Cost and Benefit Impact Analysis of the PHMSA Natural Gas Gathering and Transmission Safety Regulation Proposal



Submitted by: ICF International

July 1, 2016

Prepared for:

American Petroleum Institute 1220 L Street NW Washington, D.C. 20005



Contact:

Harry Vidas 703-218-2745





Table of Contents

E)	ecutive	Summary	1			
	ES.1 Ov	erall Summary of Gathering and Transmission Results	1			
	ES.2 Summary of Gathering Sector					
	ES.2.1 G	Sathering Compliance Costs by Company Size	5			
	ES.3 Su	mmary of Transmission Sector	6			
	ES.4 Dis	cussion of Benefits	8			
	ES.5 Str	ucture of Report	8			
1	Back	ground	10			
2	Deta	iled Cost Discussion for Gathering	11			
	2.1	Estimation of Gathering Mileage	11			
	2.1.1 "Incic	ICF Estimates for Miles of Gathering Line, Number of Gathering Companies, and dental Gathering" Miles that will Shift from Gathering to Transmission Status	11			
	2.1.2	Miles of Gathering Line	11			
	2.1.3	Number of Gas Gathering Companies	12			
	2.1.4	Number of "Incidental Gathering" Line Miles	15			
	2.2	Missing Cost for Implementation of the Rule for Gathering Pipeline	15			
	2.2.1	Cost Basis	15			
	2.2.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	15			
	2.2.3	Cost Results	15			
	2.3	Missing Cost for Pipeline Material Verification for Gathering Pipeline	18			
	2.3.1	Cost Basis	18			
	2.3.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	19			
	2.3.3	Cost Results	19			
	2.4	Missing Cost for MAOP Determination for Regulated Pipeline for Gathering Pipeline	24			
	2.4.1	Cost Basis	24			
	2.4.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	24			
	2.4.3	Cost Results	24			
	2.5	Missing Cost for MAOP Determination for Unregulated Pipeline for Gathering Pipeline	43			
	2.5.1	Cost Basis	43			
	2.5.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	43			
	2.5.3	Cost Results	43			



2.6	Mis	sing Cost for Compressor Stations for Gathering Pipeline	65
2.6.1 Cost Basis		Cost Basis	65
2.6	5.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	65
2.6	5.3	Cost Results	65
2.7	Mis	sing Cost for Field Repair of Damages for Gathering Pipeline	67
2.7	7.1	Cost Basis	67
2.7	7.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	68
2.7	7.3	Cost Results	68
2.8	Mis	sing Cost for Construction for Gathering Pipeline	78
2.8	3.1	Cost Basis	78
2.8	3.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	78
2.8	8.3	Cost Results	78
2.9	Mis	sing Cost for Design Pressure for Gathering Pipeline	83
2.9	9.1	Cost Basis	83
2.9	9.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	83
2.9	9.3	Cost Results	83
2.10	Mis	sing Cost for Vaults for Gathering Pipeline	87
2.1	.0.1	Cost Basis	87
2.1	.0.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	87
2.1	0.3	Cost Results	87
2.11	Mis	sing Cost for Moderate Consequence Area Assessment for Gathering Pipeline	90
2.1	1.1	Cost Basis	90
2.1	1.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	90
2.1	1.3	Cost Results	90
2.12	Mis	sing Cost for Leak Surveys for Gathering Pipeline	93
2.1	2.1	Cost Basis	93
2.1	2.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	93
2.1	2.3	Cost Results	93
2.13	Mis	sing Cost for Management of Change for Gathering Pipeline	95
2.1	3.1	Cost Basis	95
2.1	3.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	96
2.1	3.3	Cost Results	96



2.14 Mis		sing Cost for Corrosion Control and Test Stations for Gathering Pipeline	101
2.14	4.1	Cost Basis	101
2.14	4.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	101
2.14	4.3	Cost Results	101
2.15	Mis	sing Cost for Pipeline Inspection Following Extreme Events for Gathering Pipeline	106
2.1	5.1	Cost Basis	106
2.1	5.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	107
2.1	5.3	Cost Results	107
2.16	Mis	sing Cost for Repairing Known Existing Conditions for Gathering Pipeline	111
2.1	6.1	Cost Basis	111
2.1	6.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	112
2.1	6.3	Cost Results	112
2.17	Rev	ised Cost for Annual Reporting Requirements for Gathering Pipeline	115
2.1	7.1	Cost Basis	115
2.1	7.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	116
2 1	7.3	Cost Results	116
2.1	/		-
2.18 (Table	Rev 2-89	ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp)	oanies 120
2.18 (Table 2.18	Rev 8 3-8 9 8.1	ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp) Cost Basis	oanies 120 120
2.12 2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18	Rev 3-8 8.1 8.2	ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats	Danies 120 120 121
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.18	Rev 3-89 8.1 8.2 8.3	ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results	Danies 120 120 121 121
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1	Rev 8.3-89 8.1 8.2 8.3 Rev Newl	rised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results rised Assumption of Utilizing Offshore Incidents to Represent Initial Incident Frequery y Regulated Onshore Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-1)	Danies 120 120 121 121 ncy 121
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19	Rev e 3-89 8.1 8.2 8.3 Rev Newl 9.1	rised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results rised Assumption of Utilizing Offshore Incidents to Represent Initial Incident Frequency y Regulated Onshore Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-1) Cost Basis	Danies 120 121 121 ncy 121 121
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19 2.19	Rev 3-89 8.1 8.2 8.3 Rev Newl 9.1 9.2	cost Results ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats cost Results ised Assumption of Utilizing Offshore Incidents to Represent Initial Incident Frequence y Regulated Onshore Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-1) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats	anies 120 120 121 121 ncy 121 121 121
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19 2.19 2.19	Rev 8.3 8.3 Rev 9.1 9.2 9.3	cost Results ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp Ocost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results ised Assumption of Utilizing Offshore Incidents to Represent Initial Incident Frequery Regulated Onshore Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-1) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats	Danies 120 121 121 ncy 121 121 121 121 121
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.1	Rev 3-89 8.1 8.2 8.3 Rev 9.1 9.2 9.3 Rev (Tab	rised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Comp Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results rised Assumption of Utilizing Offshore Incidents to Represent Initial Incident Frequency Regulated Onshore Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-1) Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results Cost Results	anies 120 121 121 121 121 121 122 a 2 122
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.1	Rev 3.3 8.1 8.2 8.3 Rev 9.1 9.2 9.3 Rev (Tab 0.1	<pre>cost Results</pre>	anies 120 120 121 121 121 121 122 a 2 122 122
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.1	Rev 8.3 8.2 8.3 Rev 9.1 9.2 9.3 Rev (Tab 0.1 0.2	Cost Results Cost Results Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats Cost Results Cost Results Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Cost Results Cost Basis Major Assumption of Utilizing Previously Regulated Type B Data to Model Type A Are Results Cost Basis Major Assumptions and Caveats	anies 120 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 122 a 2 122 122 122
2.18 (Table 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.18 2.19 from 1 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.19 2.1	Rev 8.3 8.3 Rev 9.1 9.2 9.3 Rev (Tab 0.1 0.2 0.3	cost Results ised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Component of the second secon	anies 120 121 121 121 ncy 121 121 121 122 a 2 122 122 122 122



	2.21.1	Cost Basis	122
	2.21.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	123
	2.21.3	Cost Results	
3	Detailed	Cost Discussion for Transmission	
	3.1 Mis	sing Cost for MCA Field Repair of Damages for Transmission Pipeline	124
	3.1.1	Cost Basis	124
	3.1.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	124
	3.1.3	Cost Results	124
	3.2 Mis 136	sing Cost for non-HCA and non-MCA Field Repair of Damages for Transmission	on Pipeline
	3.2.1	Cost Basis	136
	3.2.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	136
	3.2.3	Cost Results	137
:	3.3 Mis	sing Cost for Incidental Mileage for Transmission Pipeline	147
	3.3.1	Cost Basis	147
	3.3.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	148
	3.3.3	Cost Results	148
:	3.4 Mis	sing Cost for Repairing Known Existing Conditions in Transmission	196
	3.4.1	Cost Basis	196
	3.4.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	197
	3.4.3	Cost Results	197
	3.5 Rev	rised Cost of Upgrading to ILI for Transmission Pipeline	200
	3.5.1	Cost Basis	200
	3.5.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	201
	3.5.3	Cost Results	201
:	3.6 Rev	rised Cost of Vendors for Transmission Pipeline	201
	3.6.1	Cost Basis	201
	3.6.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	201
	3.6.3	Cost Results	201
	3.7 Rev	rised Cost for Field Repair of Damages for Transmission Pipeline	201
	3.7.1	Cost Basis	201
	3.7.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats	202
	3.7.3	Cost Results	202



	Newseu Cost for Fipeline inspection following extreme events for fransmission Pipeline .202
3.8.1	Cost Basis
3.8.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats202
3.8.3	Cost Results
3.9	Revised Cost of In-line Inspection202
3.9.1	Cost Basis
3.9.2	Major Assumptions and Caveats203
3.9.3	Cost Results
3.10	Revised Cost of Pressure Testing203
3.10.	1 Cost Basis
3.10.	2 Major Assumptions and Caveats204
3.10.	3 Cost Results
3.11	Revised Cost for Management of Change for Transmission Pipeline
3.11.	1 Cost Basis
3.11.	2 Major Assumptions and Caveats205
3.11.	3 Cost Results
3.12	Revised Benefits of Proposed Material Documentation Requirements for Transmission
Pipelin	206
Pipeline 3.12.	206 1 Basis
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12.	206 1 Basis
Pipelin 3.12. 3.12. 3.12.	206 1 Basis
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13	206 1 Basis 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 3 Results 206
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13. 3.13.	206 1 Basis 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 3 Results 206 Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost 1 Cost Basis
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13 3.13. 3.13.	206 1 Basis 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 3 Results 206 Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost 1 Cost Basis 206 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13.	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats3Results206Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost1Cost Basis2062Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2143Cost Results
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats3Results2069Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost1Cost Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Cost Results2Cost Results2242425Cost Results224242424454445444<
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi Appendix	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats.2Major Assumptions and Caveats.3Results206Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost2061Cost Basis2062Major Assumptions and Caveats.2Major Assumptions and Caveats.224Cost Results.224Costs Lacking Data for Analysis224Inconsistencies in Regulatory Impact Analysis.22
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi Appendix Calcula	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats3Results3Results206Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost2061Cost Basis2062Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Cost Results2Cost Results224Cost Stacking Data for Analysis2Cost Stacking Cata for Analysis2
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi Appendix Calcula Identifi	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats3Results206Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost2061Cost Basis2062Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions3Cost Results4Inconsistencies in Regulatory Impact Analysis2Major Assumptions4Major Assumptions
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi Appendix Calcula Identifi Tables	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats3Results3Recalculation of HCA Cost2062061Cost Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats214Cost Results3Cost Results411111112
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi Appendix Calcula Identifi Tables Questio	2061Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats3Results2069Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost1Cost Basis2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats2Major Assumptions and Caveats21Cost Results21Cost Results21A: Inconsistencies in Regulatory Impact Analysis216cition Issues with PHMSA's RIA216cition Issues with PHMSA's RIA217Jnable to Replicate218calculation Assumptions Made by PHMSA that ICF Did Not Address217
Pipeline 3.12. 3.12. 3.12. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 3.13. 4 Signi Appendix Calcula Identifi Tables Questic Appendix	206 1 Basis 206 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 206 3 Results 206 3 Results 206 9 Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost 206 1 Cost Basis 206 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 206 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 206 2 Major Assumptions and Caveats 214 3 Cost Results 214 4 Cost Results 214 5 Cost Results 214 6 Cost S Lacking Data for Analysis 214 6 Inconsistencies in Regulatory Impact Analysis 216 1 Insues with PHMSA's RIA 216 1 Cost Replicate 217 1 Jnable to Replicate 217 1 Dable to Replicate 217 1 B: All Recalculated Tables from the RIA for Gathering 217



Appendix D: All Recalculated	Tables from the RIA Appendi	ix
------------------------------	-----------------------------	----



Executive Summary

ICF International has been asked by American Petroleum Institute (API) to evaluate the cost and benefit impact of the PHMSA safety regulation proposal (Part 191 and 192) dated April 8, 2016, but does not consider information presented in webinars after this date. ICF's analysis includes validating the methodology and assumptions of the PHMSA cost and benefit calculations and making changes as necessary as well as determining any missing costs not included in the PHMSA cost analysis.

