



October 14, 2015

Docket Management System
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)
1200 New Jersey Avenue S.E.
Room W12-140
Washington, D.C. 20590

VIA E-GOV WEB SITE (<http://www.regulations.gov>)

Re: Docket No. PHMSA-2014-0092: *Pipeline Safety: Request for Revision of a Previously Approved Information Collection – National Pipeline Mapping System Program (OMB Control No. 2137-0596)*

Dear Administrator:

Per the notice issued by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration ("PHMSA") and published in the August 27, 2015, issue of the *Federal Register*, 80 Fed. Reg. 52084, Energy Transfer Partners ("ETP"), on behalf of those of its affiliates that operate interstate natural gas and hazardous liquid transmission pipelines, submits the attached comments.

ETP is a Delaware Limited Partnership whose affiliates and subsidiaries operate several interstate and intrastate natural gas and hazardous liquid transmission pipeline systems that would be subject to this proposed information collection. ETP provided comments on the earlier notice on this subject and participated in the recent workshop held in Arlington, VA. ETP offers the following attached comments and recommendations for consideration.

ETP appreciates the changes PHMSA has made to the proposed information collection following the earlier comment period as well as the opportunity to comment on this revised proposal. Please feel free to contact me for any further information regarding ETP's comments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Eric J. Amundsen", written in a cursive style.

Eric J. Amundsen
Vice President, Technical Services

Energy Transfer Comments

Docket No. PHMSA-2014-0092: Pipeline Safety: Request for Revision of a Previously Approved Information Collection – National Pipeline Mapping System Program (OMB Control No. 2137-0596)

General

Energy Transfer (“ET”) understands PHMSA’s desire and authority to collect more data at a higher accuracy level and does not disagree in principle. However, many of the justifications and explanations do not establish a clear need or benefit. For example, in several public meetings over the past few years, emergency responders have generally noted that they do not use the NPMS and were unlikely to use it as an information source during emergencies. If PHMSA has information to the contrary, it would be helpful to present it. Emergency response organizations, even those with whom PHMSA works with on a regular basis, did not comment on the last notice on this matter.

PHMSA should provide significantly more detail and explanation regarding the stated justification points before asking operators to spend tens of millions of dollars each to meet these modified requirements. ET is not arguing against this information collection, but does believe that the need should be demonstrated and the uses should be more clearly defined. ET made some of these same points in a response to the earlier notice. Although some of those points have been addressed at least to some extent by the elimination or modification of some of the requirements, ET believes many of the questions and comments raised earlier remain valid and refer PHMSA to ET’s previous response.

Burden

The PHMSA anticipated burden is provided only in hours (335,124) with no information regarding the basis for that estimate. It does not appear to include any survey effort required to meet the centerline accuracy requirement. Although the time to conduct these surveys is difficult to estimate, the cost is likely to be in the \$4,000 - \$5,000 per mile range for just the centerline data (exclusive of other attributes) for ± 50 foot accuracy. A few assumptions must be made to translate the burden estimate to costs. First, the 335,124 hours for 1,211 respondents amounts to about 277 hours per respondent. If a respondent equates to an operator number, this number of hours may be reasonable for database preparation and submittal. If that assumption is valid, then these hours are likely to cost about \$150 per hour, fully loaded. That’s about \$50 million. For natural gas transmission operators, if, conservatively, only about 25% of the approximately 320,000 miles have to be surveyed to meet the ± 50 foot accuracy requirement, that’s an additional \$360 million. If approximately the same fraction of hazardous liquids pipelines require similar surveys, that will result in approximately \$180 million in survey costs. Therefore, the initial total, without considering costs for any additional attribute location and determination, is the sum of these, or almost \$600 million. Although significantly less than the estimated costs of meeting the previously proposed ± 5 foot accuracy requirement, it is still certainly a

great enough cost that PHMSA should acknowledge it and explain it more precisely in terms of safety benefits and efficiency gains. If PHMSA believes it can estimate the time it will take over 1,200 respondents to meet these requirements, it should also be able to estimate the savings in staff time for both PHMSA and the affected state agencies, as well as how safety will actually be improved.

Elimination of Duplicative Reporting

While some flexibility and a transition period are provided to fully implement the revised requirements, that transition should also include a plan to transition from the current annual reporting, which will become redundant when the proposed data collection is implemented.

