.

4 MEMBER HERETH: Thank you, Madam
5 Chairman. I just took the opportunity to try to
6 capture some perspectives on two slides from
7 yesterday and then some email exchanges that I
8 had last evening with a number of people, some of
9 a committee and some outside that were in the
10 crowd yesterday.

11 So I wanted to capture on this first
12 slide the information sharing types to consider,
13 and I thought Dan Cote did a really nice job of
14 setting this up and then Eric kind of did a nice
15 build, and I thought it was really important to
16 capture these for consideration. And the
17 committee may want to modify or adjust these in
18 some way, but I think they serve as a good
19 starting point.

20 The first one is learnings from
21 routine use of assessment technologies, again
22 with that broad technology. And the thing I

1 tried to do here yesterday -- and, Christina, I
2 really appreciated your making the -- well, first
3 of all, I really appreciated the work you guys
4 did preparing for the meeting. Thank you. It's
5 always great to have something to look at as a
6 starting point. I know that from my own
7 experience. And it always helps to move things
8 along, so I appreciate that.

9 But I've also tried to make the tie to
10 the applicable section in API RP 1173 in each of
11 these instances where that's appropriate. And so
12 in this case that's the lessons learned, incident
13 reporting requirements in Section 9.

14 But, and I'm going to talk about this
15 more, but it's -- I think it's the emphasis on
16 learnings and not so much on data. And I think
17 Eric did a great job of setting that up. Toby
18 did a nice job also of helping us to see the
19 challenges of using just data and the concepts
20 that -- understanding context that Eric talked
21 about, as well as understanding the challenges
22 with essential variables and all the things that

1 become complexities of using tools. And that's
2 both ILI tools, the NDE we use in the ditch, the
3 non-destructive evaluation technologies that we
4 use, direct assessment technology. I'd even put
5 hydro testing in there and other technology.

6 I think Chris mentioned for -- Chris
7 McLaren for example mentioned guided wave
8 yesterday. EMAT is a technology that is right
9 now required to be another technology for use for
10 stress corrosion cracking, so I think we need to
11 keep other technology on the table.

12 The second one, which is one that Eric
13 provided as a build to Dan's points yesterday was
14 learnings from reportable incidents and
15 accidents. I'm using incidents because that
16 applies to natural gas, and accidents because
17 that applies to hazardous liquids, and possibly
18 near misses. I think that's something to
19 discuss.

20 And the key there; I think Eric made
21 a great point yesterday, operators learn, PHMSA
22 learns, the NTSB learns, but the industry as a

1 whole and our public stakeholders aren't as able
2 to learn quickly because of some of the legal
3 constraints that are applied. And so are there
4 some things that we could learn, that we can do
5 to make that process more expedited, to make it
6 -- those really key learnings more accessible to
7 operators, and for that matter to the public
8 where it's appropriate?

9 I would include in this addressing the
10 legal protections to share promptly. That means
11 we'll probably have to -- what I'm impressed with
12 is that our chairman and our co-chairman are both
13 lawyers. And so I think they will help us with
14 that focus. And there may be others that they
15 want to draw in that can help us with having the
16 right legal protections to be able to share
17 promptly. Promptly almost sounds like a
18 regulatory use, doesn't it? No.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MEMBER HERETH: Yes, within two hours.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MEMBER HERETH: Yes. The third one,

1 which Eric mentioned yesterday, and I think Dan
2 did as well, which is also sharing information
3 with our public stakeholders. I think it's
4 really important that we keep in mind the PSMS
5 requirement or Section 2, which is stakeholder
6 engagement. I think that's a key part of this as
7 well.

8 And then the second slide is really
9 some thoughts that I tried to capture -- and
10 these are not just mine. These are from others.
11 And I'm -- and I don't mean to put others on the
12 spot on this, but I tried to capture some
13 different perspectives starting with the six
14 subcommittees. And so I'm going to kind of walk
15 through each of these briefly. I wanted to just
16 lay these out there. And again, these are just
17 ideas and if there's ways to improve these, then
18 that's fantastic.

19 With respect to lessons learned, again
20 that's Section 9 in 1173. I think what I came
21 away with yesterday, and I even came away with
22 stronger today is our learning -- is our

1 opportunity is for learnings, not such much
2 discrete data sharing. Data sharing, I'm not
3 sure -- and it's -- I think Toby helped us I hope
4 see the complexity in sharing data and that
5 really the opportunity is to learn from the
6 analysis and evaluation of data.

7 And that can be done in a way; I'm
8 going to talk about that in a second, where we're
9 sharing the learnings and not getting so focused
10 on the data and analysis of data that goes back
11 and forth, that pitch and catch, which is a
12 phrase that I love, between the operator and the
13 ILI providers.

14 But I think all operators want to have
15 the opportunity to learn from the pitch and catch
16 that a particular operator and ILI service
17 provider might have. And I think the ILI service
18 providers would like that as well. I would also
19 add that the NDE companies I think can also
20 benefit from that, and I think would also like to
21 have those learnings. And so it's the learnings.

22 One of the comments that I heard this

1 morning in some side discussions was the idea
2 that we also think about the positive learnings,
3 the good catches that we have, the things that we
4 find before they become a problem. And that good
5 catches is a phrase that Pierre Bigras from PG&E
6 I think first started using, and I think it's a
7 great phrase. It's a good way of looking at a
8 near miss. It's what are the things that we do
9 that we -- where we make a good catch?

10 I think that that subcommittee then
11 could be focused on developing a process for
12 getting learnings out of the variety of processes
13 that Toby described, whether it's PRCI, AGA, the
14 Southern Gas Association. How do we get those
15 learnings to come together to a common place so
16 there's a development process there? And that
17 subcommittee could actually have an ongoing
18 function. And you'll see that in many instances
19 here I'll note that something can be ongoing or
20 that it's a subcommittee that could conduct some
21 work or undertake something and then actually be
22 sunsetted. And I think that's an important

1 consideration for this committee.

2 So the second one -- I'll go through
3 a few of these and then maybe stop just for
4 questions, but training and qualification, which
5 is Section 13 in the API 1173. It's a really,
6 really important section and it probably needs
7 reemphasis periodically in our industry. I think
8 Bryce did a nice job of talking about the
9 triumvirate set of standards, but when we look at
10 training and qualification, we have a great one
11 to build off of with that ASMTPO standard.

12 And the opportunity there may be to
13 look at building upon the ILI standard and
14 applying those same kinds of standards and
15 competency development for the NDE side of the
16 world. And I think even Chris Warner offered
17 that maybe even in the DA side of the world
18 there's some opportunities there, although we do
19 have RPO 502, I believe, for ECDA. And there's
20 an ICDA and SECDA standard there.

21 Certainly there -- I think that this
22 subcommittee has the opportunities to define

1 opportunities to improve. How can we get better?
2 They might define scope for standards and
3 development to be undertaken. And then that
4 group could sunset. Or they could meet
5 periodically. I mean, that's really for the
6 committee to define.

7 This third one I thought was a great
8 one. And this one is really learnings of what to
9 do and what not to do from other sectors. So,
10 Christie, I thought you did a great job yesterday
11 of -- you guys and one of your staff people
12 presented that summary of the work of FAA and
13 BSEE and some other places addressing the
14 protection of proprietary information, FOIA. I
15 think we have to address legal and particularly
16 the discovery side of it. I think this is a
17 great committee to develop that common
18 terminology. That was one of the really key
19 points you guys emphasized yesterday, and I think
20 that's really, really important.

21 I would share with you that in the
22 INGAA Foundation, which is an organization that

1 I'm a member of, we have what we call a lessons
2 learned repository. And we started that in 2013
3 and it's lessons learned that our members share.
4 We have about 200 member companies. They're
5 pipeline operators, but they're also service
6 providers, engineering companies, law firms,
7 insurance companies. It's any organization that
8 serves the life cycle of the pipeline system.

9 And we developed this as an outgrowth
10 of some initiatives we had undertaken to address
11 some of the safety and quality issues that PHMSA
12 had recognized in the industry. And then we meet
13 annually in February to go through the lessons
14 learned from the year before.

15 But the interesting thing -- the
16 reason I share this example is I listened
17 yesterday and then some even this morning -- is
18 that in developing that repository we worked
19 through a lot of the issues of how do you protect
20 information? How do you protect proprietary
21 information? How do you protect persons involved
22 and being able to share information? So we've

1 worked through a lot of that and there's people
2 that run and administer that. And we'd be glad
3 to get you connected with them because I think we
4 have some learnings to share there.

5 And I think with best practices that
6 group could develop findings and then be
7 sunsetted. Again, I think it's to reach out more
8 deeply to FAA and to BSEE possibly and some other
9 organizations. I know the INGAA Foundation that
10 Rich Hoffman and Jason, our new executive
11 director, would be glad to help there.

12 The fourth area is technology R&D.
13 And I think as some of us discussed this
14 yesterday we struggled with the need and the role
15 of this one, so -- but I think this is one that's
16 probably worth pursuing and should be discussed,
17 and that is define how we can make improvements
18 in how we share learnings from technology and
19 R&D, and then possibly sunset that. It may be
20 developing a process and then sunseting it. And
21 it could be that there's a possible ongoing role.

22 I think the reason that there was some

1 reluctance on this one is that PHMSA has a
2 formalized R&D process with annual meetings. The
3 PRCI has a very similar meeting. Other
4 organizations: NiSource and the Northeast Gas
5 Association, they all have formalized processes.
6 I think the key is how do we take the learnings
7 and improvements that are pertinent to this
8 committee and bring those to bear? And we may be
9 able to define a process for that and then sunset
10 that.

11 The fifth subcommittee was regulatory
12 funding and legal, and I like the way this one
13 was set up and didn't make a lot of adjustments
14 to it. It was really -- this could be the place
15 where you define the basis for storing the
16 learnings, for funding that and then possibly
17 sunset that after that group defines how that
18 might work, again as recommendations for the
19 committee to consider. And then in this instance
20 it would be recommendation ultimately for PHMSA
21 to consider.

22 And the last one is reporting. Now

1 this one I tied to SMS No. 11, which is
2 management review. And I love the way that you
3 guys set this one up because I read this as you
4 were thinking in the context of beginning with
5 the end in mind, right, which is we want to think
6 about what it is. And somebody on the committee
7 made that point really well yesterday, but it's
8 really where are we trying to get to? And in
9 fact John Stoody made this comment from the
10 audience yesterday -- is what is it we want to
11 achieve? What are our goals here? And let's
12 figure out how to begin with the end in mind.

13 And so part of that is defining the
14 structure of the final report. The one caution I
15 would offer is that having worked through a
16 number of these kinds of exercises on gas quality
17 and interchangeability, on hydrocarbon liquid
18 dropout, on a bunch of different joint industry
19 projects we learn along the way. And so having a
20 view at the beginning is important, but we have
21 to recognize that we're going to learn along the
22 way and we want to have the openness to be able

1 to incorporate that.

2 And in the spirit of management review
3 and reporting, I would suggest there might be
4 value in this group reporting to the LPAC and
5 GPAC periodically as a way of making -- as one of
6 the ways of making this information public.

7 So I'll stop there and answer
8 questions or comments.

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Christie?

10 DR. MURRAY: Thank you, Mark, and
11 others who may have informed what you just
12 presented.

13 I think just a couple of points: One,
14 I like the fact that you built on what we
15 introduced yesterday. So this covers the safety
16 management aspect, but it also -- it keeps us
17 with alignment to make sure that this committee
18 walks away addressing the mandate itself. So
19 it's a good hybrid between the two.

20 One question for you. Well, one more
21 point: To the Reporting Subcommittee you
22 mentioned, I agree this group -- same as --

1 similar to what happened yesterday. We came. We
2 met. The consensus is, hey, maybe we need to
3 move some things in a different direction. So my
4 only comment was point well received. And this
5 is very much an iterative, progressively
6 iterative process. So as we learn, the committee
7 and the PHMSA staff will be flexible to help meet
8 the needs of the committee. So that will -- that
9 point is well taken.

10 But my question to you is for the
11 regulatory -- well, actually it's for the general
12 process. Where do you see in this process the
13 work of identifying what the system will look
14 like the system development piece? Where would
15 that fit in in this proposed structure?

16 MEMBER HERETH: I think it's largely
17 captured in that first one, the lessons learned,
18 and it's probably because I have a strong belief
19 at this point, although I'm open -- I'm open to
20 discrete data sharing. I know how FAA -- I made
21 this comment yesterday, that FAA and BSEE data is
22 a lot about discrete observable events. And a

1 lot of the data we're dealing with are indirect
2 measurements that we're then verifying and
3 validating. And I think the domains in which
4 we're managing data are a little bit different.

5 So in that context I would encourage
6 us to focus on learnings as opposed to the
7 discrete data sharing. And I think that first
8 group can really lay out how that would work
9 longer term. I'll offer though that there are
10 some of the best practices -- some of the work in
11 that subcommittee three best practices is going
12 to be a place where there may be learnings that
13 can be brought to bear and shared with that
14 lessons learned group, the Subcommittee 1, that
15 will help strengthen what they might do. It's a
16 good question.

17 So I think there needs to be, actually
18 to use Eric's term, pitch and catch between those
19 two groups, committees, subcommittees.

20 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

21 And, Dan?

22 MEMBER COTE: First of all, Mark, I

1 think this is an outstanding framework, and I
2 think you did an brilliant job in capturing all
3 of the discussion and synthesizing it into two
4 pages. And for myself I -- again, I think you
5 are -- pardon the golf metaphor, but right down
6 the fairway on this one and have caught that
7 tension between data, detailed specific data and
8 information sharing with a bias toward the
9 information sharing pieces.

10 And just two sort of more, slightly
11 more detailed comments: I guess, one, in terms
12 of the learnings what we're describing learnings
13 it seems to me are both sharing of best
14 practices, which is a learning, as well as
15 learnings from events, which may not be best
16 practices, but may be to the industry heads up,
17 don't let this happen to you, literally. And
18 that quick turnover brings maximum value in terms
19 of risks because any risk that results in a known
20 incident clearly is one that we all have to take
21 seriously quickly. And so I really like the way
22 you framed all of that.

1 I guess just one other comment, and
2 this for the committee as a whole; and I will
3 likely continue to advocate for this on the
4 committee, once this framework is built, it seems
5 to me, it will have the capacity to deal more
6 with more than just transmission issues. Clearly
7 that was the mandate. It has a bias for it. But
8 once this is built, it can store a lot of other
9 things that are valuable to the industry on best
10 practices, but not necessarily related to
11 transmission.

12 So I can -- without speaking for AGA
13 I can see this having distribution components
14 that are equally effective. And I had touched on
15 that yesterday, but it seems to me that there's
16 at least as much overall pipeline safety value
17 nationally in that area as there is in
18 transmission. The incidents are actually greater
19 in distribution, as you all know, though not so
20 sensational that they typically make national
21 headlines the way transmission issues do. No
22 less significant to our industry however, and

1 certainly no less significant to pipeline safety
2 overall.

3 And so would like you all to consider
4 that as we think about this -- these tools,
5 particularly in the things that we are likely to
6 imbed in lessons learned. Thank you.

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Walter?

8 MEMBER JONES: Hi. Granted I am an
9 occupational health and safety person. I'm a
10 certified industrial hygienist and I've done a
11 lot -- well, not a lot of work. We've been doing
12 a lot of work on pipelines lately. So I'm
13 definitely coming at this from a different angle
14 than many of you sitting here.

15 And the question I have is there's got
16 -- where would persistent problems, hazard
17 identifications and severe outcomes fall in that
18 matrix? How would that be reported out? It
19 would seem to me that there would -- part of this
20 process would be like identifying what
21 consistently seems to be a problem and then how
22 we're handling that. And where would that fall

1 into this process is what I'm kind of looking for
2 at this time.

3 MEMBER HERETH: I think that's a very
4 important topic to be discussed. I would
5 envision it being addressed as a part of
6 developing that process in the first
7 subcommittee, lessons learned. I think you make
8 a great point and we probably would need to have
9 a formalized process for raising and -- as we
10 called it in 1173, revealing concerns, revealing
11 risks. I think that's a great point. And I
12 would suggest it there, but I'd certainly be open
13 to other places. But I think it's an excellent
14 point.

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Christie?

16 DR. MURRAY: Walter, just a follow-up
17 question for clarification purposes. Is your
18 interest with that question more on the people
19 side in terms of hazards and severe outcomes or
20 just in general?

21 MEMBER JONES: Well, this is a 5,000-
22 foot view of how things are going to look and --

1 but we are going to be giving people -- we're
2 going to be expecting people that use this
3 information to be using it on a ground-level
4 basis. So my question is, yes, it's going to be
5 whether it's persistent problems and upstream or
6 downstream issues, whether it's personnel or it's
7 product or process. These things need to be
8 categorized. Because it would seem like the
9 easiest way to -- in my field to deal with things
10 is go after the low-hanging fruit.

11 So if there are consistent problems
12 that people have already developed answers for,
13 we need to get that out to the rest of the
14 industry that like this is how you do it, like we
15 had a dropped objects campaign and everybody had
16 a problem with dropped objects, just no one
17 really talked about it. Then once we started
18 talking about dropped objects, we were able to
19 move this throughout three or four different
20 companies throughout a certain industry, and then
21 now we're able to drop the hazards associated
22 with dropped objects. Everyone was thinking

1 about it, but no one didn't know that there was a
2 repository of how we were going to deal with
3 these issues. And I can go on and on and on and
4 on.

5 Like fall hazards are the biggest
6 hazards we have in construction, da, da, da, da.
7 So we address that by throwing stuff at it. But
8 I'm trying to figure out where -- I like the
9 positive nature of what we're doing here, but
10 where do we fit in? What are the persistent
11 problems and then what are the one-offs that --
12 where you have severe issues that don't occur
13 often, but when they happen they're catastrophic?
14 Where would that fit in here and then how do we
15 respond to those issues in terms -- just hazard
16 identification, risk assessment? Where does all
17 that go in that process, or do we even use those
18 words here?

19 MEMBER COTE: I guess, Walter, if --
20 and if I may, Madam Chairman and Committee, and
21 Mark particularly, the way I would see this break
22 occurring is anything that is related to the

1 delivery system, the installation of the delivery
2 system, the product, gassing up, pigging, the
3 technology of our industry, all of that that
4 deals with people I would see residing here,
5 because human issues or human -- I don't want to
6 say failures, but I mean -- but human execution
7 is a -- is certainly a piece of risk that we have
8 to analyze in our programs.

9 Anything that is really specific to
10 any industrial site, vehicular driving,
11 bulldozing, general construction practice, the
12 nature of excavation versus pipeline excavation,
13 I guess anything that is much more OSHA-centric I
14 would not see us capturing. I mean, I don't know
15 if you're comfortable with that break, but our
16 expertise in many cases, though I won't speak for
17 the rest of the committee, tends to be around
18 that -- those delivery systems, products,
19 specific execution of gas construction or oil
20 construction and infrastructure. But again, if
21 it's a more sort of industrial accident sort of
22 format, I'm not sure that was the kind of thing

1 that we were designing this to capture, though I
2 would invite others to comment.

3 CHAIR BURMAN: Do you want to respond?

4 (No audible response.)

5 CHAIR BURMAN: No? Okay.

6 So I guess from my perspective just
7 looking at this I think is also a good jumping
8 off point. I will keep in mind some of the
9 things that have been a theme throughout in the
10 different meeting: cyber security, distribution,
11 needing to make sure that we keep this in mind
12 when we go there, as well as what is the data?
13 And to the extent that when we're looking at that
14 for me, it's what's the overall benefit to the
15 sharing and who is the sharing intended for?

16 So to the extent that if we're sharing
17 just for sharing's sake, I don't think that's
18 effective. If it's not adding value, that's also
19 not effective. And so for me it's clearly
20 defining what the goal of the voluntary sharing
21 is so that we could clearly identify the
22 limitations or actually the parameters of that so

1 that it doesn't become bigger than intended and
2 then actually fail at the core issue of doing it
3 in a way that's supposed to get at the objective
4 of helping.

5 And as to the data and the lessons
6 learned, I also look at it as lessons to be
7 learned. And I know that may not necessarily
8 need to be a distinction, but I do want to focus
9 on it. And even something to the extent of near
10 misses, looking at it from the perspective of
11 what was done, what actions were done that helped
12 it to be a near miss rather than a hit.

13 So I think for me that's kind of what
14 I'm looking at. And for all of this just making
15 sure that it stays real in terms of what the
16 intent of this is rather than bringing it bigger
17 than it needs to be in a way that then makes it
18 less effective at the ground level.

19 Alan?

20 MR. MAYBERRY: I guess thinking toward
21 the end and not trying to get ahead of ourselves,
22 we basically have a framework here with the

1 context edit to each committee that Mark's done
2 an excellent job of providing. As people look at
3 this, if you could think of anything that might
4 be missing or -- I mean, certainly I can think of
5 other -- I think of human factors related to
6 lessons learned as well, because certainly we've
7 -- there are lessons out of mistakes that
8 happened out there, or close calls obviously and
9 different ways, too, that the human factor was
10 involved in close calls or not.

11 But does this seem to summarize it for
12 everyone as far as the kind of building blocks
13 for what we're going to -- what we're dealing
14 with here and will ultimately report on?

15 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Yes, you talked
16 about sort of what are we going to share and is
17 it going to be of value, and based on the
18 presentations yesterday it's clear -- Bob
19 Buchanan. Sorry. Based on the presentations
20 yesterday it's clear that the big guys do an
21 excellent job of the IM, the integrity
22 management, but yesterday we heard that there's

1 1,300 operators out there. And the three in this
2 room do an amazing job, but about the other
3 1,297? So I think the lessons learned are
4 targeted at those guys, those guys that have a 2-
5 mile-long pipeline or a 10-mile-long pipeline
6 that really can't afford to do what some of the
7 big guys do.

8 And you know when I was thinking about
9 the framework, obviously we're talking about to
10 furnish a house here and we haven't built the
11 house. So what is the framework that all this
12 information goes into?