ES.1 Overall Summary of Gathering and Transmission Results

The table below displays ICF's overall results as a present value over 15 years with a discount rate of 7%. These results include ICF's estimates for missing costs in gathering and transmission as well as ICF's revisions to PHMSA's RIA calculations for costs and benefits in both sectors. In this analysis, the low estimate benefits have been reduced from \$3,234 million to \$306 million, the high estimate benefits from \$3,738 million to \$568 million. The overall costs have increased from PHMSA's \$597 million to the ICF estimate of \$33,416 million. The sections below provide the explanations behind these differences.

Table 1

(Millions; 2015) / % Discount Kate)								
	Tonic Area	ICF Missing and Revised Calculations ¹			PHMSA RIA ²			
	Торислиса	Benefits - Low	Benefits - High	Costs	Benefits - Low	Benefits - High	Costs	
	Re-establish MAOP, Verify	\$138.7	\$401.0	\$772.3	\$2,953.5	\$3,457.5	\$267.0	
1	Material Properties, and							
-	Integrity Assessment Outside							
	HCAs			*2 570 2			¢22.0	
2	Field Repair of Damages -	n.e.	n.e.	\$3,578.2	n.e.	n.e.	\$33.0	
	(More Timely Repairs)	¢164	¢164	¢12.2	¢165	¢165	¢10.7	
3	Management of Change Process	\$16.4	\$16.4	\$12.5	\$16.5	\$16.5	\$10.5	
	Improvement	¢0(1	¢06.1	¢114.c	¢0 2 5	¢0 0 7	¢04.5	
4	Corrosion Control	\$96.1	\$96.1	\$114.6	\$82.5	\$82.5	\$94.5	
5	Pipeline Inspection Following	\$4.7	\$4.7	\$63.2	\$4.5	\$4.5	\$1.5	
5	Extreme Events							
6	MAOP Exceedance Reports and	n.e.	n.e.	\$2.9	n.e.	n.e.	\$3.0	
0	Records Verification							
7	Launcher/Receiver Pressure	\$6.7	\$6.7	\$0.4	\$6.0	\$6.0	\$0.0	
'	Relief							
Q	Expansion of Gathering	\$43.3	\$43.3	\$28,872.2	\$169.5	\$169.5	\$189.0	
0	Regulation							
	Total for Gathering and	\$305.9	\$568.2	\$33,416.1	\$3,234.0	\$3,738.0	\$597.0	
	Transmission Sectors							
n.e	$e_{i} = not estimated$							
1.	Figures for ICF Missing and Revise	ed Calculatior	ns do not acco	ount for selec	t costs as outl	ined in Sectio	on 4 of this	
rej	port.							
2.	2. PHMSA RIA values displayed are the average annual values in Table ES-6 of the RIA multiplied by 15 to get							
.1	1	CC 1	1					

Summary of 15 Year Net Present Value Benefits and Costs for Transmission and Gathering Lines (Millions; 2015\$ 7% Discount Rate)

the 15 year value. This may be slightly off due to rounding in Table ES-6.

ICF

ES.2 Summary of Gathering Sector

ICF determines that many of the costs associated with the gathering sector are completely missing from the PHMSA RIA calculations (a through o) or are incorrectly calculated (p through t), as follows:

- (a) The RIA does not account for the up-front time and associated costs to interpret the rule and determine applicability to various pipe segments within each company's system.
- (b) The proposal requires (192.607) all operators verify pipeline material that do not have "reliable, traceable, verifiable, and complete material documentation records" to conduct material testing of their pipe. The RIA does not calculate the cost of this requirement.
- (c) The proposal requires (192.619, 192.624) that all operators determine or verify Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure (MAOP). This requirement creates substantial costs for operators who must determine MAOP. Some gathering operators either cannot utilize the five-year lookback period or do not already know MAOP. Of those operators that know the MAOP or can use the 5-year lookback option, all must verify if located in Class 3, Class 4, or Moderate or High Consequence Area (MCA or HCA, respectively) location. The RIA does not include the cost of MAOP determination for such operators.
- (d) The proposal requires (191.23) operators to report safety-related conditions including the exceedance of MAOP. An operator must know the MAOP to know if this exceedance occurs, which requires the determination of MAOP. This applies to all pipeline, regardless of regulation. The RIA does not account for this cost.
- (e) The proposal requires (192.163) operators to construct compressor buildings under certain standards. The RIA does not include this cost to build a noncombustible-material building for new compressor stations built in the future that would not have this requirement without the proposal.
- (f) The proposal requires (192.706) operators perform periodic leak surveys and assessments. The RIA assumes that operators fix all conditions found during surveys. However, some operators may only monitor certain conditions and may not necessarily fix them within a set timeframe. The RIA does not consider the cost of fixing these monitored conditions. Additionally, the RIA does not take into account the incremental cost to fix a large number of conditions within an accelerated timeframe.
- (g) The proposal requires (192.321) operators of above-ground plastic pipe in operation for greater than two years install such pipeline below ground with a specified minimum cover. The RIA does not include the cost for re-installing existing plastic pipe below ground.
- (h) The proposal requires (192.105) operators to design newly installed pipeline under certain material standards. This might require higher grade steels, thicker walls, or the substitution of steel for plastic and composites. The RIA does not include the incremental costs for installing higher grade gathering pipe in the future than currently necessary to comply with the proposed design requirements for pipe.
- (i) The proposal requires (192.183) operators to construct any installed vaults under certain design requirements. The RIA does not include the incremental costs to comply with specific structural design requirements for vaults on new gathering lines installed in the future.
- (j) The proposal requires (192.619 and 192.624) operators to assess newly defined moderate consequence areas (MCA) for MAOP determination and verification. To determine whether a



pipeline must comply, an operator must identify MCA areas, if any, using a Geographic Information System (GIS). The RIA does not account for the cost to identify these areas using GIS.

- (k) The proposal requires (192.706) operators of Type A Area 2 to perform periodic leak surveys in order to maintain safe operation of a pipeline. The RIA does not consider this cost.
- (I) The proposal requires (192.13) operators to perform a management of change process as well as reestablish records when gathering systems change hands. The RIA does not consider these costs.
- (m) The proposal requires (192.478 and 192.465) operators adhere to internal and external corrosion requirements for operating gathering lines. This requires performing periodic surveys to monitor the condition of an operating pipe to ensure public safety. The RIA includes a cost for this requirement; however, these costs do not account for all specified requirements. Hence, ICF developed an estimate of additional costs for this requirement.
- (n) The proposal requires (192.613) operators to conduct an inspection of all onshore pipeline and following an extreme weather event within 72 hours of cessation of the event. ICF considers this to include the cost to develop a process and perform inspection. The RIA does not consider these costs for gathering lines.
- (o) The proposal requires (192.711, 192.713) operators to fix all conditions identified during leak surveys and assessments. Operators have historically monitoring conditions without necessarily fixing them. Therefore, a backlog of conditions exists that will need repair when the proposed rule comes into effect. The RIA does not consider the cost to address these backlog of conditions.
- (p) The proposal requires (191.17) operators to complete and submit annual reports for all pipeline to PHMSA. The RIA provides an estimate of cost to submit these annual reports, but ICF considers these costs underestimated. We include a revision of these costs in our cumulative cost calculations.
- (q) In the RIA, PHMSA assumes that 3% percent of newly regulated Type A Area 2 pipe is owned by a company not already regulated. ICF considers 80% of newly regulated Type A Area 2 pipe is owned by a company not already regulated.
- (r) In the RIA, the pre-regulation occurrence of incidents were estimated incorrectly by taking the offshore incidents from 2001-2005 and applying them to Type A Area 2. ICF considers onshore incidents from 2001-2005.
- (s) In the RIA, the post-regulation occurrence of incidents were estimated by taking the reported Type B incidents from 2010-2014 and applying them to Type A Area 2. ICF considers onshore incidents from Type A Area 1 to be a better estimate for the high stress Type A Area 2 pipeline.
- (t) Finally in the RIA, Table 6-8 estimates the gas lost from onshore and offshore incidents. ICF considers onshore, natural gas, Type A and B pipelines for determining gas lost.

The following table shows ICF's new cost estimates for various parameters for gathering systems that impact operators based on the proposed safety regulation. For each cost parameter, ICF determines a net present value cost over a 15-year period using a 7% discount rate. (ICF has incorporated the revised benefit estimates discussed in items (r)-(t) in the overall table above, Table 1.) The total cost impact of the proposed rule on gathering line operations amounts to \$27.1 billion.



15 Year Net Present Value Costs for Gathering Lines (Millions; 2015\$)				
Topic Area	Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)			
a. Implementation of the Rule	\$264.4			
b. Material Verification	\$315.0			
c. MAOP Determination for Regulated Pipeline	\$4,258.9			
d. MAOP Determination for Unregulated Pipeline	\$19,932.6			
e. Compressor Stations	\$14.4			
f. Field Repair of Damages	\$35.2			
g. Construction	\$86.9			
h. Design Pressure	\$499.2			
i. Vaults	\$1.6			
j. Moderate Consequence Area Assessment	\$543.5			
k. Leak Surveys	\$277.8			
1. Management of Change	\$778.4			
m. Corrosion Control and Test Stations	\$68.9			
n. Pipeline Inspection Following Extreme Events	\$49.1			
o. Repairing Backlog of Conditions	\$10.2			
a-o. Subtotal Cost for Items Missing from the RIA	\$27,136.2			
p-q. Subtotal Cost for Revised Items	\$1,736.0			
Total Costs	\$28,872.2			

ICF

ES.2.1 Gathering Compliance Costs by Company Size

In order to estimate the impact of the regulation on companies of different sizes, ICF breaks the gathering compliance costs into costs incurred per company regardless of mileage versus those costs which are a function of mileage.

Table 3 shows gathering mile costs on an annual basis. ICF estimates each company will incur 7.6% of those costs creating a cost per company of \$40,660. The remaining 92.4% of the costs lead to a per mile cost of \$4,451.

