

INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION

YEAR 2019

PPTS collects infrastructure data on more than just DOT assets. Collecting the number of miles and facilities that are not DOT regulated will allow for better normalization of release data as well as a greater amount of relevant data, facilitating greater accuracy in analyses.

The general rule is this: if the pipe can spill a transported liquid commodity, you should report the mileage. If a pipeline segment has been idled but still contains a transported liquid commodity, it should be included in your reports. If it has been idled and purged – i.e., no longer contains transported commodity – you should exclude it. Please note: the PHMSA Form 7000-1.1 requires you to report idled pipe whether it still contains product or not. [Key words: idle, inactive.]

PART A - OPERATOR INFORMATION

PART A - OPERATOR INFORMATION

| | |
|-------------|------|
| REPORT YEAR | 2019 |
|-------------|------|

| OPERATOR'S 5 DIGIT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (OPIDs) |
|--|
| 1 |
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| NAME OF OPERATOR | |
|------------------|--|

| 3. PLEASE SELECT COMMODITY GROUP BASED ON PREDOMINANT COMMODITY CARRIED (SELECT ALL THAT APPLIES) |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Crude Oil |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Refined and/or Petroleum Product (non-HVL) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HVL |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CO2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated system) |

PART A - OPERATOR INFORMATION

4. FOR THE DESIGNATED COMMODITY GROUP, THE PIPELINES AND/OR PIPELINE FACILITIES INCLUDED WITHIN THIS OPID ARE:

SELECT ONE OR BOTH

| State | INTERstate Pipeline | INTRAstate Pipeline |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Alabama | | |
| Alaska | | |
| Arizona | | |
| Arkansas | | |
| California | | |
| Colorado | | |
| Connecticut | | |
| Delaware | | |
| Florida | | |
| Georgia | | |
| Hawaii | | |
| Idaho | | |
| Illinois | | |
| Indiana | | |
| Iowa | | |
| Kansas | | |
| Kentucky | | |
| Louisiana | | |
| Maine | | |
| Maryland | | |
| Massachusetts | | |
| Michigan | | |
| Minnesota | | |
| Mississippi | | |
| Missouri | | |
| Montana | | |
| Nebraska | | |
| Nevada | | |
| New Hampshire | | |
| New Jersey | | |
| New Mexico | | |
| New York | | |
| North Carolina | | |
| North Dakota | | |
| Ohio | | |
| Oklahoma | | |
| Oregon | | |
| Pennsylvania | | |
| Rhode Island | | |
| South Carolina | | |
| South Dakota | | |
| Tennessee | | |
| Texas | | |
| Utah | | |
| Vermont | | |
| Virginia | | |
| Washington | | |
| West Virginia | | |
| Wisconsin | | |
| Wyoming | | |
| Washington DC | | |

PART B - MILES OF PIPE BY LOCATION AND COMMODITY TRANSPORTED

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. TOTAL SEGMENT MILES THAT COULD AFFECT HCAs ONLY | |
| Total number of miles operated Onshore | |
| Total number of miles operated Offshore | |
| Total system mileage (Onshore + Offshore) | 0 |

| | |
|--|---|
| 2. TOTAL CRUDE MILES | |
| a. Total number of miles in unregulated crude oil gathering service (excepted by 195.1.b.4) | |
| b. Total number of miles in DOT-regulated onshore crude oil gathering service (those that are within populated areas and fall under all of Part 195) | |
| c. Total number of miles in DOT-regulated offshore crude oil gathering service | |
| d. Total number of miles in rural DOT-regulated crude oil gathering service (regulated under 195.11) | |
| e. Total number of miles in crude oil service other than gathering (main lines) | |
| f. Total number of miles in crude oil service (Line 2a + Line 2b + Line 2c + Line 2d + Line 2e) | 0 |

| | |
|---|--|
| ALL OTHER MILES – MILES OF REFINED PRODUCT, HVL, CO2, N2, ETHANOL, BIOFUEL | |
| g. Total number of miles in refined products service (liquids at ambient temperature) | |
| h. Total number of miles in HVL service (gases at ambient pressure and temperature) | |
| i. Total number of miles in CO2, N2, or other non-flammable, non-toxic fluid (gases at ambient temperature) | |
| j. Total number of miles in ethanol service | |
| k. Total number of miles in bio-fuel service other than ethanol (e.g. biodiesel) | |
| l. Of the mileage reported in question 2k, how many miles of pipe transport ethanol in batches or ethanol blends. | |
| m. Total Transmission (Non-Gathering) Miles in System at end of 2019 | |

