



November 26, 2013

RECEIVED NOV 27 2013

Linda Daugherty
Director, Central Region
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
Office of Pipeline Safety
901 Locust St, Ste 462
Kansas City, MO 64106-2330

Re: Response to CPF 3-2013-1017M - Notice of Amendment (NOA) to the Kinder Morgan Public Awareness Program

Dear Ms. Daugherty,

Kinder Morgan has reviewed and analyzed the Notice of Amendment referenced above, in which PHMSA requests certain amendments to procedures based on inspections held at Kinder Morgan Lakewood, Colorado office.

On August 24- 25, 2010, representatives of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) pursuant to Chapter 601 of 49 United States Code inspected Rockies Express Pipeline LLC (Rockies Express) procedures for Public Awareness and Damage Prevention in Lakewood, Colorado. Rockies Express Pipeline LLC has since been purchased by Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission Company.

On April 20-21, 2011, representatives of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) pursuant to Chapter 601 of 49 United States Code inspected Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P. (Kinder Morgan) procedures for Public Awareness Program Effectiveness Evaluation in Lakewood, Colorado.

For the purposes of clarity, the issues presented by your office will be restated with Kinder Morgan's response immediately following in bold font. Revisions to the Public Awareness Program are attached to this response for your review and revisions within the program documentation are highlighted in yellow. All program revisions will become effective January 1, 2014.

Item 1:

§ 192.616 Public awareness.

(b) The operator's program must follow the general program recommendations of API RP 1162 and assess the unique attributes and characteristics of the operator's pipeline and facilities.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness Program does not include a process to provide the line size on county specific maps provided for natural gas assets. Instead, the PAP refers stakeholders to the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) for more details. Consequently, the PAP process does not document line size information on maps, does not verify that details have been submitted to NPMS, and overlooks the non-availability to the general public.

Response 1:

Kinder Morgan has revised Public Awareness Program section PA0080 – Delivery Methods for Messages, Section 2 (Pipeline Maps) to address the process of providing specific line size information on county specific maps. In addition, this same section has been revised to address the NPMS validation concerns.

Refer to [Attachment 1: PA0080 – Delivery Methods for Messages](#).

Item 2:

§ 192.616 Public awareness.

- (c) The operator must follow the general program recommendations, including baseline and supplemental requirements of API RP 1162, unless the operator provides justification in its program or procedural manual as to why compliance with all or certain provisions of the recommended practice is not practicable and not necessary for safety.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness/Damage Prevention Program is not documented in the Operations and Maintenance or the Public Awareness/Damage Prevention manuals that address stakeholder feedback received by the company. Kinder Morgan must have a documented procedure to manage the stakeholder feedback they receive. This procedure should include how the feedback is recorded and any changes to the program based on stakeholder feedback.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness Program does not include a process to communicate the product transported to the appropriate stakeholders and place the line size (or range of line size operated) along with the product type on maps provided to emergency responders or provide justification in its program.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness Program does not provide guidance on the process to conduct the annual implementation review and address any needed changes, does not guide the annual supplemental review along the entire pipeline by stakeholder audience and does not provide an annual implementation summary of what has been considered, what has been noted for improvement, who is responsible, when will it be done and when it is completed. Annual review should document decisions such as increasing the affected public buffer from the potential impact radius (PIR) to 1320 feet.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness Program does not include a written process for measuring the bottom-line results. The PAP does not detail the information being reviewed and analyzed on an annual basis. In addition, Kinder Morgan must document the results of the annual implementation and effectiveness evaluation meetings. This summary should include the results of any surveys or other evaluation methods performed throughout the previous year, other public awareness and damage prevention activities, any action items identified along with implementation/completion date and any changes identified for the Kinder Morgan Public Awareness/Damage Prevention program including along with the completion date. The annual implementation review and the effectiveness evaluation summaries

must be available for periodic review by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness Program does not have a process defined that identifies changes, tracks changes and tracks progress in making changes based on the findings of the effectiveness evaluation.

Response 2:

Kinder Morgan has revised Public Awareness Procedure *PA0080 – Delivery Methods for Messages, Section 2 (Email)*.

Refer to [Attachment 1: PA0080 – Delivery Methods for Messages](#).

Kinder Morgan has revised Public Awareness Program section *PA0080 – Delivery Methods for Messages, Section 2 (Pipeline Maps)* to address the process of providing product transported and specific line size information on county specific maps to emergency responders. In addition, *Section 2 (Pipeline Markers)* has been revised to demonstrate that pipeline markers are used to communicate product transported. *PA0060 – Message Type & Content, Section 3* has been revised to include the message that Kinder Morgan will communicate to Stakeholders on how to obtain specific (products transported, location, etc) pipeline information.

Refer to [Attachment 1: PA0080 – Delivery Methods for Messages](#) and [Attachment 2: PA0060 – Message Type & Content](#).

Kinder Morgan has revised *PA0110 – Program Evaluation, Section 4* to address the process to guide the annual implementation review (*Section 4.1*) and the process for measuring bottom-line results (*Section 4.2*).

