

actual remaining wall thickness. These procedures apply to corroded regions that do not penetrate the pipe wall, subject to the limitations set out in the respective procedures.

§ 195.589 What corrosion control information do I have to maintain?

(a) You must maintain current records or maps to show the location of—

- (1) Cathodically protected pipelines;
- (2) Cathodic protection facilities, including galvanic anodes, installed after January 28, 2002; and
- (3) Neighboring structures bonded to cathodic protection systems.

(b) Records or maps showing a stated number of anodes, installed in a stated manner or spacing, need not show specific distances to each buried anode.

(c) You must maintain a record of each analysis, check, demonstration, examination, inspection, investigation, review, survey, and test required by this subpart in sufficient detail to demonstrate the adequacy of corrosion control measures or that corrosion requiring control measures does not exist. You must retain these records for at least 5 years, except that records related to §§ 195.569, 195.573(a) and (b), and 195.579(b)(3) and (c) must be retained for as long as the pipeline remains in service.

APPENDIX A TO PART 195—DELINEATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE JURISDICTION—STATEMENT OF AGENCY POLICY AND INTERPRETATION

In 1979, Congress enacted comprehensive safety legislation governing the transportation of hazardous liquids by pipeline, the Hazardous Liquids Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, 49 U.S.C. 2001 *et seq.* (HLPESA). The HLPESA expanded the existing statutory authority for safety regulation, which was limited to transportation by common carriers in interstate and foreign commerce, to transportation through facilities used in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce. It also added civil penalty, compliance order, and injunctive enforcement authorities to the existing criminal sanctions. Modeled largely on the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, 49 U.S.C. 1671 *et seq.* (NGPSA), the HLPESA provides for a national hazardous liquid pipeline safety program with nationally uniform minimal standards and with enforcement administered through a Federal-State partnership. The HLPESA leaves to ex-

clusive Federal regulation and enforcement the “interstate pipeline facilities,” those used for the pipeline transportation of hazardous liquids in interstate or foreign commerce. For the remainder of the pipeline facilities, denominated “intrastate pipeline facilities,” the HLPESA provides that the same Federal regulation and enforcement will apply unless a State certifies that it will assume those responsibilities. A certified State must adopt the same minimal standards but may adopt additional more stringent standards so long as they are compatible. Therefore, in States which participate in the hazardous liquid pipeline safety program through certification, it is necessary to distinguish the interstate from the intrastate pipeline facilities.

In deciding that an administratively practical approach was necessary in distinguishing between interstate and intrastate liquid pipeline facilities and in determining how best to accomplish this, DOT has logically examined the approach used in the NGPSA. The NGPSA defines the interstate gas pipeline facilities subject to exclusive Federal jurisdiction as those subject to the economic regulatory jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Experience has proven this approach practical. Unlike the NGPSA however, the HLPESA has no specific reference to FERC jurisdiction, but instead defines interstate liquid pipeline facilities by the more commonly used means of specifying the end points of the transportation involved. For example, the economic regulatory jurisdiction of FERC over the transportation of both gas and liquids by pipeline is defined in much the same way. In implementing the HLPESA DOT has sought a practicable means of distinguishing between interstate and intrastate pipeline facilities that provide the requisite degree of certainty to Federal and State enforcement personnel and to the regulated entities. DOT intends that this statement of agency policy and interpretation provide that certainty.

In 1981, DOT decided that the inventory of liquid pipeline facilities identified as subject to the jurisdiction of FERC approximates the HLPESA category of “interstate pipeline facilities.” Administrative use of the FERC inventory has the added benefit of avoiding the creation of a separate Federal scheme for determination of jurisdiction over the same regulated entities. DOT recognizes that the FERC inventory is only an approximation and may not be totally satisfactory without some modification. The difficulties stem from some significant differences in the economic regulation of liquid and of natural gas pipelines. There is an affirmative assertion of jurisdiction by FERC over natural gas pipelines through the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity prior to

commencing operations. With liquid pipelines, there is only a rebuttable presumption of jurisdiction created by the filing by pipeline operators of tariffs (or concurrences) for movement of liquids through existing facilities. Although FERC does police the filings for such matters as compliance with the general duties of common carriers, the question of jurisdiction is normally only aired upon complaint. While any person, including State or Federal agencies, can avail themselves of the FERC forum by use of the complaint process, that process has only been rarely used to review jurisdictional matters (probably because of the infrequency of real disputes on the issue). Where the issue has arisen, the reviewing body has noted the need to examine various criteria primarily of an economic nature. DOT believes that, in most cases, the formal FERC forum can better receive and evaluate the type of information that is needed to make decisions of this nature than can DOT.