13 So one comment sort of I did --
14 thought about when I was doing my homework last
15 night was we need to create a model where the
16 experiences can be documented, and how you get
17 that information that becomes the experience,
18 that comes from data or whatever. But one
19 example was that AC interference issue that we
20 talked about yesterday. We saw that little hole
21 that was probably created by a pinhole because of
22 the interference coming from the current, but

1 that's an experience. What was found? How as it
2 found? What were the signs leading up to how
3 that was found? And then how did it occur?

4 And so that's an experience that can
5 drop into -- something into our house that a
6 number of these small operators may not have
7 known about or will learn from. So that's just a
8 comment about relevancy of what we're doing.

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Mark?

10 MEMBER HERETH: I like your
11 perspective there and I think that kind of
12 thinking would go into the process that would be
13 developed by that subcommittee to define how it
14 is you make those lessons learned available. I
15 know that's very similar to the process that we
16 use within the INGAA Foundation with our lessons
17 learned repository. There's a structure that's
18 applied: the background for the occurrence, how
19 it occurred and then the learnings from that.

20 And so I think the comments you make
21 provide great insight into how that subcommittee
22 might come together and look at formalizing that

1 process for not only finding the lessons, but
2 then sharing those lessons.

3 CHAIR BURMAN: So we're going to do --
4 and, Mark, do you still have your tent up to -- I
5 know you -- I mean, Bob. Sorry.

6 So we're going to go Walter, Mark,
7 Kate, Christie.

8 Walter's not? Okay. Mark, Kate, then
9 Christie.

10 MEMBER ZUNIGA: Yes, I guess I'm still
11 sort of -- you mentioned the house. I'm still
12 struggling as to where is that -- the system
13 architecture, where does that lay in this,
14 because honestly that's part of what -- trying to
15 avoid building the hard and really, really
16 complicated system, I think that is kind of the
17 area that I have interest in and would like to
18 participate in.

19 And I'm still struggling to understand
20 where in all this it's laid out? Where is that
21 piece that actually sort of does a review and
22 study on do we have a centralized repository? Do

1 we have disparate data sets that we're going then
2 either: (A) aggregate or simply conflate or --
3 all that sort of architecture of the house, I
4 guess, or maybe the foundation. I don't know
5 what you'd call it, but where does that lie in
6 these subcommittees?

7 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. I think that's
8 something we need to consider. I think it's
9 important, but I also look at it as the reporting
10 part, which the second bullet says begin with the
11 end in mind.

12 MEMBER ZUNIGA: Yes.

13 CHAIR BURMAN: I think overall the
14 whole structure of the subcommittees, we need to
15 begin with the end in mind and also then figure
16 out where things fit, what's not in there that we
17 need to, and sort of that helps us. And it goes
18 back to Christie's point on the planning before
19 we actually get going with some of the work that
20 might be done.

21 I'm also cognizant of the fact that we
22 had talked yesterday and then a little bit today

1 about utilizing the FAA, having a case study.
2 Both -- PRCI was mentioned. API also spoke from
3 the audience on some of their interests, and
4 other stakeholders.

5 We do also need to talk about
6 Committee members or working group members for
7 the whole group that also might necessarily need
8 to be added. With that I am cognizant of the
9 fact that we have had so far three meetings, two
10 being full meetings, one being a planning meeting
11 or -- and two days' worth today. And I think we
12 had at the first meeting 20 people. The planning
13 meeting I think we had maybe 20-22 people.
14 Yesterday I think we had 17. Today we have 18.
15 So I'm more cognizant of and I understand
16 different people have conflicts.

17 I'm also wanting to make sure that we
18 are looking to see who hasn't come consistently
19 just so that we're making sure that if they
20 haven't come that they are still interested in
21 being active. And it's not necessarily about the
22 attendance of the meeting, but what is being done

1 from meeting to meeting. So for me it's also
2 that I'd like to see that we accomplish a lot in
3 between the meetings, even if we're not formally
4 meeting. And that helps through the subcommittee
5 process, but really just making sure that we're
6 all engaged.

7 Now I think we'll go to Kate, then
8 Christie and then see if anyone else has any
9 questions. And I am cognizant of the fact that
10 we also may have people on the phone who want to
11 ask a question, and then the audience.

12 Kate?

13 MEMBER BLYSTONE: Yes, so I mean this
14 goes back to what Alan said a few minutes ago
15 about does this group of subcommittees make sense
16 and is anything missing? And I've been thinking
17 about that constantly until I stopped and said,
18 well, do we need all of these subcommittees and
19 do we need them all now?

20 I think if the will of the group is to
21 establish all six of these subcommittees today,
22 I'm not going to stand in anyone's way, but I'm

1 hesitant because I feel like as we dive deeper
2 into perhaps the BSEE process and the FAA that
3 we're going to discover some things about those
4 processes that will say -- will help us go, oh,
5 well, what we really need is a subcommittee on
6 this. And I think we're already illuminating
7 that with the fact that there really isn't a
8 place for that structure that Mark is talking
9 about.

10 Oh, and Kate Blystone, by the way. I
11 don't think I said that up front.

12 I just -- I worry that we get set in
13 this structure and we go, oh, God, we need a
14 seventh subcommittee and an eighth, and maybe
15 four of them aren't already meeting. So I would
16 propose today just; I'm not making a motion or
17 anything, this is just for discussion, adopting
18 the ones that -- or enacting the ones that make
19 the most sense right now and leaving the door
20 open for adding to that structure as we learn
21 more, because we have quite a stacked agenda for
22 September. And we might learn quite a few

1 things.

2 So I think the lessons learned one is
3 the one that's getting the most traction today,
4 and maybe that's the one we adopt today. Maybe
5 that's the one we start filling out. Those are
6 my thoughts.

7 DR. MURRAY: Great points, Kate. One
8 thing to consider -- so you guys can refer to me.
9 The only reason why I'm speaking during this
10 committee discussion time is to provide food for
11 thought, not to necessarily influence what the
12 committee wants to do. But great points.

13 The structure of these subcommittees;
14 I think you raise a good point, they don't
15 necessarily all have to be initiated into action
16 at the same time. So just be mindful of that.
17 So whatever this committee decides is important
18 to focus on.

19 I agree that the lessons learned is
20 key, but also consider the work that this group
21 may want best practices to start to inform, if
22 that could be the group that starts to tee up

1 folks from the airline industry and others to
2 come in with case studies and share what they're
3 doing so that the lessons learned group can learn
4 from them.

5 Also the reporting group that will
6 help to set the structure around what the report
7 looks like beginning with the NMI and other
8 pieces and being able to report out to the other
9 committees, advisory committees might be of use.
10 Their role and the amount of work that they work
11 on may likely vary. And this parent committee
12 can inform what that looks like and not
13 overburden them with things that may really need
14 to take place later.

15 The other point -- I had another
16 point. Let's see if I can remember what it was.
17 Actually it was going back to I think Mark Zuniga
18 -- is that correct? Close enough? Okay. He
19 raised a good point about the system
20 infrastructure. So my point, my food for thought
21 for the committee would be there's been a lot of
22 talk about sharing system. Now you can look at

1 system -- I guarantee if we went around, you
2 could probably define what a system is many
3 different ways. So food for thought for the
4 committee is a system, just a repository, which
5 we've heard referred to, or does it include the
6 people, the processes and the physical
7 infrastructure. So just as a consideration
8 consider what a system -- defining what a system
9 is in this process, because that would likely
10 advise some of the work that may come out of the
11 committee.

12 MEMBER HERETH: So I think, Mark, that
13 was a good question about the physical
14 infrastructure, the structure supporting it. My
15 view was that that could fit within the
16 regulatory funding and legal. It's really what
17 is the basis for the storage, the learnings, the
18 funding, how would that come about? And I think
19 that's separate and discrete from the process of
20 how you capture learnings and share those
21 learnings and it might take a different set of
22 people. I might move things.

1 So, Kate, I'm appreciative of your
2 thinking about do we need all these at once? I
3 think that's an excellent point. But I think
4 that's an example of where the how you store the
5 learnings, the structure, the system for doing
6 that could be run in parallel or separately from
7 the process of how you get the learnings. Just a
8 thought.

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Bob?

10 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Yes, Bob Buchanan.
11 I'm thinking some of these things are going to
12 dovetail. Best practices you're going to learn
13 from what the FAA or BSEE did as far as housing
14 that information. So you dovetail not only with
15 regulatory funding, but also reporting. So
16 you've got -- basically what I see is three
17 subcommittees there that might be looking at the
18 same thing. So that's where you talk about the
19 architecture or whatever, the repository,
20 whatever it is. But who's going to -- who's
21 responsible for that? Maybe just define that a
22 little more tightly.

1 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. Anyone
2 on the phone?

3 MEMBER JENSEN: Yes, this is Leif
4 Jensen with Sunoco Pipeline. I'd like to make
5 three comments. Having listened most of the
6 morning, I'd like to echo what Kate said as it
7 relates to are we trying to embrace too much at
8 this stage. I think we need to go down three
9 paths, and one is the technological path that
10 Mark had put on the slide. And I think there's
11 an appropriate fit there to directly link to the
12 statute 10(c), Parts (1), (2) and (3). I don't
13 think we're ready to define a system
14 infrastructure yet for data sharing. I think
15 that has to come later, but we could certainly
16 put that in that particular subcommittee.

17 The second point is around best
18 practices and lessons learned. And Heidi Keller
19 from API made the comment earlier that API has
20 several venues. I know INGAA has several venues
21 and I'm assuming that AGA and SGA have several
22 venues. We heard about some of them today. I

1 think there's an opportunity to form a
2 subcommittee of the trade associations and
3 operator representatives and other stakeholders
4 from the committee to look at common ground
5 amongst all of those and determine what would fit
6 as it relates to pipeline safety data sharing or
7 information sharing.

8 And then my third point is really
9 around governance. And we had this conversation
10 a lot yesterday as it pertains to mission,
11 vision, strategies, objectives and getting the
12 committee aligned. And if we don't form a
13 subcommittee to focus on that going forward in
14 the next couple of months, then I think that has
15 to be first and foremost on the agenda item for
16 our forthcoming meeting in September. Thank you
17 for the time.

18 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Anyone else
19 at the table?

20 (No audible response.)

21 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else on the
22 phone?

1 (No audible response.)

2 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone in the audience?

3 MEMBER PERRY: Hi, it's Simona Perry.

4 I have been listening all morning, like Leif, and
5 there's a couple things I just wanted to add
6 since I'm not there unfortunately, and I'm
7 disappointed I didn't get to meet you all.

8 One of the really important things I
9 think that was said was by Dr. Deng I believe
10 that we must -- I mean, we really need to have
11 some decision on what kind of data can be shared
12 in order to get the information that's most
13 useful. I think we've learned a lot about that
14 in the past couple of days, but the question is
15 still what data is most useful for -- hello --

16 CHAIR BURMAN: You're good.

17 MEMBER PERRY: -- for safety. Can
18 anybody hear me?

19 CHAIR BURMAN: We can hear you.

20 You're doing fine.

21 MEMBER PERRY: Oh, okay. I heard some
22 interference.

1 So the main things I think are
2 important are identifying what data we need
3 actually and that can be shared in maybe this
4 committee or in subcommittees, how data is being
5 collected, its consistency and accuracy, how the
6 data is integrated to information. So how do we
7 turn that data into useful information? Because
8 like Dr. Deng said, not all data will be useful
9 and it won't be shareable. And then how will we
10 share that information? And that's really I
11 think the -- to me the important thing for us as
12 public safety advocates is the sharing of timely
13 and accurate information with the public. And it
14 gets back to what Walter was saying as well: How
15 does public safety and environmental safety fit
16 into this?

17 There's the occupational safety piece
18 that's very important. From our perspective
19 we're interested in how we can make sure that the
20 public is getting accurate and timely information
21 from the states, from the pipeline industry that
22 then they can use in individual and local

1 community decisions about their property and
2 their families and the environment before, during
3 and after incidents. So that information is what
4 is important to the public.

5 I understand and I am very, very happy
6 to hear industry collaboration on data and
7 information that needs to be shared within the
8 industry and industry stakeholders. I want to
9 make sure we don't lose sight that we also need
10 to also really keep in mind that there's a public
11 portion of this and that some of the information
12 sharing definitely is within the industry and it
13 -- but we want to make sure that it allows for
14 feedback from the public perhaps in some way.
15 That's that learning piece.

16 And we also want to make sure that
17 there's a system of information sharing that can
18 be used by the public for their own decision
19 making and learning and communication both back
20 with the industry, but also amongst themselves
21 and with their local decision makers.

22 So I just wanted to make those points.

1 And I know they're not quite what we've been
2 talking about the past couple of days, but as a
3 public safety advocate those are the things that
4 come to my mind.

5 I really want to learn more about
6 overcoming some of the proprietary and
7 confidential barriers that I see existing within
8 the industry for making sure that we can in a
9 positive way give information to the public that
10 they can use. So thank you for your time.

11 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you.
12 We're going to go to Alan and then to the public
13 comments in the audience. And then Kate. Kate
14 will go before the audience.

15 MR. MAYBERRY: I just noted the -- I
16 know it's been mentioned a few times, the
17 examples of engage the API related to sharing
18 lessons learned, and I think that industry is to
19 be applauded for that. I think one of our
20 challenges here is as we look to that to leverage
21 that information. And in the spirit of SMS we
22 really need to be thinking about what it can be,

1 because I mean, while these are excellent
2 examples and I'm sure have prevented accidents
3 from happening we still have a very -- a
4 relatively flat instant history related to
5 reportable incidents. That's -- it's not
6 improving. It's more or less flat. And then we
7 still have incidents, low -- granted they're low-
8 probability, high-consequence events we need to
9 address. Again, granted they're very minimal.

10 So I would just urge as we look to
11 leverage the good lessons and best practices of
12 what's done out there that we look with respect
13 to what -- how could it be better? It could be
14 better if we only had this. I think we have a
15 great opportunity here bringing the right parties
16 together to make it what it can be. I think this
17 is some of the best -- we can really impact
18 pipeline safety greatly in doing so. So anyway,
19 I would just urge us to look beyond -- understand
20 what works well in these, but then also address
21 what they can be. Thanks.

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Thanks. We're going to

1 go to Kate, then to the audience members. Just
2 keep in mind we do have a hard stop at noon.

3 MEMBER BLYSTONE: My question is just
4 about where we're going from here, because I know
5 that we have all these committee homework things
6 that we want to report out on. I don't know if
7 the intention is to -- if this is what that is
8 and I've been missing the boat because I have
9 other things to say or if we have a section next
10 that's going to cover that.

11 CHAIR BURMAN: Just to respond, I do
12 think this is where that is. There was a lot of
13 homework assignments to help us to get to this
14 perspective. To the extent that we're not going
15 to go sort of question by question or item by
16 item in that homework assignment I do think it's
17 important to make sure we address it and identify
18 it in this context knowing that. So I look at it
19 as we are going to have to in short order after
20 this meeting really plan out before the next
21 meeting and take a lot of this that we're hearing
22 and put together something for a planning call to

1 go through it.

2 Again, the planning call shouldn't
3 just be everyone gets on and we have -- we're
4 waiting to hear what the next steps are. It
5 should really be something that gives us food for
6 thought to then engage in a real way to get us to
7 our next meeting in September.

8 Just so you know I've always taken the
9 position that I don't like doing things and being
10 on committees just to continue to come and talk
11 and not get anywhere. So from my perspective I
12 am very focused on what's the end that we're
13 trying to get to and then how do we get there,
14 understanding that there needs to be a lot of in-
15 the-weeds discussion that helps us in that.

16 But I do see this as if we think it
17 has value, which we do; at least I see it as
18 having value, then we've got to try to map this
19 out. And that's what this today is, to then take
20 it to give more homework to PHMSA, but with key
21 people. I think that there is a need for people
22 to help and step up to help flesh this out. So I

1 think it's important.

2 I will say thought that I also am
3 focused on the sensitivity to this being a
4 voluntary information sharing. And again the
5 objective is to help with the pipeline safety and
6 to have lessons learned. I have made mistakes as
7 a regulator where sometimes I try to be too in
8 the weeds and I want all the data and I want all
9 the information.

10 At the end of the day I wind up being
11 the one who's actually hampering the discussion
12 that needs to happen between the relevant folks
13 who may not be me and that my role is really one
14 of looking and oversight and making sure that
15 communication and collaboration happens with the
16 appropriate folks. And again it comes back to
17 what's the benefit and what's the value to the
18 user and not just for the sake of saying here it
19 is and now we've shared all this information. If
20 it's actually getting to the core of the issue, I
21 do have concern.

22 I don't think the intent is not to be

1 transparent, but I think we need to be sensitive
2 to the fact that folks need to feel comfortable
3 in sharing very sensitive information without
4 fear that -- the drive is to learn from that and
5 to prevent future accidents. So I'm just
6 sensitive to that issue.

7 MEMBER BLYSTONE: So I can keep going?
8 Okay. Just really quick I want to say a couple
9 things that I think are unique to me and Simona
10 about our perspective as just straight up
11 pipeline safety advocates.

12 We heard a lot of discussion over the
13 last several hours yesterday and today that were
14 -- that was great about industry and vendors
15 working together to get their data better, to get
16 the tools better. I think we have to see that
17 when we develop this system the reports out from
18 that system, or whatever data comes out of that
19 system or information, the -- we may have
20 multiple audiences that we're sharing it with.

21 And this kind of blew up for me when
22 Amy Nelson was giving her presentation and the

1 different interfaces that happened with the NPMS
2 system. And I followed up with her afterward to
3 ask why say the investigation reports only show
4 up for PHMSA or the operator, and she answered
5 that really clearly. She said because the data
6 that they can see is totally unintelligible to
7 the average person. It's not like there's a
8 written report that you can click on and read and
9 understand exactly what's going on.

10 So I think it should come as no
11 surprise to you that my preference is that
12 whatever system we come up with the public has
13 access to everything. But I also understand that
14 everything may not be helpful for the public if
15 they have no idea what they're looking at.

16 I think while we're talking about how
17 this system works we have to consider ways to
18 include the public in the process, just to echo
19 what Simona was saying. And as we discuss the
20 FAA system or the BSEE system going forward, I
21 want to hear about how the public has access to
22 that information, if they do. They may not. And

1 I want to hear that as well.

2 The public needs to see the system we
3 develop is working or if it's not working. And
4 they need to be able to check our work, plain and
5 simple. In my experience as an advocate and as a
6 private consultant for industry and a Government
7 employee it really benefits everyone involved to
8 have a well-informed public. And the more the
9 public knows the fewer miscommunications or
10 misunderstandings that can occur. And so
11 thinking about how the public can be plugged into
12 this process is certainly going to be something
13 that I'm going to be focusing on.

14 And the other thing, just quickly the
15 last thing is that the FAA process was not
16 developed overnight. This is something we heard
17 first day. And I think we should be mindful of
18 that going forward, that we may put out a system
19 that's not perfect, but it's a good start. And I
20 just want us to be mindful of that as we go
21 forward. And I'm done now.

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Very

1 important aspect.

2 Is there anyone on the phone who has
3 any comments or questions?

4 (No audible response.)

5 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone at the table?

6 (No audible response.)

7 CHAIR BURMAN: And I do believe we do
8 have some folks in the audience who have some
9 comments.

10 MS. WARNER: Kate, I want to thank you
11 very much for your comment because -- I'm Sherry
12 Warner. I addressed you on the first day of your
13 meeting in December last year, and that is
14 exactly what I wanted to echo, that ASIAs is like
15 the Diet Cokes. There are probably seven
16 different versions of ASIAs. There is a public-
17 facing ASIAs where information is presented, but
18 not data. That -- not high granularity data.
19 There is observational data. There's findings
20 from inspections such as what you do with
21 aircraft.

22 But there is also data that is

1 operational data. So how much fuel was burned on
2 an individual flight? How long did someone take
3 to taxi out and take off? How much fuel was
4 remaining in the aircraft when it landed? So
5 these different levels of data were required at
6 various times in the evolution of ASIAs to answer
7 the question that was presented.

8 So without taking too long in your
9 time I'm going to suggest that it's important
10 that you get a concept of how ASIAs has evolved
11 over time and what the architectures are that
12 support that evolution, but at this time ASIAs is
13 a cloud-based environment that allows people to
14 share information but not store it. It's
15 operators store and hold their own information
16 and share it at the time that an inquiry is
17 necessary. So there are all kinds of options for
18 how you might design the system, and those would
19 accommodate the proprietary nature of the data
20 and the kind of information you want to keep
21 close -- hold close.

22 I wanted to make one other comment.

1 Under SMS a hazard registry is a normal process,
2 a normal thing that you would develop. One of
3 the opportunities here is to link the findings
4 from your voluntary information sharing system to
5 the hazard registry. And that's going to take me
6 down to this topic about the GIS.

7 One of the interesting things I think
8 about your environment, very much like what you
9 deal with in the airline industry, is that the
10 asset, which is the airplane, holds the finding
11 information, but the operator uses it. It's
12 essential with pipelines I think that the
13 physical information be maintained. The legacy
14 information is held somewhere. If it disappears
15 in the transfer of the pipe, you would lose a lot
16 of the information you need for safety analysis.

17 So the summary of all this is that you
18 know that there are a lot of low-hanging fruit
19 opportunities that eventually you'll get to the
20 point where you want to do predictive analysis as
21 opposed to forensic. So a road map might be the
22 thing that you want to produce or recommend as an

1 output, a road map for information sharing that
2 would allow you to reconfigure and grow this
3 information sharing environment over time as
4 necessary. So you could achieve a lot in the
5 initial design while leaving yourself the
6 opportunity to create something more complex over
7 time as needed.

8 So thank you though very much for
9 giving me an opportunity to speak.

10 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you very much.

11 Is there anyone else from the audience
12 who'd like to speak?

13 MR. SATTERTHWAITTE: We have another
14 here.

15 MR. BOSS: Yes, Terry Boss, INGAA. I
16 think the biggest benefit this group can come up
17 with is a methodology that should be repeated
18 over and over again when you put together a
19 voluntary information system. We have a lot of
20 voluntary information systems, some mandatory
21 things out there.

