

Public Awareness Programs Workshop

November 10, 2005 Baltimore, Maryland



Welcome

- Welcome and Good Morning
- Greetings from PHMSA and NAPSR and from the Workshop Steering Committee
- Ouick Notes for:
 - Attendees Safety and Comfort Minute
 - Fire exits, restrooms, reminder on being prompt, ground rules
 - For Our Web Cast Participants



Agenda Review - Today

8:00 am Welcome and Recap from Day 1 Jeff Wiese, OPS

8:15 am Focus on Key Elements

9:15 am Clearinghouse Review Jeff Wiese, OPS

9:45 am Question Session All Presenters

• 10:15 am **Break**

10:30 am Frequently Asked Questions Blaine Keener, OPS

11: 30 am Closing Remarks & Adjournment Jeff Wiese

Office of Pipeline Safety



Recap

- Great things are happening and resources exist for those struggling to build programs
- The opportunity of model programs as well as the need for "ownership"
- The value and leverage of collaboration
 - Opportunity exists across the spectrum of public awareness activities
 - Creates a challenge to partner for success maybe with some non-traditional partners (e.g., one-calls, schools,



Recap (cont.)

- Creativity operator and vendor alike will yield effectiveness and efficiency
- Consensus that RP 1162 sharpens the focus on investing in <u>effective communications</u> and provides opportunities for efficiencies
 - Rote compliance isn't the goal perhaps no one right answer
 - Focus on whether messages are received and understood awareness (leads to behavioral change)
- Value in combining messages
- Concern compliance focus will dilute creativity



Effectiveness Assessment

John Erickson, PE
American Public Gas Association
at the
PHMSA Workshop
Baltimore, MD



RP 1162

- Is the program is being implemented as planned-the process
- Is the program is effective-program effectiveness.



Annual Audit

- Has the Public Awareness Program been developed and written to address the objectives, elements and baseline schedule as described Section 2 and the remainder of this RP?
- Has the Public Awareness Program been implemented and documented according to the written program?





- Internal Audit
- Outside Audit
- Regulatory Audit



Program Effectiveness

- Is information reaching the intended stakeholder audiences?
- Are the recipient audiences understanding the messages delivered?
- Are the recipients motivated to respond appropriately?
- Is the implementation of the Public Awareness Program impacting bottom-line results (such as reduction in the number of incidents caused by third-party damage)?



Measures

- Outreach: Percentage of Each Intended Audience Reached with Desired Messages
- Understandability of the Content of the Message
- Desired Behaviors by the Intended Stakeholder Audience
- Achieving Bottom-Line Results



APGA GOAL

Gas Overall Awareness Level

"Compliance made efficient & easy"



APGA GOAL Program

- Gas Overall Awareness Level
- Targeted at customers and public
- Telephone survey of a statistical sample of customers and non-customers
- Baseline in 2006
- Options thereafter: annual all customers or sample, maximum 4 years



Advantages

- Have a pre-RP 1162 baseline
- Ability to compare against national averages
- Ability to compare relative effectiveness of various methods of delivery



Questions?

- Call or e-mail with any questions
- jerickson@apga.org
- 202-464-0834
- Orr check www.apga.org



Clearinghouse Review of Pipeline Operator Public Awareness Programs

November 10, 2005 Baltimore, MD



Clearinghouse History

- Pipeline Safety and Improvement Act of 2002:
 - required pipeline operators to make changes to address statutory issues and submit completed pipeline public awareness programs
 - authorized DOT to issue standards to govern the adequacy of these pipeline public awareness programs
 - requires DOT/State partners to review these pipeline operator public awareness programs (> 2,200), for completeness and adequacy
- In 2005, Congress directed DOT to create a Clearinghouse for the initial review of these programs

Office of Pipeline Safety



PHMSA's Suggested Path Forward

- Clearinghouse to be established by PHMSA
- Draft review criteria for programs to be jointly established and adopted by OPS & NAPSR
 - Addressing completeness and minimal adequacy
- Gather plan data and report back to industry
- Continue collaboration with industry to foster continuous improvement in programs
- Implement enforcement, where warranted, by jurisdictional authority

Office of Pipeline Safety



Establishing the Clearinghouse

- PHMSA will seek to establish the Clearinghouse by Spring 2006
- Program review begins July 2006
 - Considering with NAPSR options for submission
 - Strong preference for electronic submission
 - Possibility of phased submission
- Review by the Clearinghouse concurrent with implementation of program by operator



Program Review Criteria

- Current draft was jointly established by an OPS & NAPSR workgroup in 2004 – not officially endorsed yet
- Verify completeness of programs
 - E.g., inclusion of all 12 Steps from RP 1162
- Verify minimal adequacy of programs
 - All stakeholder audiences identified ?
 - Supplemental enhancements considered?
 - etc...

