

- A gouge or groove greater than 12.5% of nominal wall.

*Scheduled Remediation.* The ASME/ANSI B31.8S Standard includes provisions for scheduled repairs over a period exceeding 180 days. For all indications that are not excavated and remediated within 180 days, the following requirements apply:

- For segments assessed using ILI techniques, the failure pressure must be determined and remediation carried out on a time frame consistent with Figure 7–1 in ASME/ANSI B31.8S.
- For segments assessed using direct assessment, at least one direct examination, beyond those required in Paragraph (g)(4) of the proposed rule, of a scheduled indication must be carried out in each ECDA Region between assessments. The results of this direct examination must be compared with those from earlier direct examination results for consistency. Should the defect be larger than any of those identified in previous excavations in that region, then further excavation must be carried out until the requirements in Paragraph (g)(4) of the proposed rule are satisfied.

(j) What Additional Preventive and Mitigative Measures Must an Operator Take To Protect the High Consequence Area? Proposed § 192.763(j)

The proposed rule includes the following general requirement: An operator must take measures to prevent and mitigate the consequences of a pipeline failure that could affect a high consequence area in accordance with the standard ASME/ANSI B31.8S. Table 7–1 in the ASME standard describes some preventive and mitigative measures appropriate for each threat. In addition, operators must conduct risk analysis of their pipeline segments to identify additional actions to enhance public safety. Such actions include, but are not limited to, installing Automatic Shut-off valves or Remote Control Valves, computerized monitoring and leak detection systems, extensive inspection and maintenance programs, and heavier wall thickness.

*Automatic Shut-off valve (ASV) or Remote Control Valves (RCV).* If an operator determines that an ASV or RCV is needed on a pipeline segment to protect high consequence areas in the event of gas release, an operator must install the ASV or RCV. In making that determination an operator must at least consider magnitude of leak detection and pipe shutdown capabilities, the type of gas, pressure, the rate of potential release, the potential for ignition, location of nearest response personnel, and benefits expected by

reducing the volume of gas release. The operator must document the criteria used in evaluating the need for ASVs and RCVs, and document the decisions resulting from application of these criteria.

(k) What Is a Continual Process of Evaluation and Assessment To Maintain a Pipeline's Integrity? Proposed § 192.763(k)

The integrity assessment requirements proposed in this rule do not stop with the baseline integrity assessment. An operator must, on a continual basis, assess the integrity of the line pipe and evaluate the integrity of each pipeline segment that could affect a high consequence area. The proposed rule requires an operator to conduct a periodic evaluation of each pipeline segment, as frequently as needed, to assure the pipeline's integrity. An operator would determine frequency based on threats specific to the pipeline segment, plus threats specified in proposed § 192.763(e) and in Section 2 of the ANSI/ASME B31.8S Standard.

The evaluation is based in part, on the information analysis the operator conducts of the entire pipeline to determine what history and operations elsewhere could be relevant to the segment. The evaluation must also consider the past and present integrity assessment results, and decisions about repair, and preventive and mitigative actions. The evaluation must be carried out by a person qualified to evaluate the results and other related data.

As with the baseline assessment, the continual integrity assessment method must be by internal inspection, pressure test, direct assessment, or other technology that provides an equivalent understanding of the condition of the line pipe. As with the baseline assessment, if an operator chooses other technology as a reassessment method, the operator must give 90-days advance notice (by mail or facsimile) to RSPA/OPS. As with the baseline assessment, an operator must have a process for ensuring that the assessment is being done in a manner to minimize environmental and safety risks.

Each covered pipeline segment must be reassessed at seven-year intervals, or five years if direct assessment is used and the operator directly examines and remediates defects by sampling. The period for reassessment begins with the completion of the prior assessment on that segment. The proposed rule allows an operator to base the reassessment interval on the risk the pipe poses to the high consequence area to determine the priority for assessing the pipeline segments. If the operator establishes a

reassessment interval for the covered segment that is greater than seven years, the operator must within the seven-year period, conduct a reassessment by confirmatory direct assessment on the covered segment, and then conduct the follow-up reassessment at the established interval. The length of the interval will depend on the method of assessment.

If an operator uses pressure testing or internal inspection as an assessment method, the operator must establish the reassessment interval for covered pipeline segments by either basing the intervals on the identified threats for the segment (as identified in the proposed rule and in ASME/ANSI B31.8S, Table 8–2, section 8) and on the analysis of the results from the last integrity assessment and from the required data integration or by using the intervals for different stress levels of pipeline specified in ASME/ANSI B31.8S, Table 8–1, section 8. However, under either option, the maximum reassessment interval must not exceed ten (10) years for a pipeline operating at or above 50% SMYS, and 15 years for a pipeline operating below 50% SMYS. These maximum assessment intervals will be acceptable, only if the operator demonstrates it has enhanced preventive and mitigative programs in place and the operator conducts a confirmatory direct assessment within the seven-year interval.

An operator that establishes the maximum period allowed for reassessment must conduct a confirmatory direct assessment within the seven-year interval and demonstrate that it has implemented enhanced preventive and mitigative measures for the segment.

If an operator uses direct assessment, it must determine the reassessment interval according to a calculation. The reassessment interval cannot exceed five years, if an operator directly examines and remediates defects by sampling, or ten years, if an operator conducts a direct examination of all anomalies and remediates these anomalies. A ten-year interval would necessitate an interim reassessment by confirmatory direct assessment in the seventh year.

The proposed rule requires each operator to evaluate the cause of threats for which mitigative action was undertaken, and determine whether there is reason to reassess the pipe at shorter intervals based on the nature of significant threats. For example, if the dominant cause of pipe deterioration in a particular segment was MIC, then the operator is required to reassess its similar pipe segments on a shorter