PART C - VOLUME TRANSPORTED IN BARREL-MILES

| | |
|---|---|
| 3a. Total volume in barrel-miles of crude oil moved in unregulated gathering systems | |
| 3b. Total volume in barrel-miles of crude oil moved in systems other than unregulated gathering systems | |
| 3. Total volume in barrel-miles of crude oil service (Line 3a + Line 3b) | 0 |
| 3c. Total volume in barrel-miles of HVLs or other flammable or toxic fluid which is a gas at atmospheric conditions | |
| 3d. Total volume in barrel-miles of gasoline or other petroleum product which is a liquid at ambient conditions | |
| 3e. Total volume in barrel-miles of CO2, N2 or other nonflammable, non-toxic fluid which is a gas at ambient conditions | |
| 3f. Total volume in barrel-miles of ethanol | |
| 3g. Total volume in barrel-miles of bio-fuels other than ethanol | |

| | |
|--|--|
| ONSHORE TOTAL BARREL-MILES | |
| Crude Oil | |
| Refined Product (non-HVL) | |
| HVL | |
| CO2 | |
| Ethanol | |
| Bio-Fuels other than ethanol | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated systems) | |

| | |
|--|--|
| OFFSHORE TOTAL BARREL-MILES | |
| Crude Oil | |
| Refined Product (non-HVL) | |
| HVL | |
| CO2 | |
| Ethanol | |
| Bio-Fuels other than ethanol | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated systems) | |

| | |
|--|---|
| TOTAL BARREL-MILES (ONSHORE + OFFSHORE) | |
| Crude Oil | 0 |
| Refined Product (non-HVL) | 0 |
| HVL | 0 |
| CO2 | 0 |
| Ethanol | |
| Bio-Fuels other than ethanol | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated systems) | 0 |

PART D - MILES OF PIPE BY MATERIAL AND CORROSION PREVENTION STATUS

| | |
|---|------|
| Onshore Steel Cathodically protected Bare Miles | |
| Onshore Steel Cathodically protected Coated Miles | |
| Onshore Steel Cathodically unprotected Bare Miles | |
| Onshore Steel Cathodically unprotected Coated Miles | |
| Onshore Plastic Miles | |
| Onshore Other Miles | |
| Onshore Total Miles (Bare, Coated, Plastic, Other) | 0.00 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Offshore Steel Cathodically protected Bare Miles | |
| Offshore Steel Cathodically protected Coated Miles | |
| Offshore Steel Cathodically unprotected Bare Miles | |
| Offshore Steel Cathodically unprotected Coated Miles | |
| Offshore Plastic Miles | |
| Offshore Other Miles | |
| Offshore Total Miles (Bare, Coated, Plastic, Other) | 0.00 |

| | |
|---|------|
| Total Miles Steel Cathodically protected Bare Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Miles Steel Cathodically protected Coated Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Miles Steel Cathodically unprotected Bare Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Miles Steel Cathodically unprotected Coated Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Plastic Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Other Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Miles (Bare, Coated, Plastic, Other) | 0.00 |

PART E - MILES OF ELECTRIC RESISTANCE WELDED (ERW) PIPE BY WELD TYPE AND DECADE

| | |
|----------------------------------|------|
| High Frequency Unknown Miles | |
| High Frequency Pre-1940 Miles | |
| High Frequency 1940 - 1949 Miles | |
| High Frequency 1950 - 1959 Miles | |
| High Frequency 1960 - 1969 Miles | |
| High Frequency 1970 - 1979 Miles | |
| High Frequency 1980 - 1989 Miles | |
| High Frequency 1990 - 1999 Miles | |
| High Frequency 2000 - 2009 Miles | |
| High Frequency 2010 - 2019 Miles | |
| High Frequency Total Miles | 0.00 |

| | |
|--|------|
| Low Frequency and DC Unknown Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC Pre-1940 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 1940 - 1949 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 1950 - 1959 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 1960 - 1969 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 1970 - 1979 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 1980 - 1989 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 1990 - 1999 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 2000 - 2009 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC 2010 - 2019 Miles | |
| Low Frequency and DC Total Miles | 0.00 |

| | |
|-------------------------|------|
| Total Unknown Miles | 0.00 |
| Total Pre-1940 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 1940 - 1949 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 1950 - 1959 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 1960 - 1969 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 1970 - 1979 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 1980 - 1989 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 1990 - 1999 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 2000 - 2009 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total 2010 - 2019 Miles | 0.00 |
| Total ERW Miles | 0.00 |

