# ****PIPA Communications Team – Notes from July 24-25, 2012, Meetings****

Participants: See Attachment 1

## Tuesday, July 24th

Agenda **-** Meeting at Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM), 10501 Trade Court, Richmond, VA 23236

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10:00 am – 11:00 pm | PIPA Communication Team Meeting |
| 11:00 am – 4:00 pm | Meet with VDEM to discuss their hazard mitigation plan and our pilot program |
| Lunch will be delivered (not sponsored by PHMSA) |
| Discuss deliverables: |
| 1. Update VA HMP to include pipeline failures due to natural hazards.  [Link](http://www.vaemergency.gov/node/1359) to plan.
 |
| 1. Primer for emergency management/hazard mitigation managers regarding pipelines.
 |
| 1. Primer for operators regarding hazard mitigation plans.
 |
| * VDEM may want promotional pieces to use in discussing pipelines and hazard mitigation with land owners/managers or for their website.
* Promotion plan for hazard mitigation planning for pipelines when material is complete
 |

Discussion:

PIPA Communication Team Meeting

Julie – Challenge in reaching state and local gov’t. Partnership with VDEM is good start. Local gov’ts required to implement what is in state hazard mitigation plans.

Tools for PIPA, last year:

* Brochures (2)
* Evaluation worksheets for stakeholders (developers, local gov’ts, operators) – reflect applicable PIPA recommended practices
* Two-page equivalent of environmental site assessment
* NACo document directed to local gov’t officials
* “Pick and choose” Power Point presentation
* Other presentations by others
* INGAA PIPA one-pager (on INGAA website, borrow and post on PIPA Toolbox)
* PIPA panel for PST??
* NPMS logo w/link to NPSM public viewer
* NPMS training program

Communications efforts (conferences):

* NACo
* NATaT
* AGA
* API
* CGA
* APWA
* PST
* NAHB

Last year looked at candidate cities to pilot PIPA RPs. Pipeline Safety Trust (PST) worked with five cities in Washington. In Texas, Fort Worth, Austin, Skagit County. However, those TX cities began looking at setbacks instead of consultation zones.

In WA, planners naturally lean to setbacks. PST discussed with them the use of consultation zones in lieu of setbacks.

Another barrier found was the current low level of development due to the economy. Also, state/local governments have cut back on resources for planning and zoning. Austin has recently had an emergency ramp-up in funding for planning and zoning (permit reviews). Other parts of the country are also showing signs of picking up. The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) follows new home growth (home starts, available lots) and trends are increasing this year.

We may look at shale plays overlaid with new housing starts (Julie, Claire). Stakeholders in those areas want to talk about pipelines. Emergency management has to look at both production and pipeline issues relative to shale plays. They need a systematic way to do those analyses.

PHMSA turned to looking at hazard mitigation as a way to plug in to an established channel for communicating PIPA RPs. PHMSA first looked at APA as a partner. There were a few hurdles to working with them; ultimately, APA wanted to take control of the PIPA RPs and make them their own via their established Planning Advisory Service (PAS) processes. They particularly wanted to address new pipeline construction. They also wanted funding from PHMSA and then be allowed to go do their own thing with minimal input. The original PIPA effort recognized that local governments would adopt RPs as regulation/ordinances. E.g., Austin looked at best practices to developing ordinances. APA didn’t think that “recommendations” should lead to requirements. Decision was made that partnering with APA was not a good fit. Claire Worshtil may provide some insights into state APA chapters (tomorrow’s meeting).

PHMSA then looked to establish a partnership with the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) to demonstrate how pipelines should be considered in state hazard mitigation plans, and, presumably, communication of PIPA RPs as mitigation recommendations. All states and most local governments are involved in making/implementing hazard mitigation plans.

Status of partnership with VDEM:

PHMSA is working to integrate information regarding pipeline hazards within VDEM’s Hazard Mitigation Plan update and within their process. Several meetings have been held, with VDEM and PIPA (PHMSA and operators) participation in a series of four VDEM webinars related to natural hazards (wind, fire, flooding, earthquakes). Several documents are prepared in draft to help VDEM and others understand why to include pipelines in hazard mitigation planning.