Table 3

Annual Compliance Costs (7% NPV divided by 15 years)					
Total Annual cost for gathering	\$1,924,810,153				
Fraction of costs that are per-company and unrelated to mileage	7.60%				
Annual cost allocated on per-company basis	\$146,252,538				
Annual cost allocated on per-mile basis	\$1,778,557,615				
Cost per company (unrelated to mileage)	\$40,660				
Regulatory compliance cost per mile	\$4,451				

Table 4 shows the approximate impact of the proposed regulation as estimated by ICF broken out by size of gathering company. The number of companies and the distribution of companies by size comes from the data analysis described in Section 2.1 of this report. ICF assumes the volumes gathered as equal to EIA estimates of onshore U.S. gross natural gas withdrawals in 2014 (the last full year of data). ICF also estimates revenues per Mcf of gas gathered. Additionally, ICF assumes total volumes gathered and revenues as proportional to mileage of gathering line among the three company-size segments.

For the gathering system as a whole, compliance costs average approximately 22% of revenues. However, for the smallest companies, the estimated annual compliance cost nearly equals estimated annual revenues from gathering fees. This disproportionate impact on small gatherers occurs because many of the costs incurred by the gatherers derive from regulatory analysis, set-up, and training costs which remain similar for each company regardless of its size.



Impact of Gathering System Regulations by Company Size						
Size Segment Label	Small Companies	Medium Companies	Large Companies	All Gatherers		
Minimum Miles per Company in Size Segment	0	10	100	0		
Maximum Miles per Company in Size Segment	10	100	35,000	35,000		
Company Count in Size Segment	2,223	921	453	3,597		
Miles of Gathering Line in Size Segment	5,994	25,973	367,613	399,579		
Miles of Gathering Line per Company	3	28	811	111		
Approximate Annual Gas Volumes (Mcf) in Size Segment	435,187,050	1,885,810,550	26,691,472,400	29,012,470,000		
Approximate Annual Gas Volumes (Mcf) per Company	195,770	2,047,942	58,892,711	8,065,741		
Approximate Annual Gathering Fees per Company	\$58,731	\$614,383	\$17,667,813	\$2,419,722		
Annual Compliance Cost in Size Segment (7% NPV /15 years)	\$117,062,433	\$153,046,895	\$1,654,700,826	\$1,924,810,153		
Annual Compliance Cost per Company (7% NPV /15 years)	\$52,661	\$166,205	\$3,650,972	\$535,115		
Annual Compliance Cost as % of Annual Gathering Revenues	90%	27%	21%	22%		

ES.3 Summary of Transmission Sector

ICF determines that some of the costs associated with the transmission sector are completely missing from the PHMSA RIA calculations (a through d below) and determines that several key assumptions on estimating benefits and costs for the transmission sector are not representative of the current state of industry practices and the true cost impacts of the proposed rules (e through k below). The key assumptions and calculations requiring additions and revisions are as follows:

- (a) The proposal requires (192.710 and 192.713) MCA mileage under pipeline assessment to repair conditions. These conditions are often times only monitored and not necessarily fixed within a set timeframe. The RIA does not adequately calculate the cost of this requirement.
- (b) The proposal requires (192.713) operators repair pipeline under a specified timeframe. The RIA does not include repair costs for non-HCA and non-MCA mileage.
- (c) The proposal modifies (192.3) the definition of gathering lines, requiring lines downstream of gas processing facilities (referred to as incidental pipe) that are now identified as gathering to comply with the entire transmission line regulation. This incidental transmission mileage is not accounted for in the RIA.



- (d) The proposal requires (192.713) operators to fix all conditions identified during leak surveys and assessments. Operators have historically monitoring conditions without necessarily fixing them. Therefore, a backlog of conditions exists that will need repair when the proposed rule comes into effect. The RIA does not consider the cost to address these backlog of conditions.
- (e) The RIA disregards operator feedback for the cost to upgrade pipeline to accommodate ILI, hence ICF modified the upgrade cost to reflect operator input more closely.
- (f) The RIA estimates vendor costs but does not account for costs associated to the company for scheduling, implementing, supervising and verifying the work. ICF added a general and administrative cost to all vendor costs.
- (g) The proposal requires (192.933) the repair of conditions immediately. The RIA assumes that all conditions found in an HCA during surveys are currently fixed. Many conditions currently are only monitored and not necessarily fixed within a set timeframe. The cost of fixing conditions that are only currently monitored is not a part of the RIA.
- (h) The proposal requires (192.613) operators to conduct an inspection of all onshore pipeline and following an extreme weather event within 72 hours of cessation. ICF considers this as the cost to develop a process and perform inspection. The RIA does not consider this cost.
- (i) The RIA underestimates the cost to conduct ILI, and so ICF made adjustments to the additional tools including Spiral MFL and crack tools.
- (j) The RIA underestimates the cost to conduct a pressure test and so ICF made adjustments to these costs.
- (k) The RIA underestimates the time to implement a management of change program in table 3-67.
- (I) The RIA assumes a very large economic benefit associated with the reduced cost for tensile testing (192.107) which is added language in the regulation. ICF did not include this benefit because it does not comply with the "costs without new regulation" versus "cost with new regulation" concept that must be used for cost-benefit analyses of federal regulations.
- (m) The RIA took a simple average of incidents in Table E-3 associated with incidents in HCA areas, which in turn over represents the true mean of these incidents. ICF took a power law distribution and applied it to the 23 incidents to achieve a more reasonable mean cost per incident.

The following table shows ICF's new cost estimates for various parameters for transmission systems that impact operators based on the proposed safety regulation. For each cost parameter, ICF determines a net present value cost over a 15-year period using a 7% discount rate. (ICF has incorporated the revised benefit estimates discussed in items (I) – (m) in the overall table above, Table 1.) The total cost impact of the proposed rule on transmission operations amounts to \$4.5 billion.



15 Year Net Present Value Costs for Transmission Lines (Millions; 2015\$)					
Topic Area	Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)				
a. MCA Field Repair of Damages	\$591				
b. Non-MCA/Non-HCA Miles Field Repair of Damages	\$1,594				
c. Incidental Mileage	\$270				
d. Repairing Backlog of Conditions	\$923				
a-d. Subtotal Cost for Missing Items	\$3,377				
e-k. Subtotal Cost for Revised Items	\$1,167				
Total	\$4,543.9				

ES.4 Discussion of Benefits

During review of PHMSA's Preliminary Regulatory Impact Assessment, ICF found a number of inconsistencies in the calculations, with errors from Tables 6-1 and Tables 6-6 of the RIA having a significant impact on results. Table 6-1 is applying onshore and offshore incidents to onshore gathering line mileage. Removing offshore gathering incidents from onshore mileage over the same time period results in a change from 0.329 incidents per thousand miles to 0.144 incidents per thousand miles. Further, PHMSA pulled total costs when calculating Table 6-6's "other incident costs". This effectively double counted costs associated with fatalities, injuries and evacuations. By making the corrections to Table 6-1 and 6-6, the benefits from Topic Area 8 drops from \$169.5 million to \$43.3 million over the fifteen year period (Total NPV with discount rate 7%). ICF includes a complete listing of all inconsistencies in Appendix A.

ICF also takes issue with PHMSA's calculation of the average economic consequences for certain types of incidents related to HCAs in a table entitled "Table E-3. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectable by Modern Integrity Assessment Methods Located in HCAs (2003-2015; 2015\$)." This table takes a simple average of the consequences for 23 incidents that occurred over 13 years to compute an average of \$23.4 million per incident. An analysis of the underlying data indicates that a single incident contributed 98.9% of the total consequences from the 23 incidents. Because the sample size is so small and so heavily skewed, it raises the question of how random factor commonly referred to as the "luck of the draw" might have influenced the calculated average and what a more sophisticated analysis of the data might reveal is a better estimate of the mean value for this variable. ICF conducts such an analysis assuming that consequences follow a power law distribution. This analysis suggests a better estimate of the average consequences to be expected from incidents in HCA areas from causes detectable by modern integrity assessment methods as approximately \$6.7 million rather than the \$23.4 million calculated by a simple average of the 23 incidents.

ES.5 Structure of Report

The structure of this report is as follows. The Background section provides the context to the analysis presented in this report. The Detailed Cost Discussion for Gathering section provides a detailed discussion



of each cost parameter for gathering systems either missing or revised from the analysis shown in the RIA. The Detailed Cost Discussion for Transmission section provides a discussion of the cost parameters that were missing or required revisions, including the application of the power law distribution. The Significant Costs Lacking Data for Analysis section provides a discussion of known cost parameters without easily applicable methods of estimation from present data. Appendix A provides a listing of a variety of issues ICF determined when reviewing PHMSA's calculations. Appendices B, C, and D provide all recalculated tables from the RIA that relate to gathering systems, transmission systems, and the RIA appendix itself respectively.



1 Background

In this report, ICF discusses the results of analyzing PHMSA's proposed rules - 49 C.F.R. Parts 191 and 192. For this effort, ICF analyzes both the proposed rules and PHMSA's Regulatory Impact Analysis. ICF determines the magnitude of unaccounted for or underestimated costs based on our assessment, industry inputs, and expert opinion, following PHMSA's proposed methodology in the RIA where possible. ICF calculates all applicable pipeline mileage estimates revised using HPDI data using well mapping and company location. ICF considers cost for both existing pipeline that must now comply with regulation based on the revised definition of gathering pipeline in the proposal and newly installed pipeline that will require additional standards in the future. ICF developed this analysis by directly interpreting the language in the rule, without presumptions for any inconsistencies created by the proposed regulation.

ICF

2 Detailed Cost Discussion for Gathering

2.1 Estimation of Gathering Mileage

2.1.1 ICF Estimates for Miles of Gathering Line, Number of Gathering Companies, and "Incidental Gathering" Miles that will Shift from Gathering to Transmission Status

The cost-benefit analysis requires estimates for the number of miles of gathering line and the number of companies potentially impacted by the proposed regulations. ICF independently estimates those values and related statistics for its re-estimation of the economic costs and benefits of the proposed rules. This report discusses the methodologies employed by ICF for these estimates below.

2.1.2 Miles of Gathering Line

No comprehensive statistics exist for the number of miles of gathering line in the United States and only a few statistics related to gathering miles within any given state are available. To prepare the RIA, PHMSA estimated the number of gathering miles as 355,509. PHMSA computed the number of unregulated pipeline miles by taking a survey submitted by the American Petroleum Institute (Re: Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission Pipelines, Docket No. PHMSA-2011-0023, October 23, 2012) representing data from 45 operators and assumed these operators to represent 70% of the total universe of unregulated gathering line miles. This PHMSA estimate includes both 344,086 currently unregulated miles (RIA Table ES-4) with an additional 11,424 regulated miles to give a value of 355,509 total gathering line miles.

ICF estimates gathering line miles through geographical information system (GIS) processing of gasproducing well data. ICF estimates 399,579 miles of gathering lines as of the end of 2015. Table 6 includes the ICF estimates for gathering line miles by type along with PHMSA's estimates.

The ICF methodology for estimating gathering system miles consist of the following steps.