In delineating which liquid pipeline facilities are interstate pipeline facilities within the meaning of the HLPESA, DOT will generally rely on the FERC filings; that is, if there is a tariff or concurrence filed with FERC governing the transportation of hazardous liquids over a pipeline facility or if there has been an exemption from the obligation to file tariffs obtained from FERC, then DOT will, as a general rule, consider the facility to be an interstate pipeline facility within the meaning of the HLPESA. The types of situations in which DOT will ignore the existence or non-existence of a filing with FERC will be limited to those cases in which it appears obvious that a complaint filed with FERC would be successful or in which blind reliance on a FERC filing would result in a situation clearly not intended by the HLPESA such as a pipeline facility not being subject to either State or Federal safety regulation. DOT anticipates that the situations in which there is any question about the validity of the FERC filings as a ready reference will be few and that the actual variations from reliance on those filings will be rare. The following examples indicate the types of facilities which DOT believes are interstate pipeline facilities subject to the HLPESA despite the lack of a filing with FERC and the types of facilities over which DOT will generally defer to the jurisdiction of a certifying state despite the existence of a filing with FERC.

Example 1. Pipeline company P operates a pipeline from "Point A" located in State X to "Point B" (also in X). The physical facilities never cross a state line and do not connect with any other pipeline which does cross a state line. Pipeline company P also operates another pipeline between "Point C" in State X and "Point D" in an adjoining State Y. Pipeline company P files a tariff with FERC for transportation from "Point

A" to "Point B" as well as for transportation from "Point C" to "Point D." DOT will ignore filing for the line from "Point A" to "Point B" and consider the line to be intrastate.

Example 2. Same as in example 1 except that P does not file any tariffs with FERC. DOT will assume jurisdiction of the line between "Point C" and "Point D."

Example 3. Same as in example 1 except that P files its tariff for the line between "Point C" and "Point D" not only with FERC but also with State X. DOT will rely on the FERC filing as indication of interstate commerce.

Example 4. Same as in example 1 except that the pipeline from "Point A" to "Point B" (in State X) connects with a pipeline operated by another company transports liquid between "Point B" (in State X) and "Point D" (in State Y). DOT will rely on the FERC filing as indication of interstate commerce.

Example 5. Same as in example 1 except that the line between "Point C" and "Point D" has a lateral line connected to it. The lateral is located entirely with State X. DOT will rely on the existence or non-existence of a FERC filing covering transportation over that lateral as determinative of interstate commerce.

Example 6. Same as in example 1 except that the certified agency in State X has brought an enforcement action (under the pipeline safety laws) against P because of its operation of the line between "Point A" and "Point B". P has successfully defended against the action on jurisdictional grounds. DOT will assume jurisdiction if necessary to avoid the anomaly of a pipeline subject to neither State or Federal safety enforcement. DOT's assertion of jurisdiction in such a case would be based on the gap in the state's enforcement authority rather than a DOT decision that the pipeline is an interstate pipeline facility.

Example 7. Pipeline Company P operates a pipeline that originates on the Outer Continental Shelf. P does not file any tariff for that line with FERC. DOT will consider the pipeline to be an interstate pipeline facility.

Example 8. Pipeline Company P is constructing a pipeline from "Point C" (in State X) to "Point D" (in State Y). DOT will consider the pipeline to be an interstate pipeline facility.

Example 9. Pipeline company P is constructing a pipeline from "Point C" to "Point E" (both in State X) but intends to file tariffs with FERC in the transportation of hazardous liquid in interstate commerce. Assuming there is some connection to an interstate pipeline facility, DOT will consider this line to be an interstate pipeline facility.

Example 10. Pipeline Company P has operated a pipeline subject to FERC economic regulation. Solely because of some statutory

economic deregulation, that pipeline is no longer regulated by FERC. DOT will continue to consider that pipeline to be an interstate pipeline facility.

As seen from the examples, the types of situations in which DOT will not defer to the FERC regulatory scheme are generally clear-cut cases. For the remainder of the situations where variation from the FERC scheme would require DOT to replicate the forum already provided by FERC and to consider economic factors better left to that agency, DOT will decline to vary its reliance on the FERC filings unless, of course, not doing so would result in situations clearly not intended by the HLPESA.