22 We've got NTSB reports that come out

1 that give information. We have safety moments,
2 but they've got certain characteristics. They've
3 got a marketing group you're trying to
4 communicate to; much like Eric was talking about,
5 the pitch and the catch. There may be details
6 certain folks want. Other folks don't want to
7 know those kinds of details.

8 But coming up with a standardized way
9 of coming up with a voluntary information system,
10 if you're going to analyze the PHMSA failures
11 that are going on, this is the methodology, this
12 is how you recommunicate this information out.
13 If you're going to be talking about occupational
14 things, the INGAA sharing information with the
15 construction folks that are the audience on that
16 have a whole different dialogue. They're trying
17 to learn something from that.

18 So I think this group raising up high
19 enough can figure out maybe there's 20 or 30 or
20 100 different information sharing processes out
21 there, but each one of these processes should
22 have these characteristics and how you can

1 improve, very much like the SMS standard says
2 here's the management process of what you put
3 together and here are the components in there. I
4 think that could be the biggest benefit that this
5 group could put together. Thank you.

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Does anyone have
7 any other comments?

8 MR. SATTERTHWAITTE: We have one more.

9 CHAIR BURMAN: One more? Thank you.

10 MR. KIEBA: Yes, Max Kieba, Pipeline
11 Safety. I think I'll -- might get behind the
12 public on some of my comments because I agree
13 there's a lot of good stuff existing out there.
14 I was the Pipeline Safety Trust in the fall;
15 which I also put a plug in for that great
16 conference, and we did hear about things like
17 PRCI, the API Pipeline Info Exchange. I said,
18 well, that sounds great. Do you invite
19 regulators and the public to it, and the answer
20 is, well, we've thought about it, but the answer
21 is no.

22 And I think part of that is what I

1 heard was industry is a little concerned about
2 being as open maybe, but my pitch back to
3 industry is it's hard for the public I think to
4 trust you unless you trust the public. So maybe
5 a good start to that would be if we want to build
6 on some of these efforts consider inviting public
7 to it. And maybe it's not the full public, but
8 maybe members of this committee just to see if
9 what they share is reasonable.

10 The other comment I'd say is a lot of
11 good stuff, a lot of big operators. That's
12 great. But frankly, when we talk about SMS, what
13 I've seen is the biggest operates that wave the
14 SMS flag the most are also ones that have a lot
15 of incidents, but they're not also ones saying,
16 you know what, we just had an incident. This
17 also happened on Pipeline Safety Trust. So
18 again, it's good. Looks good on the slides, but
19 let's also be honest of what's happening out
20 there.

21 And I will also say you can learn a
22 lot from your smaller operators as well. Lot of

1 small operators do have very limited resources
2 that they boil it down to most fundamental things
3 of what they need. You're going to learn a lot
4 from them. So having said that, not all your
5 smaller operators are going to ILI. So that's
6 this whole scope thing of is it ILI only or is it
7 ILI or equivalent with pressure testings like
8 that? If it's ILI or equivalent with pressure
9 test, you could probably learn a heck of a lot
10 from your smaller operators, but that's kind of a
11 scoping issue. So thank you.

12 CHAIR BURMAN: I do think that this
13 has been very helpful. We do need to talk about
14 additional expertise needs that we have
15 potentially for the committee, for the working
16 group. So I don't know if anyone has any
17 thoughts. Doctor?

18 DR. DENG: Yiming Deng. I'll make a
19 shot. And to responding the public, what Kate
20 mention and that gentleman just mentioned,
21 everybody agree that there are some barriers or
22 gaps between operators, technology providers and

1 public. And from my perspective as an educator
2 at a public research institution and what I can
3 see here there's opportunities, as just Mark
4 mention, in training and qualification
5 subcommittee idea that at public research
6 institutions we are training the next generation
7 operators, technology providers. And that's what
8 I was doing. There must be some information
9 which can be shared among technology providers,
10 operators and the public. And I treat myself in
11 the public sector that we share the information
12 with the future workforce in this area.

13 So I think that's pretty important
14 that we can figure out a way that -- how to share
15 those kind of information. What can be shared
16 among this group and what can be share among the
17 public and the future workforce in this area.
18 That's my point, yes. Thank you.

19 CHAIR BURMAN: Great. Thank you.
20 Does anyone on the phone have any comments or
21 questions?

22 (No audible response.)

1 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone else at the
2 table?

3 (No audible response.)

4 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone in the audience?

5 (No audible response.)

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Mark?

7 MEMBER HERETH: I think with respect
8 to your question about other groups or other
9 entities to be represented I'd propose two for
10 consideration. One would be additional pipeline
11 operators. I think when you look at the --
12 across the whole group, I don't think we have as
13 many operators as we do those of us that are
14 represented in other contexts. So I'd certainly
15 open that up for consideration.

16 And I think the other thing that came
17 up maybe initially with Michael Stackhouse's
18 comments yesterday, but it's come up today and
19 even in the recent comments, like Sherry's
20 comment about moving from being forensic to being
21 predictive, that we might think about bringing
22 somebody in who has experience in -- I think it's

1 called the -- it's actually called data science
2 these days of which predictive analytics and big
3 data and all those things fit in that.

4 I have somebody that I would recommend
5 that's presented in this forum, in a PHMSA forum
6 before, but I think you should consider a broad
7 set of people. But I think there's an
8 opportunity for us to look at moving from being
9 simply forensic to being more predictive. And
10 Michael Stackhouse did a nice job of sort of
11 setting that up yesterday.

12 So those are two areas I would
13 proposed for consideration.

14 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. And just to
15 clarify, I do believe it's the Secretary of DOT
16 who actually appoints someone, so this is really
17 our opportunity to give PHMSA information to take
18 back to appoint someone to that.

19 Does anyone else have any other
20 thoughts? Doctor?

21 (No audible response.)

22 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Bob?

1 MEMBER BUCHANAN: The only other
2 thought I had would be an oil and gas producer.
3 We've got operators around the table, but do we
4 have a multinational like an Exxon, Mobil or BP,
5 or somebody like that? There's stuff going
6 through the pipeline and they might have a
7 viewpoint as well.

8 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. Kate?

9 MEMBER BLYSTONE: Just real quick to
10 put a finer point on what Mark said. I would say
11 if we're going to add an operator, we should add
12 a small operator because that's certainly
13 something that we don't have represented in the
14 room.

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Great point.

16 Does anybody else on the phone have
17 any comments?

18 (No audible response.)

19 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone at the table?

20 (No audible response.)

21 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone in the audience?

22 Oops, sorry. Mark?

1 MEMBER HERETH: I know that when -- to
2 build on Kate's point, I know that we put the
3 1173 Committee together for pipeline safety
4 management systems we did in fact have a small
5 operator on that group and that perspective, also
6 playing to Max' point, could be very, very
7 valuable.

8 CHAIR BURMAN: Bryce?

9 MEMBER BROWN: Just thinking about
10 this whole idea about messaging and the marketing
11 side of it, we talk about this, as I mentioned in
12 my earlier comments and in many of these industry
13 association meetings that attend -- is how do
14 these groups get their messages out? And sure,
15 I'm looking at four of the web sites right now.
16 But is that something we need to think about here
17 as well and having somebody that's an expert in
18 that to kind of grapple with all this information
19 here on the screen and think about if you have a
20 best practice already in place, how do you
21 enhance the message that you're trying to put out
22 there already into something that makes better

1 sense for the young engineer that's just coming
2 out of school, for example?

3 You can go to four web sites right
4 here and learn a lot about the industry and about
5 how pipelines safe and some of the challenges
6 with them. But if you're talking about lessons
7 learned, where do you place that information
8 based on this committee's work? So
9 marketing/messaging/communication.

10 CHAIR BURMAN: Does anyone else on the
11 phone have any comments?

12 (No audible response.)

13 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone at the table?

14 (No audible response.)

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Anyone in the audience?

16 Yes?

17 Okay. I was just going to say; Erin
18 Kurilla, AGA, the point about the small operators
19 I think is a really good one because if you think
20 about it, if we build this too big and too
21 clunky, you're not going to get the small
22 operators to even report in especially because

1 this is going to be voluntary, right? So we've
2 got to think about that. Just punch line things.

3 CHAIR BURMAN: All right. Thank you.
4 That's very helpful.

5 I don't mean to call him about, but
6 did we lose Dan or is he --

7 PARTICIPANT: Yes, we lost him.

8 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. I just wanted to
9 make sure.

10 So thank you, Erin.

11 So I guess now we're at the point of
12 figuring out what to do next.

13 Oh, I'm sorry. Alan?

14 MR. MAYBERRY: No, I was just going to
15 that last subject you'll probably see us come out
16 with a Federal Register notice then to solicit
17 additional members. So if you give it other
18 thought, if there are other specialties or skill
19 sets perhaps we may want to consider, be thinking
20 about that.

21 CHAIR BURMAN: So just a quick recap.
22 We have taken official votes on the alternate

1 DFOs, as well as the alternate co-chair, and we
2 have looked at potentially meeting September 13th
3 and 14th, which is tentative. Just again I won't
4 be able to be here, but if the majority is good,
5 that's fine.

6 And then the other issue is we had
7 sort of reset a lot of the focus in terms of when
8 we do have our next meeting, drilling down more
9 on the steps and getting into those processes,
10 again looking at sort of the scope and the
11 governance, keeping in mind that we have to still
12 figure out the overall -- the beginning with the
13 end in mind and where do we do that.

14 We do, because of the way PHMSA and
15 Government works, need to make some decision
16 points so that they have it formally in terms of
17 subcommittees, keeping in mind that we're really
18 looking at the framework. It's not necessarily
19 intended that subcommittees will be up and
20 running. And we still have to work out a lot of
21 those dynamics. But they do need to be able to
22 have some focus logistically and legally for what

1 they need to do after they leave this meeting.

2 So I am looking for some ideas on
3 that. And my concept really is how do we get
4 from here to the next meeting with some things
5 getting started and underway, as well as again
6 figuring out -- I think I like -- somebody in the
7 audience talked about a road map. It's not
8 really a road map per se to feel, but really
9 trying to get a sense of the structure and where
10 do we want to be, keeping in mind the processes
11 and the life of this working group and
12 understanding that at the end we need to be able
13 to offer up some recommendations and what's that
14 structure to get where we need to be? And from
15 my perspective trying to also look at it from a
16 case study perspective with the FAA and the
17 relevant folks who may be able to help so that we
18 can work through some of it.

19 To both Simona's, Kate and the person
20 in the audience's -- or at least two people in
21 the audience focus on the public, that's also why
22 we need to have your input in terms of looking at

1 it from, okay, what's the relevance, what does it
2 need, and what is helpful, keeping in mind I
3 don't think that there's any intent to not share.
4 It's just a matter of is it helpful and then how
5 do we do that? Because the overall intent is for
6 -- at least where I sit, me to get out of the way
7 so that we can have what needs to be done
8 effective so that the public benefits from it.
9 So to the extent that we work through that I
10 think that's also helpful to hear from the FAA
11 now how they dealt with some of those issues and
12 then working through the different data sets.

13 I am very cognizant of the fact that
14 sometimes data goes up that is not done in a way
15 that is clear and there's a lot of then
16 misconceptions to what that data is or isn't so
17 that we need to be cognizant of the fact that
18 it's very important so that it's then not taken
19 out of context.

20 So with that, looking for someone who
21 might have some ideas on -- or want to be the
22 first one. If Dan was here, I'd nominate him,

1 but he's not. So maybe we'll still nominate him
2 to make the first vote. But I am looking for
3 someone who maybe wants to take a stab at what we
4 should be doing from a formal vote perspective so
5 that we can move forward.

6 Does anyone have any, before that,
7 comments that they might want to offer or
8 questions on the phone?

9 (No audible response.)

10 CHAIR BURMAN: At the table?

11 (No audible response.)

12 CHAIR BURMAN: In the audience?

13 (No audible response.)

14 CHAIR BURMAN: Why don't we take just
15 a minute to think and maybe Alan can help us with
16 the next steps?

17 MR. MAYBERRY: I just was going to ask
18 do we want to add some discussion on the
19 subcommittees? So are there -- do -- does anyone
20 want to propose say taking a vote that we stand
21 one or two or perhaps even three up and then
22 maybe after this be thinking about the membership

1 makeup and maybe look for volunteers to step
2 forward, but maybe identify and maybe vote to
3 approve some of these committees or -- just
4 thinking. Just so we can end up in a place where
5 we can make some progress.

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Mark?

7 MEMBER HERETH: And I'm happy to make
8 a proposal. And I appreciated Kate's points a
9 few minutes ago, so they're probably going to be
10 reflected in this.

11 I would propose that we would stand up
12 lessons learned, best practices and reporting,
13 because I think, without belaboring it, best
14 practices we need to learn from these other
15 sectors what they're done and what to do and what
16 not to do, and particularly as they've gone
17 through evolution. Maybe there's evolutionary
18 steps we need to take. There may be some that we
19 can skip.

20 I would stand up lessons learned so we
21 can begin to understand how to build that process
22 and structure it. I don't know that that's going

1 to be an easy exercise. And I think we
2 absolutely need our public member involvement in
3 that process. I think a part of what we should
4 be doing with our lessons learned is building
5 public confidence. And then I think that
6 reporting item becomes important because it
7 really gets to the beginning with the end in
8 mind.

9 So I would propose lessons learned,
10 best practices and reporting, but certainly
11 that's subject to discussion and debate.

12 CHAIR BURMAN: We're going to go to
13 Jason, then Kate and then Walter. I'm sorry. I
14 didn't see you.

15 MEMBER CRADIT: Yes, hi. Jason
16 Cradit. I think very similar to Mark perhaps on
17 best practice and lessons learned, but I guess a
18 very specific outcome of looking towards MITRE's
19 work, how they did the geographically dispersed
20 information sharing, as well as how they secured
21 it, where they draw their -- the cyber security
22 as well as information classification and what

1 gets shared, what be shared publicly and those
2 sort of things and coming back with I guess a
3 report back to this team so we can understand
4 kind of the lessons they learned along the way
5 and the journey they went through.

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Thank you.

7 Kate and then Walter.

8 MEMBER BLYSTONE: I agree with Mark
9 and Jason, and I would add one more, and it's not
10 one that's on the list, but it may -- it's a
11 short-term committee to set up our -- to
12 establish a mission statement and some of those
13 goals and objectives and we talked about a few
14 times. I don't know how everyone else feels
15 about that, but I feel like that could be like
16 two meetings to establish that and then we can
17 have it when we meet again in September.

18 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Walter?

19 MEMBER JONES: Mark, I just want you
20 to clarify for me what is the -- what do you
21 anticipate the difference between lessons learned
22 and best practices? I see them almost as the

1 same, but maybe I'm missing something.

2 MEMBER HERETH: So I'm viewing the
3 best -- it's a really good question. I was
4 viewing the best practices in the way they were
5 presented to us yesterday by the staff. I
6 thought they did a really nice job of saying with
7 best practices what we'd be doing is to look at
8 what are the best practices from other sectors?
9 What can we learn from --

10 MEMBER JONES: Right.

11 MEMBER HERETH: -- FAA and ASIAs?
12 What can we learn from BSEE? What can we learn
13 from these other industry organizations? And I
14 looked at it in that context.

15 And the lessons learned is really how
16 do we develop the process to share the learnings
17 from the work that's going to be done?

18 MEMBER JONES: Oh, okay. I see what
19 you're saying. Okay.

20 MEMBER HERETH: You could --

21 MEMBER JONES: Thank you.

22 MEMBER HERETH: You could at some

1 point apply best practices within the lessons
2 learned.

3 MEMBER JONES: Yes, exactly. That's
4 exactly how I --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MEMBER HERETH: That's a fair point.

7 MEMBER JONES: Yes, that's exactly
8 what I was saying.

9 MEMBER HERETH: But what I -- but in
10 the short term I viewed the best practices as the
11 mechanism to learn from other industries, other
12 sectors.

13 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay.

14 MEMBER AMUNDSEN: Eric Amundsen,
15 Energy Transfer. I think just a real quick
16 comment. I think lessons learned might -- we
17 might re-title that sharing process development.
18 I think that's kind of what Mark just described.
19 And so I think it's certainly misleading for me
20 to say lessons learned. I mean, that's kind of
21 the outcome, but I think what we want here is a
22 committee that works on how do we develop that

1 process to do that?

2 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you.

3 I'm sorry. Walter, did you have
4 another question?

5 (Off microphone comment.)

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Anyone on the
7 phone?

8 MEMBER JENSEN: Yes, this is Leif
9 Jensen. I'd just like to at least add a
10 clarifier pertaining to the lessons learned
11 perspective. From my earlier comments there are
12 many initiatives with INGAA, SGA, AGA and API and
13 instruments and mechanisms whereby we share
14 information amongst operators. And I think it
15 was someone from the audience who made the
16 comment that why don't we invite other
17 stakeholders? And I think there's an appropriate
18 time right now to at least get a subcommittee
19 focused on that opportunity.

20 And maybe I'm just battering about
21 some semantical comments about what has been made
22 in the room, but I don't want to miss that. I

1 think there's opportunity here in one of these
2 subcommittees in the short term to focus on that.
3 And just develop what it can be and then with a
4 primary focus on pipeline safety and preventing
5 that next accident. Thanks.

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Does anyone have
7 any -- any other comments on the phone?

8 (No audible response.)

9 CHAIR BURMAN: At the table?

10 (No audible response.)

11 CHAIR BURMAN: In the audience?

12 MS. WARNER: Hi, I'm not sure who that
13 was on the phone; I didn't catch your name, but
14 that was the other -- I think that's the other
15 thing that's missing. It would be covered in
16 that Regulatory Framework Steering Committee or
17 Working Group, Subcommittee. But the way that
18 ASIAs works successfully is that it is a joint
19 industry government entity.

20 So the structure that allows that open
21 information sharing among participants from both
22 groups is what allows them to actually

1 successfully identify issues and address them.
2 And separating the two makes it more difficult I
3 think to actually get a successful information
4 sharing environment. So the distinction between
5 safety information versus enforcement information
6 has to be made and it has to be structured so
7 that people can share information in a safe
8 environment

9 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. That was
10 helpful.

11 I don't -- you have her name, right,
12 Cheryl, the woman speaking? I didn't catch --

13 MS. WHETSEL: Sherry Warner.

14 CHAIR BURMAN: Okay. Great. Thank
15 you. Very helpful.

16 So where I see this now is -- and I
17 had Christie put up the slide when we first
18 started, which had some of the potential topics
19 and committee business, is needing to kind of
20 fold into understanding that we will be meeting
21 at some point in September, and in between that
22 we will have some work to do. And so needing to

1 look at, now after hearing a lot of the
2 discussion around the subcommittees and the
3 formation of them and the different things that
4 need to be done, someone taking a formal vote so
5 that we could refine Mark's proposal to really
6 get to the next objectives.

7 What are the things -- just where I
8 sit is also I am cognizant of the fact that each
9 meeting we may need to take a deeper dive and
10 tweak where we are going, but trying to again get
11 that road map that helps us to stay on track,
12 which is why I'm also cognizant that we only have
13 11 minutes left and I really always want to be
14 able to have a hard stop so that we are making
15 progress at least in the time, but that it is
16 important for me that we don't try to also do --
17 oversell, that we're going to be able to do
18 everything with -- in between meeting to meeting,
19 but that we do have to try to be realistic in
20 what we are going to get accomplished. And we --
21 it's very important that we take time to map this
22 out.

1 So, Mark?

2 MEMBER HERETH: Are you looking for a
3 formal motion at this point or --

4 CHAIR BURMAN: Yes.

5 MEMBER HERETH: Okay. So, Cameron, if
6 you could put up that slide again. And I think
7 we need to rename that first subcommittee. And,
8 Eric, I think you called that sharing process
9 development. So I would propose a motion that
10 would stand up three subcommittees, the Process
11 Sharing Subcommittee, the Best Practices
12 Subcommittee, and the Reporting Subcommittee.
13 Oh, and I would add a fourth one for
14 consideration in the motion of a subcommittee to
15 look at I believe it's mission statement goals
16 and objectives.

17 CHAIR BURMAN: I think that also kind
18 of falls under the overall policy objectives with
19 that.

20 So with that motion and my
21 clarification, do we have a --

22 MEMBER JONES: Second.

1 CHAIR BURMAN: -- second? All those
2 in favor?

3 (Chorus of aye.)

4 CHAIR BURMAN: Any opposition?

5 (No audible response.)

6 CHAIR BURMAN: Abstentions?

7 (No audible response.)

8 CHAIR BURMAN: With that it passes.

9 Woo-hoo.

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIR BURMAN: So we will have --
12 we're not going to ask people to commit.

13 Mark, do you have something you want
14 to say? Sorry.

15 (No audible response.)

16 CHAIR BURMAN: I do also want folks to
17 be thinking about the things that we should never
18 lose sight of so that we do have those key
19 takeaways. Whatever subcommittee and whatever
20 the committee does we still come back to those
21 key takeaways. And for some it will be more
22 important than others.

1 I think the one key takeaway is what's
2 the value-added and are we meeting our objective?
3 I think we all would agree that pipeline safety
4 is very important and are we meeting the
5 framework in getting there? and I think it's
6 important also that we keep in mind the cyber
7 security issues. And the other key takeaway is
8 the public and what does that mean? And I think
9 that if we do that while we work out through each
10 one what that means and the details, we won't
11 overlook very important things.

12 I'm sure there are other key
13 takeaways. I'm not asking people to say them
14 now, but I do want to make sure that we have that
15 core group that we go back to to make sure and
16 that it fits in. Okay?

17 Before we leave for today is there any
18 other process items that we need to address?
19 Really this is a question to Alan, Cheryl and
20 Christie. Any core -- is there any core process
21 issue that we have overlooked from making sure
22 that we take care of it today?

1 PARTICIPANT: I'm sorry.

2 CHAIR BURMAN: That's all right. So
3 any core process issue that we forgot to take
4 care of today that you guys need for the next
5 steps, Cheryl, Alan or Christie, or counsel? I
6 know there's a bunch of them back there, so --

7 DR. MURRAY: I think that we've made
8 a lot of progress even though it may not appear
9 that way, but just these discussions and getting
10 to the point where we are has been very
11 rewarding.