In reviewing the current annual report requirements, and in response to PHMSA's request for comments on how this expanded information request could affect the annual report, it appears that the annual report, as it currently exists, could be almost completely eliminated. Only the portion of Part M, dealing with numbers of leaks, is not included in the ICR. It appears that the data provided in all other sections of the current annual report are either provided directly in this ICR or may be easily derived from data in this ICR. If PHMSA chooses to add leak reporting in some manner to this ICR, then the annual report, as it currently exists, can and should be completely eliminated. ET believes elimination of the annual report in its current format could be done through an information request such as this one.

Enforcement

The quality and reliability of data and records has been a central focus in the industry, both among regulators and operators. This subject has been addressed in PHMSA Advisory Bulletins and in the most recent reauthorization of the Pipeline Safety Act, and is anticipated to be a focal point of proposed regulations. Both PHMSA and the NTSB have alluded to records that are "traceable, verifiable and complete," now typically abbreviated as "TVC records." It must be recognized and acknowledged, however, that even records meeting this standard can be in error. People make mistakes. Digits get transposed. Incorrect reference points may be inadvertently chosen. In the normal course of business, pipeline operators can and do find locations where the pipe location, a connection or take-off, or the location of some attribute is incorrectly represented on a properly conducted and otherwise correct survey. Such a survey could easily qualify as a TVC record, but still contain some information not meeting the required standards. When operators find such data errors, the errors are corrected. The operator should be afforded the opportunity to make such corrections without penalty, and report the corrected data in its next filing.

Protection of Information

Protection of and access to data are now addressed in the ICR, essentially following the hierarchy of availability PHMSA had alluded to in earlier discussions, with basic information being generally available to all, some attributes restricted to PIMMA users and some classified as SSI. However, some states have “Sunshine Laws” that require public availability of any information or data to which state officials or agencies have access. In this ICR, PHMSA does not address how access to PIMMA or SSI data will be managed relative to requests made pursuant to Sunshine Laws or the Freedom of Information Act.

ET also suggests that a revision to the data table structure may be beneficial in keeping attributes with different security levels separate. Such revision may also significantly reduce the number of segments reported.

Attribute Comments

Year and Pressure of Original and Last Pressure Test – As noted during a recent discussion, this item requires clarification. There are several scenarios for which the reporting requirements may not be clear. These include:

1. Line with 1 pressure test
 - a. Conducted as part of construction or commissioning.
 - b. Conducted well after construction, for example during the integrity management baseline period.
2. Line with 2 or more pressure tests
 - a. First test conducted as part of construction or commissioning.
 - b. First test conducted well after construction and not part of construction or commissioning.

In 1a, is the Original test reported only as such, with no Last test, or is it reported as both Original and Last, since it is the only test?

In 1b, is the test still an Original test, since it is the first, or is there no Original test and only a Last test? If it is reported as Original, the question for 1a also applies?

In 2a, the reporting seems straightforward, with the first test reported as Original and the most recent subsequent test reported as Last.

In 2b, again it seems clear that the most recent subsequent test is reported as Last, but is the first test the Original or is there no Original test?

Mainline Block Valves – As noted during a recent discussion, PHMSA’s designations do not conform to common industry usage and may therefore result in confusion and inconsistent reporting. Specifically,

PHMSA's use of "manually operated" appears to refer to a valve with a power operator that is locally activated, while "no operator" refers to a valve that is closed by turning a hand wheel or similar device. In common industry usage, however, "manually operated" refers to valves without a power operator that are closed manually, typically by turning a hand wheel. Valves with power operators may be locally activated, remotely operated (ROV or remotely operated valves), or automatically activated (ASV or automatic shutoff valves). The classification of "no operator" would seem to imply a valve that cannot be operated at all. ET recommends PHMSA adopting the more commonly used industry terminology for these valves.

Summary and Conclusion

Energy Transfer appreciates the opportunity to comment on this matter and offers the following summary points:

- The burden and impacts of complying with this ICR have been significantly underestimated.
- PHMSA should state their plan or intention to eliminate the duplicative reporting that will exist due to this ICR.
- ET recommends flexibility in enforcement of the requirements of this ICR.
- Given the burden and impacts of complying with this ICR, PHMSA should be more precise and quantitative regarding the benefits to various stakeholder groups as well as the reasonably anticipated safety benefits.
- Questions regarding protection of information have not been adequately addressed.
- Some questions remain regarding reporting on some of the attributes.