Q: (Steve Fischer) Need to understand, for the team, why we are focusing on hazard mitigation planning instead of local land use planning.

Within PHMSA, post APA, was discussion of how best to get PIPA info out to local stakeholders. Decided that the people looking at risk should be the ones looking at PIPA RPs to help mitigate pipeline risks. Thus, settled on looking at emergency planners (e.g., VDEM), as looking at mitigating hazards is what they do. On the positive side is that emergency planners have wide-spread processes in place. Virginia is a Dillon-rule state which meant that if implemented at the state level all counties would have to develop. Also, state and local governments are big-time developers for roads and other infrastructure.

FEMA’s Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is helping incentivize state hazard mitigation planners to include man-made hazards.

PIPA Background for VDEM staff:

Julie (PHMSA) – Things to consider:

* What are impacts if critical infrastructure (i.e., pipelines) is out of service?
* What could impacts of natural hazards be on pipelines?
* What are impacts of pipeline failures on communities?
* Land planning is one mitigation strategy for local governments. What are others that local governments have influence over to reduce pipeline hazards?
* How can we quickly get pipeline operators up-to-speed on hazard mitigation planning processes?
* How can we get hazard mitigation managers quickly knowledgeable of pipeline hazards?

Matt Wall (VDEM) – Discussion of general process/requirements for hazard mitigation.

Mitigation is any action or plan to reduce damages to future events. Most mitigative actions have costs associated with them. Various options often are available to try to mitigate hazards, especially for pipelines, with differing costs/impacts. Mitigation works in conjunction with recovery actions. Must look at risk impacts and what mitigative actions are feasible. Look at mitigating risks to pipeline integrity. Look at mitigating impacts to community of pipeline failure. Look at recovery needs/options. Recovery involves short-term and potentially long-term economic impacts (loss of services/products, repair costs, loss of ability to function due to loss of services/products) on state, regional, and local economies, large and small businesses, community (residents), local governments (tax base, restoration of services).

VDEM is assisting the PIPA team to develop tools to help/encourage others to integrate pipelines in hazard mitigation plans and future updates to such plans. This will help the PIPA Comm Team plan and implement outreach efforts.

Q: (Steve Fischer) What, specifically, is VDEM looking to incorporate relative to pipelines in its state HMP?

Robbie Coates

FEMA requires all states and tribal governments to develop HMPs that must be revised every three years. A lot of resources (dollars) are tied to the HMP development processes. In VA, 21 regions/planning districts develop HMPs; these are on a 5-year planning cycle and are focused on local community planning.

On the state level, VDEM must look at all natural hazard categories. VDEM considers that hazards for both gas and liquid pipelines are already understood. VDEM wants to communicate to local communities, without painting pipelines negatively, what those risks are. Also need to identify:

* Where pipelines are, overlaid with locations/risks of natural hazards (e.g., landslides).
* What the potential interaction/impacts of natural hazards are on pipelines.

Risks are often determined by historical occurrence data. Starting point is to identify how much pipeline is located in specific communities, then, communicate that information to local HMP planners. (State HMP is good vehicle for this.) Need to determine best way to discuss/define these areas and what the potential impacts are. Local governments need to identify most critical locations that could be impacted by pipeline failures events (e.g., high-impact locations). Then must develop mitigative measures in conjunction with discussion with pipeline operators.

Julie: Operators have defined potential impact radii (gas pipelines) and could affect areas (liquid pipelines).

Matt Wall: The FEMA-required HMP in VA drives equivalent but smaller scale plans by local communities. Need to develop risk matrix to enable state/community to decide if pipeline risk is precedent over mitigation for other hazard risks, and where highest pipeline risks are and, therefore, where is most critical place to expend resources.

Q: (Chuck Lesniak) Does VDEM work with local jurisdictions to determine what they can do to mitigate pipeline risks in lieu of operator actions? Yes

Q: (Steve Fischer) State can overlay pipeline locations on other, natural hazard areas. Local government can overlay on other types of areas (e.g., high population). Those overlays can identify impacts of natural hazards on pipelines. (Matt) – Can also use overlays to determine what impacts to community could be.