12 I would say in terms of the newly-
13 voted-on subcommittees that we will work hand in
14 hand with the committee to stand up. Please
15 anticipate an administrative meeting with no
16 deliberations, but certainly an opportunity for
17 this committee to further inform the work that we
18 will all need to engage in for subcommittee
19 efforts and a discussion around some of the other
20 questions that we posed here for consideration,
21 that we'll need to think about and have that
22 administrative meeting to prepare more work so

1 that as we invite potentially others either on
2 the committee or outside of the committee to
3 participate on that we have enough information to
4 help them to understand what this committee --
5 each one of those subcommittees will focus on.

6 Also, we will be reaching out -- so
7 now that we have three committees we're working
8 on -- four -- thank you -- four including the
9 mission and vision objective one, we will be
10 reaching out to this committee likely via email;
11 hope that's okay, and may even touch on it at the
12 administrative meeting to understand this
13 committee's interest in passion to serve on the
14 committees that we have. Thank you.

15 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you. Before --
16 oh, Alan?

17 MR. MAYBERRY: I was just going to say
18 I agree we've made -- I think we made good
19 progress. One thing obviously I don't lose sight
20 on is -- or if is that I'll ultimately be
21 reporting to Congress or to our administrator who
22 will report to Congress on the progress of this

1 committee. And I think we're making good
2 progress. I think we've -- at least I hope
3 you'll agree we've coalesced about, but I'm --
4 we're not where we need to be, I think we have
5 identified basic building blocks of what will
6 ultimately be a deliverable, will -- will have
7 prepared on a recommendation on a path forward.

8 But the other thing I think as we look
9 toward -- I think we covered this the first
10 meeting, perhaps the need for contractor support
11 if we need that help. That's kind of an option
12 we have available to us, for us in helping to at
13 least put things together. That's a tool we'll
14 have as we go forward.

15 But anyway, appreciate the
16 collaboration these last -- this last day-and-a-
17 half.

18 CHAIR BURMAN: Thank you very much.
19 Anyone else on the phone have any comments?

20 (No audible response.)

21 CHAIR BURMAN: Around the table?

22 (No audible response.)

1 CHAIR BURMAN: In the audience?

2 (No audible response.)

3 CHAIR BURMAN: I do think it is
4 important also that we follow up on having a real
5 good liaison with the FAA, especially for our
6 next meeting to help us with a lot of the mapping
7 out, and I'm really looking forward to that.

8 I think we heard a theme throughout
9 about relationships and trust, and it's really
10 important that folks who are a part of this
11 working group understand that that's really the
12 core for me is working through, trying to get to
13 a good spot and understanding that that also
14 means that we have to be willing to share and
15 work through some of the pros and the cons and
16 also be comfortable in disagreeing with each
17 other and knowing that at the end of the day we
18 all want to do some good work. And that's really
19 kind of where I come from and I want to make a
20 difference. And I think that this really is
21 something that we really can make a difference,
22 and that's important.

1 So thank you, all. And I believe we
2 can adjourn. Thank you.

3 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
4 went off the record at 11:57 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A		
a.m 1:12 4:2 81:12,13	additional 3:13 14:9 83:9,21 85:9,22 88:8 147:14 149:10 154:17	agree 36:4 37:13 70:13 70:13 71:12,13 75:7 103:22 123:19 145:12 147:21 161:8 170:3 172:18 173:3
ability 17:5 48:19 49:11	address 33:12 45:9,13 98:15 99:10 111:7 133:9,20 134:17 166:1 170:18	agreed 77:16
able 41:19 47:9 48:3,21 51:18,22 52:3 53:6,9 54:2 69:21 80:2 88:2 89:9,14 93:1,16 99:22 101:9 102:22 110:18 110:21 124:8 139:4 155:4,21 156:12,17 167:14,17	addressed 72:14 109:5 140:12	Agreement 3:11
above-entitled 81:11 175:3	addresses 30:3	ahead 80:6,6 87:5 114:21
absolutely 160:2	addressing 93:9 98:13 103:18	aimed 50:10
Abstentions 86:15 169:6	adhere 74:3	air 38:10
AC 116:19	adjoin 9:17 175:2	aircraft 140:21 141:4
access 17:16 138:13,21	adjudgments 48:17	airline 14:8 124:1 142:9
accessible 28:10 93:6	adjust 90:17	airplane 85:6 142:10
accident 12:22 34:20 40:1,1 112:21 165:5	adjustments 48:12,14 101:13	Alan 2:2 4:19 11:3 33:1 65:5 69:11 82:19 114:19 121:14 132:12 154:13 158:15 170:19 171:5 172:16
accidents 92:15,16 133:2 137:5	administer 100:2	algorithms 17:4 53:1,3 55:14 63:11 70:3
accommodate 141:19	ADMINISTRATION 1:2	Alicia 5:14
accomplish 81:20 90:2 121:2	administrative 88:1 171:15,22 172:12	align 87:11
accomplished 167:20	administrator 2:2 10:18 172:21	aligned 128:12
accuracy 130:5	adopt 123:4	alignment 103:17
accurate 130:13,20	adopted 67:18	allow 143:2
achieve 102:11 143:4	adopting 122:17	allows 75:17 131:13 141:13 165:20,22
achieving 42:2	advance 44:8 47:1,18 54:3 64:4	alternate 3:16 9:6 83:9 83:17 154:22 155:1
acknowledge 17:20	advanced 41:17,20 43:1 46:2 54:21 60:6	alternative 85:11
acknowledged 8:8	advancement 44:3 46:17,21	amazing 116:2
acronym 35:5 38:6	advancing 47:5 54:7 61:22	ambiguities 42:8
act 11:14 17:8 41:2	advantages 38:7	America 2:1,2
Acting 10:18	advice 11:16,18	amount 46:19 63:6 124:10
action 3:19 9:17 17:21 25:1,1,6,13 26:13,14 26:21 52:1,4 82:13 123:15	advise 13:6 125:10	Amundsen 1:16 5:7,8,8 18:14,15 28:13,17 29:1 33:4,17,20 35:1 36:14 163:14,14
actionable 24:21 37:6 53:6 58:1,7 62:10	advisory 11:13 124:9	Amy 15:14 137:22
actions 25:14 77:1 114:11	Advocacy 6:7	analogy 39:11
active 29:5 44:7 120:21	advocate 107:3 132:3 139:5	analysis 30:22 41:18 48:13 55:8,9,13 56:13 56:20 59:13 60:19 61:2,11,11,19 62:18 63:19 70:3 77:19 95:6 95:10 142:16,20
actively 44:16	advocates 130:12 137:11	analyst 65:22
activities 8:22 45:20	affect 16:21	analytics 20:13 30:13 150:2
activity 44:19	afford 116:6	analyze 28:8 30:9 112:8 144:10
actual 26:10 77:20	afterward 138:2	analyzed 26:12
acute 21:12	AGA 74:15 96:13 107:12 127:21 153:18 164:12	analyzing 61:6
acutely 30:3	agenda 8:12 88:13 122:21 128:15	angle 108:13
add 14:3 88:11 95:19 129:5 151:11,11 158:18 161:9 164:9 168:13	aggregate 38:15 79:13 119:2	annual 101:2
added 120:8	aggregated 38:9	annually 51:5,12 99:13
adding 113:18 122:20	aggregation 79:11,21	
addition 79:22	ago 26:4 31:10 54:14 121:14 159:9	
		anomalies 59:11,18,21
		anomaly 58:15,19 59:8
		answer 17:2 42:10 103:7 141:6 145:19 145:20
		answered 138:4
		answers 110:12
		anticipate 161:21 171:15
		anybody 80:16 129:18 151:16
		anyone's 121:22
		anyway 133:18 173:15
		AOPL 64:15
		API 64:12,14 67:1,2 70:10 73:15 74:1,2,8 74:14 75:17 78:14 91:10 97:5 120:2 127:19,19 132:17 145:17 164:12
		API1163 69:16
		APIs 74:19
		apologize 83:6
		appear 171:8
		applauded 132:19
		apples 61:15
		applicable 21:21 91:10
		application 43:1 69:22
		applied 93:3 117:18
		applies 92:16,17
		apply 163:1
		applying 97:14
		appoint 150:18
		appoints 150:16
		appreciate 32:17 38:17 39:8 40:17 62:17,20 64:1 65:10 69:13 71:13 79:9 91:8 173:15
		appreciated 37:13 78:20 91:2,3 159:8
		appreciative 126:1
		approach 22:11 23:21 69:16 75:15,17
		appropriate 15:1 88:10 91:11 93:8 127:11 136:16 164:17
		approval 85:11 86:6
		approve 82:19 159:3
		approved 86:5
		approving 85:13
		architecture 118:13 119:3 126:19
		architectures 141:11
		area 27:15 36:2 87:18 100:12 107:17 118:17 148:12,17
		areas 13:22 47:16,17

59:5 150:12
arenas 74:14
Arlington 1:12,12
arms 66:18
art 45:12
articulated 33:3
ASIAS 38:5 140:14,16
 140:17 141:6,10,12
 162:11 165:18
asking 170:13
ASMT 67:12
ASMTPQ 97:11
aspect 34:3,12 103:16
 140:1
aspects 10:6 14:20
 15:5,6,17 27:14 85:1
assessment 13:18 14:1
 31:16 78:22 90:21
 92:4 111:16
asset 142:10
assigned 70:2
assignment 134:16
assignments 9:11
 89:22 134:13
assist 64:15 65:3
assistance 67:2
Associate 2:2
associated 51:10 56:21
 110:21
association 96:14
 101:5 152:13
associations 51:4,5
 128:2
assuming 127:21
attempt 40:22 41:8
attend 152:13
attendance 120:22
audible 5:15 6:3,16 7:8
 7:14 32:21 38:22
 62:14 64:9 86:3,14,16
 113:4 128:20 129:1
 140:4,6 148:22 149:3
 149:5 150:21 151:18
 151:20 153:12,14
 158:9,11,13 165:8,10
 169:5,7,15 173:20,22
 174:2
audience 24:13 39:4
 64:10 70:16 102:10
 120:3 121:11 129:2
 132:13,14 134:1
 140:8 143:11 144:15
 149:4 151:21 153:15
 156:7,21 158:12
 164:15 165:11 174:1
audience's 156:20
audiences 137:20
audit 68:10 74:11

auditable 74:8
audited 69:1,4
audits 43:9
availability 84:3
available 8:1 17:17 28:9
 28:21 30:14,15,17
 56:4 117:14 173:12
average 138:7
avoid 54:20 118:15
awareness 26:15
always 9:1
axial 53:15
aye 86:1,12 169:3

B

back 18:20 23:18 39:16
 41:14 49:4 51:18
 65:18 66:4,10 68:12
 69:3 73:16 78:13 81:8
 81:14 86:20 87:7
 95:10 119:18 121:14
 124:17 130:14 131:19
 136:16 146:2 150:18
 161:2,3 169:20
 170:15 171:6
backbone 71:11
backed 70:20
background 80:21
 117:18
bad 19:17
ball 25:18
Ballroom 1:12
bandwidth 16:4
barriers 132:7 147:21
base 29:21 83:22 85:1
based 27:22 53:2 54:9
 57:20 60:22 68:5 70:4
 115:17,19 153:8
basic 173:5
basically 33:13 114:22
 126:16
basis 50:9 67:17 101:15
 110:4 125:17
battering 164:20
bear 101:8 105:13
beat 42:3
beginning 80:10 102:4
 102:20 124:7 155:12
 160:7
belaboring 159:13
belief 104:18
believe 68:22 97:19
 129:9 140:7 150:15
 168:15 175:1
benefit 24:13 50:6,21
 51:19 95:20 113:14
 136:17 143:16 145:4
benefits 139:7 157:8

best 22:19 27:19 28:8
 28:15 29:15,15,21
 40:22 41:8 50:4 51:7
 62:2 64:13,18 66:18
 67:13,16 68:11,20
 70:21,22 71:7,10,18
 74:7,7 100:5 105:10
 105:11 106:13,15
 107:9 123:21 126:12
 127:17 133:11,17
 152:20 159:12,13
 160:10,17 161:22
 162:3,4,7,8 163:1,10
 168:11
better 19:22 20:4,12,22
 22:2 34:5 50:1 75:15
 98:1 133:13,14
 137:15,16 152:22
beyond 15:8 39:12 60:6
 72:2 133:19
bias 61:3 106:8 107:7
big 115:20 116:7
 146:11 150:2 153:20
bigger 114:1,16
biggest 74:15 111:5
 143:16 145:4 146:13
Bigras 96:5
bio 84:9
bit 12:7 27:13 36:9
 42:13 46:12,15 63:18
 65:8 77:6 78:21 84:2
 105:4 119:22
black 66:1
blatant 34:11
blew 137:21
blocks 115:12 173:5
Blystone 1:16 6:8,9
 86:8 121:13 122:10
 134:3 137:7 151:9
 161:8
boat 134:8
Bob 115:18 118:5 126:9
 126:10 150:22
boil 147:2
boss 33:14 39:7,7
 143:15,15
box 66:1
BP 151:4
break 81:7 111:21
 112:15
breaking 59:16
brick 32:7
brief 8:21 10:15
briefly 94:15
brilliant 106:2
bring 30:1 34:16 65:22
 74:13 88:9 101:8
bringing 66:10 114:16

133:15 149:21
brings 106:18
broad 55:5 90:22 150:6
broader 12:14
broken 59:20
brought 19:11 66:11
 68:6,17 84:13 105:13
Brown 1:17 5:10,11
 65:6,6 70:13 72:21
 88:21 152:9
brush 55:5
Bryce 1:17 5:10 65:4,6
 69:13 72:20 75:12
 97:8 152:8
BSEE 98:13 100:8
 104:21 122:2 126:13
 138:20 162:12
Buchanan 1:17 5:20,20
 115:15,19 126:10,10
 151:1
bucket 12:16 56:18
buckets 12:11
Buckingham 5:19
build 90:15 92:13 97:11
 146:5 152:2 153:20
 159:21
building 97:13 115:12
 118:15 160:4 173:5
built 31:12 103:14
 107:4,8 116:10
bulldozing 112:11
bullet 119:10
bunch 102:18 171:6
burned 141:1
business 3:6 11:7,8
 15:5 17:8 73:22
 166:19
bylaws 85:19

C

call 3:2,2 4:11 58:10
 59:4 63:11 83:14 99:1
 119:5 134:22 135:2
 154:5
called 7:17 26:7 33:22
 58:22 59:1 109:10
 150:1,1 168:8
calls 115:8,10
Cameron 2:10 168:5
campaign 110:15
Canada 46:13
capabilities 55:6 57:19
capacity 107:5
capture 17:5 20:14
 43:16 90:6,11,16 94:9
 94:12 113:1 125:20
captured 104:17
capturing 20:14 106:2

112:14
care 8:11 85:12 170:22
 171:4
career 65:21
case 38:10 45:14 74:2
 75:22 91:12 120:1
 124:2 156:16
cases 28:19 57:16
 112:16
catastrophic 111:13
catch 24:10 95:11,15
 96:9 105:18 144:5
 165:13 166:12
catches 96:3,5
categorized 110:8
category 4:17
Catholic 5:19
caught 106:6
Causation 61:13
cause 61:14
caution 102:14
center 31:11,13,18
central 38:8
centralized 118:22
centric 20:19
certain 39:12,12 46:5
 61:4 110:20 144:2,6
certainly 13:20 41:21
 44:3 45:1 46:20 48:1
 50:11,15 52:4 54:12
 55:2 62:7 87:13 97:21
 108:1 109:12 112:7
 115:4,6 127:15
 139:12 149:14 151:12
 160:10 163:19 171:16
certified 108:10
cetera 14:2 50:4 53:3
 60:7
CFRs 74:1
chain 23:5
chairman 78:9 84:1,11
 90:5 93:12 111:20
chairs 84:17
challenges 3:7 9:3,20
 16:4 18:9 19:1 36:22
 41:6 51:7 52:12,18
 54:5 57:19 60:3 61:7
 72:6 91:19,21 132:20
 153:5
challenging 13:2 56:17
chance 24:15
change 22:21,22 34:19
 40:2 71:4 89:7,12
changed 66:9 77:21
changes 83:6
changing 32:17
characteristics 144:2
 144:22

charter 85:18
check 26:8 81:1 139:4
checklist 43:10
Cheryl 2:10 166:12
 170:19 171:5
Chorus 86:1,12 169:3
Chris 78:18 83:11 92:6
 92:6 97:16
Christie 2:9 7:19 8:12
 81:17,22 86:20 98:10
 103:9 109:15 118:7,9
 121:8 166:17 170:20
 171:5
Christie's 119:18
Christina 91:1
Christopher 2:6 5:21
clarification 60:1 69:14
 109:17 168:21
clarifier 164:10
clarify 150:15 161:20
classification 160:22
clear 13:3,4 14:15
 27:13 68:17 115:18
 115:20 157:15
clearly 74:8 78:2
 106:20 107:6 113:19
 113:21 138:5
click 138:8
Cliff 30:16
cloning 82:20
close 21:21 115:8,10
 124:18 141:21,21
closed 32:1
closest 23:9
Closing 3:19
cloud-based 141:13
clunky 153:21
cluster 59:4
clustering 58:22
co- 9:8
co-chair 3:11 84:4,12
 84:21 85:13 86:7
 155:1
co-chairman 93:12
coalesced 78:21 173:3
coalescing 78:2
Coalition 2:3
Coating 5:18
cognitive 17:1
cognizant 8:16 35:15
 119:21 120:8,15
 121:9 157:13,17
 167:8,12
coil 53:17
Cokes 140:15
collaborated 44:6
collaboration 44:7
 49:14,17 54:17 131:6

136:15 173:16
collaborative 41:22
collaboratively 47:15
 48:20
collect 30:7
collected 30:11 31:18
 37:2 130:5
collecting 31:3
combination 28:15
come 25:17 34:7 39:5
 40:17 48:3 60:21,21
 65:21 66:8 68:9 69:6
 74:10 80:8 83:11 87:3
 87:7 96:15 117:22
 120:18,20 124:2
 125:10,18 127:15
 132:4 135:10 138:10
 138:12 143:16,22
 149:18 154:15 169:20
 174:19
comes 44:17 116:18
 136:16 137:18
comfortable 112:15
 137:2 174:16
coming 42:10 55:18
 56:1 87:17 108:13
 116:22 144:8,9 153:1
 161:2
comment 8:11 18:5
 64:12 71:16 75:9
 88:21 89:1,2 102:9
 104:4,21 107:1 113:2
 116:13 117:8 127:19
 140:11 141:22 146:10
 149:20 163:16 164:5
 164:16
comments 8:8 19:13
 27:6 62:11 64:8 88:20
 89:19 95:22 103:8
 106:11 117:20 127:5
 132:13 140:3,9 145:7
 145:12 148:20 149:18
 149:19 151:17 152:12
 153:11 158:7 164:11
 164:21 165:7 173:19
Commerce 1:19
Commission 1:15,20
 2:4,5
Commissioner 84:6
Commissioners/State
 6:18
commit 169:12
committee 3:6,10,11,14
 4:16 9:5,9,14 11:14
 11:17,22 12:12 13:1,1
 13:6,9,21 14:4,7,10
 14:12,15,19 16:8
 17:21 30:17 35:17

42:9 70:17 75:4 76:22
 77:4 78:3 81:15 82:13
 83:4,10 84:4,14,17
 87:2 88:5,12,15 90:2
 90:9,17 97:1 98:6,17
 101:8,19 102:6
 103:17 104:6,8 107:2
 107:4 111:20 112:17
 115:1 120:6 123:10
 123:12,17 124:11,21
 125:4,11 128:4,12
 130:4 134:5 146:8
 147:15 152:3 161:11
 163:22 165:16 166:19
 169:20 171:14,17
 172:2,2,4,10 173:1
committee's 77:6 83:19
 153:8 172:13
committees 12:9
 105:19 124:9,9
 135:10 159:3 172:7
 172:14
common 61:5,15 96:15
 98:17 128:4
communicate 74:17
 144:4
communicating 22:3
communication 22:1
 40:9 77:14 131:19
 136:15
community 22:9 67:5
 131:1
companies 27:21 29:10
 39:13 46:1,2,7 51:13
 68:7 95:19 99:4,6,7
 110:20
company 21:4 22:19
 25:3 26:1,13,16,20
 39:13 49:9 65:19
 68:10
company-specific
 27:14
compare 30:4 61:16
 72:3 79:14
comparing 59:19
compendium 29:15
competency 97:15
complete 17:11 60:10
completely 71:13
complex 143:6
complexities 92:1
complexity 95:4
complicated 35:10
 118:16
component 24:19 47:9
 48:21 49:7 70:10
components 60:20
 107:13 145:3

compromise 60:10
concept 66:5 82:4
 141:10 156:3
concepts 91:19
concern 33:15 136:21
concerned 146:1
concerns 41:7 55:3
 60:5 109:10
conclusion 60:11,17,22
 61:9,19
conduct 32:3 96:20
conference 46:13 49:22
 50:4 145:16
conferences 46:11 50:8
 50:10
confidence 49:3,11
 53:9 68:12 160:5
confidential 42:1 132:7
confidentiality 47:8
confirmation 61:3
confirming 87:16
conflate 119:2
conflicts 120:16
congratulations 86:18
Congress 172:21,22
connected 15:17 61:11
 100:3
connection 36:7,10
cons 174:15
consensus 50:15,20
 104:2
conservative 58:22
consider 16:18 55:9
 75:3,18 82:5 88:8
 90:12 101:19,21
 108:3 119:8 123:8,20
 125:8 138:17 146:6
 150:6 154:19
consideration 90:16
 97:1 125:7 149:10,15
 150:13 168:14 171:20
considerations 41:22
 42:2 58:3 62:7
considered 52:18 53:12
 73:10
considering 13:9
consistency 130:5
consistent 60:9,15
 110:11
consistently 108:21
 120:18
constantly 121:17
constraints 93:3
construction 111:6
 112:11,19,20 144:15
consultant 139:6
Consultants 1:21
content 64:13