[Amdt. 195–33, 50 FR 15899, Apr. 23, 1985]

APPENDIX B TO PART 195—RISK-BASED ALTERNATIVE TO PRESSURE TESTING OLDER HAZARDOUS LIQUID AND CARBON DIOXIDE PIPELINES

RISK-BASED ALTERNATIVE

This Appendix provides guidance on how a risk-based alternative to pressure testing older hazardous liquid and carbon dioxide pipelines rule allowed by §195.303 will work. This risk-based alternative establishes test priorities for older pipelines, not previously pressure tested, based on the inherent risk of a given pipeline segment. The first step is to determine the classification based on the

type of pipe or on the pipeline segment's proximity to populated or environmentally sensitive area. Secondly, the classifications must be adjusted based on the pipeline failure history, product transported, and the release volume potential.

Tables 2–6 give definitions of risk classification A, B, and C facilities. For the purposes of this rule, pipeline segments containing high risk electric resistance-welded pipe (ERW pipe) and lapwelded pipe manufactured prior to 1970 and considered a risk classification C or B facility shall be treated as the top priority for testing because of the higher risk associated with the susceptibility of this pipe to longitudinal seam failures.

In all cases, operators shall annually, at intervals not to exceed 15 months, review their facilities to reassess the classification and shall take appropriate action within two years or operate the pipeline system at a lower pressure. Pipeline failures, changes in the characteristics of the pipeline route, or changes in service should all trigger a reassessment of the originally classification.

Table 1 explains different levels of test requirements depending on the inherent risk of a given pipeline segment. The overall risk classification is determined based on the type of pipe involved, the facility's location, the product transported, the relative volume of flow and pipeline failure history as determined from Tables 2–6.

TABLE 1. TEST REQUIREMENTS—MAINLINE SEGMENTS OUTSIDE OF TERMINALS, STATIONS, AND TANK FARMS

Pipeline segment	Risk classification	Test deadline ¹	Test medium
Pre-1970 Pipeline Segments susceptible to longitudinal seam failures ² .	C or B	12/7/2000 ³	Water only.
	A	12/7/2002 ³	Water only.
All Other Pipeline Segments	C	12/7/2002 ⁴	Water only.
	B	12/7/2004 ⁴	Water/Liq. ⁵
	A	Additional pressure testing not required.	

¹ If operational experience indicates a history of past failures for a particular pipeline segment, failure causes (time-dependent defects due to corrosion, construction, manufacture, or transmission problems, etc.) shall be reviewed in determining risk classification (See Table 6) and the timing of the pressure test should be accelerated.

² All pre-1970 ERW pipeline segments may not require testing. In determining which ERW pipeline segments should be included in this category, an operator must consider the seam-related leak history of the pipe and pipe manufacturing information as available, which may include the pipe steel's mechanical properties, including fracture toughness; the manufacturing process and controls related to seam properties, including whether the ERW process was high-frequency or low-frequency, whether the weld seam was heat treated, whether the seam was inspected, the test pressure and duration during mill hydrotest; the quality control of the steel-making process; and other factors pertinent to seam properties and quality.

³ For those pipeline operators with extensive mileage of pre-1970 ERW pipe, any waiver requests for timing relief should be supported by an assessment of hazards in accordance with location, product, volume, and probability of failure considerations consistent with Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

⁴ A magnetic flux leakage or ultrasonic internal inspection survey may be utilized as an alternative to pressure testing where leak history and operating experience do not indicate leaks caused by longitudinal cracks or seam failures.

⁵ Pressure tests utilizing a hydrocarbon liquid may be conducted, but only with a liquid which does not vaporize rapidly.

Using LOCATION, PRODUCT, VOLUME, and FAILURE HISTORY “Indicators” from Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 respectively, the overall risk classification of a given pipeline or pipeline segment can be established from Table 2. The LOCATION Indicator is the primary

factor which determines overall risk, with the PRODUCT, VOLUME, and PROBABILITY OF FAILURE Indicators used to adjust to a higher or lower overall risk classification per the following table.

TABLE 2—RISK CLASSIFICATION

Risk classification	Hazard location indicator	Product/volume indicator	Probability of failure indicator
A	L or M	L/L	L.
B	Not A or C Risk Classification
C	H	Any	Any.

H=High M=Moderate L=Low.