Office of Pipeline Safety



Gather Data

- Results for selected review criteria could be fed into database to quantify effort – e.g.:
 - Number of languages
 - Number of stakeholders
 - Challenge/issue areas for programs
 - Program evaluation approaches and successes
- Identify good practices and share aggregate results with industry



Foster Improvements

- Not measuring program
 effectiveness results (due in 2010, §8.4)
- Are measuring program implementation (due annually, §8.3)
- Clearinghouse review can provide additional input to operators while measuring implementation

Office of Pipeline Safety



Enforcement Actions

- The Clearinghouse may communicate with the operator, but it will have no enforcement authority
- OPS and NAPSR retain enforcement authority for their jurisdictional operators
- Foster Improvements



American Petroleum Institute (API) & Association of Oil Pipelines (AOPL) Request for Clarification, 6-15-2005

- Seeks details for submitting programs
- Recommends broadening inspection authority of Clearinghouse
- Urges PHMSA to work closely with NAPSR to encourage a fair and consistent evaluation
- Requests opportunity for an operator to meet with Clearinghouse during review of its program



Details for Submitting Programs

- Details will be provided through an OPS Advisory Bulletin
- Electronic submission will be encouraged
- Clearinghouse work not scheduled to begin until June 2006
- States may elect to act independently



Authority of Clearinghouse

- Clearinghouse will be established for initial review – jury is out on subsequent periodic reviews called for by statute
- Congressional Appropriations was for an "initial effort..."
- PHMSA will discuss options with NAPSR and consult with the industry and Congress



Fair and Consistent Evaluation

 PHMSA has been, and will continue to, work with NAPSR to implement a fair and consistent evaluation of public awareness programs



Opportunity for an Operator to Meet with Clearinghouse

- 2,200 meetings would distract the Clearinghouse from its review function
- PHMSA will consider incorporating a smaller number of large group feedback meetings periodically during the Clearinghouse review



Question the Panelists Session

- Please direct your questions, if possible
- State your name and affiliation
- Take advantage of the operator experience here compliance is important, of course, but this shot is rare
- Public Awareness Program information provided at: http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/PublicEducation.htm



Public Awareness Programs for Pipeline Operators Frequently Asked Questions

PHMSA Workshop

November 10, 2005

Baltimore, MD

Presented by Blaine Keener

OPS Community Assistance & Technical Services Coordinator

Office of Pipeline Safety



Gas Integrity Management Communications and RP 1162

- RP 1162 generally addresses External Communications requirements of ASME B31.8S, Section 10.2
- <u>Does not address</u> IM Rule requirement that operators have procedures to address safety concerns raised by OPS or interstate agents (49 CFR 192.911(m))
- <u>Does not address</u> Internal Communications requirements of ASME B31.8S, Section 10.3



Affected Public Stakeholder Audience

- If the TO is participating in a mass media campaign, can the TO omit direct mailings to residents along the ROW?
- TO Affected Public Message Type beyond LDC messages:
 - One-call requirements
 - Pipeline location information
 - Availability of operator list through NPMS



Places of Congregation

- How can a TO raise the awareness of people who congregate?
 - Schools
 - Businesses
 - Places of Worship
 - Hospitals
 - Prisons
 - Parks & Playgrounds



Supplemental Enhancement Metrics

How will operators assess these factors:

- Land Development Activity
- Population Density / HCA
- Frequently Changing Population
- Third Party Damage Incidents



Non-English Speaking Populations

- How do operators determine percentage of non-English speaking populations?
- What percentage is significant?



Baseline Measurements of Effectiveness

- Appendix E provides list of questions
- Mail Surveys pros and cons
- Phone Surveys pros and cons
- Other Methods?



State Requirements

 Are there States with public awareness regulations different from RP 1162?



Thanks for Participating

- blaine.keener@dot.gov
- 202-366-0970
- Public Awareness Program information provided at:

http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/PublicEducation.htm