CONTENTS 3:1
context 19:10,14 20:3,7
 20:12 25:19 36:19
 37:1 51:3 52:10 91:20
 102:4 105:5 115:1
 134:18 157:19 162:14
contexts 149:14
continue 11:10 107:3
 135:10
continuing 44:7
continuity 84:3
continuous 26:8 54:9
contractor 173:10
control 50:11 76:18
conversation 10:16
 11:15 15:4 16:3 128:9
cool 33:8
core 114:2 136:20
 170:15,20,20 171:3
 174:12
corollary 28:5
correct 124:18
correctly 40:5
correlation 61:13,14
corrosion 47:21,22
 50:10 59:5 92:10
Cote 1:18 5:5,6 27:8
 28:14,18 76:4 85:15
 86:10 90:13 105:22
 111:19
Council 44:12
counsel 171:5
count 16:5 43:17 83:20
counterparts 85:2
couple 11:14 19:7
 27:18 29:2 54:22 76:4
 103:13 128:14 129:5
 129:14 132:2 137:8
course 72:1 77:6
cover 134:10
covered 66:21 165:15
 173:9
covers 103:15
crack 30:11
cracking 47:21,22
 92:10
Credit 1:18 5:12,13
 37:12 160:15,16
create 31:6 116:15
 143:6
created 116:21
credible 60:9
credit 25:21 44:21
critical 58:6,18 61:21
 63:7
crowd 90:10
cultural 21:13 34:13
culture 21:15 26:3 33:8

34:5,7,19 35:6 39:18
 40:2 49:9
curious 33:6,11
current 20:5 53:20,20
 62:19 116:22
currently 7:16
curve 76:11 80:5,6,7
cyber 113:10 160:21
 170:6
cycle 99:8

D

D.C 87:18
da 20:19 79:4,19 97:17
 111:6,6,6,6
daily 67:17
Dan 1:18 5:5 19:11 27:7
 29:13 30:21 76:3
 90:13 94:1 105:21
 154:6 157:22
Dan's 92:13
data-sharing 14:13
database 30:7,9,12
 38:8 54:8 61:8
date 87:9,9,14,17 89:6
dated 54:10
dates 89:14
David 15:21
day 4:4 8:13,19 9:17
 19:22,22 35:20 58:2
 73:22,22 74:16 89:10
 136:10 139:17 140:12
 174:17
day-and-a- 173:16
days 73:18 129:14
 132:2 150:2
days' 120:11
deal 42:20 107:5 110:9
 111:2 142:9
dealing 76:17 105:1
 115:13
deals 112:4
dealt 157:11
debate 160:11
December 140:13
decides 123:17
decision 129:11 131:18
 131:21 155:15
decisions 131:1
deep 59:9
deeper 10:10 122:1
 167:9
deeply 100:8
defect 31:20 59:3
defects 31:22
Defense 7:13
define 97:22 98:2,6
 100:17 101:9,15

117:13 125:2 126:21
 127:13
defines 101:17
defining 102:13 113:20
 125:8
definitely 36:8,10
 108:13 131:12
deliberate 24:4,15,18
 25:12 26:21 29:5
deliberation 29:8
deliberations 171:16
deliverable 173:6
delivery 112:1,1,18
Deng 1:19 6:13,14
 62:16 129:9 130:8
 147:18,18
density 53:13 57:15
DEPARTMENT 1:1
department's 87:12
Depending 48:10 83:18
deploy 35:19
deployed 35:8,22
deployment 21:18
depth 59:14
Deputy 10:18
derive 61:9 76:9
described 27:20 77:2
 96:13 163:18
describing 22:3 106:12
descriptions 13:5
design 35:19 53:11
 55:10 141:18 143:5
designated 2:9 9:6
 82:17
designed 55:6
designing 113:1
designs 52:22 53:2
 63:10
detail 10:6 30:19 76:11
 80:15
detailed 76:16 77:1,7
 106:7,11
details 31:15 144:5,7
 170:10
determine 128:5
devalues 23:19
develop 35:19 44:8
 46:6 48:4 67:1,12
 98:17 100:6 137:17
 139:3 142:2 162:16
 163:22 165:3
developed 31:10 33:7
 41:14 55:15,16 99:9
 110:12 117:13 139:16
developing 33:13 48:16
 50:20 54:12 66:18
 73:17 96:11 99:18
 100:20 109:6

development 31:10
 34:13 41:17 44:5
 46:16 54:17 56:21
 64:5 96:16 97:15 98:3
 104:14 163:17 168:9
developmental 62:2
develops 48:6
deviation 58:10
DFO 3:16 83:17
DFOs 83:9 85:9,11,14
 85:22 155:1
dialog 39:8
dialogue 144:16
Diane 1:12,15 6:18
dictates 32:13
Diet 140:15
difference 55:2 77:13
 161:21 174:20,21
differences 55:11 56:13
 56:14,15 75:18
different 4:13 13:13,13
 20:15 21:1 27:18
 32:13 53:6,16 54:14
 55:13 57:7,13,13 63:4
 80:8 85:2 94:13
 102:18 104:3 105:4
 108:13 110:19 113:10
 115:9 120:16 125:3
 125:21 138:1 140:16
 141:5 144:16,20
 157:12 167:3
difficult 19:3 39:14
 166:2
difficulties 35:13
dig 41:5,10 42:12,20
 43:15,16,20 46:22
 49:12 63:13
digs 48:9,10,16 79:7
direct 14:1 78:22 92:4
direction 19:5 104:3
directions 57:16
directly 11:19 51:10
 127:11
director 40:20 100:11
disagreeing 174:16
disappears 142:14
disappointed 129:7
disclosure 12:5
discover 21:16 122:3
discovery 77:20 98:16
discrete 95:2 104:20,22
 105:7 125:19
discuss 9:12,16 40:21
 41:2 45:11 51:7 92:19
 138:19
discussed 12:5 87:22
 100:13,16 109:4
discussing 10:1,5

discussion 11:12 12:10
 14:9,21 15:20 18:19
 29:8 36:3 75:8 76:8
 81:5 106:3 122:17
 123:10 135:15 136:11
 137:12 158:18 160:11
 167:2 171:19
discussion's 45:18
discussions 9:19 12:20
 41:11 96:1 171:9
disparate 119:1
dispersed 160:19
disposal 42:21
disproportionate 56:10
disregard 34:11
distinction 82:8 114:8
 166:4
distribution 14:2
 107:13,19 113:10
district 39:12
ditch 92:2
dive 122:1 167:9
Diversity 84:18
docket 8:2,3
Doctor 147:17 150:20
documentation 43:13
documented 116:16
documents 67:16
doing 11:1 12:22 13:1
 13:21 19:19 20:13,15
 22:7 23:14 28:7 36:11
 44:22 45:19 46:1,8
 49:10 54:20 62:1 72:7
 108:11 111:9 114:2
 116:14 117:8 124:3
 126:5 129:20 133:18
 135:9 148:8 158:4
 160:4 162:7
domain 74:21
domains 105:3
door 122:19
DOT 150:15
dovetail 126:12,14
downstream 110:6
Dr 6:10,13 8:18 10:14
 82:2,22 83:2 86:21
 103:10 109:16 123:7
 129:9 130:8 147:18
 171:7
dramatically 54:14
draw 93:15 160:21
Drew 42:14
drill 27:13
drilling 155:8
drive 137:4
driving 112:10
drop 84:8 110:21 117:5
dropout 102:18

dropped 110:15,16,18
 110:22
due 73:14 107:21
duplicate 77:12
dynamic 71:3
dynamics 155:21

E

earlier 17:13 49:21
 52:15 127:19 152:12
 164:11
early 65:21 66:9
easier 85:6
easiest 110:9
easy 34:18,19 35:3
 160:1
ECDA 97:19
echo 44:12 57:22 127:6
 138:18 140:14
eddy 53:20,20
edit 115:1
educate 47:15
education 20:16
educator 148:1
Edwards 1:19 6:19,20
 84:6,7 86:7
effect 38:15 61:14
effective 76:21 77:17
 107:14 113:18,19
 114:18 157:8
efficient 41:15
effort 14:20 39:20 46:20
 51:11
efforts 10:20 12:21
 44:13,15 45:4 49:16
 50:12 51:2 82:15
 87:11 146:6 171:19
eGov 8:2
eight 42:18
eighth 122:14
either 34:11 35:3 48:6
 119:2 172:1
element 47:14
elevated 26:19
email 87:16 90:7 172:10
EMAT 68:1 92:8
embrace 127:7
emerge 16:8
emerged 12:11
emerging 45:11 54:4
emphasis 51:1 91:15
emphasize 43:19 44:15
emphasized 98:19
employ 69:16
employee 139:7
enables 68:7
enacting 122:18
encourage 105:5

encouraging 41:17
energy 1:16 9:3 16:11
 18:15 163:15
enforcement 166:5
engage 132:17 135:6
 171:18
engaged 24:6 121:6
engagement 24:7 94:6
engaging 82:6
engineer 153:1
engineering 46:2 99:6
enhance 152:21
enhanced 20:10 41:18
 49:10
ensure 72:15
entire 23:12
entities 7:12 149:9
entity 165:19
environment 131:2
 141:13 142:8 143:3
 166:4,8
environmental 7:13
 130:15
envision 28:6,14 109:5
equally 107:14
equation 34:3
equivalent 147:7,8
Eric 1:16 5:7 7:7 18:10
 18:11,15 27:8 36:18
 37:12 40:4 57:22 64:1
 76:7 90:14 91:17,20
 92:12,20 94:1 144:4
 163:14 168:8
Eric's 39:10 105:18
Erin 153:17 154:10
especially 9:20 32:17
 85:4 153:22 174:5
essential 53:4 57:14
 73:9 77:2 91:22
 142:12
establish 59:11 70:7
 121:21 161:12,16
established 26:5 30:7,8
estimate 36:21
et 14:2 50:4 53:3 60:7
evaluate 80:2
evaluated 58:19
evaluation 92:3 95:6
evening 90:8
event 26:9
events 26:7 104:22
 106:15 133:8
eventually 82:4 142:19
everybody 110:15
 147:21
everybody's 39:22 40:1
evolution 141:6,12
 159:17

evolutionary 159:17
evolved 141:10
exactly 29:14 65:9
 71:12 73:8 77:12
 138:9 140:14 163:3,4
 163:7
examination 59:15
examinations 43:8
example 28:7,9 47:19
 58:21 59:6 92:7 99:16
 116:19 126:4 153:2
examples 53:11 55:11
 132:17 133:2
excavation 112:12,12
excellence 28:11
excellent 27:9 85:7
 109:13 115:2,21
 126:3 133:1
exchange 41:18,21
 51:11 52:5 58:16 74:6
 145:17
exchangeably 63:2
exchanges 65:1 90:7
exchanging 62:2
exclusively 45:7
excruciating 30:19
executing 20:22
execution 20:17 112:6
 112:19
executive 100:10
exercise 160:1
exercises 102:16
exist 29:20
existing 48:8 49:14
 54:7 132:7 145:13
exists 37:1
expand 39:12
expecting 70:12 110:2
expedited 93:5
experience 28:1 74:19
 91:7 116:17 117:1,4
 139:5 149:22
experienced 54:16,18
experiences 116:16
expert 152:17
expertise 3:13 14:9
 47:16,20 48:2 112:16
 147:14
explained 65:8
explicit 41:9 42:6
exploit 73:5
extends 15:8
extensive 41:11 46:18
extent 10:2 113:13,16
 114:9 134:14 157:9
extract 63:20
Exxon 151:4

F

FAA 38:5 98:12 100:8
 104:20,21 120:1
 122:2 126:13 138:20
 139:15 156:16 157:10
 162:11 174:5
face 16:4
faced 73:2
facilitate 32:7 36:1
Facilities 5:2
facing 140:17
fact 16:5 29:1 50:1
 65:14,17 69:17 102:9
 103:14 119:21 120:9
 121:9 122:7 137:2
 152:4 157:13,17
 167:8
factor 37:3 115:9
factors 115:5
facts 17:13
fail 114:2
failures 112:6 144:10
fair 163:6
fairly 22:6 54:10
fairway 106:6
fall 108:17,22 111:5
 145:14
falls 168:18
families 131:2
fantastic 94:18
far 72:14 74:17 115:12
 120:9 126:13
Farag 5:14
fashion 22:8
favor 85:21 86:11 169:2
fear 137:4
features 30:12
February 99:13
federal 2:9 9:6 11:13
 82:17 154:16
feedback 48:11 79:8
 131:14
feel 75:11 81:9 122:1
 137:2 156:8 161:15
feels 161:14
fewer 139:9
field 30:5 35:9,11 43:9
 59:10,16 110:9
fifth 101:11
figure 90:1 102:12
 111:8 119:15 144:19
 148:14 155:12
figuring 154:12 156:6
filling 123:5
final 83:19 102:14
finally 43:19 49:1
find 96:4
finding 118:1 142:10

findings 70:5 100:6
 140:19 142:3
fine 129:20 155:5
finer 151:10
firms 99:6
first 4:11 5:1 27:8 37:20
 67:14 73:16 78:11
 82:2 85:9 90:11,20
 91:2 96:6 104:17
 105:7,22 109:6
 120:12 128:15 139:17
 140:12 157:22 158:2
 166:17 168:7 173:9
fit 104:15 111:10,14
 119:16 125:15 127:11
 128:5 130:15 150:3
fits 170:16
five 71:8 81:7
five-year 17:14
flag 146:14
flat 133:4,6
flesh 83:18 135:22
fleshing 73:18
flexibility 71:6
flexible 104:7
flight 141:2
flux 57:15
focus 10:4,22 12:21
 13:7,18,19 14:3,19
 17:2,11 19:7 24:1
 27:2 34:4 39:18 46:3
 56:6,10 61:10 63:14
 75:21 77:3 81:16,19
 89:10,22 93:14 105:6
 114:8 123:18 128:13
 155:7,22 156:21
 165:2,4 172:5
focused 8:14 12:12
 33:11 34:14 95:9
 96:11 135:12 136:3
 164:19
focuses 31:15
focusing 18:12 76:8
 139:13
FOIA 98:14
fold 166:20
folks 4:13 8:5 10:4,7
 40:10 124:1 136:12
 136:16 137:2 140:8
 144:6,6,15 156:17
 169:16 174:10
follow 63:19 174:4
follow-up 109:16
followed 12:15 138:2
following 9:12 43:11
food 123:10 124:20
 125:3 135:5
foot 109:22

footprint 53:13
Fore 2:15 40:16,19
 69:12,13 72:19 75:10
 75:12 78:16
foremost 128:15
forensic 142:21 149:20
 150:9
forgot 171:3
form 18:22 29:7,9,13
 128:1,12
formal 89:8 158:4 167:4
 168:3
formalized 101:2,5
 109:9
formalizing 117:22
formally 85:20 121:3
 155:16
format 112:22
formation 88:16 167:3
formats 27:18
forming 12:7
forms 32:13
forth 34:7 95:11
forthcoming 128:16
forum 52:5 54:20 150:5
 150:5
forward 8:15 25:18
 44:22 48:22 56:5
 71:11 82:16 83:17
 84:13 128:13 138:20
 139:18,21 158:5
 159:2 173:7,14 174:7
found 47:4,12 49:5
 117:1,2,3
foundation 98:22 100:9
 117:16 119:4
four 37:6 110:19 122:15
 152:15 153:3 172:8,8
fourth 100:12 168:13
framed 106:22
framework 19:1 22:10
 22:13 24:19 33:3
 37:15 68:3 106:1
 107:4 114:22 116:9
 116:11 155:18 165:16
 170:5
frankly 146:12
free 75:11
FRIDAY 1:9
front 16:13 122:11
fruit 110:10 142:18
fuel 31:4 141:1,3
full 49:3 120:10 146:7
fully 77:16
function 71:22 96:18
Fund 2:1 7:13
fundamental 60:8
 147:2

funding 101:12,16
125:16,18 126:15
furnish 116:10
further 23:19 55:8,15
73:17 171:17
future 3:17 9:13 11:5,9
68:2 137:5 148:12,17

G

Gallery 1:11
gap 17:15 21:19,19
gaps 20:5 21:22 147:22
gas 1:18,18 39:14 51:5
74:15 84:17 92:16
96:14 101:4 102:16
112:19 151:2
gassing 112:2
gather 43:15 61:1
GE 72:9
general 6:4 41:7 60:5
61:2 77:8 104:11
109:20 112:11
generally 12:14
generation 148:6
gentleman 147:20
geographically 160:19
Georgia 2:5
geospatial 15:3,4
geospatially 15:17
getting 20:4,12,22
23:11 39:13,13,18,18
49:12 80:9 89:5 95:9
96:12 123:3 128:11
130:20 136:20 155:9
156:5 170:5 171:9
GIS 15:10 16:1 142:6
give 10:15 58:21 86:20
87:8 132:9 135:20
144:1 150:17 154:17
given 42:15 56:6 59:4
67:22
gives 135:5
giving 110:1 137:22
143:9
glad 100:2,11
globally 52:21
goal 61:12 113:20
goals 90:2 102:11
161:13 168:15
God 122:13
golf 106:5
gotten 46:18 72:18
governance 128:9
155:11
government 15:19
139:6 155:15 165:19
GPAC 103:5
grade 43:5

granted 108:8 133:7,9
granularity 140:18
grapple 152:18
greater 55:22 107:18
greatly 133:18
GRI 39:17
ground 45:16 114:18
128:4
ground-level 110:3
group 1:5,11,17 2:6 4:6
4:12 12:3 16:19 63:17
65:7 67:1 78:19 90:3
98:4 100:6 101:17
103:4,22 105:8,14
120:6,7 121:15,20
123:20,22 124:3,5
143:16 144:3,18
145:5 147:16 148:16
149:12 152:5 156:11
165:17 170:15 174:11
groups 6:8 105:19
149:8 152:14 165:22
grow 143:2
grown 49:13
guarantee 125:1
guard 23:16
guess 33:13 71:16
78:13 85:8 106:11
107:1 111:19 112:13
113:6 114:20 118:10
119:4 154:11 160:17
161:2
guidance 13:4
guided 92:7

H

half 59:12 74:17 173:17
hall 53:17
hampering 136:11
hand 24:20,20 76:10
171:13,14
handling 12:6 108:22
happen 40:9 73:20 83:3
106:17 111:13 136:12
happened 104:1 115:8
138:1 146:17
happening 133:3
146:19
happens 19:18,18 50:1
72:4 136:15
happy 64:15 65:3 88:10
131:5 159:7
hard 10:12 35:9 42:4
81:6 89:10 118:15
134:2 146:3 167:14
hardware 67:9
HARRC 35:5
hazard 35:5 108:16

111:15 142:1,5
hazardous 1:2 92:17
hazards 45:16 109:19
110:21 111:5,6
headed 38:13
headlines 107:21
heads 106:16
health 2:1 108:9
hear 4:7 62:22 66:4
85:14 88:17 129:18
129:19 131:6 135:4
138:21 139:1 145:16
157:10
heard 16:8 33:15 77:16
82:16 90:1 95:22
115:22 125:5 127:22
129:21 137:12 139:16
146:1 174:8
hearing 80:20 134:21
167:1
heart 89:4
heck 147:9
Heidi 64:11 127:18
held 142:14
hello 4:3 129:15
help 14:12 18:1 40:7
93:13,15 100:11
104:7 105:15 122:4
124:6 134:13 135:22
135:22 136:5 156:17
158:15 172:4 173:11
174:6
helped 95:3 114:11
helpful 4:15 85:3
138:14 147:13 154:4
157:2,4,10 166:10,15
helping 40:2 91:18
114:4 173:12
helps 91:7 119:17
121:4 135:15 167:11
Hereth 1:20 6:5,6 36:16
36:17 85:16 90:4
93:20,22 104:16
109:3 117:10 125:12
149:7 152:1 159:7
162:2,11,20,22 163:6
163:9 168:2,5
hesitant 37:20 122:1
hey 69:13 104:2
hi 64:11 108:8 129:3
160:15 165:12
high 22:14,15 23:22
26:17 27:3 37:6 43:5
43:6 64:1 67:19 78:4
140:18 144:18
high-consequence
133:8
higher 26:20

highest 27:3 76:9
highlight 10:15 43:14
49:15 51:5,9 52:17
65:11 69:18
highlighted 12:16
13:19 14:11 15:7
Hilton 1:12
history 133:4
hit 33:20 42:4 114:12
hitting 79:11
Hoffman 100:10
hold 141:15,21
holds 142:10
hole 116:20
holistic 15:10 17:12
Holly 7:12
homework 9:11 88:18
89:21 116:14 134:5
134:13,16 135:20
honest 146:19
honestly 118:14
hope 24:17 95:3 172:11
173:2
hopefully 87:6
hoping 78:2
hosted 29:11
hours 93:20 137:13
house 30:9 116:10,11
117:5 118:11 119:3
housing 126:13
Houston 31:11
Howard 10:19
human 37:3 112:5,5,6
115:5,9
HUNG 2:9
hybrid 103:19
hydro 20:19 92:5
hydrocarbon 102:17
hygienist 108:10
hypothesis 61:4

I

i.e 11:22 20:11
ICDA 97:20
idea 96:1 138:15 148:5
152:10
ideas 94:17 156:2
157:21
identification 20:4
23:17 111:16
identifications 108:17
identified 20:6 26:11,19
78:1 173:5
identify 113:21 134:17
159:2 166:1
identifying 104:13
108:20 130:2
ILI 13:17 15:8 20:19

