**Participants** (see participants list below)

**Discussion**

1. ***Introduction of new/returning team members*** -Dan Dana – Vectren, representing AGA and Chuck Lesniak – City of Austin, TX, representing NLC
2. ***Consultation zone update*** – Carl Weimer

Washington (state) Consultation Zone efforts - Carl Weimer provided an update local governments efforts to develop and implement consultation zone ordinances. Four counties and seven cities have begun efforts. See Pipeline Safety Trust website at [www.pstrust.org](http://www.pstrust.org) for more information. Communities that have tried to implement setbacks have experienced problems. Skagit County was one such county. They subsequently passed a 100’ consultation zone ordinance. In WA State, new pipelines being out of PIPA’s scope has not an issue although Carl was not aware of any new transmission pipelines proposed in Washington. In areas where new pipelines are being installed, such as Ft. Worth, new ordinances have involved new pipelines.

The state vs. local authority for implementing land use ordinances/zoning related to pipelines is evolving in [NY](http://finance.yahoo.com/news/ny-gas-drilling-opponents-aim-150355255.html) and [PA](http://stateimpact.npr.org/pennsylvania/2011/12/20/house-votes-down-senate-impact-fee-setting-up-january-conference-committee/). In NY home rule legislation is planned that would give local governments veto power over natural gas drilling through zoning authority. In PA, the opposite occurred. The state id in the process of updating its Oil and Gas Act which proposes to set statewide guidelines for what local governments can and cannot regulate. Some places, such as Pittsburgh, had passed outright bans on fracking. The case illustrates some of the complexity and challenges of land use planning related to pipelines.

1. ***Hazard mitigation plan update*** – Julie

Julie met with Loudoun County, VA emergency management to gain feedback to the efficacy of using the hazard mitigation planning process to encourage local governments to consider PIPA recommended practices. They supported this channel as a viable method. Here is a summary of the meeting:

Summary of Discussion:

Julie Halliday, Senior Program Manager, US DOT – Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration – Office of Pipeline Safety, provided information about Pipelines and Informed Planning Alliance (PIPA). The PIPA report is a set of recommended practices for land use and development planning near transmission pipelines whose goal is to reduce risks and improve safety of affected communities and transmission pipelines. Examples of recommended practices discussed include: *ND 23 Consider Site Emergency Response Plans in Land Use Development (*consider reviewing existing pipeline ROW with operator based on the items listed in the recommended practice)*,  ND 22 Reduce Transmission Pipeline Risk through Design and Location of New Places of Mass Public Assembly* (e.g. locating the entrance to a church away from the pipeline) and *ND17 Reduce Transmission Pipeline Risk in New Development for Residential, Mixed-Use, and Commercial Land Use* (cul-de-sac streets should not be designed crossing a transmission pipeline as the only route of ingress or egress could be blocked during a pipeline incident).

The PIPA Implementation Team is comprised of pipeline safety stakeholders representing local governments, pipeline operators, home builders, and pipeline safety regulators. The team is evaluating existing communication channels to engage local governments to promote the awareness of and support their implementation of the PIPA recommended practices. The team sought Loudoun County Emergency Management’s insights into the efficacy of incorporating consideration of pipeline hazards into local hazard mitigation plans as one method to achieve and institutionalize this goal. FEMA requires that approved hazard mitigation plans include natural hazards. Inclusion of other hazards is optional and supported through the All Hazards approach to emergency management. If the team’s approach has merit, they would work with local governments to create guidance material to disseminate to others to support their efforts during the hazard mitigation planning process.

Julie provided examples of hazard mitigation plans which include pipelines; California State and Washtenaw County, MI. California added consideration of pipelines to their hazard mitigation plans after the tragic San Bruno gas transmission incident. Also presented was a relative risk assessment of pipeline hazards compared with natural hazards in terms of injuries, fatalities and property damage for Loudoun and Fairfax counties. The sole fatality due to a gas pipeline in Loudoun County in the last 25 years occurred on July 7, 1998 in the South Riding neighborhood and was the subject of an NTSB safety recommendation which led to regulations requiring the installation of excess flow valves on all new residential service lines. Loudoun County provided that as a result of the incident, the county built a fire station in the South Riding neighborhood. This fire station is within miles of an existing fire station.