- 1. Identify the latitude and longitude of all onshore wells producing gas in 2010 and 2015 using the Drilling Info Inc. HPDI database.
- 2. Use a "Euclidean minimum spanning tree" GIS algorithm to create minimum length straight-lines that link all wells within specific geographic areas together to create hypothetical production/gathering systems. Add up the miles of these links by state.
- 3. Adjust the miles to account for the fact that production/gathering lines do not follow straight lines and that redundant gathering systems sometime serve the same area.
- 4. Calibrate this adjustment factor of 17% to match the production/gathering line miles report by the Texas Railroad Commission.¹
- 5. Separate production system miles from gathering line miles based on assuming a certain number of production line feet associated per well.
- 6. Add another 2,905 miles of gathering line to connect those GIS-estimated well gathering line networks to gas processing plants.

¹ See: http://www.rrc.texas.gov/pipeline-safety/reports/texas-pipeline-system-mileage/

ICF sums the number of miles by state into PHMSA cost regions so that the unit cost items can use appropriate region-specific cost factors. The "West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest" region has 73.9% of the miles, the "South, West Coast" region has 2.2% and the "East" region has 23.9%.

Table 6

Estimation of Gathering Line							
PHMSA Previous Designation	Proposed New PHMSA Designation	ICF Designation	PHMSA Estimate	Revised Estimate			
Туре А	Type A Area 1 ¹	Type A Area 1 ¹	7,844	7,844			
Type B (includes Area 1 and Area 2) ¹	Type B (includes Area 1 and Area 2) ¹	Type B (includes Area 1 and Area 2) ¹	3,580	3,580			
Unregulated	Type A, Area 2 (Class 1, high stress, $\ge 8''$) ^{1,3}	Type A, Area 2 (Class 1, high stress, ≥ 8 ") ^{1,3}	68,749	77,554			
Unregulated	Unregulated	Type A -Unregulated (Class 1, high stress < 8) ^{2,3}	101,316	114,292			
Unregulated	Unregulated	Type A -Unregulated (Class 1, high stress: with no diameter records were assumed to be less < 8.) ^{2,3}	19,346	21,823			
Unregulated	Unregulated	Type B - Unregulated (Class 1 and some Class 2, low stress, all sizes) ^{2,3}	154,676	174,486			
Tota	al		355,509	399,579			

1. Area 1 and Area 2 are defined individually for Type A and Type B pipe and are not consistent between the two designations of pipe

2. Pipe designated as unregulated in this table still is required to adhere to specific provisions in the proposed regulation.

3. Designations are based on GIS mapping for total miles of gas gathering pipe with each category determined based on ratios of each category estimated from a 2012 API survey

2.1.3 Number of Gas Gathering Companies

As shown in Table 7, ICF estimates 3,597 gathering companies potentially affected by the proposed rule compared to the PHMSA estimate of only 367. PHMSA's estimate of the number of operators currently reporting regulated Type A and Type B gathering lines to PHMSA appears in RIA Table 2-2. The RIA also used this number of reporters to compute compliance cost estimates. While PHMSA assumes operators that do not currently have regulated miles contribute 3% of Type A Area 2 miles, PHMSA does not add any newly regulated gathering line operators to drive cost estimates. Thus, PHMSA considers the number of regulated gathering operators subject to the new rule as the current number of regulated operators for the purpose of cost estimates.

ICF derives the estimate for gathering line operators by assuming that the average gatherer operates roughly 111 miles of onshore gathering line. ICF computes this average size using two methods. In the



first method, ICF processes the GIS-estimated gathering line miles for the five states (Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Kansas) that report the name of the gas gatherer in their state natural gas production data as compiled in the HPDI oil and gas well database. Adjusting for affiliated companies (that is, combining affiliated companies under a single parent name), a total of 1,576 gathering line operators exist in those five states with an average of roughly 130 miles of gathering line per gathering line operator. Table 7 below shows the size distribution of these companies by miles of gathering line. The distribution contains a large number of very small operators with approximately 60% of operators have 10 or fewer miles.

In a second method, ICF looks at the gathering line miles reported by the 104 gatherers reporting their mileage to the state of Pennsylvania² and computes an average miles per operator of approximately 110 miles.

Estimation of Gathering Companies						
	PHMSA Estimate	ICF Estimate				
Number of Operators	367	3,597				

² Annual gatherer reports for the state of Pennsylvanian may be found at: http://www.puc.pa.gov/filing_resources/issues_laws_regulations/act_127_pipeline_act.aspx





Figure 1: Size Distribution Gathering Companies (data for TX, LA, NM, OK and KS)



2.1.4 Number of "Incidental Gathering" Line Miles

The term "incidental gathering" miles refers to gathering line that connect gas processing plants to gas transmission lines or to local gas distribution companies (LDCs). ICF expects such lines to change status under the proposed rule and become regulated as transmission lines. ICF estimates 1,628 miles of incidental gathering line exist using the following steps:

- 1. Compile the universe of gas processing plants from the Energy Information Administration, ³ excluding a few plants that process CO₂ only.
- 2. Identify processing plants directly connected to interstate gas transmission lines using the pipeline bulletin board data compiled in the PointLogic databases.⁴
- 3. Assume that the plants in PointLogic directly connects to interstate pipeline since the pipeline bulletin board receipt point is named for a gas processing plant. The processing plants have no associated incidental gathering miles.
- 4. Assume that some existing plants connect to intrastate pipeline and to LDCs. 86% of gas processing plants connect directly to transmission lines and 14% (or 81 plants) connect through incidental gathering line.
- 5. Assuming 20 miles of line from each plant, compute that 1,628 miles of incidental gathering line exist.

2.2 Missing Cost for Implementation of the Rule for Gathering Pipeline

2.2.1 Cost Basis

All gathering operators must evaluate the proposed regulation and determine whether they will need to comply with new requirements. To accomplish this, operators must provide qualified personnel enough time to understand regulation requirements and identify total applicable mileage. ICF considers this cost by determining the amount of personnel required and the number of hours needed to evaluate what an operator must provide in order to comply. ICF considers this as a one-time cost over the course of one year. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.2.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers 3,597 systems that must determine what information they need to comply.
- ICF considers that it will take 500 hours to understand and evaluate the rule.

2.2.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to implement PHMSA's proposed rule. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 1 year of \$264.4 million at a 7% discount rate (\$264.4 million, 3% discount rate) from understanding implementation requirements.

³ See:

http://www.eia.gov/cfapps/ngqs.ngqs.cfm?f_report=RP9&f_sortby=&f_items=&f_year_start=&f_year_end=&f_sh ow_compid=&f_fullscreen=

⁴ PointLogic is a commercial service providing energy data. See: http://www.pointlogicenergy.com/

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}

Gathering Expension									
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years			
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844			
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724			
Total		304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941			
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.									
2. The breakdown for categories	s of pipe uses the same rat	tio as presente	ed in the API	survey that	was used by Pl	HMSA, but this may be			

2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014) ³									
	Type A, Area 1 Miles ¹	Type B, Area 1 and Area 2 Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators					
Total Regulated Miles 7,844 3,580 11,423 367									
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart									
1 Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.									
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations									
3. Regulated Miles are from 2014 as th	at was the most rec	cent year when the analysi	s started						

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579
Assumed Mileage per gathering system	111
Assumed Number of Systems	3,597

Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
11-3071	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
13-1041	Compliance Officers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Compliance Officer	\$41	\$66
23-1011	Lawyers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Lawyers	\$76	\$101
	Contracted Compliance personnel ²	Oil and Gas Extraction	Contracted Compliance personnel	\$225	\$250
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics ((September 2015).	Occupational Employ	ment Statistics (May 20	014) and Employer Cost of	Employee Compensati	ion
1. Total Labor Cost is mean hourly	wage plus mean bene	fits (\$25.01 per hour we	orked).		
2. Contracted compliance personnel	was an assumption b	based on company input	t		

Total Hours for Evaluating Rule per System						
Total Hours	500					

Table 13

Estimated Time to Evaluate and Implement Rule per System ¹								
	Percent of Time by Labor Category	Total Labor Cost	Hours per Labor Category	Cost				
Sr. Engineer	20%	\$99	100	\$9,901				
Project engineer	20%	\$81	100	\$8,101				
Operator	20%	\$55	100	\$5,501				
Contracted Compliance personnel	40%	\$250	200	\$50,000				
Total	100%	NA	500	\$73,503				
1. All companies will have to evaluate	e if they must follow	the existing regulation						

Table 14

Total Cost to Evaluate Rule	
Total Number of Systems	3,597
Cost for Each System	\$73,503
Total Cost	\$264,391,015

Table 15

Present Value Incremental Costs								
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%) ¹	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%) ¹	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)					
\$264,391,015	\$17,626,068	\$264,391,015	\$17,626,068					
1 Since implementation of the rule wo	1 Since implementation of the rule would take place in year 1 assumed all costs were in year 1							

2.3 Missing Cost for Pipeline Material Verification for Gathering Pipeline

2.3.1 Cost Basis

For existing regulated pipeline with incomplete material documentation, operators must perform verification of material on both above and below ground pipeline locations according to 192.607. This



regulation applies to pipeline that lacks reliable, traceable, verifiable, and complete material verification including documentation requirements for various aspects such as the line pipe itself, fittings, valves, flanges, and components. Gathering pipeline located in High Consequence Areas, or in Class 3 or Class 4, locations must comply with this regulation.

For pipeline lacking required documentation, operators must perform destructive or non-destructive testing. To test below ground locations, 192.607 requires a minimum number of excavations that an operator must perform to verify material properties. This minimum depends on either one excavation per pipeline mile up to, but not more than, 150 excavations. If an operator determines an inconsistency based on expectations from available information for a pipeline during testing, the minimum number of excavations required increases. For instance, if an operator determines more than 2 inconsistences exist, the minimum number of excavations required increases to 2.3 times the pipeline mileage or 350 excavations, whichever is less. To determine costs, ICF considers sampling costs for above ground locations, excavation/testing costs for below ground locations based on applicable mileage, the percentage of previously regulated pipe that do not know all material records, and the percentage of pipelines that will discover inconsistencies. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.3.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers Type A and Type B gathering mileage in HCAs or Class 3 or 4 locations.
- ICF considers that 99% of pipe will be below ground and 80% of those do not know all material records.
- ICF considers a cost of \$75,000 to excavate for Class 3 locations and \$100,000 for Class 4 locations.

2.3.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to verify pipeline material. ICF determines the applicable mileage and the number of tests for each pipeline system, and then multiples by a cost for material testing per mile. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$315 million at a 7% discount rate (\$397.5 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from material verification.

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014)									
Туре	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators	Average Size of System				
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367	31				
Class 3 Miles	2,783	1,543	4,326	297	15				
Class 4 Miles	29	11	40	15	3				
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart									
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.									
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% spoperating pressure is less than 125 pounds per squ	pecified minimum yie are inch in a Class 3	eld strength or non- , Class 4, or certain	metallic pipe for v Class 2 locations	which maximum	allowable				



Estimated Mileage that will be effected by 192.607									
Туре	Percentage of previously regulated pipe that do not know all material records ¹	Overall Percentage of Pipe that is Steel	Percentage of Pipe Below Ground/Above Ground ²	Mileage that do not have records for underground pipe					
Type A, Class 3 and 4 Underground Miles	80%	95%	99%	2,120					
Type A, Class 3 and 4 Above Ground Miles	1%	95%	1%	0.3					
Type B Class 3 and 4 Underground Miles	80%	82%	99%	1,006					
Type B Class 3 and 4 Above Ground Miles	1%	82%	1%	0.1					
Total Underground Miles	NA	NA	NA	3,126					
Total Above Ground Miles	NA	NA	NA	0.4					
1. Made assumption that previously regulated Type A a is required by the material verification requirements	nd Type B pipe had	records for most of	their pipe, but not	all have what					

2. Assumed most pipe in class 3 and 4 categories would be underground. Furthermore, any pipe above ground would have reduced costs since they would not need to replace sidewalks, driveways, etc.



