



Enbridge

915 N. Eldridge Parkway, Ste. 1100
Houston, TX 77079

Via Electronic Mail

July 31, 2025

Mr. David A. Barrett
Acting Director, Central Region, Office of Pipeline Safety
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
901 Locust Street, Suite 480
Kansas City, MO 64106

**RE: Texas Eastern Transmission, LP Response
Notice of Probable Violation and Proposed Compliance Order
CPF 3-2025-027-NOPV**

Dear Mr. Barrett,

From May 13 through June 27, 2024, a representative of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS), pursuant to Chapter 601 of 49 United States Code (U.S.C.), inspected the Texas Eastern Gas Transmission (TETLP) procedures and records for the new gas integrity rule in Houston, Texas.

On July 1, 2025, PHMSA issued the above referenced Notice of Probable Violation and Proposed Compliance Order (NOPV) alleging TETLP has committed probable violations of the Pipeline Safety Regulations, Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

The following is a summary of PHMSA's findings and TETLP's response to those findings.

PHMSA Finding

1. § 192.605 Procedural manual for operations, maintenance, and emergencies.

(a) General. Each operator shall prepare and follow for each pipeline, a manual of written procedures for conducting operations and maintenance activities and for emergency response. For transmission lines, the manual must also include procedures for handling abnormal operations. This manual must be reviewed and updated by the operator at intervals not exceeding 15 months, but at least once each calendar year. This manual must be prepared before operations of a pipeline system commence. Appropriate

parts of the manual must be kept at locations where operations and maintenance activities are conducted.

TET did not follow its manual of written procedures in accordance with § 192.605(a). Specifically, TET did not follow its “Pipeline Integrity – Integrity Management Plan” (IMP), section 7.3.1 which requires the identification of Moderate Consequence Areas (MCA) for the purpose of conducting baseline assessments in accordance with § 192.710(b). Section 7.3.1 referenced procedure OC-52.201 – “HCA/MCA Identification Process” which states in section 3 that “HCAs and MCAs shall be identified, evaluated, and published once per calendar year, not to exceed a period of 15 months for all US Enbridge (as built/in service) gas transmission pipelines.”

During PHMSA’s inspection, PHMSA inspectors reviewed TET’s pipeline system for MCAs and determined that six MCAs were missed at the time of the inspection. A historical review of publicly available satellite imagery found that these locations existed prior to the effective date of the regulation, which was July 1, 2020. The missed MCAs discovered during PHMSA’s inspection were as follows:

PHMSA Finding

1. 40.439063°, -78.978202° - ARMA-LILL/12 was not designated as an MCA even though it met the 5 buildings intended for human occupancy density count within a potential impact radius. The adjacent lines ARMA-LILL/19 and ARMA-LILL/27 were designated as MCAs within this area.

TETLP Response

In 2015, the original structure at the above location was abandoned and subsequently recorded as such in the GIS. The expectation was that this abandonment status would remain until a new development was officially documented. However, in September 2022, a new structure (Mobile Home) was placed on the same site. Because the site continued to be designated as “abandoned,” the presence of this new structure was not immediately detected in our analysis processes.

To address this issue, several modifications have been made to the process of monitoring site status, particularly for locations previously marked as abandoned.

1. Annual Review of Abandoned Locations

Prior to conducting class and HCA analysis, a thorough review of all locations previously designated as abandoned is now mandatory. This annual review includes:

- Physical site inspections where feasible
- Cross-referencing of records with other field data sources

- Engagement with local stakeholders or property managers to confirm current site status

This systematic approach ensures that any structures returning to previously abandoned locations are identified and documented before analyses.

2. Integration with Class and HCA Analysis

The process now mandates that before any class or HCA analysis is performed, the status of all "abandoned" sites must be verified.

3. Enhancements to Aerial Imagery Programs

A crucial aspect of the process improvement involves leveraging technology to capture changes on the ground. To ensure that new structures are not overlooked, the aerial imagery program will no longer exclude abandoned boundaries during scheduled flyovers. Instead:

- All previously abandoned sites will have their boundaries temporarily lifted prior to flyover scheduling
- This allows aerial imaging to treat these areas as active, capturing any new developments or changes in land use
- Imagery data will be analyzed in conjunction with field reports to corroborate findings and eliminate blind spots

PHMSA Finding

2. 40.338835°, -75.078314° - EAGL-LAMT/1 line segment had an MCA identified in this area due to the house density. However, the MCA should have been longer than what was designated in the map. This MCA was right next to a designated high consequence area (HCA) for this line. The adjacent line EAGL-LAMT/2 was designated as an HCA throughout this entire area.