28:7 30:4 31:3,17,21
 33:11 41:5,10 42:11
 42:16,20 43:16,21,22
 44:8 46:20 47:7,13
 48:1,11 49:2 52:7,11
 52:11,20 53:5,7,22
 55:8,12 56:18 57:8
 58:5,7 59:7 60:2,6
 61:22 63:9,13 65:15
 66:13 67:2,13 68:4
 79:3,16,19 92:2 95:13
 95:16,17 97:13 147:5
 147:6,7,8
ILI's 58:11
ILIPQ 67:13
ILIs 9:21
Illinois 1:19
illuminating 122:6
IM 115:21
IM/ILI/ 3:7
imbed 108:6
IMP 66:11 73:14 74:7
impact 133:17
importance 36:19
 52:16
important 13:7 37:4,17
 39:19 53:5 54:1 55:10
 60:18 61:20 85:19
 90:15 94:4 96:22 97:6
 98:20 102:20 109:4
 119:9 123:17 129:8
 130:2,11,18 131:4
 134:17 136:1 140:1
 141:9 148:13 157:18
 160:6 167:16,21
 169:22 170:4,6,11
 174:4,10,22
impossible 83:1
impressed 93:11
improve 11:11 34:5,6
 94:17 98:1 145:1
improved 25:2,3,14
 26:14
improvement 1:20
 22:18 26:9 52:6 54:9
improvements 19:16
 21:13,14,18 45:2
 78:22 100:17 101:7
improving 52:11 54:8
 133:6
in- 135:14
in-ditch 43:8
in-line 42:12
inaccurate 60:11,17
inch 59:12
incident 19:18 21:6,8
 26:10 91:12 106:20
 146:16

incidents 12:19 17:13
 51:16 64:21 80:1
 92:14,15 107:18
 131:3 133:5,7 146:15
include 31:19 93:9
 125:5 138:18
including 172:8
incorporate 103:1
increase 14:4 22:18
 74:5
indicated 8:20
indirect 105:1
individual 34:15 59:5
 130:22 141:2
individually 40:6
individuals 67:11
industrial 108:10
 112:10,21
industries 1:17 163:11
industry 4:22 6:4 14:8
 17:17 19:19 21:10
 23:12 28:3,21 29:20
 29:21,21 35:22 45:5,6
 45:15,21 46:10 49:14
 49:18 50:13,22 66:6
 66:17,18 67:19 68:9
 70:9 71:3 75:1 77:11
 79:1,16 80:4 92:22
 97:7 99:12 102:18
 106:16 107:9,22
 110:14,20 112:3
 124:1 130:21 131:6,8
 131:8,12,20 132:8,18
 137:14 139:6 142:9
 146:1,3 152:12 153:4
 162:13 165:19
inferring 61:17
influence 123:11
Info 145:17
inform 13:6 16:17
 123:21 124:12 171:17
information-sharing
 1:4 4:5 10:20
informed 103:11
infrastructure 11:5,6,7
 112:20 124:20 125:7
 125:14 127:14
INGAA 39:8 51:10
 66:10,11 74:14 98:22
 100:9 117:16 127:20
 143:15 144:14 164:12
INGAAs 74:19
inherently 75:17,20
initial 13:7 143:5
initially 22:15 149:17
initiated 30:2 45:6,8
 123:15
initiative 26:3 33:7,10

33:22 44:1
initiatives 64:19 99:10
 164:12
injury 34:21
innovative 46:6
input 15:9 88:13 156:22
inputs 71:19
inquiry 141:16
insight 117:21
inspection 5:10 6:1
 42:12
inspections 66:8
 140:20
Inspectors 6:22
installation 112:1
instance 101:19
instances 91:11 96:18
instant 133:4
instituted 26:2
institution 148:2
institutions 6:12 148:6
instruments 164:13
insurance 99:7
integrated 22:8 130:6
integration 16:5,10,10
 78:7
integrity 15:5 17:1,11
 19:15 20:18,20 40:20
 115:21
intelligence 17:8
intended 69:17 113:15
 114:1 155:19
intent 31:11 34:2 44:14
 60:14,14,16 114:16
 136:22 157:3,5
intention 134:7
interaction 47:9,11,12
 47:18 48:20 52:16
 58:6,18 59:1,2 60:1
 61:1 79:3,4
interactive 76:16
interacts 59:3
interchangeability
 102:17
interest 16:8 109:18
 118:17 172:13
interested 120:20
 130:19
interesting 67:21 99:15
 142:7
interests 120:3
interfaces 56:14 138:1
interference 116:19,22
 129:22
internal 33:6,11 42:22
internally 12:17
international 2:6 44:13
 49:21 50:9

introduce 8:6 9:6 83:5
 83:9,21 84:6,8 86:22
introduced 103:15
invalid 60:17
inventory 32:10
investigation 138:3
invitation 87:15
invite 87:14 113:2
 145:18 164:16 172:1
inviting 146:6
invoke 67:17 68:14
invoked 67:12
involved 29:10 50:18
 50:19 99:21 115:10
 139:7
involvement 37:2 160:2
IPC 46:13
irrelevancy 61:10
issue 28:22 34:16 72:6
 114:2 116:19 136:20
 137:6 147:11 155:6
 170:21 171:3
issues 14:13,14 21:16
 76:17 99:11,19 107:6
 107:21 110:6 111:3
 111:12,15 112:5
 157:11 166:1 170:7
item 3:19 17:21 128:15
 134:15,16 160:6
items 9:17 26:13,14
 87:7 170:18
iterative 48:5,18 104:5
 104:6

J

Jason 1:18 5:12 37:11
 100:10 160:13,15
 161:9
Jensen 1:22 4:9 5:2,3
 127:3,4 164:8,9
job 22:3 40:7 90:13
 91:17,18 97:8 98:10
 106:2 115:2,21 116:2
 150:10 162:6
Joe 2:4 6:22
John 2:2 7:5 102:9
joining 4:4 8:19 83:12
joint 45:5,15 50:13
 102:18 165:18
Jones 2:1 7:9,10 78:12
 78:17 108:8 109:21
 161:19 162:10,18,21
 163:3,7 168:22
journey 161:5
jumping 113:7
JUNE 1:9

K

Kate 1:16 6:8 118:7,8
121:7,12 122:10
123:7 126:1 127:6
132:13,13 134:1
140:10 147:19 151:8
156:19 160:13 161:7
Kate's 152:2 159:8
keep 18:12 89:17 92:11
94:4 113:8,11 131:10
134:2 137:7 141:20
170:6
keeping 155:11,17
156:10 157:2
keeps 103:16
Keller 6:15 64:11,11
127:18
key 8:22 10:15 11:14
15:15 16:6,22 24:19
37:7 47:5,8,14,17
48:21 49:6 64:19
79:12 92:20 93:6 94:6
98:18 101:6 123:20
135:20 169:18,21
170:1,7,12
keys 69:21 77:15
Kieba 145:10,10
Kinder 2:15 9:4 40:19
41:3 42:14 43:20 44:2
45:22 46:18 47:3 68:7
69:16
kinds 97:14 102:16
141:17 144:7
knowing 10:12 134:18
174:17
knowledge 17:6 22:18
23:1,5 24:2,10 29:21
35:18 64:3,4
known 20:11 35:9
106:19 117:7
knows 139:9
Kurilla 153:18

L

Labor 7:4
Laborers' 2:1
lag 82:11
laid 118:20
Lamont 6:2
landed 141:4
largely 104:16
laser 43:2
lastly 22:1
lately 108:12
latest 45:12 78:16
Laughter 82:21 93:19
93:21 169:10
law 99:6
lawyers 93:13

lay 94:16 105:8 118:13
leading 117:2
leads 29:16
learn 14:7 17:5 21:5,7
80:8 92:21 93:2,4
95:5,15 102:19,21
104:6 117:7 122:20
122:22 124:3 126:12
132:5 137:4 144:17
146:21 147:3,9 153:4
159:14 162:9,12,12
163:11
learned 20:17 23:10
25:1 51:12,14,16 71:9
74:13 80:1 91:12
94:19 99:2,3,14
104:17 105:14 108:6
109:7 114:6,7 115:6
116:3 117:14,17
123:2,19 124:3
127:18 129:13 132:18
136:6 153:7 159:12
159:20 160:4,9,17
161:4,21 162:15
163:2,16,20 164:10
learning 17:3 21:4
22:16 26:3,18 27:4,22
28:20 63:12,20 77:8
77:13 94:22 106:14
131:15,19
learnings 27:22 28:6
64:21 76:15,21 77:3
78:4 90:20 91:16
92:14 93:6 95:1,9,21
95:21 96:2,12,15 98:8
100:4,18 101:6,16
105:6,12 106:12,12
106:15 117:19 125:17
125:20,21 126:5,7
162:16
learns 92:22,22
leave 156:1 170:17
leaving 122:19 143:5
left 23:20 167:13
legacy 142:13
legal 14:12 93:2,10,16
98:15 101:12 125:16
legally 155:22
legislation 30:4
Leif 1:22 5:2 127:3
129:4 164:8
length 59:4
lessons 20:16 51:12,14
51:16 71:9 74:13
79:22 91:12 94:19
99:1,3,13 104:17
105:14 108:6 109:7
114:5,6 115:6,7 116:3

117:14,16 118:1,2
123:2,19 124:3
127:18 132:18 133:11
136:6 153:6 159:12
159:20 160:4,9,17
161:4,21 162:15
163:1,16,20 164:10
let's 16:12 83:5 87:6,6
102:11 124:16 146:19
level 22:19 26:20 27:10
43:6,6 56:6,11 57:21
67:20 114:18
levels 141:5
leverage 14:7 15:12
17:8 43:18 44:3,22
45:3 49:2,20 50:5,21
51:2,8,18 53:6 54:2
62:3 132:20 133:11
leveraging 15:13 50:12
52:13 70:9
liaison 174:5
liberty 18:16
library 28:11
lie 119:5
life 1:17 99:8 156:11
lifetime 83:3
light 85:5
limitations 113:22
limited 147:1
line 84:8 154:2
link 76:5 127:11 142:3
liquid 102:17
liquids 39:14 92:17
list 4:12 54:19 88:11
161:10
listened 99:16 127:5
listening 74:19 129:4
literally 106:17
little 36:9 42:13 46:12
46:15 57:4,6,10 63:5
63:18 76:11 78:21
84:2 105:4 116:20
119:22 126:22 146:1
live 4:9
loading 16:14
local 130:22 131:21
location 58:18
logistically 155:22
Logistics 1:22
long 55:21 59:12 141:2
141:8
longer 81:4 105:9
look 9:14 12:8 13:13,20
13:22 15:16 17:10
19:5 22:13 66:15,19
67:19 70:19,22 89:15
91:5 97:9,13 104:13
109:22 114:6 115:2

117:22 119:9 124:22
128:4 132:20 133:10
133:12,19 134:18
149:11 150:8 156:15
159:1 162:7 167:1
168:15 173:8
looked 62:8 155:2
162:14
looking 23:12 36:20
45:17 61:3 62:7 85:8
89:6,12,21 96:7 109:1
113:7,13 114:10,14
120:18 126:17 136:14
138:15 152:15 155:10
155:18 156:2,22
157:20 158:2 160:18
168:2 174:7
looks 73:20 83:20
124:7,12 146:18
looms 13:15
loop 32:1,1
lose 88:4 131:9 142:15
154:6 169:18 172:19
lost 154:7
lot 15:20 21:14,15 22:5
22:20 23:7 32:12
43:15 44:19,20 45:4
45:20 46:1 49:20
50:16 51:21 56:15
57:2 62:1,4 63:1,5
65:15,16 66:9 68:17
79:2 80:11 99:19
100:1 101:13 104:22
105:1 107:8 108:11
108:11,12 121:2
124:21 128:10 129:13
134:12,21 135:14
137:12 142:15,18
143:4,19 145:13
146:10,11,14,22,22
147:3,9 153:4 155:7
155:20 157:15 167:1
171:8 174:6

love 95:12 102:2
low 133:7
low- 133:7
low-hanging 110:10
142:18
LPAC 103:4

M

MacNEILL 2:2 7:5,6
madam 78:9 90:4
111:20
mail 66:3
main 130:1
maintained 142:13
major 50:8,14 51:4

66:12
majority 89:13 155:4
makers 131:21
makeup 159:1
making 17:17 25:5
 70:11 82:4 91:2 103:5
 103:6 114:14 120:19
 121:5 122:16 131:19
 132:8 136:14 167:14
 170:21 173:1
manage 26:6
managed 37:22
management 3:10 9:5
 15:6 17:1,11,21 19:15
 20:18,20 26:6 35:12
 35:21 39:22 45:16
 81:16 88:15 102:2
 103:2,16 115:22
 145:2 152:4
managing 105:4
mandate 13:20 30:4
 44:17 51:3 103:18
 107:7
mandatory 143:20
manifest 21:11
manifested 25:2
map 135:18 142:21
 143:1 156:7,8 167:11
 167:21
mapping 174:6
Mark 1:20 2:6 5:16 6:4
 17:22 18:4 19:13 36:5
 36:15,17 39:1 81:19
 89:20 103:10 105:22
 111:21 117:9 118:4,6
 118:8 122:8 124:17
 125:12 127:10 148:3
 149:6 151:10,22
 159:6 160:16 161:8
 161:19 163:18 168:1
 169:13
Mark's 115:1 167:5
market 55:17,18,21
 56:2,4 74:21 75:4,5
marketing 144:3 152:10
marketing/messagin...
 153:9
marry 48:2
MATERIALS 1:2
matrix 108:18
matter 68:2 70:1,2,3
 81:11 93:7 157:4
 175:3
mature 79:3
maturities 55:13
maturity 55:17,22 56:11
 56:21 57:21
Max 145:10

Max' 152:6
maximum 106:18
Mayberry 2:2 4:20,21
 11:3 33:2,5,18 36:4
 71:15 75:11 83:1
 114:20 132:15 154:14
 158:17 172:17
MAYE 1:19
McLaren 83:12 92:7
McMillan 10:19
mean 24:5 28:15 29:6
 29:17 30:6,14 32:12
 37:7 79:18 94:11 98:5
 112:6,14 115:4 118:5
 121:13 129:10 133:1
 154:5 163:20 170:8
meaningful 76:15
means 31:21 32:2
 82:18 93:10 170:10
 174:14
Mears 2:6 78:19
measurable 25:4,9
 37:16 38:15
measure 37:19 58:14
 72:2,16
measured 25:10 30:5,5
 31:4,4
measurement 30:8
measurements 105:2
measuring 37:18
mechanism 163:11
mechanisms 46:4
 47:20 164:13
media 11:22
meet 88:14 98:4 99:12
 104:7 129:7 161:17
meeting 1:7 3:17 7:17
 7:20 8:4,9 10:9 51:14
 51:17 57:1 82:18 87:1
 87:15,17 88:1,1,7,9
 91:4 101:3 113:10
 120:10,12,13,22
 121:1,1,4 122:15
 128:16 134:20,21
 135:7 140:13 155:2,8
 156:1,4 166:20 167:9
 167:18,18 170:2,4
 171:15,22 172:12
 173:10 174:6
meetings 9:13 87:13
 101:2 120:9,10 121:3
 152:13 161:16
member 4:9,12 5:3,6,8
 5:11,13,17,20,22 6:6
 6:9,11,14,20 7:1,3,6
 7:10 18:14 27:8 28:13
 28:14,17,18 29:1 33:4
 33:17,20 35:1 36:14

36:16 37:12 51:13
 62:16 65:6 70:13
 72:21 76:4 78:12,17
 78:18 85:15,16 86:8
 86:10 88:21 90:4
 93:20,22 99:1,4
 104:16 105:22 108:8
 109:3,21 111:19
 115:15 117:10 118:10
 119:12 121:13 125:12
 126:10 127:3 129:3
 129:17,21 134:3
 137:7 149:7 151:1,9
 152:1,9 159:7 160:2
 160:15 161:8,19
 162:2,10,11,18,20,21
 162:22 163:3,6,7,9,14
 164:8 168:2,5,22
members 1:14 12:12
 14:11 70:17 99:3
 120:6,6 134:1 146:8
 154:17
membership 158:22
mention 52:11 63:9
 147:20 148:4
mentioned 10:21 29:14
 33:22 42:14 57:3
 62:21 64:1 65:14,17
 66:15 71:2 92:6,7
 94:1 103:22 118:11
 120:2 132:16 147:20
 152:11
mentioning 39:16
 62:17,20
message 152:21
messages 152:14
messaging 152:10
met 1:11 104:2
metaphor 106:5
method 62:6
methodology 143:17
 144:11
MFL 53:16 68:1
mic 39:5,6
Michael 6:15 16:12
 149:17 150:10
Michelle 2:5 7:2
Michigan 1:19
microphone 18:5 164:5
mid 39:16 66:8
Mike 6:2
mile-long 116:5
miles 42:19
mind 18:12 76:5,20
 77:22 89:17 94:4
 102:5,12 113:8,11
 119:11,15 131:10
 132:4 134:2 155:11

155:13,17 156:10
 157:2 160:8 170:6
mindful 123:16 139:17
 139:20
mine 94:10
minimal 133:9
minute 81:7 158:15
minutes 81:9,10 121:14
 159:9 167:13
miscommunications
 139:9
misconceptions
 157:16
misleading 163:19
misses 92:18 114:10
missing 35:17 36:3
 115:4 121:16 134:8
 162:1 165:15
mission 10:22 13:5
 15:21 16:7 29:19
 63:12,19 128:10
 161:12 168:15 172:9
mistakes 115:7 136:6
misunderstandings
 139:10
MITRE 38:4,5
MITRE's 160:18
Mobil 151:4
model 30:21 38:8 51:20
 116:15
modify 90:17
moment 8:21
moments 144:1
months 128:14
Morgan 2:15 9:4 40:19
 41:3 42:14 43:20 44:2
 45:22 46:18 47:3 68:8
 69:16
morning 8:18 18:14,17
 32:15 39:9 40:16,18
 76:8 96:1 99:17 127:6
 129:4
morphology 47:21
mortar 32:7
motion 85:10,14 86:6
 122:16 168:3,9,14,20
move 9:4,10 19:4 48:21
 52:9 56:5 71:11 72:1
 79:1 82:13 83:17
 86:19 91:7 104:3
 110:19 125:22 158:5
moved 23:20 85:15
 86:8
movement 45:16
moving 25:18 38:7
 82:16 149:20 150:8
multinational 151:4
multiple 29:10 137:20

MURRAY 2:9 8:18
10:14 82:2,22 83:2
86:21 103:10 109:16
123:7 171:7
mute 80:20

N

NACE 50:9
name 4:18 8:7 79:19,19
165:13 166:11
Nancy 83:14,15
NARUC 84:16 85:2
NASE 67:13
national 50:9 107:20
nationally 107:17
natural 92:16
nature 24:19 111:9
112:12 141:19
NDE 32:3 43:3 44:11
59:15 92:2 95:19
97:15
near 26:10 92:18 96:8
114:9,12
necessarily 9:22 17:7
68:4 107:10 114:7
120:7,21 123:11,15
155:18
necessary 47:18 85:20
141:17 143:4
need 3:13 10:5,22
14:18,18,19 17:7 19:2
31:14 32:13 35:21
36:5 44:21 50:11 51:2
52:18 53:12 66:15
73:9 75:3 76:15 81:20
82:10,17 83:19 87:10
90:1 92:10 100:14
104:2 109:8 110:7,13
114:8 116:15 119:8
119:14,17 120:5,7
121:18,19 122:5,13
124:13 126:2 127:8
129:10 130:2 131:9
132:22 133:8 135:21
137:1,2 139:4 142:16
147:3,13 152:16
155:15,21 156:1,12
156:14,22 157:2,17
159:14,18 160:2
167:4,9 168:7 170:18
171:4,18,21 173:4,10
173:11
needed 14:10,15 18:21
143:7
needing 113:11 166:19
166:22
needs 9:14 12:17 13:20
16:5,20 77:17 80:20

82:13 97:6 104:8
105:17 114:17 131:7
135:14 136:12 139:2
147:14 157:7
Nelson 15:14 137:22
Nemeth 15:21
never 66:4 169:17
new 1:15 54:11 66:6
89:8 100:10
newly- 171:12
NGUYEN 2:9
nice 90:13,14 91:18
97:8 150:10 162:6
night 38:4 116:15
nimble 77:18
NiSource 1:18 101:4
NMI 124:7
noise 80:21
nominate 84:5 157:22
158:1
non-destructive 92:3
noon 10:13 81:7 134:2
normal 142:1,2
North 1:12 2:1
Northeast 101:4
note 96:19
noted 12:11 132:15
notes 72:3
notice 154:16
notion 27:16 28:16 29:4
NPMS 138:1
NTSB 92:22 143:22
number 8:4 26:1 50:7
58:8 64:20 90:8
102:16 117:6

O

object 45:9
objective 114:3 136:5
170:2 172:9
objectives 14:16
128:11 161:13 167:6
168:16,18
objects 110:15,16,18
110:22
observable 104:22
observational 140:19
observations 76:5
78:19
obviously 54:4 60:8,12
115:8 116:9 172:19
occupational 108:9
130:17 144:13
occur 20:2 50:8 111:12
117:3 139:10
occurred 117:19
occurrence 117:18
occurring 111:22

occurs 79:8
offer 56:9 64:14 65:3
102:15 105:9 156:13
158:7
offered 97:16
offering 27:22 83:4
official 2:9 7:16 82:17
154:22
officials 6:18 9:7
oftentimes 82:10
oil 1:18 112:19 151:2
once 69:7 107:4,8
110:17 126:2
one-offs 111:11
ones 50:1 122:18,18
146:14,15
ongoing 44:7,13 45:4
45:18 46:20 49:21
51:2 96:17,19 100:21
Oops 151:22
open 32:1 68:2 69:5
104:19,19 109:12
122:20 146:2 149:15
165:20
opening 3:3 11:4
openness 102:22
opens 81:4
operate 71:4
operates 146:13
operational 141:1
operator 3:7 9:2,20
15:2 18:9 20:12 23:18
24:10,12 29:11 37:22
45:7 47:6,14,20 58:6
60:2 65:20 66:19
68:12 70:19 71:21
73:21 77:11 79:3,7
95:12,16 128:3 138:4
142:11 151:11,12
152:5
operators 5:1 13:10
14:2 15:7 19:21 20:4
20:5,8,22 21:5,9 24:8
24:12 29:7 50:5,17
51:6,15,17 65:10 69:1
69:10 79:5,14,19 80:2
80:8,12 92:21 93:7
95:14 99:5 116:1
117:6 141:15 146:11
146:22 147:1,5,10,22
148:7,10 149:11,13
151:3 153:18,22
164:14
opportunities 14:7
22:16 27:4 45:2 97:18
97:22 98:1 142:3,19
148:3
opportunity 22:17