PART F - INTEGRITY INSPECTIONS CONDUCTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN BASED ON INSPECTION

PART F - INTEGRITY INSPECTIONS CONDUCTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN BASED ON INSPECTION

| 1. MILEAGE INSPECTED IN CALENDAR YEAR USING THE FOLLOWING IN-LINE INSPECTION (ILI) TOOLS | | | ILI Tool Miles |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Tool Technology Type | | | |
| a. Axial MFL | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| If the MFL tool was attuned to detect: (select all that apply) | Metal Loss | High Resolution | |
| | | Standard Resolution | |
| | Hard Spots | | |
| | Girth Weld Anomalies | | |
| b. Circumferential/Transverse MFL | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| Select all that apply | High Resolution | | |
| | Standard Resolution | | |
| c. Helical MFL | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| Select all that apply | High Resolution | | |
| | Standard Resolution | | |
| d. Wall Measurement Ultrasonic | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| Regarding Metal Loss, select all that apply | Pitting Resolution | | |
| | Standard Resolution | | |
| e. Shear Wave Ultrasonic | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| If the Ultrasonic tool was attuned to detect: | Axial Cracking Flaws | | |
| | Circumferential Cracking Flaws | | |
| f. Geometry/Deformation | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| Select all that apply | High Resolution | | |
| | Standard Resolution | | |
| g. Electronic Acoustic Transducer (EMAT) | | | |
| h. Camera | | | |
| i. Cathodic Protection Current Measurement (CPCM) | | | |
| j. Any other internal inspection tools, specifically other tools: | | | |
| k. Total tool mileage inspected in calendar year using in-line inspection tools. (Lines a thru j) | | | 0 <i>Calc. total</i> |
| l. Total miles analyzed in the five years from 2015 to 2019 | | | |

PART F - INTEGRITY INSPECTIONS CONDUCTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN BASED ON INSPECTION

| 2. ACTIONS TAKEN IN CALENDAR YEAR BASED ON IN-LINE INSPECTIONS | |
|--|---|
| a. Based on ILI data, total number of anomalies excavated in calendar year because they met the operator's criteria for excavation | |
| b. Total number of anomalies repaired in calendar year that were identified by ILI based on the operator's criteria, both within a segment that could affect an HCA and outside of a segment that could affect an HCA. | |
| c1. Total number of conditions repaired WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " Immediate repair condition. " [195.452(h)(4)(i)] | |
| c2. Total number of conditions repaired WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " 60-day condition. " [195.452(h)(4)(ii)] | |
| c3. Total number of conditions repaired WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " 180-day condition " [195.452(h)(4)(iii)] | |
| c. Total number of conditions repaired WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA (Lines c1 + c2 + c3) | 0 |

| 3. MILEAGE INSPECTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN IN CALENDAR YEAR BASED ON PRESSURE TESTING | |
|--|--|
| a. Total mileage inspected by pressure testing in calendar year | |
| b. Total number of pressure test failures (ruptures and leaks) repaired in calendar year, both within a segment that could affect HCA and outside of a segment that could affect an HCA. | |
| c. Total number of pressure test ruptures (complete failure of pipe wall) repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA. | |
| d. Total number of pressure test leaks (less than complete wall failure but including escape of test medium) repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA. | |

| 4. MILEAGE INSPECTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN IN CALENDAR YEAR BASED ON ECDA (EXTERNAL CORROSION DIRECT ASSESSMENT) | |
|---|---|
| a. Total mileage inspected by ECDA in calendar year | |
| b. Total number of anomalies identified by ECDA and repaired in calendar year based on the operator's criteria, both within a segment that could affect an HCA and outside of a segment that could affect an HCA. | |
| c1. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " Immediate repair condition. " [195.452(h)(4)(i)] | |
| c2. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " 60-day condition. " [195.452(h)(4)(ii)] | |
| c3. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " 180-day condition " [195.452(h)(4)(iii)] | |
| c. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA (Lines c1 + c2 + c3) | 0 |