NOTE: For Location, Product, Volume, and Probability of Failure Indicators, see Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Table 3 is used to establish the LOCATION Indicator used in Table 2. Based on the population and environment characteristics associated with a pipeline facility's location, a LOCATION Indicator of H, M or L is selected.

TABLE 3—LOCATION INDICATORS—PIPELINE SEGMENTS

Indicator	Population ¹	Environment ²
H	Non-rural areas	Environmentally sensitive ² areas.
M
L	Rural areas	Not environmentally sensitive ² areas.

¹The effects of potential vapor migration should be considered for pipeline segments transporting highly volatile or toxic products.

²We expect operators to use their best judgment in applying this factor.

Tables 4, 5 and 6 are used to establish the PRODUCT, VOLUME, and PROBABILITY OF FAILURE Indicators respectively, in Table 2. The PRODUCT Indicator is selected from Table 4 as H, M, or L based on the acute and chronic hazards associated with the product transported. The VOLUME Indicator is selected from Table 5 as H, M, or L based on the nominal diameter of the pipeline. The Probability of Failure Indicator is selected from Table 6.

TABLE 4—PRODUCT INDICATORS

Indicator	Considerations	Product examples
H	(Highly volatile and flammable)	(Propane, butane, Natural Gas Liquid (NGL), ammonia)
.....	Highly toxic	(Benzene, high Hydrogen Sulfide content crude oils).
M	Flammable—flashpoint <100F	(Gasoline, JP4, low flashpoint crude oils).
L	Non-flammable—flashpoint 100+F	(Diesel, fuel oil, kerosene, JP5, most crude oils).
.....	Highly volatile and non-flammable/non-toxic.	Carbon Dioxide.

Considerations: The degree of acute and chronic toxicity to humans, wildlife, and aquatic life; reactivity; and, volatility, flammability, and water solubility determine the Product Indicator. Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act Reportable Quantity values can be used as an indication of chronic toxicity. National Fire Protection Association health factors can be used for rating acute hazards.

Table 6 is used to establish the PROBABILITY OF FAILURE Indicator used in Table 2. The "Probability of Failure" Indicator is selected from Table 6 as H or L.

TABLE 5—VOLUME INDICATORS

Indicator	Line size
H	≥18".
M	10"–16" nominal diameters.
L	≤8" nominal diameter.

H=High M=Moderate L=Low.

TABLE 6—PROBABILITY OF FAILURE INDICATORS [in each haz. location]

Indicator	Failure history (time-dependent defects) ²
H ¹	>Three spills in last 10 years.
L	≤Three spills in last 10 years.

H=High L=Low.

¹Pipeline segments with greater than three product spills in the last 10 years should be reviewed for failure causes as described in subnote². The pipeline operator should make an appropriate investigation and reach a decision based on sound engineering judgment, and be able to demonstrate the basis of the decision.

²Time-Dependent Defects are defects that result in spills due to corrosion, gouges, or problems developed during manufacture, construction or operation, etc.

[Amdt. 195–65, 63 FR 59480, Nov. 4, 1998; 64 FR 6815, Feb. 11, 1999]

APPENDIX C TO PART 195—GUIDANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

This Appendix gives guidance to help an operator implement the requirements of the integrity management program rule in §§ 195.450 and 195.452. Guidance is provided on:

- (1) Information an operator may use to identify a high consequence area and factors an operator can use to consider the potential impacts of a release on an area;
- (2) Risk factors an operator can use to determine an integrity assessment schedule;
- (3) Safety risk indicator tables for leak history, volume or line size, age of pipeline, and product transported, an operator may use to determine if a pipeline segment falls into a high, medium or low risk category;
- (4) Types of internal inspection tools an operator could use to find pipeline anomalies;
- (5) Measures an operator could use to measure an integrity management program's performance; and
- (6) Types of records an operator will have to maintain.
- (7) Types of conditions that an integrity assessment may identify that an operator should include in its required schedule for evaluation and remediation.

I. Identifying a high consequence area and factors for considering a pipeline segment's potential impact on a high consequence area.