26:18 40:17 49:19
88:12 90:5 95:1,5,15
97:12 128:1 133:15
143:6,9 150:8,17
164:19 165:1 171:16
opposed 19:1 23:6,11
105:6 142:21
opposition 86:2,13
169:4
option 173:11
options 141:17
oranges 61:16
order 3:2 7:17 8:17
27:17 76:14 77:18
129:12 134:19
organization 8:7 15:18
50:15 98:22 99:7
organizations 6:2
44:20 100:9 101:4
162:13
Originally 81:2
OSHA-centric 112:13
outcome 160:18 163:21
outcomes 72:3,3,15
108:17 109:19
outgrowth 99:9
outline 40:20
output 143:1
outs 9:11
outset 77:20
outside 11:21 88:7 90:9
172:2
outstanding 106:1
overall 16:21 107:16
108:2 113:14 119:13
155:12 157:5 168:18
overburden 124:13
overcoming 132:6
overlook 170:11
overlooked 170:21
overnight 139:16
oversell 167:17
oversight 136:14
owned 37:22

P

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
4:1
p.m 175:4
pace 54:13
pages 30:18 57:9,11
106:4
painting 55:4
papers 50:6
parallel 126:6
parameters 113:22
pardon 106:5
parent 11:17 124:11

- part** 26:2 33:7,21 41:15
44:1 51:17 52:14
71:16,16 74:7 79:12
81:2 87:20 88:17 94:6
102:13 108:19 109:5
118:14 119:10 145:22
160:3 174:10
PARTICIPANT 154:7
171:1
participants 165:21
participate 118:18
172:3
particular 95:16 127:16
particularly 36:18
98:15 108:5 111:21
159:16
parties 133:15
Partners 1:16
partnership 65:11
parts 15:18 127:12
pass 43:5 87:6
passes 169:8
passing 43:6
passion 87:3 172:13
path 31:3 68:14 127:9
173:7
paths 127:9
pathway 8:15
pattern 61:4
peers 67:5
people 4:13 34:19
35:18 65:12 67:1,10
80:7 90:8 98:11 100:1
109:18 110:1,2,12
112:4 115:2 120:12
120:13,16 121:10
125:6,22 135:21,21
141:13 150:7 156:20
166:7 169:12 170:13
percent 59:9,15,17,19
59:20
perfect 28:2 139:19
perfectly 57:11
perform 43:8,22 48:12
48:13
performance 1:20 55:2
70:8,11 71:20 72:16
75:19 79:15 80:3
performs 42:14 72:9
period 17:14
periodically 97:7 98:5
103:5
Perrin 7:12
Perry 2:3 6:10,11 129:3
129:3,17,21
persistent 108:16 110:5
111:10
person 64:22 84:10
85:5 108:9 138:7
156:19
person's 4:18
personal 34:3,21
personnel 110:6
persons 99:21
perspective 55:12
76:22 81:1 113:6
114:10 117:11 130:18
134:14 135:11 137:10
148:1 152:5 156:15
156:16 158:4 164:11
perspectives 90:6
94:13
pertaining 164:10
pertains 128:10
pertinent 101:7
PG&E 96:5
Ph.D 1:19 2:3
phenomenal 84:12
philosophy 61:5
PHMSA 1:2 2:3,8 4:19
8:1 9:6 11:19 85:17
92:21 99:11 101:1,20
104:7 135:20 138:4
144:10 150:5,17
155:14
PHMSA-2016-0136 8:4
phone 4:7,8 32:20
38:21 62:13 80:19
83:14 121:10 127:2
128:22 140:2 148:20
151:16 153:11 158:8
164:7 165:7,13
173:19
phrase 95:12 96:5,7
physical 125:6,13
142:13
picks 24:17
piece 13:12 24:20 25:8
27:9 34:9 35:16 41:20
42:11 46:22 55:9 58:4
61:21 73:13 88:16
104:14 112:7 118:21
130:17 131:15
pieces 24:3 106:9 124:8
Pierre 96:5
piggable 42:16
pigging 112:2
pinhole 116:21
pipe 31:19 142:15
pipeline 1:2,16 2:3,3
5:1 6:1,21 11:11
12:19 40:19 41:18,21
42:7,19 43:8 44:12
45:7 47:6,13,19 49:22
50:17 51:11,16 52:5,6
58:5 65:9 68:15 69:1
69:10 70:6,19,20 75:1
75:20 84:20 99:5,8
107:16 108:1 112:12
116:5,5 127:4 128:6
130:21 133:18 136:5
137:11 145:10,14,17
146:17 149:10 151:6
152:3 165:4 170:3
pipelines 108:12
142:12 153:5
PIPES 41:2 64:22
pitch 29:17 95:11,15
105:18 144:5 146:2
pitch- 24:9
pitch-catch 25:13 27:16
27:20 28:16 39:10
pitfall 33:16
pitfalls 61:3,19 62:18
place 26:1 29:6 32:7
35:4 45:20 58:13,14
68:11 71:1 82:12
96:15 101:14 105:12
122:8 124:14 152:20
153:7 159:4
places 98:13 109:13
plain 139:4
plan 64:17 134:20
planning 3:17 9:13 10:9
82:7,10,11 87:1,10,13
119:18 120:10,12
134:22 135:2
Planning/Formation
3:15
plans 87:16
play 88:22
playing 152:6
please 8:6 88:8 171:14
plug 145:15
plugged 139:11
point 13:8 15:22 16:18
16:22 30:21 32:12
33:21 34:17 37:15,18
45:14 61:5 74:10
89:13 90:19 91:6
92:21 102:7 103:21
104:4,9,19 109:8,11
109:14 113:8 119:18
123:14 124:15,16,19
124:20 126:3 127:17
128:8 142:20 148:18
151:10,15 152:2,6
153:18 154:11 163:1
163:6 166:21 168:3
171:10
pointed 73:7
Pointing 75:14
points 37:6,7 68:5,18
69:17 92:13 98:19
103:13 123:7,12
131:22 155:16 159:8
policies 87:12
policy 168:18
Portal 64:22
portion 131:11
posed 171:20
position 135:9
positive 19:4 96:2
111:9 132:9
possible 28:4,19,21
31:20 100:21
possibly 92:17 100:8
100:19 101:16
post-accident 17:16
Post-incident 21:3
potential 88:22 166:18
potentially 9:9 147:15
155:2 172:1
practice 22:19 25:3
67:13,17 68:20 70:21
70:22 71:7,7,10 74:7
74:8 112:11 152:20
160:17
practices 20:10 26:15
29:15,21 41:3 50:4
51:8 62:3 64:13,16,18
66:19 68:11 71:18
100:5 105:10,11
106:14,16 107:10
123:21 126:12 127:18
133:11 159:12,14
160:10 161:22 162:4
162:7,8 163:1,10
168:11
PRCI 29:17,18 31:10
33:10 38:13 39:15
50:14 74:14 96:13
101:3 120:2 145:17
PRCIs 74:20
pre 66:11
predictive 142:20
149:21 150:2,9
predominantly 50:10
preference 138:11
premature 82:7
prepare 171:22
prepared 173:7
preparing 91:4
present 1:14 2:8,13
4:21 5:3,6,8,11,13,17
5:20,22 6:6,9,14,19
6:20 7:3,6 82:18
presentation 15:15
19:6 32:18 36:18
41:13 62:16 137:22
presentations 8:1 9:3
10:3 15:3 18:18 76:6

76:14 78:20 80:17
115:18,19
presented 98:12 103:12
140:17 141:7 150:5
162:5
presiding 1:13
pressure 147:7,8
pretty 18:19 42:4 52:7
78:1 148:13
prevent 12:21 33:12
137:5
prevented 133:2
preventing 165:4
preview 36:6
previous 87:22
previously 88:3
primarily 20:8
primary 165:4
private 139:6
probability 133:8
probably 18:22 20:8
63:15 72:8 83:3 89:14
93:11 97:6 100:16
104:18 109:8 116:21
125:2 140:15 147:9
154:15 159:9
problem 67:7 96:4
108:21 110:16
problems 20:9,11 46:3
108:16 110:5,11
111:11
procedure 45:11
procedures 43:4,11
49:8
process 1:20 20:18
21:13 22:18 23:10
24:3,6 25:2,10 26:9
26:15,22 29:6 30:13
40:11 48:5,13,18 52:7
59:13 63:10 69:22
75:15,22 76:19 77:8
77:12 80:9 93:5 96:11
96:16 100:20 101:2,9
104:6,12,12 108:20
109:1,6,9 110:7
111:17 117:12,15
118:1 121:5 122:2
125:9,19 126:7
138:18 139:12,15
142:1 145:2 159:21
160:3 162:16 163:17
164:1 168:8,10
170:18,20 171:3
processes 19:15 20:10
21:1 42:22 43:12 49:4
49:8 52:22 53:3 55:13
56:20,22 67:14 70:3
80:3 87:12 96:12

101:5 122:4 125:6
144:20,21 155:9
156:10
produce 76:15 77:2
142:22
produced 7:21
producer 151:2
produces 76:20
product 49:12 110:7
112:2
productive 47:11
products 112:18
professionals 32:4
profilometry 43:2
program 27:14 71:20
81:2
programmatic 14:20
programs 80:3 112:8
progress 159:5 167:15
171:8 172:19,22
173:2
progressively 104:5
project 30:2,6,15 31:8
39:15 45:15
projects 45:5,6 50:13
102:19
Promoting 16:9
promptly 93:10,17,17
pronounce 38:6
property 131:1
proposal 84:2,5 159:8
167:5
propose 84:4 122:16
149:9 158:20 159:11
160:9 168:9
proposed 12:9 19:1
88:5 104:15 150:13
proposition 18:22
proprietary 42:1 72:6
98:14 99:20 132:6
141:19
pros 174:15
protect 99:19,20,21
protecting 12:12
protection 5:19 98:14
protections 93:10,16
provide 11:16,18 15:10
29:20 48:11 65:9
66:16 68:12 79:6
80:11 88:13 117:21
123:10
provided 15:14 52:2
92:13
provider 29:12 41:11
47:7,10,13 48:1,11
49:2 53:5,7 54:1,2
55:12 57:8 58:5,7,9
59:7 60:2,6 66:17

67:5,19 68:9 69:20
73:22 95:17
providers 12:18 19:21
20:6,9 24:12 43:17
44:8 54:18 65:15
66:12,13 79:5,17,20
80:13 95:13,18 99:6
147:22 148:7,9
provides 30:20 68:3
providing 115:2
PSMS 94:4
public 1:7,15 2:5 6:17
12:4 13:11 14:11
74:21 75:6 93:1,7
94:3 103:6 130:12,13
130:15,20 131:4,10
131:14,18 132:3,9,12
138:12,14,18,21
139:2,8,9,11 145:12
145:19 146:3,4,6,7
147:19 148:1,2,5,10
148:11,17 156:21
157:8 160:2,5 170:8
public- 140:16
publicly 161:1
publish 45:17
published 58:10 67:14
pull 31:21 78:6 84:9
punch 154:2
punished 34:20
punishing 34:7
purchased 35:8
purpose 13:4 31:12
60:14,14,16 78:3
purposes 84:3,3 109:17
pursuing 100:16
put 13:7 14:19 15:22
16:16 24:16 25:1 35:4
40:11 51:22 52:4
56:18 80:15 92:4
94:11 127:10,16
134:22 139:18 143:18
145:2,5,15 151:10
152:2,21 166:17
168:6 173:13
puts 16:1
puzzle 73:13

Q

QA/QC 43:12 49:4
qualification 32:3 66:20
67:3,10 97:4,10 148:4
qualify 68:4
quality 16:21 43:17
76:18 99:11 102:16
question 9:8 11:20
13:14 17:3 27:12 28:8
39:2 58:8 70:14 71:17

72:22 73:3 77:22 78:6
78:12 103:20 104:10
105:16 108:15 109:17
109:18 110:4 121:11
125:13 129:14 134:3
134:15,15 141:7
149:8 162:3 164:4
170:19
questioned 65:17 68:18
questionnaire 16:14
questions 27:5 32:19
38:20 62:11,12 64:8
88:20 89:19 97:4
103:8 121:9 140:3
148:21 158:8 171:20
quick 32:9 65:12 77:17
78:8,19 81:15 87:5
106:18 137:8 151:9
154:21 163:15
quickly 54:10 93:2
106:21 139:14
quite 35:11 65:8 122:21
122:22 132:1
quorum 7:16

R

R&D 100:12,19 101:2
radar 38:10
raise 9:8 123:14
raised 11:20 13:9 15:22
16:22 124:19
raising 109:9 144:18
ranks 83:12
rapid 54:12
rapidly 54:6
rat 33:13
raw 62:21,21
RCFAs 21:3
re-title 163:17
reach 100:7
reaching 172:6,10
read 4:17 38:3 57:2
102:3 138:8
readily 28:21
ready 82:9,13 127:13
real 15:1 49:19 114:15
135:6 151:9 163:15
174:4
realistic 167:19
realization 39:21
realizing 39:22
reason 63:16 99:16
100:22 123:9
reasonable 146:9
reasons 60:4
recalibrated 18:20
recap 3:4,19 8:21 9:17
10:15 154:21

recaps 17:21
received 51:21 104:4
recipe 47:2
recognition 9:21
recognize 9:19 102:21
recognized 66:14 99:12
recognizing 28:3
recommend 142:22
 150:4
recommendation 14:3
 14:17 84:13 101:20
 173:7
recommendations
 11:19 101:18 156:13
recommunicate 144:12
reconfigure 143:2
record 7:21 81:12 175:4
recorded 7:20
reduction 35:6
reemphasis 97:7
refer 123:8
referenced 49:21 58:19
 73:19 74:1
referred 125:5
refine 44:9,11 88:6
 167:5
refining 48:7
reflected 159:10
refresh 84:10
regard 46:16 52:19
 69:15 72:22 74:4
regarding 11:20 64:13
Regional 50:9
Register 154:16
registry 142:1,5
regular 50:8
regulation 73:19
regulator 21:4 136:7
regulators 13:11 19:20
 21:7 50:17 74:10 85:3
 145:19
regulatory 93:18
 101:11 104:11 125:16
 126:15 165:16
reinforce 36:17 37:8
reinforced 19:11
reintroduce 83:11
rejoins 83:16
relate 36:22 60:20
related 11:21 15:3 21:3
 41:3 71:18 72:6
 107:10 111:22 115:5
 132:17 133:4
relates 127:7 128:6
relationship 24:10
 27:17,20 47:6,7 48:19
 49:6 52:16 58:4 61:15
 61:17,20 65:11 69:9

70:19 73:22 74:4
relationships 174:9
relative 70:5
relatively 133:4
released 64:17
relevance 157:1
relevancy 117:8
relevant 14:22 16:18
 38:11 61:10 136:12
 156:17
reliable 60:9
reluctance 101:1
remaining 9:16 87:4
 141:4
Remarks 3:3
remember 8:14 65:20
 124:16
remind 7:19
reminder 8:5
rename 168:7
repeated 143:17
report 9:10 30:15 45:17
 45:19 48:9 58:11,20
 59:7,8 66:3 87:2,20
 88:18 102:14 115:14
 124:6,8 134:6 138:8
 153:22 161:3 172:22
reportable 92:14 133:5
reported 70:4 108:18
reporting 91:13 101:22
 103:3,4,21 119:9
 124:5 126:15 159:12
 160:6,10 168:12
 172:21
reports 137:17 138:3
 143:22
repository 28:6 29:14
 52:10,13,19 53:9,13
 54:6,8 55:4 60:3,13
 62:8 75:16 99:2,18
 111:2 117:17 118:22
 125:4 126:19
representation 4:14,16
 14:12
Representative 4:19
representatives 7:4
 128:3
represented 68:8 149:9
 149:14 151:13
representing 85:1
represents 25:22
required 26:21 60:1
 92:9 141:5
requirement 94:5
requirements 11:13,14
 91:13
rerun 48:15
research 6:12 29:20

38:4 44:12 50:3 62:2
 64:5 148:2,5
reset 155:7
residing 112:4
resources 56:4 147:1
respect 20:17 73:15
 94:19 133:12 149:7
respective 47:16
respond 69:12 111:15
 113:3 134:11
responding 147:19
response 5:15 6:3,16
 7:8,14 32:21 38:22
 62:14 64:9 86:3,14,16
 113:4 128:20 129:1
 140:4,6 148:22 149:3
 149:5 150:21 151:18
 151:20 153:12,14
 158:9,11,13 165:8,10
 169:5,7,15 173:20,22
 174:2
responsible 126:21
rest 68:8 79:16 110:13
 112:17
result 22:17 25:13,14
 26:14
results 30:15 48:10
 106:19
resumed 81:12
revealing 109:10,10
review 8:12 43:12 71:7
 88:13 102:2 103:2
 118:21
reviews 45:19
rewarding 171:11
rich 18:19 100:10
risk 15:11 35:5 41:18
 106:19 111:16 112:7
risks 106:19 109:11
road 142:21 143:1
 156:7,8 167:11
Robert 1:17 5:19
robust 10:16 12:10
 42:22 43:12 49:4,8
 79:2
role 100:14,21 124:10
 136:13
roll 3:2 4:11 69:21
rolling 35:13
room 68:8 116:2 151:14
 164:22
root 21:15 34:15
Rosen 1:17 65:7
ROSEN's 72:10
roundtables 51:6
routine 90:21
RP 91:10
RP0102 67:14

RPO 97:19
rules 59:1,2
run 66:1 100:2 126:6
running 155:20

S

safe 153:5 166:7
safety 1:2,16 2:1,3,3
 6:7,21 11:5,6,7,11
 16:9 21:14 25:6,14
 26:2 39:21 52:6 72:3
 72:15 84:20 99:11
 103:15 107:16 108:1
 108:9 128:6 129:17
 130:12,15,15,17
 132:3 133:18 136:5
 137:11 142:16 144:1
 145:11,14 146:17
 152:3 165:4 166:5
 170:3
sake 113:17 136:18
sample 32:10
samples 31:19,22
SATTERTHWAITE 2:10
 143:13 145:8
saturation 57:18
save 87:8,9,14,16
saw 36:6 57:2 116:20
saying 40:5 80:5
 130:14 136:18 138:19
 146:15 162:6,19
 163:8
says 43:11 119:10
 145:1
scalable 27:17
scanning 43:2
school 153:2
science 150:1
scope 14:4 20:20 28:3
 98:2 147:6 155:10
scoping 147:11
scratch 44:18
screen 8:20 152:19
scrub 76:19
se 156:8
Seal 1:17
seam 28:8
SECDA 97:20
second 4:4 85:16 86:9
 86:10 92:12 94:8 95:8
 97:2 119:10 127:17
 168:22 169:1
Secretary 150:15
section 41:1,3,8 91:10
 91:13 94:5,20 97:5,6
 134:9
sector 148:11
sectors 98:9 159:15

162:8 163:12
secured 160:20
security 14:14 113:10
 160:21 170:7
seeing 79:15,16 80:4
seen 61:21 76:13 79:4
 146:13
segment 40:15 42:18
segments 42:15,16
segue 29:2
select 85:18
Selection 3:12
semantical 164:21
seminar 29:9
send 66:3 87:15 89:16
sensational 107:20
sense 12:14 23:13
 25:10 85:5 121:15
 122:19 153:1 156:9
sensitive 14:13 42:1
 137:1,3,6
sensitivity 72:9 136:3
sensor 53:13,13,17
 57:15,15
sensors 53:17,18,20
sentiment 13:3,17
sentiments 11:2
separate 125:19
separately 126:6
separating 166:2
separation 78:1
September 87:14,17
 89:8 122:22 128:16
 135:7 155:2 161:17
 166:21
seriously 106:21
serve 84:4 90:18
 172:13
served 84:19,19
serves 99:8
service 12:18 19:21
 24:12 29:11 41:10
 43:17 44:8 47:7,10,13
 48:1,11 49:2 53:5,7
 53:22 54:1,18 55:12
 57:8 58:5,7,9 59:7
 60:2,6 66:12,13,17
 67:5,19 68:9 69:20
 73:21 79:5,17,20
 80:12 95:16,17 99:5
Services 1:15 2:5
servicing 83:13,16
session 89:8,11
sessions 74:18
set 8:10 30:12 39:18
 61:9 67:8,9 74:18
 76:7 97:9 101:13
 102:3 122:12 124:6