Number of Gathering Systems with Corresponding Inconsistencies for Below Ground Pipe											
Average Mileage Per System	Average Mileage for System	Percent of Mileage in category	Number of Systems	Percentage of newly regulated lines with 0 inconsistency	Percentage of newly regulated lines with 1 inconsistency	Percentage of newly regulated lines with 2 inconsistency	Percentage of newly regulated lines with > 2 inconsistency	Number of systems with 0 inconsistency	Number of systems with 1 inconsistency	Number of systems with 2 inconsistency	Number of systems with >2 inconsistency
<50	25	93%	116	20%	30%	30%	20%	23	35	35	23
50-100	75	4%	1.7	15%	25%	25%	35%	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6
100-150	125	2%	0.5	10%	20%	20%	50%	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
>150	200	1%	0.2	5%	15%	15%	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1

Total Number of Excavations for Below Ground Pipe								
Inconsistencies	0	1	2	>2	Total			
Maximum Excavations	150	225	300	350				
Mileage times factor	1	2	2	2				
<50	581	1,308	1,744	1,337	4,971			
50-100	19	47	63	101	229			
100-150	6	19	25	72	122			
>150	1.2	5	7	36	49			
Total Excavations	608	1,379	1,839	1,545	5,371			



Number of Gathering Systems with Corresponding Inconsistencies for Above Ground Pipe											
Average Mileage Per System	Average Mileage for System	Percent of Mileage in category	Number of Systems	Percentage of newly regulated lines with 0 inconsistency	Percentage of newly regulated lines with 1 inconsistency	Percentage of newly regulated lines with 2 inconsistency	Percentage of newly regulated lines with > 2 inconsistency	Number of systems with 0 inconsistency	Number of systems with 1 inconsistency	Number of systems with 2 inconsistency	Number of systems with >2 inconsistency
<50	25	93%	0.01	20%	30%	30%	20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-100	75	4%	0.0	15%	25%	25%	35%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
100-150	125	2%	0.0	10%	20%	20%	50%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
>150	200	1%	0.0	5%	15%	15%	65%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Inconsistencies	0	1	2	>2	Total
Maximum Excavations	150	225	300	350	
Mileage times factor	1	2	2	2	
<50	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.2
50-100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0
100-150	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0
>150	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0
Total Excavations	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2



Cost Breakdown for Excavations and Testing							
	Class 3	Class 4					
Cost Per Excavation including removing of coupon plus repair ¹	\$75,000	\$100,000					
Assumed Percentage of Cost Associated with Testing	50%	50%					
Cost plus Testing of Underground Pipe	\$75,000	\$100,000					
Cost of Testing of Above Ground Pipe	\$37,500	\$50,000					
1. Assumed a cost for replacing sidewalks, driveways, and taking a sample and fixing pipe after.							

Table 23

Estimated Annual Cost							
	Undergrou	und Pipe	Above Ground Pipe				
	Class 3	Class 4	Class 3	Class 4			
Percent of Pipe in Each Class	99%	0.9%	99%	0.9%			
Number of Pipe Excavations	5322	49	0.2	0.0			
Cost Per Excavation plus removing of coupon plus							
repair	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$37,500	\$50,000			
Cost of Excavations	\$399,167,991	\$4,899,896	\$8,400	\$103			
Annual Cost	\$26,611,199	\$326,660	\$560	\$7			
G&A Cost							
	\$5,322,240	\$65,332	\$112	\$1			
Total Annual Cost	\$31,933,439	\$391,992	\$672	\$8			

Present Value Incremental Costs							
7% Discount Rate	3% Disco	unt Rate					
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)				
\$315,033,082	\$21,002,205	\$397,484,228	\$26,498,949				



2.4 Missing Cost for MAOP Determination for Regulated Pipeline for Gathering Pipeline

2.4.1 Cost Basis

All regulated gathering pipeline must determine the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) in order to comply with regulations set forth in 192.619(e) and 192.624. Operators may determine MAOP using a number of different methods. An existing pipeline system may know MAOP prior to regulation or, if known, operators of a pipeline deemed in satisfactory condition based on maintenance history may consider pressure records for the past five years of the pipe and select the highest actual operating pressure as the MAOP (also known as a 'lookback period'). The date in which an operator must know previous operating pressure records depends on the classification of pipe.

Operators unable to implement the above methods (either through a known MAOP value or lookback period pipeline) may use pressure testing, pressure reduction, or direct assessment (ECA/ILI) as a method to determine MAOP. Each of these methods have a corresponding cost which impact the implementation of the requirements of 192.619. ICF considers an associated cost with each method which varies by pipeline diameter of applicable mileage. ICF distributes applicable mileage and costs to each test to determine the amount operators must spend to comply.

For all regulated gathering line, those that do not have adequate records or sufficient pressure records to fulfill the lookback period must determine MAOP. For existing regulated gathering lines, if the pipeline exists in a HCA or Class 3 or Class 4, the operator must verify MAOP using the proposed methods in 192.624 regardless of either the lookback period or known pressure records. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.4.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers 90% of Type A Area 2 gathering lines do not have adequate records and of those 56% cannot be grandfathered in.
- ICF considers 10% of Type A Area 1 and Type B gathering lines do not have adequate records and of those 56% cannot use the lookback period.
- ICF considers for Type A Area 2 gathering lines, 5% perform inline inspection, 90% perform pressure testing, and 5% perform upgrades to allow inline inspection.
- ICF considers for Type A Area 1 and Type B gathering lines, 5% perform inline inspection, 90% perform pressure testing, and 5% perform upgrades to allow inline inspection.

2.4.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to determine or verify MAOP for regulated pipeline. ICF determines the applicable mileage and the cost of each test for each pipeline system, and then multiples by the cost of testing per applicable mile. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$4.3 billion at a 7% discount rate (\$5.4 billion, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from determination of MAOP.



Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}							
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years	
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767	
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605	
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844	
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724	
Total	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941		
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.							
2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category							



Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014)							
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators			
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367			
Class 3 and Class 4 Miles	2,812	1,499	4,312	301			
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart							
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.							
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations							

Determining Previously Untested Pipe within Gathering Lines										
Туре	Estimated Mileage	Pipeline in Category that rule applies to	Mileage from the past 5 years that would be expected to have records	Percent of Gathering Lines that have MAOP records ¹	Percent of Gathering Lines that do not have pressure records to comply with the rule or do not meet the safety buffer criteria ¹	Pipelines that need to verify MAOP	Percent in Class 3 and 4	Mileage in Class 3, Class 4	Mileage not in Class 3, Class 4	
Type A, Area 2	72,212	100%		10%	56%	33,435	0.0%	0	33,435	
(high stress, $\geq 8''$)			5,341							
Type A, Area 1, and	11,423	100%		90%	56%	635	38%	240	395	
Type B Area 1 and										
Area 2			0							
Total	83,636	NA	NA	NA		34,070	NA	240	33,831	
1. Assumed mileage from the past 5 years have records. Of the remaining pipeline, assumed 20% don't have records and 50% of the remaining can use the pressure lookback period to comply.										



	Тур	e A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥	: 8")
	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12'' ²
Diameter (inches)	30	16	8
Pipe thickness (inches)	0.4	0.4	0.3
Segment Miles	60	60	60
Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3
Number of Bends	3	3	3
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,676,000	\$1,718,000	\$875,000
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$44,600	\$28,633	\$14,583
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,203	\$327	\$79
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%
Cost to replace per inch mile	120.000	120.000	120.000
G&A Cost ⁷	45,161	24,992	120,000
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶	\$225,803	\$124,960	\$62,662
HCA = high consequence area MCF = thousand cubic feet			
1. Based on best professional judgment of PHMSA staff, and released based on incident reports.	includes excavation, permitting, c	onstruction, and cleanup co	sts. Unit cost of gas
2. Pipelines below 4" generally cannot accommodate in-line in	nspection and will be exempt from	n requirements.	



Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-HCA Pipelines¹

4. Based on Equation 1 using temperature (70 degrees F), pressure (14.7 PSIA at standard conditions; 50 PSI at blowdown conditions), and compressibility (factor of 0.88 at packed conditions) assumptions.

5. Assumes a natural gas cost of \$4.21 per MCF, based on the cost of gas released intentionally during a controlled blowdown as part of a response to an incident (median of costs based on data for 294 incidents). Does not include the social cost of methane released.

6. Upgrade costs per mile plus cost of gas released during blowdown per mile.

7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs

Table 29

Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 3 and Class 4 Pipelines and Class 1 and Class 2 HCA Pipelines¹

	T	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")					
	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12'' ²				
Diameter (inches)	30	16	8				
Segment Miles	45	45	45				
Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3				
Number of Bends	6	6	6				
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000				
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000				
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000				
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000				
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,856,000	\$1,814,000	\$923,000				
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$63,467	\$40,311	\$20,511				
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19				
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,203	\$327	\$79				
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%				
Cost to replace per inch mile	120,000	120,000	120,000				


Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 3 and Class 4 Pipelines and Class 1						
and Class 2 HCA Pipelines ¹		-				
C& A Coot?						
Gaa cost	48 934	27 328	13 718			
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶	\$293,603	\$163,966	\$82,308			
HCA = high consequence area MCF = thousand cubic feet						
PHMSA = Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration						
1. Based on best professional judgment of PHMSA staff, and includes excavation, permitting, construction, and cleanup costs. Unit cost of gas						
released based on incident reports.	released based on incident reports.					
2. Pipelines below 4" generally cannot accommodate in-line inspection	on and will be exempt from r	equirements.				
3. Total upgrade cost calculated as cost of launcher plus cost of receiver plus cost per bend multiplied by number of bends plus cost per mainline						
valve and number of mainline valves.						
4. Based on Equation 1 using temperature (70 degrees F), pressure (14.7 PSIA at standard conditions; 50 PSI at blowdown conditions), and						
compressibility (factor of 0.88 at packed conditions) assumptions.						
5. Assumes a natural gas cost of \$4.21 per MCF, based on the cost of gas released intentionally during a controlled blowdown as part of a response						
to an incident (median of costs based on data for 294 incidents). Does not include the social cost of methane released.						
6. Upgrade cost plus cost per mile plus the cost of gas release per mil	e.					
7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs						

Calculation of Weighted Average Unit Cost to Accommodate Inline Inspection Tools					
Tuno	Pipeline Diameter			Weighted Average Cost per Mile	
туре	> 26''	14'' - 24''	<12''	Class 1 and 2	Class 3 and 4
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, \geq 8")	3%	25%	72%	\$82,973	\$108,852
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	0.3%	12%	88%	\$70,513	\$92,592