| 5. MILEAGE INSPECTED AND ACTIONS TAKEN IN CALENDAR YEAR BASED ON OTHER INSPECTION TECHNIQUES) | |
|--|---|
| a. Total mileage inspected by inspection techniques other than those listed above in calendar year. | |
| b. Total number of anomalies identified by other inspection techniques and repaired in calendar year based on the operator's criteria, both within a segment that could affect an HCA and outside of a segment that could affect an HCA. | |
| c1. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " Immediate repair condition. " [195.452(h)(4)(i)] | |
| c2. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " 60-day condition. " [195.452(h)(4)(ii)] | |
| c3. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA meeting the definition of: " 180-day condition " [195.452(h)(4)(iii)] | |
| c. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA (Lines c1 + c2 + c3) | 0 |

| 6. TOTAL MILEAGE INSPECTED (ALL METHODS) AND ACTIONS TAKEN IN CALENDAR YEAR | |
|--|--|
| a. Total mileage inspected in calendar year | |
| b. Total number of anomalies repaired in calendar year both within a segment that could affect an HCA and outside of a segment that could affect an HCA. | |
| c. Total number of conditions repaired in calendar year WITHIN A SEGMENT THAT COULD AFFECT AN HCA. | |
| d. Total number of actionable anomalies eliminated by pipe replacement in calendar year that could affect an HCA. | |
| e. Total number of actionable anomalies eliminated by pipe abandonment in calendar year that could affect an HCA. | |

| 7. TOTAL NUMBER OF TOOLS RUN IN CALENDAR YEAR | |
|--|---|
| Count each run of each tool in each segment as a separate run. Example: a 100-mile pipeline system that is inspected by doing ILI tool runs in 4 different segments, at different times, would be 4 runs. If 2 different types of tools are used, at different times, that would be 8 runs | |
| Axial MFL tool run | |
| Circumferential/Transverse MFL | |
| Helical MFL | |
| Wall Measurement Ultrasonic | |
| Shear Wave Ultrasonic | |
| Geometry/Deformation | |
| Electronic Acoustic Transducer (EMAT) | |
| Camera | |
| Cathodic Protection Current Measurement (CPCM) | |
| Other | |
| Total number of tool runs | 0 |

PART G - MILES OF BASELINE ASSESSMENTS AND REASSESSMENTS COMPLETED IN CALENDAR YEAR

| | |
|---|--|
| segment miles that could affect HCAs ONLY | |
| a. Baseline assessment miles completed during the calendar year | |
| b. Reassessment miles completed during the calendar year | |
| c. Total assessment and reassessment miles completed during the calendar year | |

PART H - ONSHORE AND OFFSHORE MILES OF PIPE BY NOMINAL PIPE SIZE (NPS)

| ONSHORE MILES OF PIPE BY NOMINAL PIPE SIZE (NPS) | |
|--|---|
| NPS 4 OR LESS | |
| 6 | |
| 8 | |
| 10 | |
| 12 | |
| 14 | |
| 16 | |
| 18 | |
| 20 | |
| 22 | |
| 24 | |
| 26 | |
| 28 | |
| 30 | |
| 32 | |
| 34 | |
| 36 | |
| 38 | |
| 40 | |
| 42 | |
| 44 | |
| 46 | |
| 48 | |
| 50 | |
| 52 | |
| 54 | |
| 56 | |
| 58 AND OVER | |
| OTHER PIPE SIZES NOT LISTED (SIZE) | |
| OTHER PIPE SIZES NOT LISTED (MILES) | |
| TOTAL MILES OF ONSHORE PIPE | 0 |

| OFFSHORE MILES OF PIPE BY NOMINAL PIPE SIZE (NPS) | |
|--|---|
| NPS 4 OR LESS | |
| 6 | |
| 8 | |
| 10 | |
| 12 | |
| 14 | |
| 16 | |
| 18 | |
| 20 | |
| 22 | |
| 24 | |
| 26 | |
| 28 | |
| 30 | |
| 32 | |
| 34 | |
| 36 | |
| 38 | |
| 40 | |
| 42 | |
| 44 | |
| 46 | |
| 48 | |
| 50 | |
| 52 | |
| 54 | |
| 56 | |
| 58 AND OVER | |
| OTHER PIPE SIZES NOT LISTED (SIZE) | |
| OTHER PIPE SIZES NOT LISTED (MILES) | |
| TOTAL MILES OF OFFSHORE PIPE | 0 |