A. The rule defines a High Consequence Area as a high population area, an other populated area, an unusually sensitive area, or a commercially navigable waterway. The Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) will map these areas on the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS). An operator, member of the public, or other government agency may view and download the data from the NPMS home page <http://www.npms.rspa.dot.gov>. OPS will maintain the NPMS and update it periodically. However, it is an operator's responsibility to ensure that it has identified all high consequence areas that could be affected by a pipeline segment. An operator is also responsible for periodically evaluating its pipeline segments to look for population or environmental changes that may have occurred around the pipeline and to keep its program current with this information. (Refer to § 195.452(d)(3).) For more information to help in identifying high consequence areas, an operator may refer to:

(1) Digital Data on populated areas available on U.S. Census Bureau maps.

(2) Geographic Database on the commercial navigable waterways available on <http://www.bts.gov/gis/ntatlas/networks.html>.

(3) The Bureau of Transportation Statistics database that includes commercially navigable waterways and non-commercially navigable waterways. The database can be downloaded from the BTS website at <http://www.bts.gov/gis/ntatlas/networks.html>.

B. The rule requires an operator to include a process in its program for identifying which pipeline segments could affect a high consequence area and to take measures to prevent and mitigate the consequences of a pipeline failure that could affect a high consequence area. (See §§ 195.452 (f) and (i).) Thus, an operator will need to consider how each pipeline segment could affect a high consequence area. The primary source for the listed risk factors is a US DOT study on instrumented Internal Inspection devices (November 1992). Other sources include the National Transportation Safety Board, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standards Committee. The following list provides guidance to an operator on both the mandatory and additional factors:

(1) Terrain surrounding the pipeline. An operator should consider the contour of the land profile and if it could allow the liquid from a release to enter a high consequence area. An operator can get this information from topographical maps such as U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle maps.

(2) Drainage systems such as small streams and other smaller waterways that could serve as a conduit to a high consequence area.

(3) Crossing of farm tile fields. An operator should consider the possibility of a spillage in the field following the drain tile into a waterway.

(4) Crossing of roadways with ditches along the side. The ditches could carry a spillage to a waterway.

(5) The nature and characteristics of the product the pipeline is transporting (refined products, crude oils, highly volatile liquids, etc.) Highly volatile liquids becomes gaseous when exposed to the atmosphere. A spillage could create a vapor cloud that could settle into the lower elevation of the ground profile.

(6) Physical support of the pipeline segment such as by a cable suspension bridge. An operator should look for stress indicators on the pipeline (strained supports, inadequate support at towers), atmospheric corrosion, vandalism, and other obvious signs of improper maintenance.

(7) Operating conditions of the pipeline (pressure, flow rate, etc.). Exposure of the pipeline to an operating pressure exceeding the established maximum operating pressure.

(8) The hydraulic gradient of the pipeline.

(9) The diameter of the pipeline, the potential release volume, and the distance between the isolation points.

(10) Potential physical pathways between the pipeline and the high consequence area.

(11) Response capability (time to respond, nature of response).

(12) Potential natural forces inherent in the area (flood zones, earthquakes, subsidence areas, etc.)

II. Risk factors for establishing frequency of assessment.

A. By assigning weights or values to the risk factors, and using the risk indicator tables, an operator can determine the priority for assessing pipeline segments, beginning with those segments that are of highest risk, that have not previously been assessed. This list provides some guidance on some of the risk factors to consider (see §195.452(e)). An operator should also develop factors specific to each pipeline segment it is assessing, including:

(1) Populated areas, unusually sensitive environmental areas, National Fish Hatcheries, commercially navigable waters, areas where people congregate.

(2) Results from previous testing/inspection. (See §195.452(h).)

(3) Leak History. (See leak history risk table.)

(4) Known corrosion or condition of pipeline. (See §195.452(g).)

(5) Cathodic protection history.

(6) Type and quality of pipe coating (disbonded coating results in corrosion).

(7) Age of pipe (older pipe shows more corrosion—may be uncoated or have an ineffective coating) and type of pipe seam. (See Age of Pipe risk table.)

(8) Product transported (highly volatile, highly flammable and toxic liquids present a greater threat for both people and the environment) (see Product transported risk table.)

(9) Pipe wall thickness (thicker walls give a better safety margin)

(10) Size of pipe (higher volume release if the pipe ruptures).

(11) Location related to potential ground movement (e.g., seismic faults, rock quarries, and coal mines); climatic (permafrost causes settlement—Alaska); geologic (landslides or subsidence).

(12) Security of throughput (effects on customers if there is failure requiring shutdown).

(13) Time since the last internal inspection/pressure testing.

(14) With respect to previously discovered defects/anomalies, the type, growth rate, and size.

(15) Operating stress levels in the pipeline.