Loudoun County Emergency Management representatives included Kevin Johnson, Coordinator, Chris Athey, First Lieutenant, and Joe Dame, Lieutenant. Feedback supported this approach as a valid channel to advance the consideration of land use planning practices by local governments. It was suggested that the PIPA Team begin at the state hazard mitigation planning level. The state plans feed into and provide direction for local plans. A state level view would also include rural, suburban and urban counties. The state Director of Planning is Ted Costin. Other organizations for the Team to consider are: International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM), Paradigm, and the All Hazards Consortium. A concern expressed was the sharing of pipeline maps and information with the public through mitigation plans and the planning process. Operators have been more willing to share information about aboveground facilities with police as it enhances their protection and security. The National Pipeline Mapping System provides geographic and contact information about transmission pipelines. There is a public viewer which allows anyone to view the maps. Additional information is available to local governments through a password protected site. The maps at the scale provided to local governments could not be shared but small scale maps could be. Pipeline data is not considered Protected Critical Infrastructure Information by DHS.

**ACTION**: Julie will be meeting with Virginia state emergency managers. Jim Hottinger, VA SCC, will also attend. VA develops hazard based templates to distribute to local emergency management groups to assist them in addressing hazards in their hazard mitigation planning process. Julie is drafting an outline to use for development of the template, *Hazard Mitigation Planning for Pipelines*.

**Q**: Should hazard mitigation encompass gathering and distribution pipelines as well as transmission pipelines?

A: Provide guidance that the PIPA RPs were created for new development near existing transmission pipelines but the mitigation measures may apply to other types of pipelines within a community’s jurisdiction.

**Q**: Should the capability assessment include assessment of the local government’s damage prevention regulations and practices? Emergency response? Public awareness?

A: Comment is that this would change scope of Communication Team’s efforts. Also, a concern is where information is to come from – i.e., is it available. Could PHMSA’s SDPPC information be used to perform the capability assessment for damage prevention? Perhaps first step is to focus on land use practices and see if opportunity is there to look at other aspects.

1. ***Pilot of RP ND 23***

PIPA practice ND 23 encourages the local government and the property developer/owner to consider emergency response needs when planning land use or development in proximity to existing transmission pipeline right-of-ways to ensure that emergency response is not impeded in the event of a pipeline emergency.

We are now looking to test implementation of practice ND 23. The pilot proposes that local government emergency management personnel and the affected pipeline operator(s) jointly review emergency response needs in the event of a postulated incident involving an existing transmission pipeline against the emergency response requirements listed in the recommended practice. From this review, implementation of the recommended practice will be evaluated.

In preparation for the meeting with Loudoun Emergency Managers, Julie used NPMS to examine the pipeline right-of-way in Loudoun County. She provided examples (photos) of situations where awareness of PIPA recommended practices could be discussed such as areas where new development near existing pipelines is likely, difficult to evacuate buildings with entrances facing the pipeline ROW, and a cul-de-sac where access is cut off by the pipeline ROW. The review is hoped to lead to a greater awareness and consideration of implementation of PIPA RPs that are relevant to the local government.

For the second round of the pilot, the local homebuilder representatives will be brought into the pilot and join the review process.

**ACTION:** Looking for industry volunteers to help pilot ND23. Andrea Grover and Dwayne Teschendorf will work with INGAA to find a rep. Terri Larson/Gina Greenslate will work with API/AOPL and Dan Dana will work with AGA. A draft of the plan for implementing this pilot has been created. Once the volunteers are in place, the group will jointly review and modify the plan.

1. ***Operator PIPA RP Evaluation Spreadsheet Review and Develop Communication Plan***

The spreadsheet Spectra developed to evaluate their practices against PIPA recommended practices was modified for use by all operators to perform this review. The final product should be distributed to operators to help make PIPA RPs more tangible and to assist them in developing a plan to adopt recommended practices they find appropriate. The worksheet will be revised to group practices where operators lead the primary action at the beginning of the spreadsheet.

API/AOPL could utilize list serves for various committees to distribute. Terri inquired INGAA would consider including API/AOPL to partner on the PIPA webinar.

The spreadsheet needs a better introduction that provides the operator with an understanding of how they can utilize the spreadsheet. Suggestion to reorganize practices in spreadsheet to list those that target operators as “primary audience” first, then list others. The document should reference the PIPA material on SC website.

ACTION: Team members were asked to review and comment on the worksheet after it is revised. INGAA will promote the spreadsheet as part of their “PIPA 101” webinar tentatively scheduled for late Feb. Dan, Terri and Gina were asked to develop a plan to distribute this document and raise PIPA awareness with AGA and API/AOPL members respectively. To whom should questions be sent if operators have questions (if they don’t want to send them to Julie)? Will the questions go to a trade staff person or to the PIPA representative? Julie will revise and distribute the document to the team.