PART I - MILES OF PIPE BY DECADE INSTALLED

| | |
|-------------|---|
| UNKNOWN | |
| PRE-1920s | |
| 1920 - 1929 | |
| 1930 - 1939 | |
| 1940 - 1949 | |
| 1950 - 1959 | |
| 1960 - 1969 | |
| 1970 - 1979 | |
| 1980 - 1989 | |
| 1990 - 1999 | |
| 2000 - 2009 | |
| 2010 - 2019 | |
| TOTAL MILES | 0 |

PART J - MILES OF PIPE BY SPECIFIED MINIMUM YIELD STRENGTH

Pipeline Segments Subject to ALL 49 CFR 195 Requirements

Rural Low-Stress Pipeline Segments Subject ONLY to Subpart B of 49 CFR 195

| | |
|---|---|
| Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | |
| Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at an unknown stress level | |
| Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at an unknown stress level | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | |
| Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | |
| Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | |
| | |
| Offshore Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | |
| Offshore Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | |
| Offshore Steel Pipe - Operating at an unknown stress level | |
| Offshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | |
| Offshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | |
| | |
| Rural Low-Stress Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | |
| Rural Low-Stress Steel Pipe - Operating at an unknown stress level | |
| Rural Low-Stress Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | |
| | |
| Total Miles of Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | 0 |
| Total Miles of Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | 0 |
| Total Miles of Steel Pipe - Operating at unknown stress level | 0 |
| Total Miles of Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | 0 |
| Total Miles of Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | 0 |
| | |
| TOTAL MILES OF ONSHORE PIPE | 0 |
| TOTAL MILES OF OFFSHORE PIPE | 0 |
| TOTAL MILES OF RURAL LOW-STRESS PIPE | 0 |
| TOTAL MILES | 0 |

PART K - MILES OF REGULATED GATHERING LINES

| | |
|---|--|
| Non-Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | |
| Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | |
| Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | |
| Non-Rural Onshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Offshore Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | |
| Offshore Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | |
| Offshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | |
| Offshore Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Total Miles of Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 20% SMYS | 0 |
| Total Miles of Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 20% SMYS | 0 |
| Total Miles of Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at greater than 125 psig | 0 |
| Total Miles of Non-Steel Pipe - Operating at less than or equal to 125 psig | 0 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Total Non-Rural Onshore Miles | 0 |
| Total Rural Onshore Miles | 0 |
| Total Offshore Miles | 0 |
| Total Miles | 0 |

PART L - TOTAL SEGMENT MILES THAT COULD AFFECT HIGH CONSEQUENCE AREAS (HCAs)

| | |
|--|--|
| Onshore High Population | |
| Onshore Other Population | |
| Onshore USA Drinking Water | |
| Onshore USA Ecological Resource | |
| Onshore Commercially Navigable Waterways | |
| Onshore Total Segment Miles That Could Affect HCAs | |
| | |
| Offshore USA Ecological Resource | |
| Offshore Commercially Navigable Waterways | |
| Offshore Total Segment Miles That Could Affect HCAs | |

PART M - BREAKOUT TANKS

BREAKOUT DOT TANKS

| | |
|--|--|
| Crude Oil Total Number of DOT Tanks Less than or equal to 50,000 Bbls | |
| Crude Oil Total Number of DOT Tanks 50,001 to 100,000 Bbls | |
| Crude Oil Total Number of DOT Tanks 100,001 to 150,000 Bbls | |
| Crude Oil Total Number of DOT Tanks Over 150,000 Bbls | |
| Total Number of Crude Oil DOT Tanks | |
| | |
| Refined and/or Petroleum Product (non-HVL) Total Number of DOT Tanks Less than or equal to 50,000 Bbls | |
| Refined and/or Petroleum Product (non-HVL) Total Number of DOT Tanks 50,001 to 100,000 Bbls | |
| Refined and/or Petroleum Product (non-HVL) Total Number of DOT Tanks 100,001 to 150,000 Bbls | |
| Refined and/or Petroleum Product (non-HVL) Total Number of DOT Tanks Over 150,000 Bbls | |
| Total Number of Refined and/or Petroleum Product (non-HVL) DOT Tanks | |
| | |
| HVL Total Number of DOT Tanks Less than or equal to 50,000 Bbls | |
| HVL Total Number of DOT Tanks 50,001 to 100,000 Bbls | |
| HVL Total Number of DOT Tanks 100,001 to 150,000 Bbls | |
| HVL Total Number of DOT Tanks Over 150,000 Bbls | |
| Total Number of HVL DOT Tanks | |
| | |
| CO2 Total Number of DOT Tanks Less than or equal to 50,000 Bbls | |
| CO2 Total Number of DOT Tanks 50,001 to 100,000 Bbls | |
| CO2 Total Number of DOT Tanks 100,001 to 150,000 Bbls | |
| CO2 Total Number of DOT Tanks Over 150,000 Bbls | |
| Total Number of CO2 DOT Tanks | |
| | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated system) Total Number of DOT Tanks Less than or equal to 50,000 Bbls | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated system) Total Number of DOT Tanks 50,001 to 100,000 Bbls | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated system) Total Number of DOT Tanks 100,001 to 150,000 Bbls | |
| Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated system) Total Number of DOT Tanks Over 150,000 Bbls | |
| Total Number of Fuel Grade Ethanol (dedicated system) DOT Tanks | |