(16) Location of the pipeline segment as it relates to the ability of the operator to detect and respond to a leak. (e.g., pipelines deep underground, or in locations that make

leak detection difficult without specific sectional monitoring and/or significantly impede access for spill response or any other purpose).

(17) Physical support of the segment such as by a cable suspension bridge.

(18) Non-standard or other than recognized industry practice on pipeline installation (e.g., horizontal directional drilling).

B. *Example:* This example illustrates a hypothetical model used to establish an integrity assessment schedule for a hypothetical pipeline segment. After we determine the risk factors applicable to the pipeline segment, we then assign values or numbers to each factor, such as, high (5), moderate (3), or low (1). We can determine an overall risk classification (A, B, C) for the segment using the risk tables and a sliding scale (values 5 to 1) for risk factors for which tables are not provided. We would classify a segment as C if it fell above $\frac{2}{3}$ of maximum value (highest overall risk value for any one segment when compared with other segments of a pipeline), a segment as B if it fell between $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ of maximum value, and the remaining segments as A.

i. For the baseline assessment schedule, we would plan to assess 50% of all pipeline segments covered by the rule, beginning with the highest risk segments, within the first 3½ years and the remaining segments within the seven-year period. For the continuing integrity assessments, we would plan to assess the C segments within the first two (2) years of the schedule, the segments classified as moderate risk no later than year three or four and the remaining lowest risk segments no later than year five (5).

ii. For our hypothetical pipeline segment, we have chosen the following risk factors and obtained risk factor values from the appropriate table. The values assigned to the risk factors are for illustration only.

Age of pipeline: assume 30 years old (refer to “Age of Pipeline” risk table)—

Risk Value=5

Pressure tested: tested once during construction—

Risk Value=5

Coated: (yes/no)—yes

Coating Condition: Recent excavation of suspected areas showed holidays in coating (potential corrosion risk)—

Risk Value=5

Cathodically Protected: (yes/no)—yes—Risk Value=1

Date cathodic protection installed: five years after pipeline was constructed (Cathodic protection installed within one year of the pipeline’s construction is generally considered low risk.)—Risk Value=3

Close interval survey: (yes/no)—no—Risk Value =5

Pt. 195, App. C

49 CFR Ch. I (10–1–02 Edition)

Internal inspection tool used: (yes/no)—yes.
Date of pig run? In last five years—Risk Value=1

Anomalies found: (yes/no)—yes, but do not pose an immediate safety risk or environmental hazard—Risk Value=3

Leak History: yes, one spill in last 10 years. (refer to “Leak History” risk table)—Risk Value=2

Product transported: Diesel fuel. Product low risk. (refer to “Product” risk table)—Risk Value=1

Pipe size: 16 inches. Size presents moderate risk (refer to “Line Size” risk table)—Risk Value=3

iii. Overall risk value for this hypothetical segment of pipe is 34. Assume we have two other pipeline segments for which we conduct similar risk rankings. The second pipeline segment has an overall risk value of 20, and the third segment, 11. For the baseline assessment we would establish a schedule where we assess the first segment (highest risk segment) within two years, the second segment within five years and the third segment within seven years. Similarly, for the continuing integrity assessment, we could establish an assessment schedule where we assess the highest risk segment no later than the second year, the second segment no later than the third year, and the third segment no later than the fifth year.

III. Safety risk indicator tables for leak history, volume or line size, age of pipeline, and product transported.

LEAK HISTORY

Safety risk indicator	Leak history (Time-dependent defects) ¹
High	> 3 Spills in last 10 years
Low	< 3 Spills in last 10 years

¹Time-dependent defects are those that result in spills due to corrosion, gouges, or problems developed during manufacture, construction or operation, etc.

LINE SIZE OR VOLUME TRANSPORTED

Safety risk indicator	Line size
High	≥ 18'
Moderate	10'—16' nominal diameters
Low	≤ 8' nominal diameter

AGE OF PIPELINE

Safety risk indicator	Age Pipeline condition dependent) ¹
High	> 25 years
Low	< 25 years

¹Depends on pipeline's coating & corrosion condition, and steel quality, toughness, welding.