125:21 150:7 161:11
sets 38:9 61:17 119:1
 154:19 157:12
setting 18:1 90:14
 91:17 150:11
seven 140:15
seventh 122:14
severe 108:17 109:19
 111:12
SGA 127:21 164:12
share 11:2 13:10 16:13
 17:3,6,7 21:1,9 22:4,4
 22:9 23:10 32:14
 39:17 43:20 45:2 47:2
 51:15 64:21 93:10,16
 98:21 99:3,16,22
 100:4,18 115:16
 124:2 125:20 130:10
 141:14,16 146:9
 148:11,14,16 157:3
 162:16 164:13 166:7
 174:14
shareable 130:9
shared 10:19 11:3
 12:17,18 16:20 25:11
 42:6 45:21 46:10 50:3
 105:13 129:11 130:3
 131:7 136:19 148:9
 148:15 161:1,1
shares 43:20
sharing 3:8 12:13 13:15
 17:13 20:2,7,10 23:4
 24:6,11 31:1,3,13
 32:8 41:5,7,10 42:5,7
 42:11 46:22 60:5
 63:16 64:13,15,18
 69:3 72:11 73:10 78:4
 90:12 94:2 95:2,2,4,9
 104:20 105:7 106:8,9
 106:13 113:15,15,16
 113:20 118:2 124:22
 127:14 128:6,7
 130:12 131:12,17
 132:17 136:4 137:3
 137:20 142:4 143:1,3
 144:14,20 160:20
 163:17 165:21 166:4
 168:8,11
sharing's 113:17
Sherina 1:19 6:19 84:6
 84:6,15 85:7 86:7,17
Sherman 7:7
Sherry 140:11 166:13
Sherry's 149:19
shifted 33:9
shop 68:10
short 8:17 84:19 134:19
 163:10 165:2

short-term 161:11
shot 147:19
show 138:3
side 8:10 23:4,8 37:3
 46:20 76:11,22 96:1
 97:15,17 98:16
 109:19 152:11
sides 76:14
sight 131:9 169:18
 172:19
significant 58:10 70:10
 107:22 108:1
signs 117:2
similar 44:10 101:3
 104:1 117:15 160:16
Simona 2:3 6:10 129:3
 137:9 138:19
Simona's 156:19
simple 139:5
simply 119:2 150:9
Simultaneous 163:5
single 41:1
sit 51:6 157:6 167:8
site 112:10
sites 152:15 153:3
sitting 73:1 84:11
 108:14
situation 73:5 74:6
six 12:9 42:17,18 94:13
 121:21
six-inch 59:8
size 28:3 59:2
skill 154:18
skip 159:19
slide 41:1,8 44:15 52:15
 83:5 90:12 94:8
 127:10 166:17 168:6
slides 18:1 19:8 29:3
 36:6 89:20 90:6
 146:18
slightly 106:10
small 63:6 73:13 117:6
 147:1 151:12 152:4
 153:18,21
smaller 146:22 147:5
 147:10
SMEs 26:12
SMS 36:7,11,13 102:1
 132:21 142:1 145:1
 146:12,14
software 26:6 35:7
 56:14 67:9
solicit 154:16
solution 46:4 48:4
solutions 20:11 34:16
 40:3 46:7
solve 20:9
solving 46:3 67:6

somebody 24:17 57:3
 102:6 149:22 150:4
 151:5 152:17 156:6
sooner 71:5,8
sorry 33:1 115:19 118:5
 151:22 154:13 160:13
 164:3 169:14 171:1
sort 35:21 71:21 89:20
 106:10 112:21,21
 115:16 116:13 118:11
 118:21 119:3,17
 134:15 150:10 155:7
 155:10 161:2
sounds 93:17 145:18
Southern 51:5 74:15
 96:14
SP0102 67:15
space 32:2 38:11
spatially 15:16
speak 8:6,6 41:16 42:13
 44:2 46:11,14 72:19
 75:10 112:16 143:9
 143:12
speaking 107:12 123:9
 163:5 166:12
speaks 46:21 49:4
specialties 154:18
specific 23:18 43:4
 53:14,22 57:17 60:13
 67:22 72:22 76:16,17
 76:18 77:7 106:7
 112:9,19 160:18
specifically 31:2 54:19
 65:10 73:9
specifications 55:3
specificity 70:18
spend 80:14
spin 23:14
spirit 103:2 132:21
spoke 120:2
spoken 50:13,14 52:14
spot 94:12 174:13
stab 158:3
stacked 122:21
Stackhouse 16:13
 150:10
Stackhouse's 149:17
staff 2:8 98:11 104:7
 162:5
Stafford 1:12
stage 18:2 76:7 127:8
stakeholder 22:9 94:5
stakeholders 4:14 5:1
 13:14 19:20 22:2
 50:16,19 93:1 94:3
 120:4 128:3 131:8
 164:17
stand 121:22 158:20

159:11,20 168:10
171:14
standard 43:10 45:11
61:18 97:11,13,20
145:1
standardized 144:8
standards 50:15,20,21
66:18 68:21 69:5,15
70:9 73:17 97:9,14
98:2
standpoint 35:2
stands 27:21
start 44:18 123:5,21
139:19 146:5
started 19:9 27:2 37:14
37:21 67:4 73:16 96:6
99:2 110:17 156:5
166:18
starting 90:19 91:6
94:13
starts 123:22
state 1:15,19 6:17,21
45:12 85:3
stated 73:16
statement 13:5 15:21
16:7 29:19 161:12
168:15
states 130:21
stating 8:7
statute 42:8 44:17
127:12
stay 167:11
stays 114:15
Steering 165:16
step 26:22 74:12 89:3
89:17 135:22 159:1
steps 8:15 18:13 81:5
81:19 89:21 135:4
155:9 158:16 159:18
171:5
stick 25:16
stint 84:19
stood 35:5
Stoody 102:9
stop 10:12 38:1 81:6
97:3 103:7 134:2
167:14
stopped 121:17
storage 125:17
store 107:8 126:4
141:14,15
stored 60:13
storing 101:15
straight 137:10
strategic 15:13 64:17
64:19
strategically 76:6
strategies 128:11

strategy 27:10
Street 1:12
strengthen 105:15
stress 47:21,22 87:9
92:10
strikes 79:10
strong 104:18
stronger 94:22
strongly 68:22 75:3
structure 37:5 102:14
104:15 117:17 119:14
122:8,13,20 123:13
124:6 125:14 126:5
156:9,14 159:22
165:20
structured 166:6
struggled 100:14
struggling 118:12,19
stuck 16:7
studies 124:2
study 46:4 118:22
120:1 156:16
stuff 81:17,22 111:7
145:13 146:11 151:5
subcommittee 3:15
11:13,20 12:4 82:15
82:18 83:10 84:18,20
88:16 96:10,17,20
97:22 101:11 103:21
105:11,14 109:7
117:13,21 121:4
122:5,14 127:16
128:2,13 148:5
164:18 165:17 168:7
168:11,12,12,14
169:19 171:18
subcommittees 11:16
12:1,8 82:5,6,7 83:13
83:19,20 94:14
105:19 119:6,14
121:15,18,21 123:13
126:17 130:4 155:17
155:19 158:19 165:2
167:2 168:10 171:13
172:5
subject 12:4 73:2
154:15 160:11
submit 80:13
subsequent 21:4
Subsits 2:4 6:22 7:1
substantially 54:21
success 37:19
successful 166:3
successfully 165:18
166:1
sufficient 57:12
suggest 103:3 109:12
141:9

suite 56:8
summarize 41:1 61:20
115:11
summary 62:19 98:12
142:17
summed 75:12
Sunoco 1:22 127:4
sunset 98:4 100:19
101:9,17
sunsetted 96:22 100:7
sunsetting 100:20
Supplier 84:18
support 27:10 36:13
61:4 82:15 141:12
173:10
supporting 125:14
supposed 81:3 114:3
Surface 17:8
surprise 138:11
surveys 43:22
suspect 87:1
synthesizing 106:3
system 1:4 4:5 15:10
16:17 17:12 24:4
25:22 26:5,6,6 33:6
33:12,13,14 35:4,7,14
35:21 37:22 63:17,17
67:8,20 68:2,4 75:15
75:16,20,22 99:8
104:13,14 112:1,2
118:12,16 124:19,22
125:1,2,4,8,8 126:5
127:13 131:17 137:17
137:18,19 138:2,12
138:17,20,20 139:2
139:18 141:18 142:4
143:19 144:9
systematic 62:6
systematically 22:7
systemic 21:12
systems 33:18 34:5
35:2,20 39:22 40:10
67:3 112:18 143:20
152:4

T

table 33:1 39:1 51:7
62:15 92:11 128:19
140:5 149:2 151:3,19
153:13 158:10 165:9
173:21
take- 8:22
take-aways 10:16 11:15
15:15
takeaway 170:1,7
takeaways 169:19,21
170:13
taken 18:16 104:9

135:8 154:22 157:18
talk 4:16 41:20 63:11,12
82:5 84:1 91:14 95:8
120:5 124:22 126:18
135:10 146:12 147:13
152:11
talked 11:4,9 12:3,7
16:13 19:10 21:14
22:6,20 23:16 30:16
32:8 36:9 52:15 57:14
74:16 82:3 89:4 91:20
110:17 115:15 116:20
119:22 156:7 161:13
talking 19:14 23:3 36:1
37:21 67:4 71:19
78:13 87:19 97:8
110:18 116:9 122:8
132:2 138:16 144:4
144:13 153:6
target 22:15
targeted 116:4
task 13:4
taxi 141:3
TDC 31:9
team 35:12 161:3
technical 28:7 60:20,22
81:22
technician 59:15
technicians 43:10
technological 127:9
technologies 14:1
31:16 41:17,20 42:17
43:1 44:9,11 45:12,13
46:17,22 47:1,5,19
48:2 53:14 54:5,7,11
54:17,21 56:5,7,9
57:21 60:7 61:22 70:1
90:21 92:3
technology 5:10 13:18
19:16 20:5 21:17,17
21:19,20 31:10,13
44:4,5 48:7,8,16,22
53:15,17,20,21 54:3,6
55:4,22 56:10,12,18
67:22 70:20 90:22
92:4,5,8,9,11 100:12
100:18 112:3 147:22
148:7,9
tee 89:21 123:22
teed 88:3
telephone 2:18 5:4
tell 34:8,8 35:1
ten 81:9
tended 76:10
tendency 44:17
tends 112:17
tension 106:7
tent 118:4

tent-a-card 8:10
tentative 87:9 89:6
 155:3
term 105:9,18 163:10
 165:2
termed 35:4
terminology 98:18
terms 11:10 14:8 17:4
 18:12 22:10 44:5 54:1
 54:11 55:16,17 59:3
 62:2,9 63:1 77:14
 78:3 87:12 106:11,18
 109:19 111:15 114:15
 155:7,16 156:22
 171:12
Terry 39:7 143:15
test 22:12 25:16 43:4,5
 147:9
testing 20:19 32:3 43:7
 92:5
testings 147:7
thank 4:3,10 5:9 7:11
 7:15 8:17,19 10:13
 17:18,19 27:8 32:16
 37:9,10,12 38:19
 40:12,13 65:4,7 69:7
 69:10,11 71:14 76:2
 78:9,10,17 80:16
 88:18 90:4 91:4
 103:10 105:20 108:6
 117:9 128:16,18
 132:10,11 139:22
 140:10 143:8,10
 145:5,9 147:11
 148:18,19 150:14
 154:3,10 161:6
 162:21 164:2 166:9
 166:14 172:8,14,15
 173:18 175:1,2
thanks 18:13 64:6
 133:21,22 165:5
the-weeds 135:15
Thebert 2:5 7:2,3
theme 113:9 174:8
thickness 57:18
things 21:11 22:6 23:4
 24:16 29:16,22 32:5
 38:3,11 39:19 41:4
 44:10 47:4 51:9 57:19
 62:1 65:13,16 66:14
 71:4 74:16,22 89:7,11
 91:7,22 93:4 96:3,8
 104:3 107:9 108:5
 109:22 110:7,9 113:9
 119:16 122:3 123:1
 124:13 125:22 126:11
 129:5,8 130:1 132:3
 134:5,9 135:9 137:9

142:7 143:21 144:14
 145:16 147:2 150:3
 154:2 156:4 161:2
 167:3,7 169:17
 170:11 173:13
thinks 16:19
third 12:16 60:18 93:22
 98:7 128:8
thoroughly 52:8
thought 37:22 76:6
 90:13,15 98:7,10
 116:14 123:11 124:20
 125:3 126:8 135:6
 136:2 145:20 151:2
 154:18 162:6
thoughts 10:19 11:4
 94:9 123:6 147:17
 150:20
thousand 30:11 31:19
 42:18 57:9
threat 31:20
threats 17:6,9 45:10,13
 46:5
three 42:17 59:11,21
 64:17 67:16 68:21
 69:4 73:17 105:11
 110:19 116:1 120:9
 126:16 127:5,8
 158:21 168:10 172:7
throwing 111:7
tie 91:9
tied 15:4 59:13 102:1
tightly 126:22
timely 130:12,20
times 132:16 141:6
 161:14
tirelessly 66:22
Toby 2:15 18:10,11
 40:14,19 65:7,17 68:5
 68:17 69:7,12 71:3
 74:2 75:9 91:17 95:3
 96:13
Toby's 66:15 73:7
today 4:4 10:12 38:14
 54:15 55:22 69:2 73:1
 88:9 94:22 119:22
 120:11,14 121:21
 122:16 123:3,4
 127:22 135:19 137:13
 149:18 170:17,22
 171:4
tolerate 34:10
tool 48:14,15 52:21
 53:2,11,14,16,22
 54:13 55:5,10 56:16
 57:17 63:10 67:6
 69:20,22 70:2,8 71:20
 173:13

tools 31:21 32:4 53:19
 56:19 57:13 70:12
 76:18 92:1,2 108:4
 137:16
top 40:5
topic 18:16 88:3 109:4
 142:6
topics 87:22 88:7,8,13
 88:22 166:18
tossed 87:21
totally 70:14 71:12
 138:6
touch 83:22 85:1
 172:11
touched 107:14
track 88:4 167:11
traction 123:3
trade 128:2
train 43:3
training 20:16 97:4,10
 148:4,6
transcript 7:21,22 8:9
 57:2
transfer 1:16 9:3 16:11
 18:15 142:15 163:15
transmission 107:6,11
 107:18,21
transparency 47:8
transparent 68:13 69:9
 73:8 74:9 137:1
Transportation 1:1 2:4
TRC 1:18
treat 148:10
tried 91:1,9 94:9,12
triumvirate 97:9
trust 1:16 47:8 145:14
 146:4,4,17 174:9
try 17:2 40:22 41:14
 42:3 71:9 73:6 90:5
 135:18 136:7 167:16
 167:19
trying 8:16 10:4 19:4
 20:9 23:12 39:11 61:8
 72:1,2 102:8 111:8
 114:21 118:14 127:7
 135:13 144:3,16
 152:21 156:9,15
 167:10 174:12
turn 7:18 8:12 81:16,21
 89:18,19 130:7
turning 25:6
turnover 106:18
tweak 167:10
two 8:19 9:2 12:11
 17:22 27:21 57:11
 59:18 76:5 78:20 83:9
 90:6 93:20 103:19
 105:19 106:3,10

120:9,11 149:9
 150:12 156:20 158:21
 161:16 166:2
type 30:22,22 31:20,21
 46:9 57:15 59:22
 73:13
types 31:22 53:16
 90:12
typical 58:3
typically 42:17,18 45:6
 45:7 107:20

U

U.S 1:1
ultimate 14:15
ultimately 46:9 49:1
 53:8 57:22 63:3
 101:20 115:14 172:20
 173:6
ultrasonic 68:1
Um-hum 28:13 33:17
uncomfortable 65:13
underscore 58:4
understand 37:18 49:7
 60:19 66:5 68:20
 118:19 120:15 131:5
 133:19 138:9,13
 159:21 161:3 172:4
 172:12 174:11
understanding 21:20
 23:2,6 24:2,11 36:19
 36:22 64:6 91:20,21
 135:14 156:12 166:20
 174:13
understood 70:17
undertake 96:21
undertaken 98:3 99:10
underway 44:16 156:5
unfortunately 41:13
 88:2 129:6
unintelligible 138:6
Union 2:2
unique 52:21,22 53:1
 55:7 57:15,16 63:10
 137:9
uniquely 55:6
uniqueness 53:11
 56:19,20 57:20 69:20
uniquenesses 57:8
UniversalPegasus 2:6
University 1:19
unrelated 61:16
unwanted 26:7,9
Update 3:16
updated 67:15 78:14,15
upstream 110:5
urge 133:10,19
use 4:12 25:16 42:17,22

53:19,19 60:15 62:9
63:2 70:2 71:10 75:14
76:18 82:4 90:21 92:2
92:4,9 93:18 105:18
110:2 111:17 117:16
124:9 130:22 132:10
useful 63:21 129:13,15
130:7,8
user 56:14 136:18
uses 24:17 142:11
Utilities 2:4
Utility 2:2 6:17
utilize 53:10 68:21
utilizing 120:1

V

validate 44:9,11 69:22
validating 70:4 105:3
valuable 25:11 28:20
51:21 74:12 80:16
107:9 152:7
value 14:14 17:12 22:14
22:16,21,22 23:5,6,22
25:7 26:17 27:3 37:6
40:5,6 64:1 76:9
77:10 78:4 79:22
80:11,12 103:4
106:18 107:16 113:18
115:17 135:17,18
136:17
value-added 170:2
variable 53:4
variables 57:7,14 60:20
61:1 69:19 73:8,9
75:18 91:22
Variations 16:20
variety 96:12
various 12:5 15:2 20:17
46:11 141:6
vary 124:11
vehicle 34:20
vehicular 112:10
vendors 43:21 56:1
vendor 48:6,19 49:6
52:17 56:22 57:17
70:8 71:21
vendor's 55:5
vendors 5:10,19 43:3
52:20 55:18,20 56:3,8
57:20 63:10 70:2
75:19 137:14
venues 127:20,20,22
verification 41:5,10
42:12,21 43:16,21
58:12
verify 58:17
verifying 105:2
version 78:16

versions 140:16
versus 31:4 53:17
61:16 112:12 166:5
vet 77:5
view 15:10 35:11 61:5
67:20 102:20 109:22
125:15
viewed 163:10
viewing 162:2,4
viewpoint 151:7
Virginia 1:12
vision 128:11 172:9
volume 62:22
voluntarily 80:13
voluntary 1:4 4:5 10:20
42:1 113:20 136:4
142:4 143:19,20
144:9 154:1
volunteers 159:1
vote 9:9 85:9,11,13,20
158:2,4,20 159:2
167:4
voted-on 171:13
votes 154:22

W

waiting 135:4
walk 94:14
walks 103:18
Wall 57:18
Walter 2:1 7:9 108:7
109:16 111:19 118:6
130:14 160:13 161:7
161:18 164:3
Walter's 118:8
wanted 10:14 27:15
46:17 47:2 52:11
64:12,14 82:3 83:22
86:22 87:8 88:2 90:11
94:15 129:5 131:22
140:14 141:22 154:8
wanting 120:17
wants 85:10 123:12
158:3
warn 10:2
Warner 2:6 5:21,22
78:18,18 97:16
140:10,12 165:12
166:13
Washington 2:4
wasn't 57:1 70:14
wave 83:15 92:7 146:13
way 17:6 20:15 28:8
29:15 31:1,5 33:7
34:14 35:12,12 37:1,2
49:10 62:6 68:13 70:7
72:10,10 78:13 81:18
82:1 90:18 95:7 96:7

101:12 102:2,19,22
103:5 106:21 107:21
110:9 111:21 114:3
114:17 121:22 122:10
131:14 132:9 135:6
144:8 148:14 155:14
157:6,14 161:4 162:4
165:17 171:9
ways 11:10 12:5 64:20
94:17 103:6 115:9
125:3 138:17
weather 38:10
web 152:15 153:3
webinar 10:9
webinars 65:1
website 8:2
weeds 136:8
weeks 42:10
weigh 88:12
Welcome 81:14
welds 28:8
well-defined 45:10 46:4
well-informed 139:8
went 18:20 52:8 81:12
87:13 125:1 161:5
175:4
weren't 88:2
wheels 23:14
WHETSEL 2:10 166:13
White 83:15
wider 40:3
willing 82:19 174:14
wind 38:10 136:10
wisdom 23:2,6 24:2,11
24:13 64:6
wise 62:3
woman 166:12
Woo-hoo 169:9
word 16:6 34:1
words 16:5 48:6 53:15
111:18
work 9:5 11:1,21 12:4
12:22 13:6,21 14:5
23:7 27:9 47:14 48:19
49:10,11,20 63:17
73:6 77:6,9 82:6,9
83:10 87:20 89:7 91:3
96:21 98:12 101:18
104:13 105:8,10
108:11,12 119:19
123:20 124:10,10
125:10 139:4 153:8
155:20 156:18 157:9
160:19 162:17 166:22
170:9 171:13,17,22
174:15,18
worked 47:2 66:22
84:16 99:18 100:1

102:15
Workers 2:2
workforce 148:12,17
working 1:5,11 4:5,12
12:1 42:9 46:2 48:7
90:3 120:6 137:15
139:3,3 147:15
156:11 157:12 165:17
172:7 174:11,12
works 89:12 133:20
138:17 155:15 163:22
165:18
workshop 29:10
world 72:12 97:16,17
worry 122:12
worse 34:21
worth 100:16 120:11
wouldn't 89:9,14
wrap 66:17
wrapped 68:21
wrapping 45:15
written 138:8
www.regulations.gov
8:3

X

Y

yard 25:16
year 42:15 50:2 54:13
55:1,1 99:14 140:13
years 26:2,3 31:9 44:6
46:19 51:20 54:22
64:18 65:18,19 71:8
yesterday 10:17 18:19
19:10 25:20 32:18
36:9 41:11 42:4,14
52:8 77:16 82:3,16
83:7 84:10 89:5 90:7
90:10 91:1 92:8,13,21
94:1,21 98:10,19
99:17 100:14 102:7
102:10 103:15 104:1
104:21 107:15 115:18
115:20,22 116:20
119:22 120:14 128:10
137:13 149:18 150:11
162:5
yesterday's 8:22
yield 60:10,17
Yiming 1:19 6:13
147:18
York 1:15 89:8
young 153:1

Z

Zuniga 2:6 5:16,17
118:10 119:12 124:17

0	4 3:2 41:16 45 67:1	
01 73:16		
1	5	
1,297 116:3 1,300 116:1 10 3:4 41:1,3 81:10 10-mile-long 116:5 10(c) 127:12 10(c)(1) 41:9 10(c)(2) 41:16 10(c)(3) 41:9 10:00 81:1 10:14 81:13 100 144:20 11 102:1 167:13 11:00 81:3 11:57 175:4 1163 67:1 69:22 73:15 75:17 78:14 1173 91:10 94:20 97:5 109:10 152:3 13 87:14 97:5 13th 87:18 155:2 14 87:15 147 3:14 14th 87:18 89:8 155:3 15 59:19,20 81:10 154 3:16 158 3:17 160 30:18 42:15 17 120:14 174 3:19 18 3:8 120:14 1991 66:9	5,000- 109:21 50 30:11 502 97:19	
	6	
	60s 66:8	
	7	
	8	
	8 3:3 8:30 1:12 8:37 4:2 84 3:12	
	9	
	9 91:13 94:20 9:59 81:12 90's 39:16 950 1:12	
2		
2 94:5 127:12 2- 116:4 20 120:12 144:19 20-22 120:13 200 42:15 99:4 2001 66:10 2002 67:15 2003 66:11 2010 67:15 2013 78:16 99:2 2014 30:2 2017 1:9 26 65:19		
3		
3 127:12 30 1:9 52:20 59:9,14,17 59:19 63:9 144:19		
4		

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

Before: US DOT/PHMSA

Date: 06-30-17

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

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701