Q: Is VDEM also looking at potential impacts of pipeline failures on areas outside of natural hazard areas? I.e., potential impacts of pipeline failures without concern of natural hazards. No.

Greg Ford – Few pipeline failures are instigated by natural hazard events. An area where focus is needed to improve pipeline safety is communication of the existence and hazards of pipeline failures to local communities. Pipeline failures are very local with regard to impact.

Chuck Lesniak – Life safety issues are generally required to be addressed by planners. How they are addressed can vary but they must be addressed.

Robbie Coates – Review of VA Standard HMP Support Annex, Section 3.4: State and Critical Facility Analysis.

## Wednesday, July 25th

**Meeting at Virginia State Corporation Commission**

Tyler Building, 1300 East Main Street, 4th Floor, Richmond, VA  23219

### Meeting Agenda

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8:00 am | Discuss strategy and develop communications plan for next year.  See some thoughts to prompt discussion below and handout of planned communication efforts and potential target audiences for future efforts. |
| 12:30 pm – 2:00 pm | Discuss revamp of PIPA external website and PIPA Communication Team webpage.  Please bring ideas. Pictures below are hyperlinked to respective webpages. |
| 2:00 pm | Close Meeting |

### Discussion

What is experience to-date of communicating with other stakeholders about PIPA?

* Others are too busy to pay attention or be concerned.
* Perhaps information coming from operators presents/causes a bias against the message.
* Some overload of public awareness messages coming from operators from PA programs. Addition of PIPA information may cause overload.
* Presenting information about development near pipelines should be presented as a reference (i.e., here is where info can be found) and present it through other stakeholder organizations than the operators (e.g., emergency management officials).
* Public awareness is likely not the right delivery pipe for PIPA. But, it can be in the toolkit provided to local governments and others as additional info.
* Working through emergency management organizations has benefit of using existing processes.
* Over time, the best approach will evolve. Repeat messages from various sources will make message more familiar and recognizable.
* Integrating PIPA messages with operator encroachment programs is likely a good avenue. E.g., Vectren (Chuck Kanoy) identified one contact person to which encroachment issues are referred. That contact tries to talk with affected parties to determine if encroachments can be resolved and offer suggestions. Having one-person, knowledgeable contact is the key to their success.
* Andrea, Greg, including PIPA info on operator PA literature and websites is becoming typical. Terri Larson did informal email survey of members showing same.
* All recognize that implementing in a planned setting instead of an emergency setting is best. Problem is getting stakeholders to pay attention to messages.
* More non-operator stakeholders are now encountering pipeline info in news. PIPA Comm Team just needs to make sure that message is being communicated in a variety of forums.
* Idea: Team should develop an advertisement that operators could use in an ad campaign (newspapers, trade journals, newsletters, web sites, brochures, etc.). Be clear on target audiences to determine best placements.
* E-Blasts are becoming more prevalent. Julie did one-pager to promote tools for use by Team. What would a good tagline be? Needs to regard safety along pipelines when developing.
* PHMSA has allocated $100K to promote 811 this year. Could also include PIPA message.
* PSAs are another issue, but funding the messages is another issue.
* Interest drops of among stakeholders if the information (i.e., along the ROW) doesn’t affect them. However, many aren’t aware if they are adjacent to the ROW or not. Level of public knowledge about pipeline locations is low. This includes public officials. NPMS is not a push product; local officials must request access.
* Requests for pipeline location information to operators trigger response to work with developer but not release of total pipeline mapping/location information.
* Trying to get uninvolved stakeholders to absorb basic pipeline awareness is very difficult.
* If municipality is annexing an area, they must develop comprehensive plan and should consider impacts of pipeline ROW. They should consider development regulations along ROW in implementing comprehensive plans. (Chuck Lesniak) In Austin he tried to increase awareness and consideration of pipeline in this occurrence and was unable to gain traction. Part of problem might have been that ROW affected only a small part of the comprehensive plan which covered a much larger land mass. What message would have resonated with the local officials in this case? Another potential issue is that audiences might think of distribution systems when pipelines are mentioned. In Washington, money was being offered to get local government to consider projects – few takers.
* A post-accident environment is a good time to try to get the attention of other local officials. Keep promoting messages in a large variety of communications so that some will remember that there is an issue that should be considered when developing near ROW.
* Pre-housing market crash developers didn’t pay a lot of attention to due diligence. Post-crash developers are paying more attention to doing due diligence and if PIPA information is more readily available and known widespread, developers are more likely to be aware and pay attention.
* One key is for existence of pipeline ROW to be required in all property transfers. Raising awareness of builders and developers and government officials through real estate disclosure can go a long way to getting stakeholders to consider this. Getting state laws changed to include pipelines as hazards for disclosure in all real estate transactions should be considered.
* Long-term strategy could be to train new planners, engineers, and architects to consider ROW development.
* Fundamental awareness (lack of) issue is just awareness of pipelines in general by developers and others. Positive is that the target audience(s) for PIPA is limited to people involved in (1) hazard mitigation planning and (2) development. Good to identify all stakeholders and prioritize who to outreach to for next year.
* Perspective: planning council works for city management. VA Assoc. of Counties and VA Association of City Managers are two examples of target audiences to reach out to. I.e., look for organizations that have as members those types of audiences. It can be a challenge finding those organizations.
* Looking at three groups over next year:
	+ State/local governments – Convey information about VDEM pilot to them. Include national associations representing their organizations. Perhaps outreach to NAPSR to make them aware of VDEM pilot. Would need to package PIPA message differently. PIPA practices would need to be discussed as mitigation actions. Try to work with VA Municipal League and VA Assoc. of Counties. Issue with VDEM Pilot is that focus is mainly on natural hazards and protecting pipelines from impact as critical infrastructure. However, it does get the consideration of pipeline hazards in front of local officials. Thought is that VDEM will link to PIPA reference materials in discussion of pipelines in their HMP update. What is possibility of getting FEMA to include pipeline hazard consideration in its HMP program – likely ten year out. Discussion would be needed at top PHMSA Administrator level with FEMA. Some understanding could be gained to understand from FEMA what their plan is to include manmade hazards.
	+ Developers/builders, and
	+ Operators.