PART T - API STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

| |
|---|
| 1. Has your company adopted API Recommended Practice 1177 for this pipeline/facility? |
| <input type="radio"/> I don't know |
| |
| |
| If No, please choose from the following reasons why: |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 2. Did this pipeline/facility undergo any new construction during the calendar year? |
| |
| |
| If Yes, did the pipeline/facility experience any hydrostatic test failures associated with new construction? |
| |
| |
| |
| Did the pipeline/facility experience any failures in the first year (not calendar year) of product running through the pipe? |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 3. Has your company signed an API RP 1174 commitment form? |
| |
| |
| |

Dear AOPL or API member:

The rest of the survey seeks data from AOPL and API members about pipeline capacity additions and pipeline safety. We ask that each member company complete the attached survey to provide support for industry messages that AOPL and API convey to policymakers, regulators, the press, and the public. Similar surveys completed during the last two years helped our efforts significantly, including contributing heavily to the API-AOPL Pipeline Safety Excellence Performance Report.

Survey responses will support our arguments that the industry is investing to respond to market needs in a time of many changes in production and refining. Survey responses will also support our arguments that the industry is investing in safety and that integrity costs are significant and rising. Responses to previous surveys showed operators spent more than \$1.5 billion in 2016 on pipeline and tank integrity. Your responses helped us tell policymakers that pipeline operators inspected at least 35,296 miles of their pipelines with in-line-inspections, and conducted at least 8,872 excavations for further inspection or maintenance in 2016.

All data will again be analyzed and aggregated by RCP Inc. (RCP). Data will be publicly disclosed on an aggregate basis only. Company-specific information will be destroyed after it has been verified and aggregated, and will not be publicly disclosed, except where specifically authorized or required by law or court order.

We review survey questions each year to make sure that we only ask you for data that is needed to advocate on your behalf.

Should you have any questions about completing this survey, please contact John Stoody at jstoody@aopl.org.

Thank you for your help on this project. We assure you the data will contribute greatly to our work on your behalf.

Sincerely,

**Andy Black
President and CEO
AOPL**

**David Murk
Pipeline Manager
API**

PART II - SAFETY / INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT

1. Integrity Management Spending in 2019 - Pipelines and Facilities (excluding tanks)

dollars

| | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| Evaluation | <input type="text"/> |
| Inspection | <input type="text"/> |
| Maintenance | <input type="text"/> |

2. Integrity Management Spending in 2019 - Storage Tanks

dollars

| | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| Evaluation | <input type="text"/> |
| Inspection | <input type="text"/> |
| Maintenance | <input type="text"/> |

3a. Hydrotesting in 2019 - spending

dollars

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount spent on integrity-related (not pre-service) hydrotesting in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |
| Amount spent on pre-service (new or reversal) hydrotesting in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |

3b. Hydrotesting in 2019 - mileage

Miles

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Miles of pipe integrity-related (not pre-service) hydrotested in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |
| Miles of pipe pre-service (new or reversal) hydrotested in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |

4. Integrity-Related Digs

total count

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Number of Integrity-Related Digs in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |
| Number of Repairs Related to Integrity-Related Digs in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |
| Number of Integrity-Related Digs resulting in repairs in 2019 | <input type="text"/> |

5. Public Awareness Spending in 2019

dollars

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Complying with PHMSA Public Awareness Requirements | <input type="text"/> |
| Not Required Other Public Awareness Spending (e.g., sponsorship of Common Ground Alliance, other 811 promotion) | <input type="text"/> |