1. ***PIPA operator contact list***

When local governments are contacted about PIPA, the relevant operators will be sent an email to give them notice that they may be receiving questions from the local government. NPMS contacts may not be the right person but could be a starting point.

ACTION: Request that Susan, Dan, Terri , Gina work with their trades to develop a list of PIPA contacts.

1. ***INGAA’s PIPA efforts* *update***– Susan/Andrea

The INGAA is meeting in DC next week to plan the PIPA 101 webinar. The webinar may cover topics such as what it PIPA, what is expected of various stakeholders, what are the benefits of implementing the RPs.

1. ***APA PAS report update*** – Julie

Julie provided an update to Jeff/Linda/Steve on the Team’s implementation plan. PIPA has followed a consensus process but AGA requires full editorial control. They asked if everyone on the team was supportive of working with APA on development of a PAS report. A teleconference is being scheduled to further understand APA’s process for developing a report, APA’s thoughts on the consultation zone concept and setbacks, and how APA might approach topics that were not in the PIPA report.

**ACTION**: Julie to coordinate call with APA. Please send any questions you would like APA to discuss. Also let Julie know if you would like to include others on the call.

**Future meetings**

* Feb 8
* Mar 14
* Apr 11
* May 9
* Jun 13

**Meeting concluded.**

**Participants**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | [**Representing**](#'PIPA_Tracking'!A1) | **Company** | **Email** |
| Cynthia Munyon\* | NAPSR | Iowa Utilities Board | [cynthia.munyon@iub.iowa.gov](mailto:cynthia.munyon@iub.iowa.gov) |
| Steve Fischer | PHMSA | PHMSA | [Steve.fischer@dot.gov](mailto:Steve.fischer@dot.gov) |
| Julie Halliday\* | PHMSA | PHMSA | [julie.halliday@dot.gov](mailto:julie.halliday@dot.gov) |
| James Davenport | NACo | Nat’l Assoc. of Counties | [jdavenpo@naco.org](mailto:jdavenpo@naco.org) |
| Jim Philipps | NACo | Nat’l Assoc. of Counties | [jphilipps@naco.org](mailto:jphilipps@naco.org) |
| Chuck Lesniak | NLC | City of Austin, TX | chuck.lesniak@austintexas.gov |
| Julia Pulidindi | NLC | National League of Cities | [pulidindi@nlc.org](mailto:pulidindi@nlc.org) |
| Debbie Bassert | NAHB | Nat’l Assoc. of Home Builders | [dbassert@nahb.org](mailto:dbassert@nahb.com) |
| Erika Lee | CGA | Common Ground Alliance | [erikaa@commongroundalliance.com](mailto:erikaa@commongroundalliance.com) |
| Rebecca Craven | PST | Pipeline Safety Trust | [rebecca@pstrust.org](mailto:rebecca@pstrust.org) |
| Carl Weimer | PST | Pipeline Safety Trust | [carl@pstrust.org](mailto:carl@pstrust.org) |
| Gina Greenslate | API/AOPL | Panhandle Energy Companies | [gina.greenslate@sug.com](mailto:gina.greenslate@sug.com) |
| Terri Larson | API/AOPL | Enbridge Energy Company | [Terri.larson@enbridge.com](mailto:Terri.larson@enbridge.com) |
| Phil Bennett | AGA | American Gas Association | [pbennett@aga.org](mailto:pbennett@aga.org) |
| Dan Dana | AGA | Vectren | ddana@Vectren.com |
| Lydia Meiqs | AGA | American Gas Association | [Lmeiqs@aga.org](mailto:Lmeiqs@aga.org) |
| Susan Waller | INGAA | Spectra Energy | [SDWaller@spectraenergy.com](mailto:SDWaller@spectraenergy.com) |
| Andrea Grover | INGAA | Spectra Energy | [ADGrover@spectraenergy.com](mailto:ADGrover@spectraenergy.com) |
| Dwayne Teschendorf | INGAA | Spectra Energy | [DETeschendorf@spectraenergy.com](mailto:%20DETeschendorf@spectraenergy.com) |
| Amber Pappas | RCP | RCP | [apappas@rcp.com](mailto:apappas@rcp.com) |
| Herb Wilhite | PHMSA/Cycla | Cycla Corporation | [herbw@cycla.com](mailto:herbw@cycla.com) |
| \* Co-Leaders |  |  |  |
| Gray font indicates PIPA Communication Team Members not participating in meeting | | | |