#### State/local governments

* Perhaps target states where pipelines are “hot topics”. E.g., New Jersey vs Spectra Energy development issue, Fort Worth pipeline issues. Perhaps two messages: (1) general pipeline awareness, and (2) what to consider in planning development. In VA, when doing RP1162 Program inspections, the regulator calls the communities’ stakeholders and gauge if operators are doing a good job of outreach.
* Consultation zone ordinance is a topic that many communities don’t want to talk about.
* State regulatory agencies generally aren’t involved in local land development decisions.
* Webinars – SGA, NACo/NACP, INGAA, NAHB – better to continue to have multiple webinars and enable discussions among participants. Different participant groups will have different sets of concerns. Perhaps target webinar for wide audience within single states. Target planning commissions (not elected officials) and/or city/county managers, fire marshals. Consider either rural or urban state.
* Additional state other than Virginia, consider areas where pipeline awareness is higher due to pipeline development and/or recent incidents, but perhaps not too controversial. For example, North Dakota. Terri Larson will try to identify contact(s) for ND.
* What are topics that should be included in webinar?
	+ Graphics (INGAA presentation showing subdivision access/ingress cut off, schools/hospitals/etc. next to pipelines, traffic related to liquid spill cleanup). Pictures should show distance (consultation zone, ROW width, PIR), but this would involve showing accident pictures. Fire fuel is more than just the pipeline product – it involves the surrounding structures and other features that may catch fire and burn. (E.g., PHMSA overlay of San Bruno neighborhood with PIR.)
	+ Who can develop graphics? There is sensitivity by operators relative to showing graphic accident pictures and relating them to a specific operator/incident. Solution suggested is to label graphics as examples of impacts that could happen anywhere. Offset with suggested settings around pipelines (PIPA).
	+ When could graphics be created? Who could create them?
	+ Messages: Why should I (audience) be concerned with pipelines? What are impacts of pipelines, of incidents? How should existing pipelines affect future land planning decisions?
* What is time frame for webinar(s)?