Estimated Unit Cost of ILI for 60 Mile Segments						
Commonwet	Cost from Interstate (60-mile) Segment used as a Proxy for Gathering					
Component	26" - 48"	14" - 24"	4" - 12"			
Mobilization ¹	\$15,000	\$12,500	\$10,000			
Base MFL tool ²	\$90,000	\$72,000	\$54,000			
Additional combo tool (deformation & crack tools)	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000			
Reruns	\$63,000	\$50,400	\$37,800			
Analytical and data integration services	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000			
Operator preparation ³	\$27,000	\$23,050	\$19,100			
G&A Cost ⁴	\$123,000	\$111,990	\$100,980			
Total	\$738,000	\$671,940	\$605,880			
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment.	I	I				
1. Mobilization is the cost for mobilization and demobilization of the construction work crew, material and equipment to and from the work site. Regional differences may apply.						
2. Typically \$900 to \$1,500 per mile.						
3. Includes analysis, specifications, cleaning pigs data analysis.	3. Includes analysis, specifications, cleaning pigs, fatigue crack growth analysis, etc. Estimated as 10% of cost of ILI and related data analysis.					
4. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, sche	eduling, working with vendo	ors, etc. equal to 20% of	of all costs			

Estimation of ILI Assessment Cost					
Segment Type	Less than 12" Diameter	14'' - 24''	Greater than 26" Diameter	Weighted Average Cost Per Mile	
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	72%	25%	3%	\$10,436	
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	88%	12%	0.3%	\$10,235	



Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test (\$2015)						
Bing Diamatan (inghas)	Segment Length (miles)					
Fipe Diameter (inclus)	1	2	5	10		
12	\$297,205	\$325,730	\$399,940	\$877,272		
24	\$375,000	\$420,000	\$720,000	\$1,160,769		
36	\$578,424	\$738,787	\$1,018,202	\$2,053,359		
Source: T.D. Williamson, Inc., Houston, TX - was used to determine 24 inch pressure test costs						
Source: Greene's Energy Group, LLC (2013), - and determine 12 inch and 36 inch pipe	Ratios from Green's Ener	rgy Group report were use	ed to take T.D. Williamson's 24 i	nch diameter figures		

Direct Directory (in short)		Segmer	nt Length (miles)	
Pipe Diameter (inches)	1	2	5	10
12				
	48	96	240	481
24				
	192	385	962	1,923
36				
	433	866	2,164	4,328
MCF = thousand cubic feet	· · ·			



Cost of Lost Gas ¹					
Pipe Diameter (inches)			Segment Length (miles)		
-	1 Mile	2 Mile	5 Mile	10 Mile	Average
12	\$274	\$548	\$1,370	\$2,741	\$1,233
24	\$1,096	\$2,193	\$5,482	\$10,964	\$4,934
36	\$2,467	\$4,934	\$12,334	\$24,668	\$11,101
1. Calculated based on volume lost (see Table Volume of Gas Lost During Pressure Tests (MCF)) times the cost of gas (\$5.71 per thousand cubic feet).					



Total Pressure Test Assessment Cost: Gathering Pipelines							
	Segment Length (miles)						
Component	1	2	5	10			
12 inch							
Pressure test ¹	\$356,646	\$390,876	\$479,928	\$1,052,726			
Lost gas ²	\$274	\$548	\$1,370	\$2,741			
Alternative supply	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Total	\$356,920	\$391,424	\$481,298	\$1,055,467			
24 inch							
Pressure test ¹	\$450,000	\$504,000	\$864,000	\$1,392,923			
Lost gas ²	\$1,096	\$2,193	\$5,482	\$10,964			
Alternative supply	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Total	\$451,096	\$506,193	\$869,482	\$1,403,887			
36 inch							
Pressure test ¹	\$694,109	\$886,544	\$1,221,843	\$2,464,030			
Lost gas ²	\$2,467	\$4,934	\$12,334	\$24,668			
Alternative supply	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0			
Total	\$696,576	\$891,478	\$1,234,177	\$2,488,698			
 Unit costs (see Table Estimated Cost of C See Cost of Lost Gas 	onducting Pressure Test (\$2015))	plus 20% G&A	· · ·				



Per Mile Pressure Test Costs					
Bing Diamator (inchos)	Bing Disputser (inches) Segment Length (miles)				
ripe Diameter (menes)	1	2	5	10	Average
Gathering					
12	\$356,920	\$195,712	\$96,260	\$105,547	\$188,609
24	\$451,096	\$253,096	\$173,896	\$140,389	\$254,619
36	\$696,576	\$445,738.97	\$246,835.33	\$248,869.85	\$409,505

Estimated Assessment Method for Gathering Pipe					
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14"-34" Diameter	36''+ Diameter	Average Cost	
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	72%	27%	1%	\$207,635	
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	88%	12%	0.0%	\$196,650	



Estimated Assessment Method for Gathering Pipe					
Location	ILI	Pressure Test	ILI and Upgrade	Total	
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	50/	000/		1	
	5%	90%	5%	1	
Type A, Area I, and Type B Area I and Area 2 and Area 2	5%	90%	5%	1	
Mileage Subject to Testing Type A,					
Area 2 (high stress, $\geq 8''$)	1,672	30,092	1,672	33,435	
Mileage Subject to Testing Type A, Area 1, and Type B Area 1 and					
Area 2	32	571	32	635	
Total Annual Cost - Type A Area					
2	1,163,109	416,542,604	10,410,524	428,116,237	
Total Annual Cost - Type A Area					
1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	21,651	7,487,999	188,446	7,698,096	

Natural Gas Composition					
Gas	Percent of Volume				
Methane (CH4)	96%				
Carbon dioxide (C02)	1%				
Other Fluids	3%				
Source: Estimated based on natural gas quality standards and operator reported measurements					
Enbridge Estimates: https://www.enbridgegas.com/gas-safety/about- natural-gas/components-natural-gas.aspx Spectra Estimates:					
https://www.uniongas.com/about-us/about-natural-gas/Chemical- Composition-of-Natural- Gas					



Proportion of Gas Gathering Mileage by Diameter						
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14"-34" Diameter	36''+ Diameter			
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	72%	27%	1%			
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	88%	12%	0%			
Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report						

GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns					
Diameter (inches)	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)		
12	113	108			
			168		
24	424	406			
			631		
36	974	932			
			1,449		
Source: See Equation 1 and Natural Gas Comp	osition Table lbs. = pound	ls			
MCF = thousand cubic feet					



GHG Emissions from Pressure Tests per Assessment Mile ¹							
Location	Gas Released per mile (MCF)	Methane Released per Mile (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide Released per Mile (lbs.)				
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")							
	202	193	300				
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2							
	151	144	224				
lbs. = pounds							
MCF = thousand cubic feet							
1. Weighted average based on share of pipeline mile	age by diameter.						

Total GHG Emissions from Pressure	Test Blowdowns			
Item	PT Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)
Re-establish MAOP: Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	30,092	6,070,259	5,809,238	9,027,689
Re-establish MAOP: Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	571	86,178	82,473	128,164
Total	30,663	6,156,437	5,891,710	9,155,853
PT = pressure test				
MCF = thousand cubic feet				



Average Diameter in for Applicable Miles							
	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 14" to 24"	Diameter 26" and above				
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	9.6	18.2	29.8				
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	6.7	18.6	30.2				

Table 46

Natural Gas Lost due to Blowdowns per Mile (MCF/Mile)							
Location	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 14" to 24"	Diameter 26" and above				
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	27.7	101.3	282.6				
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	12.9	106.3	289.1				
MCF = thousand cubic feet							
Source: See Equation 1 in Section 3.1.4.3							

Proportion of Gas Gathering Mileage by Diameter						
Segment Type	≤12" Diameter	14"-24" Diameter	≥26"Diameter			
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	72%	25%	3%			
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	88%	12%	0%			
Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report	S					



GHG Emissions from Blowdowns, ILI Upgrade (per Mile)							
Location	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF)	C02 Emissions (lbs.)				
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	54	51	80				
Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	25	24	37				

Total GHG Emissions due to Blowdowns							
Item	ILI Upgrade Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	C02 Emissions (lbs.)			
Re-establish MAOP: Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")	1,672	89,642	85,787	133,315			
Re-establish MAOP: Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	32	787	753	1,170			
Total	1,704	90,428	86,540	134,485			
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = methane$							
GHG = greenhouse gas							
HCA = high consequence area ILI = inline insp	ection						
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure	re MCF = thousand cubic	feet					
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength							



Total Emissions Per Year							
Item	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	C02 Emissions (lbs.)				
Re-establish MAOP: Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	410,660	393,002	610,734				
Re-establish MAOP: Type A. Area 1 and Type B Area 1 and Area 2	5,798	5,548	8,622				
Total	416,458	398,550	619,356				
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = methane$							
HCA = high consequence area lbs. = pounds							
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressur	re MCF = thousand cubic	feet					
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength							

Tonia Area 1 Saana	Average Ann	ual Methane Lost from Blov	vdown (MCF)	Average Annual
Topic Area 1 Scope	ILI Upgrade	Social Cost 1		
Previously untested in HCA	5,719	387,283	393,002	\$11.6
HCA and Class 3 and 4 with inadequate records	50	5,498	5,548	\$0.2
Subtotal	5,769	392,781	398,550	\$11.7



	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Social cost of methane	25	25	26	26	26	27	28	29
Previously untested in HCA	\$9,825,041	\$9,825,041	\$10,218,043	\$10,218,043	\$10,218,043	\$10,611,044	\$11,004,046	\$11,397,048
HCA and Class 3 and 4 with inadequate records	\$138,709	\$138,709	\$144,257	\$144,257	\$144,257	\$149,806	\$155,354	\$160,902

Table 53

	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Social cost of methane	30	31	32	33	34	34	35
Previously untested in HCA	\$11,790,049	\$12,183,051	\$12,576,053	\$12,969,054	\$13,362,056	\$13,362,056	\$13,755,058
HCA and Class 3 and 4 with inadequate records	\$166,451	\$171,999	\$177,547	\$183,096	\$188,644	\$188,644	\$194,192

Present Value Costs Discounted at 7%, Topic Area 1										
	Total			Average Annual						
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total				
Type A Area 1, 2 and Type B Area 1 and										
Area 2	\$4,247,214,635	\$11,717,370	\$4,258,932,005	\$283,147,642	\$781,158.0	\$283,928,800				



Present Value Costs Discounted at 3%, Topic Area 1										
		Total		Average Annual						
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total				
Type A Area 1, 2 and										
Type B Area 1 and Area 2	\$5.358.804.921	\$11.717.370	\$5.370.522.291	\$357.253.661	\$781.158.0	\$358.034.819				

Present Value Incremental Costs								
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)					
\$4,258,932,005	\$283,928,800	\$5,370,522,291	\$358,034,819					



2.5 Missing Cost for MAOP Determination for Unregulated Pipeline for Gathering Pipeline

2.5.1 Cost Basis

According to requirements under 191.23 and 191.25, an operator must report any malfunction that causes the pressure of a gathering pipeline to exceed the MAOP as this is a safety-related condition. Because of this, an operator must first determine the MAOP in order to know whether an exceedance has occurred. This requirement applies to all gathering line, regardless of whether the pipeline is regulated or not. ICF considers the cost to determine MAOP for all unregulated gathering pipeline in a very similar fashion as regulated gathering lines in the previous section, with revisions to applicable mileage and assumptions. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.5.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers 95% of unregulated gathering lines do not have adequate records and of those 63% cannot be grandfathered in.
- ICF considers for unregulated gathering lines 100% perform pressure testing.