Refer to [Attachment 3: PA0110 – Program Evaluation](#).

Kinder Morgan has revised *PA0110 – Program Evaluation, Section 6* to address the process of how changes to the public awareness program will be identified and tracked.

Refer to [Attachment 3: PA0110 – Program Evaluation](#).

Item 3:

§ 192.616 Public awareness.

- (g) The program must be conducted in English and in other languages commonly understood by a significant number and concentration of the non-English speaking population in the operator's area.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness Program does not include a process to address the identification of the non-English speaking population in the operator's area.

Response 3:

Kinder Morgan has revised PA0010 – Program Objectives, Overview and Definitions, Section 1 to address the process for identifying the non-English speaking populations in our operating area.

Refer to [Attachment 4: PA0010 – Program Objectives, Overview and Definitions.](#)

Item 4:

§ 192.616 Public awareness.

- (i) The operator's program documentation and evaluation results must be available for periodic review by appropriate regulatory agencies.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness/Damage Prevention program does not have a documented procedure in the Operations and Maintenance or the Public Awareness/Damage Prevention manuals to analyze and address findings on excavation-related events. Kinder Morgan must have a documented procedure on how excavation-related events are analyzed and the related findings are incorporated back into the public awareness and damage prevention program.

Response 4:

Kinder Morgan has revised PA0110 – Program Evaluation, Section 4 to address analyzing and addressing findings on excavation related events.

Refer to [Attachment 3: PA0110 – Program Evaluation.](#)

Item 5:

§ 192.917 How does an operator identify potential threats to pipeline integrity and use the threat identification in its integrity program?

- (b) Data gathering and integration. To identify and evaluate the potential threats to a covered pipeline segment, an operator must gather and integrate existing data and information on the entire pipeline that could be relevant to the covered segment. In performing this data gathering and integration, an operator must follow the requirements in ASME.ANSI B31.8S, section 4. At a minimum, an operator must gather and evaluate the set of data specified in Appendix A to ASME.ANSI B31.8S, and consider both the covered segment and similar non-covered segments, past records, continuing surveillance records, patrolling records, maintenance history, internal inspection records and all other conditions specific to each pipeline.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness/Damage Prevention Program does not include a process for damage prevention threats that will be collected, assessed, and integrated into the threat identification portion of the Integrity Management Program in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the Operations and Maintenance Procedures. Kinder Morgan's process must adequately guide the identification of damage prevention threats that will be collected, assessed, and integrated into the threat identification portion of their Integrity Management Program.

Response 5:

Kinder Morgan has revised O&M Procedure 232 – Damage Prevention and Public Awareness to address the process for collecting, assessing and integrating damage prevention threats into the Integrity Management Program.

Refer to [Attachment 5: O&M Procedure 232 – Damage Prevention and Public Awareness](#).

Item 6:

§ 192.917 How does an operator identify potential threats to pipeline integrity and use the threat identification in its integrity program?

(e) Actions to address particular threats. If an operator identified any of the following threats, the operator must take the following actions to address the threat.

(1) Third party damage. An operator must utilize the data integration required in paragraph (b) of the section and ASME.ANSI B31.8S, Appendix A7 to determine the susceptibility of each covered segment to the threat of third party damage. If an operator identifies the threat of third party damage, the operator must implement comprehensive additional preventive measure in accordance with 192.395 and monitor the effectiveness of the preventive measure. If, in conducting a baseline assessment under 192.921, or a reassessment under 192.937, an operator uses an internal inspection tool or external correction direct assessment, the operator must integrate data from these assessments with data related to any encroachment of foreign line crossing on the covered segment, to define where potential indications or third party damage may exist in the covered segment.

An operator must also have procedures in its integrity management program addressing actions it will take to respond to findings from this data integration.

Kinder Morgan's procedures are inadequate because its Public Awareness/Damage Prevention Program does not specify how reports of third party damage are compared against One-Call tickets. Furthermore, the procedures do not address how information obtained through this process is to be implemented into the Integrity Management and Public Awareness/Damage Prevention Programs.

Response 6:

Kinder Morgan has revised O&M Procedure 232 – Damage Prevention and Public Awareness, Section 3 to address the process comparing third party damage reports against One-Call tickets and how this information obtained through this process is implemented in the Integrity Management and Public Awareness/Damage Prevention Program.

Refer to [Attachment 5: O&M Procedure 232 – Damage Prevention and Public Awareness](#).

CPF 3-2013-1017M Response
November 26, 2013
Page 6 of 6

Thank you for your consideration of this information as a resolution to the NOA. Please contact Reji George at 713-420-5433 or me at 713-369-8463 should you wish to discuss the information provided above.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Gary Buchler, appearing as "MSB" followed by a flourish and the word "for".

Gary Buchler
Vice President, Operations and Engineering
Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Division

cc: Jorge Torres, Vice President, Engineering
Reji George, Director, Compliance / Codes and Standards
Buzz Fant, Director, Compliance / Codes and Standards