#### Developers

* NAHB could include messages with Friday morning email blasts. Important to attach to source/topic that is recognizable to and trusted by target audience.
* National association meetings (e.g., NAHB, NACo); might be good venues for operators to step in and convey PIPA messages from their perspectives and for target audience information.
	+ Issue involving who pays for booths at trade shows.
	+ NAHB design studio (Claire Warshtil works with); used to address issues that developers may be having.
* Outreach to top developers/design firms in U.S.? Need to identify outreach contacts within the firms. Their perspective is likely to be on how much developable area does the pipeline take out, not how to develop around pipeline ROW.
* Targeted email distributions.

National Building Museum Exhibit - “Designing for Disasters”

* Opens October 2013. ([www.nbm.org/exhibitions-collections/exhigitions/designing-for-disaster.html](http://www.nbm.org/exhibitions-collections/exhigitions/designing-for-disaster.html))
* Two primary questions to help guide approach: Where should we build? How should we build?
* One question asked by Museum is what operators do to make pipelines resilient to natural hazards.

#### Operators

* Look at national, regional, and state associations (SGA, AGA, Virginia Gas and Oil Pipeline Assoc.).
* Might be best to target regional and state organizations if focusing on states for this year.
* Identify PIPA efforts to NAPSR reps for target states.
* Identify who operators are in target states and ensure they are PIPA aware and up-to-speed in PIPA effort.

### PIPA Website – Redesign?

Note: most state pipeline safety websites do not have PIPA link.

* Top page: make easier for stakeholder to get to their info. Dashboard? Better graphics? Give subject line at top to each paragraph.
* Tag line for PIPA?
* Too much narrative on top page.
* Why should I care about pipelines? I am a [target audience]. Link to separate pages for each audience.
* Caution: (Steve Fischer) consider top audience links and potential confusion with audiences with same names within PIPA pages.
* Delete bullets and just keep thumbnails on Toolbox page.
* Add links to industry association PIPA pages (INGAA, API, AOPL, AGA)
* Create archive and move anything past 2011 into it, grouped by year
* Outreach to all PIPA participants to create info links to PIPA website on their websites (e.g., www.austintexas.gov)
* Keep it simple stupid (KISS)
* Add case studies: practices implemented, land use planning could have helped,
* Need page (not website) of arguments to use for proponents of implementing PIPA RPs within communities.

Meeting concluded.

# Attachment 1

## Participants

|  **Date** | **Name** | **Organization Representing** | **Company** | **Email** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Cynthia Munyon\* | NAPSR | Iowa Utilities Board | cynthia.munyon@iub.iowa.gov |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Steve Fischer | PHMSA | Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) | Steve.fischer@dot.gov |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Julie Halliday\* | PHMSA | PHMSA | Julie.Halliday@dot.gov |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Andrew Kohout | FERC | Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | andrew.kohout@ferc.gov |
| 7/24, 7/25 | James Davenport | NACo | National Association of Counties | jdavenport@naco.org |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Chuck Lesniak | NLC | City of Austin, TX | chuck.lesniak@austintexas.gov |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Claire Worshtil | NAHB | National Association of Home Builders | cworshtil@nahb.org  |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Rebecca Craven | PST | Pipeline Safety Trust | rebecca@pstrust.org |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Terri Larson | API | Enbridge Energy Company, Inc. | terri.larson@enbridge.com |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Greg Ford | INGAA | Williams | Greg.r.ford@williams.com |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Andrea Grover | INGAA | Spectra Energy | ADGrover@spectraenergy.com |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Chuck Kanoy | AGA | Vectren | bckanoy@vectren.com |
| 7/25 | Jim Hotinger | VA SCC | Virginia State Corporation Commission | jim.hotinger@scc.virginia.gov  |
| 7/24 | Matthew Wall | VDEM | Virginia Department of Emergency Management | Matthew.Wall@vdem.virginia.gov |
| 7/24 | Robbie Coates | VDEM | VDEM | Robert.Coates@vdem.virginia.gov  |
| 7/24, 7/25 | Herb Wilhite | Cycla | Cycla Corporation | herbw@cycla.com |

\* Co-Leaders