PART IV - PROJECT SPENDING

1. New Transmission Pipeline (including tanks and facilities) **added into service in 2019**

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Total Project Length (miles) | <input type="text"/> |
| Amount Spent (total cost of project in dollars) | <input type="text"/> |
| New Liquids Pipeline Capacity (barrels per day) | <input type="text"/> |

2. New Transmission Pipeline (including tanks and facilities) **Ongoing Construction or Already Added into Service in 2020**

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Total Project Length (miles) | <input type="text"/> |
| Total Projected Budget (over length of project - in dollars) | <input type="text"/> |
| Total Projected New Liquids Pipeline Capacity (barrels per day) | <input type="text"/> |

3. New Transmission Pipeline Projects **With Firm Commitments But Not Yet Ongoing Construction**

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Total Project Length (miles) | <input type="text"/> |
| Total Projected Budget (over length of project - in dollars) | <input type="text"/> |
| Total Projected increase in Liquids Pipeline Capacity (barrels per day) | <input type="text"/> |

NEW SERVICE - STATES AFFECTED

Alabama _____
 Alaska _____
 Arizona _____
 Arkansas _____
 California _____
 Colorado _____
 Connecticut _____
 Delaware _____
 Florida _____
 Georgia _____
 Hawaii _____
 Idaho _____
 Illinois _____
 Indiana _____
 Iowa _____
 Kansas _____
 Kentucky _____
 Louisiana _____
 Maine _____
 Maryland _____
 Massachusetts _____
 Michigan _____
 Minnesota _____
 Mississippi _____
 Missouri _____
 Montana _____
 Nebraska _____
 Nevada _____
 New Hampshire _____
 New Jersey _____
 New Mexico _____
 New York _____
 North Carolina _____
 North Dakota _____
 Ohio _____
 Oklahoma _____
 Oregon _____
 Pennsylvania _____
 Rhode Island _____
 South Carolina _____
 South Dakota _____
 Tennessee _____
 Texas _____
 Utah _____
 Vermont _____
 Virginia _____
 Washington _____
 West Virginia _____
 Wisconsin _____
 Wymoing _____

ONGOING CONSTRUCTION - STATES AFFECTED

Alabama _____
 Alaska _____
 Arizona _____
 Arkansas _____
 California _____
 Colorado _____
 Connecticut _____
 Delaware _____
 Florida _____
 Georgia _____
 Hawaii _____
 Idaho _____
 Illinois _____
 Indiana _____
 Iowa _____
 Kansas _____
 Kentucky _____
 Louisiana _____
 Maine _____
 Maryland _____
 Massachusetts _____
 Michigan _____
 Minnesota _____
 Mississippi _____
 Missouri _____
 Montana _____
 Nebraska _____
 Nevada _____
 New Hampshire _____
 New Jersey _____
 New Mexico _____
 New York _____
 North Carolina _____
 North Dakota _____
 Ohio _____
 Oklahoma _____
 Oregon _____
 Pennsylvania _____
 Rhode Island _____
 South Carolina _____
 South Dakota _____
 Tennessee _____
 Texas _____
 Utah _____
 Vermont _____
 Virginia _____
 Washington _____
 West Virginia _____
 Wisconsin _____
 Wymoing _____

FIRM COMMITMENTS - STATES AFFECTED

Alabama _____
 Alaska _____
 Arizona _____
 Arkansas _____
 California _____
 Colorado _____
 Connecticut _____
 Delaware _____
 Florida _____
 Georgia _____
 Hawaii _____
 Idaho _____
 Illinois _____
 Indiana _____
 Iowa _____
 Kansas _____
 Kentucky _____
 Louisiana _____
 Maine _____
 Maryland _____
 Massachusetts _____
 Michigan _____
 Minnesota _____
 Mississippi _____
 Missouri _____
 Montana _____
 Nebraska _____
 Nevada _____
 New Hampshire _____
 New Jersey _____
 New Mexico _____
 New York _____
 North Carolina _____
 North Dakota _____
 Ohio _____
 Oklahoma _____
 Oregon _____
 Pennsylvania _____
 Rhode Island _____
 South Carolina _____
 South Dakota _____
 Tennessee _____
 Texas _____
 Utah _____
 Vermont _____
 Virginia _____
 Washington _____
 West Virginia _____
 Wisconsin _____
 Wymoing _____

PART V - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

in dollars

Contribution to PRCI in 2019

Estimated 2018 spending on pipeline research and development outside of PRCI contribution