PRODUCT TRANSPORTED

Safety risk indicator	Considerations ¹	Product examples
High	(Highly volatile and flammable). Highly toxic	(Propane, butane, Natural Gas Liquid (NGL), ammonia). (Benzene, high Hydrogen Sulfide content crude oils).
Medium	Flammable—flashpoint <100F.	(Gasoline, JP4, low flashpoint crude oils).
Low	Non-flammable—flashpoint 100+F.	(Diesel, fuel oil, kerosene, JP5, most crude oils).

¹The degree of acute and chronic toxicity to humans, wild-life, and aquatic life; reactivity; and, volatility, flammability, and water solubility determine the Product Indicator. Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act Reportable Quantity values may be used as an indication of chronic toxicity. National Fire Protection Association health factors may be used for rating acute hazards.

IV. Types of internal inspection tools to use.

An operator should consider at least two types of internal inspection tools for the integrity assessment from the following list. The type of tool or tools an operator selects will depend on the results from previous internal inspection runs, information analysis and risk factors specific to the pipeline segment:

- (1) Geometry Internal inspection tools for detecting changes to ovality, e.g., bends, dents, buckles or wrinkles, due to construction flaws or soil movement, or other outside force damage;
- (2) Metal Loss Tools (Ultrasonic and Magnetic Flux Leakage) for determining pipe wall anomalies, e.g., wall loss due to corrosion.
- (3) Crack Detection Tools for detecting cracks and crack-like features, e.g., stress corrosion cracking (SCC), fatigue cracks, narrow axial corrosion, toe cracks, hook cracks, etc.

V. Methods to measure performance.

A. *General.* (1) This guidance is to help an operator establish measures to evaluate the effectiveness of its integrity management program. The performance measures required will depend on the details of each integrity management program and will be based on an understanding and analysis of the failure mechanisms or threats to integrity of each pipeline segment.

(2) An operator should select a set of measurements to judge how well its program is performing. An operator's objectives for its program are to ensure public safety, prevent or minimize leaks and spills and prevent property and environmental damage. A typical integrity management program will be an ongoing program and it may contain many elements. Therefore, several performance measure are likely to be needed to

measure the effectiveness of an ongoing program.

B. *Performance measures.* These measures show how a program to control risk on pipeline segments that could affect a high consequence area is progressing under the integrity management requirements. Performance measures generally fall into three categories:

(1) *Selected Activity Measures*—Measures that monitor the surveillance and preventive activities the operator has implemented. These measure indicate how well an operator is implementing the various elements of its integrity management program.

(2) *Deterioration Measures*—Operation and maintenance trends that indicate when the integrity of the system is weakening despite preventive measures. This category of performance measure may indicate that the system condition is deteriorating despite well executed preventive activities.

(3) *Failure Measures—Leak History*, incident response, product loss, etc. These measures will indicate progress towards fewer spills and less damage.

C. *Internal vs. External Comparisons.* These comparisons show how a pipeline segment that could affect a high consequence area is progressing in comparison to the operator's other pipeline segments that are not covered by the integrity management requirements and how that pipeline segment compares to other operators' pipeline segments.

(1) *Internal*—Comparing data from the pipeline segment that could affect the high consequence area with data from pipeline segments in other areas of the system may indicate the effects from the attention given to the high consequence area.

(2) *External*—Comparing data external to the pipeline segment (e.g., OPS incident data) may provide measures on the frequency and size of leaks in relation to other companies.

D. *Examples.* Some examples of performance measures an operator could use include—

(1) A performance measurement goal to reduce the total volume from unintended releases by -% (percent to be determined by operator) with an ultimate goal of zero.

(2) A performance measurement goal to reduce the total number of unintended releases (based on a threshold of 5 gallons) by ___-% (percent to be determined by operator) with an ultimate goal of zero.

(3) A performance measurement goal to document the percentage of integrity management activities completed during the calendar year.

(4) A performance measurement goal to track and evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's community outreach activities.

(5) A narrative description of pipeline system integrity, including a summary of performance improvements, both qualitative

and quantitative, to an operator's integrity management program prepared periodically.

(6) A performance measure based on internal audits of the operator's pipeline system per 49 CFR Part 195.

(7) A performance measure based on external audits of the operator's pipeline system per 49 CFR Part 195.

(8) A performance measure based on operational events (for example: relief occurrences, unplanned valve closure, SCADA outages, etc.) that have the potential to adversely affect pipeline integrity.

(9) A performance measure to demonstrate that the operator's integrity management program reduces risk over time with a focus on high risk items.

(10) A performance measure to demonstrate that the operator's integrity management program for pipeline stations and terminals reduces risk over time with a focus on high risk items.