2.5.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to determine MAOP for unregulated pipeline. ICF determines the applicable mileage and the cost of each test for each pipeline system, and then multiples by the cost for testing per applicable mile. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$19.9 billion at a 7% discount rate (\$25.1 billion, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from determination of MAOP.



Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines 1,2									
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years			
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844			
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724			
Total			361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941			
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.									
2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be	2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category								



Determining Previously Untested Pipe within Gathering Lines									
Туре	Estimated Unregulated Mileage	Pipeline in Category that rule applies to	New Mileage that would be expected to have records	Percent of Gathering Lines that have MAOP records	Percent of Gathering Lines that do not have pressure records to comply with the rule or do not meet the safety buffer criteria ¹	Pipelines that need to verify MAOP	Percent in Class 3 and 4	Mileage in Class 3, Class 4	Mileage not in Class 3, Class 4
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	106,420	100%	7,872	5%	63%	59,129	0.0	0	59,129
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records- assumed to be less < 8)	20,320	100%	1,503	5%	63%	11,290	0.0	0	11,290
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	162,469	100%	12,018	5%	63%	90,271	0.0	0	90,271
Total	289,209	NA	21,392	NA	NA	160,690	NA	0	160,690
1. Assumed mileage from t comply.	1. Assumed mileage from the past 5 years have records. Of the remaining pipeline, assumed 20% don't have records and 50% of the remaining canuse the pressure lookback period to comply.								



	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")				
	26'' - 48''	14" - 24"	4'' - 12'' ²		
Diameter (inches)	30	16	8		
Pipe thickness (inches)	0.375	0.375	0.25		
Segment Miles	60	60	60		
Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3		
Number of Bends	3	3	3		
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000		
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000		
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000		
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000		
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,676,000	\$1,718,000	\$875,000		
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$44,600	\$28,633	\$14,583		
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19		
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,203	\$327	\$79		
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%		
Cost to replace per inch mile	120,000	120,000	120,000		
$G\&A Cost^7$	45,161	24,992	12,532		
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶	\$225,803	\$148,960	\$134,662		
HCA = high consequence area MCF = thousand	l cubic feet				

Estimated Average Unit Cost of Ungrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-



Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-HCA Pipelines¹

3. Total upgrade cost calculated as cost of launcher plus cost of receiver plus cost per bend multiplied by number of bends plus cost per mainline valve and number of mainline valves.

4. Based on Equation 1 using temperature (70 degrees F), pressure (14.7 PSIA at standard conditions; 50 PSI at blowdown conditions), and compressibility (factor of 0.88 at packed conditions) assumptions.

5. Assumes a natural gas cost of \$4.21 per MCF, based on the cost of gas released intentionally during a controlled blowdown as part of a response to an incident (median of costs based on data for 294 incidents). Does not include the social cost of methane released.

6. Upgrade costs per mile plus cost of gas released during blowdown per mile.

7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs

Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 3 and Class 4 Pipelines and Class 1 and Class 2 HCA Pipelines ¹								
	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")							
	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12'' ²					
Diameter (inches)	30	16	8					
Segment Miles	45	45	45					
Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3					
Number of Bends	6	6	6					
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000					
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000					
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000					
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000					
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,856,000	\$1,814,000	\$923,000					
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$63,467	\$40,311	\$20,511					
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19					
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,203	\$327	\$79					



Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 3 and Class 4									
Pipelines and Class 1 and Class 2 HCA Pipelines ¹									
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%						
Cost to replace per inch mile	120,000	120,000	120,000						
G&A Cost ⁷	48,934	27,328	13,718						
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶	Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶ \$293,603 \$163,966 \$82,303								
HCA = high consequence area MCF = thousand cu	HCA = high consequence area MCF = thousand cubic feet								
PHMSA = Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safet	y Administration								
1. Based on best professional judgment of PHMSA Unit cost of gas released based on incident reports.	staff, and includes excavat	ion, permitting, construction	i, and cleanup costs.						
2. Pipelines below 4" generally cannot accommoda	ate in-line inspection and wi	ill be exempt from requireme	ents.						
3. Total upgrade cost calculated as cost of launcher cost per mainline valve and number of mainline va	plus cost of receiver plus c lves.	cost per bend multiplied by n	umber of bends plus						
4. Based on Equation 1 using temperature (70 degr conditions), and compressibility (factor of 0.88 at p	ees F), pressure (14.7 PSIA backed conditions) assumpti	at standard conditions; 50 F	'SI at blowdown						
 Assume a natural gas cost of \$4.21 per MCF, based on the cost of gas released intentionally during a controlled blowdown as part of a response to an incident (median of costs based on data for 294 incidents). Does not include the social cost of methane released. 									
6. Upgrade cost plus cost per mile plus the cost of	gas release per mile.								
7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs									



Calculation of Weighted Average Unit Cost to Accommodate Inline Inspection Tools								
Туре	Pip	eline Diamete	r	Weighted Average Cost per Mile				
	> 26''	14'' - 24''	<12''	Class 1 and 2	Class 3 and 4			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	0%	0%	100%	\$134,662	\$82,308			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	0%	0%	100%	\$134,662	\$82,308			
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	0%	6%	94%	\$135,549	\$87,047			



Estimated Unit Cost of ILI for 60 mile segments								
Common and	Cost from Interstate (60-mile) Segment used as a Proxy for Gathering							
Component	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12''					
Mobilization ¹	\$15,000	\$12,500	\$10,000					
Base MFL tool ²	\$90,000	\$72,000	\$54,000					
Additional combo tool (deformation & crack tools)	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000					
Reruns	\$63,000	\$50,400	\$37,800					
Analytical and data integration services	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000					
Operator preparation ³	\$27,000	\$23,050	\$19,100					
G&A Cost ⁴	\$123,000	\$111,990	\$100,980					
Total	\$615,000	\$559,950	\$504,900					
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment.								
1. Mobilization is the cost for mobilization and from the work site. Regional differences may ap	demobilization of the const oply.	truction work crew, mate	erial and equipment to and					
2. Typically \$900 to \$1,500 per mile.								
3. Includes analysis, specifications, cleaning pigs, fatigue crack growth analysis, etc. Estimated as 10% of cost of ILI and related data analysis.								
4. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs								



Estimation of ILI Assessment Cost				
Segment Type	Less than 12'' Diameter	14'' - 24''	Greater than 26" Diameter	Weighted Average Cost Per Mile
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	100%	0%	0%	\$8,415
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	100%	0%	0%	\$8,415
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	94%	6%	0%	\$8,468

Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test (\$2015)							
Segment Length (miles)							
ripe Diameter (inclus)	1	2	5	10			
12	\$297,205	\$325,730	\$399,940	\$877,272			
24	\$375,000	\$420,000	\$720,000	\$1,160,769			
36	\$578,424	\$738,787	\$1,018,202	\$2,053,359			
Source: T.D. Williamson, Inc., Houston, TX - was used to determine 24 inch pressure test costs							
Source: Greene's Energy Group, LLC (2013), - and determine 12 inch and 36 inch pipe	Ratios from Green's Ene	rgy Group report were us	ed to take T.D. Williamson's 24 i	inch diameter figures			



Volume of Gas Lost During Pressure Tests (MCF)						
Bing Diamatar (inchas)		Segmer	nt Length (miles)			
ripe Diameter (inches)	1	2	5	10		
12	48	96	240	/81		
24	40	90	240	401		
27	192	385	962	1,923		
36	433	866	2,164	4,328		
MCF = thousand cubic feet						
1. Estimated using Equation 1.						

Cost of Lost Gas						
Pipe Diameter			Segment Length (miles)			
(inches)	1 Mile	2 Mile	5 Mile	10 Mile	Average	
12	\$274	\$548	\$1,370	\$2,741	\$1,233	
24	\$1,096	\$2,193	\$5,482	\$10,964	\$4,934	
36	\$2,467	\$4,934	\$12,334	\$24,668	\$11,101	
1. Calculate cubic feet).	ed based on volume lost ((see Table Volume of Ga	s Lost During Pressure Tests (N	ICF)) times the cost of ga	s (\$5.71 per thousand	



Common and		Segment Leng	th (miles)	
Component	1	2	5	10
12 inch	· · ·	·		
Pressure test ¹	\$356,646	\$390,876	\$479,928	\$1,052,726
Lost gas ²	\$274	\$548	\$1,370	\$2,741
Alternative supply	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$356,920	\$391,424	\$481,298	\$1,055,467
24 inch				
Pressure test ¹	\$450,000	\$504,000	\$864,000	\$1,392,923
Lost gas ²	\$1,096	\$2,193	\$5,482	\$10,964
Alternative supply	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$451,096	\$506,193	\$869,482	\$1,403,887
36 inch				
Pressure test ¹	\$694,109	\$886,544	\$1,221,843	\$2,464,030
Lost gas ²	\$2,467	\$4,934	\$12,334	\$24,668
Alternative supply	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$696,576	\$891,478	\$1,234,177	\$2,488,698



Per Mile Pressure Test Costs Pipe Diameter Segment Length (miles) (inches) 5 10 1 2 Average Gathering 12 \$356,920 \$195,712 \$96,260 \$105,547 \$188,609 24 \$451,096 \$253,096 \$173,896 \$140,389 \$254,619 36 \$696,576 \$445,738.97 \$246,835.33 \$248,869.85 \$409,505

Estimated Assessment Method for Previously Untested Pipe							
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14"-34" Diameter	36"+ Diameter	Average Cost			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	100%	0%	0%	\$188,609			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	100%	0%	0%	\$188,609			
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	94%	6%	0%	\$192,101			



Estimated Assessment Method for Previously Untested Pipe						
Location	ILI 1	Pressure Test ₂	ILI and Upgrade	Total		
High stress, < 8"	0%	100%	0%	1		
Type A (assumed < 8")	0%	100%	0%	1		
Low stress, all sizes	0%	100%	0%			
Mileage Subject to High stress, < 8"	-	59,129	-	59,129		
Mileage Subject to Type A (assumed < 8")	-	11,290	-	11,290		
Mileage Subject to Low stress, all sizes	-	90,271	-	90,271		
Total Annual Cost High stress, < 8"	-	743,487,320	-	743,487,320		
Total Annual Cost Type A (assumed < 8")	-	141,965,078	-	141,965,078		
Total Annual Cost Low stress, all sizes	-	1,156,070,033	-	1,156,070,033		

Natural Gas Composition	
Gas	Percent of Volume
Methane (CH4)	96%
Carbon dioxide (C02)	1%
Other Fluids	3%
Source: Estimated based on natural gas quality a reported measurements	standards and operator
Enbridge Estimates: https://www.enbridgegas.c natural-gas/components-natural-gas.aspx Spectr https://www.uniongas.com/about-us/about-natu Composition-of-Natural- Gas	om/gas-safety/about- ra Estimates: ral-gas/Chemical-



Proportion of Gas Gathering Mileage by Diameter						
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14"-34" Diameter	36''+ Diameter			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	100%	0%	0%			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	100%	0%	0%			
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	94%	6%	0%			
Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report						

GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns						
Diameter (inches)	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)			
12	113	108	168			
24	424	406	631			
36	974	932	1,449			
Source: See Equation 1 and Natural Gas Co	omposition Table lbs. = pound	ls				
MCF = thousand cubic feet						



GHG Emissions from Pressure Tests per Assessment Mile ¹						
Location	Gas Released per mile (MCF)	Methane Released per Mile (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide Released per Mile (lbs.)			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	113	108	168			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	113	108	168			
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	130	125	194			
Ibs. = pounds MCF = thousand cubic feet 1. Weighted average based on share of pipeline mileage by diameter.						