TETLP Response

The aerial imagery captured for the 2024 analysis revealed new single-family and multi-family dwelling structures. These additions caused the existing HCA 7-12180 to expand upstream into existing MCA 7-15927. As a result, the MCA contracted and is now shorter than in previous years due to the increased structure density established by the new structures included in the analysis.

PHMSA Finding

3. 40.116594°, -75.272552° - EAGL-LAMT/1-B-2 had an MCA established for the PA Turnpike (Hwy 276). However, the MCA stopped short of a location where the pipe segments met the

house density count requirement. Therefore, the MCA should have been expanded to include this area.

TETLP Response

MCA 7-15778 was initially established in 2021 by a 4+ lane road but did not include the structure density north of the MCA. The structures, centerline, and pipeline data within the area in question have existed prior to 2020. Due to a system issue or GIS data error, the software excluded the structure density along with the identified road MCA. This error cannot be replicated under the current version of the software. Following the 2024 analysis, the MCA now includes the previously omitted structure density area.

PHMSA Finding

4. 40.134355°, -75.248624° - EAGL-LAMT/1-B-1 did not have an MCA designated at this location, despite it meeting the criteria due to the housing density.

TETLP Response

Due to a system issue or GIS data error, the software did not recognize the structure density MCA in 2021. This error cannot be replicated under the current version of the software. The structures, centerline, and pipeline data within the area in question have existed in our GIS database since before 2020. During the 2024 analysis, the system accurately identified a new MCA.

PHMSA Finding

5. 40.111930°, -75.270010° - EAGL-LAMT/1-B-1 and EAGL-LAMT/1-B-2 were not identified MCAs at this location, despite meeting the criteria due to housing density. This area was adjacent to existing MCAs on both lines.

TETLP Response

MCA 7-15771 and MCA 7-15778 were established in 2021 by 4+ lane roads but did not include all the structure density within the area in question. Due to a system issue or GIS data error, the software excluded the structure density from the identified MCAs. This error cannot be replicated under the current version of the software. The structures, centerline, and pipeline data within the area have existed in our GIS database since before 2020. During the 2024 analysis, both existing MCAs expanded into the area.

PHMSA Finding

6. 40.081469°, -75.134934° - EAGL-LAMT/1-F did not have an MCA designated in this area, despite meeting the criteria due to housing density.

TETLP Response

Due to a system issue or GIS data error, the software did not recognize the structure density MCA in 2021. This error cannot be replicated under the current version of the software. The structures, centerline, and pipeline data within the area in question have existed in our GIS database since before 2020. During the 2024 analysis, the system accurately identified a new MCA.

PROPOSED COMPLIANCE ORDER

Pursuant to 49 United States Code § 60118, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) proposes to issue to Texas Eastern Transmission, LP a Compliance Order incorporating the following remedial requirements to ensure the compliance of Texas Eastern Transmission, LP, with the pipeline safety regulations:

- A. In regard to Item 1 of the Notice pertaining to missed Moderate Consequence Areas (MCAs), Texas Eastern Transmission, LP, must review all processes that are associated with the identification of MCAs to determine how existing structure MCAs were not previously identified and provide documentation of the review and approval to the Director, Central Region within **90** days of issuance of the Final Order. Once this review is complete, Texas Eastern Transmission, LP, must ensure all MCAs and other pipe segments subject to § 192.710 are identified and submit the final results to the Director, Central Region for review and approval within **180** days of issuance of the Final Order.

TETLP Response

TETLP has reviewed all processes associated with MCA identification as summarized above. All line segments discussed are piggable and have associated High Consequence Areas (HCA's); therefore, they were already subject to the HCA maximum assessment frequency of once every seven calendar years. The identification of § 192.710 segments has a minimal impact on integrity assessments. Due to a system issue or GIS data error, the software excluded the structure density from the identified MCAs. This error cannot be replicated under the current version of the software. We are currently upgrading our structure analysis programs to include quality assurance verifications to avoid such issues. A listing of all TETLP § 192.710 segments will be provided at a later date.

- B. It is requested (not mandated) that Texas Eastern Transmission maintain documentation of the safety improvement costs associated with fulfilling this Compliance Order and submit the total to Director, Central Region, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. It is requested that these costs be reported in two categories: 1) total cost associated with preparation/revision of plans, procedures, studies and analyses, and 2) total cost associated with replacements, additions and other changes to pipeline infrastructure.

TETLP Response

- 1) TETLP Estimates costs for plans and procedure modifications at \$2,000 - \$3,000.
- 2) No replacements, additions or other changes were made to any pipeline infrastructure.

Enbridge takes the alleged violations seriously and will work expeditiously to resolve them. Please call me at (713) 627-6601 if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Peter Seydewitz".

Peter Seydewitz
Director, Operational Excellence
GTM Engineering & Asset Management