VI. Examples of types of records an operator must maintain.

The rule requires an operator to maintain certain records. (See §195.452(1)). This section provides examples of some records that an operator would have to maintain for inspection to comply with the requirement. This is not an exhaustive list.

(1) a process for identifying which pipelines could affect a high consequence area and a document identifying all pipeline segments that could affect a high consequence area;

(2) a plan for baseline assessment of the line pipe that includes each required plan element;

(3) modifications to the baseline plan and reasons for the modification;

(4) use of and support for an alternative practice;

(5) a framework addressing each required element of the integrity management program, updates and changes to the initial framework and eventual program;

(6) a process for identifying a new high consequence area and incorporating it into the baseline plan, particularly, a process for identifying population changes around a pipeline segment;

(7) an explanation of methods selected to assess the integrity of line pipe;

(8) a process for review of integrity assessment results and data analysis by a person qualified to evaluate the results and data;

(9) the process and risk factors for determining the baseline assessment interval;

(10) results of the baseline integrity assessment;

(11) the process used for continual evaluation, and risk factors used for determining the frequency of evaluation;

(12) process for integrating and analyzing information about the integrity of a pipeline, information and data used for the information analysis;

Pt. 198

(13) results of the information analyses and periodic evaluations;

(14) the process and risk factors for establishing continual re-assessment intervals;

(15) justification to support any variance from the required re-assessment intervals;

(16) integrity assessment results and anomalies found, process for evaluating and remediating anomalies, criteria for remedial actions and actions taken to evaluate and remediate the anomalies;

(17) other remedial actions planned or taken;

(18) schedule for evaluation and remediation of anomalies, justification to support deviation from required remediation times;

(19) risk analysis used to identify additional preventive or mitigative measures, records of preventive and mitigative actions planned or taken;

(20) criteria for determining EFRD installation;

(21) criteria for evaluating and modifying leak detection capability;

(22) methods used to measure the program's effectiveness.

VII. Conditions that may impair a pipeline's integrity.

Section 195.452(h) requires an operator to evaluate and remediate all pipeline integrity issues raised by the integrity assessment or information analysis. An operator must develop a schedule that prioritizes conditions discovered on the pipeline for evaluation and remediation. The following are some examples of conditions that an operator should schedule for evaluation and remediation.

A. Any change since the previous assessment.

B. Mechanical damage that is located on the top side of the pipe.

C. An anomaly abrupt in nature.

D. An anomaly longitudinal in orientation.

E. An anomaly over a large area.

F. An anomaly located in or near a casing, a crossing of another pipeline, or an area with suspect cathodic protection.

[Amdt. 195-70, 65 FR 75409, Dec. 1, 2000, as amended by Amdt. 195-74, 67 FR 1661, Jan. 14, 2002]

PARTS 196-197 [RESERVED]

PART 198—REGULATIONS FOR GRANTS TO AID STATE PIPELINE SAFETY PROGRAMS

Subpart A—General

Sec.

198.1 Scope.

198.3 Definitions.

49 CFR Ch. I (10-1-02 Edition)

Subpart B—Grant Allocation

198.11 Grant authority.

198.13 Grant allocation formula.

Subpart C—Adoption of One-Call Damage Prevention Program

198.31 Scope.

198.33 [Reserved]

198.35 Grants conditioned on adoption of one-call damage prevention program.

198.37 State one-call damage prevention program.

198.39 Qualifications for operation of one-call notification system.

AUTHORITY: 49 U.S.C. 60105, 60106, 60114; and 49 CFR 1.53.

SOURCE: 55 FR 38691, Sept. 20, 1990, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart A—General

§ 198.1 Scope.

This part prescribes regulations governing grants-in-aid for State pipeline safety compliance programs.

§ 198.3 Definitions.

As used in this part:

Adopt means establish under State law by statute, regulation, license, certification, order, or any combination of these legal means.

Excavation activity means an excavation activity defined in §192.614(a) of this chapter, other than a specific activity the State determines would not be expected to cause physical damage to underground facilities.

Excavator means any person intending to engage in an excavation activity.

One-call notification system means a communication system that qualifies under this part and the one-call damage prevention program of the State concerned in which an operational center receives notices from excavators of intended excavation activities and transmits the notices to operators of underground pipeline facilities and other underground facilities that participate in the system.

Person means any individual, firm, joint venture, partnership, corporation,