Total GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns						
Item	PT Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)		
Re-establish MAOP: High stress, < 8"	59,129	6,681,589	6,394,281	9,936,859		
Re-establish MAOP: Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records- assumed to be less < 8)	11,290	1,275,815	1,220,955	1,897,392		
Re-establish MAOP: Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	90,271	11,750,939	11,245,649	17,475,997		
Total	70,420	7,957,404	7,615,236	11,834,251		
PT = pressure test						
MCF = thousand cubic feet						



Average Diameter in for Applicable Miles							
	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 14" to 24"	Diameter 26" and above				
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	4.6	0.0	0.0				
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	4.6	0.0	0.0				
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	6.1	17.7	30.1				

Table 77

Natural Gas Lost due to Blowdowns per Mile (MCF/Mile)								
Location	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 14" to 24"	Diameter 26" and above					
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	5.7	0.0	0.0					
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	5.7	0.0	0.0					
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	10.6	95.8	288.5					
MCF = thousand cubic feet								
Source: See Equation 1 in Section 3.1.4.3								

Proportion of Gas Gathering Mileage by Diameter								
Segment Type	≤ 12" Diameter	14"-24" Diameter	≥ 26"Diameter					
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	100%	0%	0%					
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	100%	0%	0%					
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	94%	6%	0%					
Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Reports								



GHG Emissions from Blowdowns, ILI Upgrade (per Mile)							
Location	Gas Released (MCF) Methane Emissions (MCF)		CO ₂ Emissions (lbs)				
High stress, < 8"	6	5	8				
Type A (assumed < 8")	6	5	8				
Low stress, all sizes	16	15	23				

GHG Emissions from Blowdowns, ILI Upgrade (per Mile)									
Location	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF)	CO2 Emissions (lbs.)						
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	6	5	8						
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	6	5	8						
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	16	15	23						



Total GHG Emissions due to Blowdowns ¹							
Item	ILI Upgrade Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	CO ₂ Emissions (lbs.)			
Re-establish MAOP: High stress, < 8"	0	0	0	0			
Re-establish MAOP: Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records- assumed to be less < 8)	0	0	0	0			
Re-establish MAOP: Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	0	0	0	0			
Total	0	0	0	0			
$CO_2 =$ carbon dioxide $CH_4 =$ methane							
GHG = greenhouse gas							
HCA = high consequence area ILI = inline inspection							
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressur	re MCF = thousand cubic	feet					
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength							
1. As 100% of Unregulated pipe would have to	utilize pressure testing, th	ere will be no miles und	er this category that will upgrade	to ILI			



Total Emissions Per Year							
Item	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	CO ₂ Emissions (lbs.)				
Re-establish MAOP: High stress, < 8"	445,439	426,285	662,457				
Re-establish MAOP: Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records- assumed to be less < 8)	85,054	81,397	126,493				
Re-establish MAOP: Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	783,396	749,710	1,165,066				
Total	1,313,890	1,257,392	1,954,017				
$CO_2 =$ carbon dioxide $CH_4 =$ methane							
HCA = high consequence area lbs. = pounds							
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressu	re MCF = thousand cubic	e feet					
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength							



Average Annual Social Cost of Gas Lost due to Blowdown (Millions 2015\$)							
Tonio Anos 1 Soons	Average Ann	ual Methane Lost from E	Blowdown (MCF)	Average Annual			
Topic Area 1 Scope	ILI Upgrade	Pressure Test	Total	Social Cost ¹			
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	0	426,285	426,285	\$12.5			
	0	81,397	81,397	\$2.4			
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)							
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	0	749,710	749,710	\$22.0			
Subtotal	0	1,257,392	1,257,392	\$37			
MCF = thousand cubic feet							
1. Based on the values for social cost of methane and social cost of carbon calculated using a 3% discount rate (see Appendix B).							

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Social cost of methane	25	25	26	26	26	27	28	29
High stress, < 8"								
	10,657,135	10,657,135	11,083,420	11,083,420	11,083,420	11,509,705	11,935,991	12,362,276
Type A (assumed < 8")								
	2,034,925	2,034,925	2,116,322	2,116,322	2,116,322	2,197,719	2,279,116	2,360,513
Low stress, all sizes								
	10,695,955	10,695,955	11,123,793	11,123,793	11,123,793	11,551,632	11,979,470	12,407,308



	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Social cost of methane	30	31	32	33	34	34	35
High stress, < 8"	12,788,562	13,214,847	13,641,132	14,067,418	14,493,703	14,493,703	14,919,988
Type A (assumed <							
8")	2,441,910	2,523,307	2,604,704	2,686,101	2,767,498	2,767,498	2,848,895
Low stress, all sizes	22,491,298	23,241,008	23,990,718	24,740,428	25,490,138	25,490,138	26,239,848

Table 86

Present Value Costs Discounted at 7%								
	Total Average Annual							
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total		
Unregulated Gathering Miles	19,895,591,486	36,967,334	19,932,558,821	1,326,372,766	2,464,489	1,328,837,255		

Present Value Costs Discounted at 3%								
Total Average Annual								
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total		
Unregulated Gathering Miles	25,102,709,119	36,967,334	25,139,676,453	1,673,513,941	2,464,489	1,675,978,430		



Present Value Incremental Costs								
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)					
\$19,932,558,821	\$1,328,837,255	\$25,139,676,453	\$1,675,978,430					


2.6 Missing Cost for Compressor Stations for Gathering Pipeline

2.6.1 Cost Basis

According to requirements under 192.163, operators must house compressors in buildings made of noncombustible materials containing pipe more than 2 inches in diameter that is carrying gas under pressure or gas handling equipment other than utilization equipment used for domestic purposes. ICF considers newly regulated gathering line now subject to house compressors in the future to act as an additional cost over the current regulation. ICF considers a number of future compressor stations with a given cost to construct the required housing under the rule. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

One other interpretation of this requirement could be that operators would only have to follow this requirement if a building is built. Under this interpretation, the costs presented here may be overstated.

2.6.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers 1,815 future compressor stations with 19% requiring housing regulation based on newly regulated Type A Area 2 miles.
- ICF considers 25% of stations built as acceptable under the regulation.
- ICF considers \$70,000 as the cost of housing.

2.6.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to compressor housing for newly regulated pipeline. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage, the number of future compressor buildings, and the cost of each building to determine the cost. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$14.4 million at a 7% discount rate (\$18.2 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from compressor housing requirements.



Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}

Gathering Tipennes	Gathering Lipennes /						
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years	
	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767	
Type A Area 2							
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605	
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844	
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724	
Total 304,034 361,422 388,156 26,734 103,941							
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.							
2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Turne A Area 2 high stress ≥ 8 inchester and ≥ 8 inche							

Table 90

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2015)						
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators		
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367		
Class 3 and Class 4 Miles	2,812	7,873	7,844	301		
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart						
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.						
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum						
allowable operating pressur	e is less than 125 po	unds per square inch in a Cla	iss 3, Class 4, or certain Cla	iss 2 locations		

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579



Compressor Stations Newly Required to House Compressors Inside 192.163								
Category	New Compression for Gathering Line Annual HP	Percentage of Pipe that will be expected to comply (Existing- retroactively and Future - upon new construction)	Count of Compressor Stations	Percent of gathering line that would have to follow the rule	Percentage of compressor stations that are not already housed in buildings that will have to be or were not planned to be housed in a building	Cost of Housing in Building	Cost to house compressors in building	
Existing Compressor Stations	12,000,000	0.0%	4,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Future Compressor Stations	5,445,000	100%	1,815	19%	75%	\$70,000	\$18,494,230	
Total G & A Cost ¹	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$3,698,846	
Total	17,445,000		5,815				\$22,193,076	
Source: INGA	Source: INGAA report: http://www.ingaa.org/File.aspx?id=27961&v=db4fb0ca							
1. Assumed 20	1. Assumed 20% G &A Cost							

Table 93

Present Value Incremental Costs						
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)			
\$14,418,794	\$961,253	\$18,192,512	\$1,212,834			

2.7 Missing Cost for Field Repair of Damages for Gathering Pipeline

2.7.1 Cost Basis

Operators must now perform permanent field repair of imperfections and damages pending on discovered conditions under a required remediation schedule specified in 192.713. Although 192.9 states that Type A Area 1 gathering lines are excluded from this paragraph, 192.711(b)(1) states that if a discovered condition could adversely affect safe operation not covered under "Subpart O – Gas Transmission Pipeline Integrity Management", an operator must correct the condition per 192.713. As such, ICF considers Type A Area 1 gathering lines to apply to the accelerated permanent repair condition requirements.



To interpret the cost to comply, ICF considers a similar estimation method in PHMSA's RIA used for Transmission miles. Operators assess applicable mileage for required repair conditions every seven years leading to a number of conditions discovered per year. ICF delineates discovered repairs into three regions and subsequently applies a cost per type of repair condition as specified by PHMSA to determine a total repair cost. Each type of repair has an associated cost based on the applicable region.

ICF then considers a percentage of conditions operators would repair under the accelerated time frame, with the cost being the difference in net present value of repairing the conditions immediately versus an expected average repair time of five years under normal business operation. ICF then determines the labor costs based on required personnel to monitor the remaining repairs over the lifetime of the condition. Finally, ICF determines the total cost to comply as the difference in net present values due to the accelerated timeframe plus the total cost to repair the remaining conditions minus the labor cost to monitor. This value is not accounted for in PHMSA's proposed RIA.

2.7.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers Type A Area 1 gathering lines must follow accelerated repair procedures.
- ICF considers 0.2 scheduled repair conditions per mile assessed.
- ICF considers 67% of repairs will be done on an accelerated timeframe.

2.7.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost of permanent repair to regulated gathering line conditions. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage, the number of repair incidents per region, the cost of each repair performed under the accelerated timeline, the cost to monitor the remaining repairs, and labor requirements to determine the cost to comply. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$35.2 million at a 7% discount rate (\$36.7 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA for permanent field repairs.

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}

Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
	Type A, Area 2	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A Area 2	(high stress, ≥ 8")					
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
Total		304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941
1. Estimate based on using G	IS mapping, HPDI	well data, and a cou	nt of processing pl	ants to determin	e the mileag	e necessarv

1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.

2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014)								
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators				
Total Regulated Miles 7,844 3,580 11,423 367								
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart								
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non- metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.								
2. Metallic gathering line open pipe for which maximum allow Class 3, Class 4, or certain Cla	2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3. Class 4. or certain Class 2 locations.							



Table 3-60. Calculation of Mileage					
Scope	Miles				
Type A, Area 1	7,844				
Average assessed per year ¹	1,121				
1. Assumed miles were assessed every seven years					

Table 97

Hazardous Liquid Scheduled Repair Conditions, 2004- 2009					
Repair Condition	Number	Percent of Total			
60-day conditions	4,673	19%			
180-day conditions	20,468	81%			
Total	25,141	100%			
Source: 2004-2009 Hazardous C-2	Liquid Annual Rep	oorts; see Table			

Gathering Systems Repair						
	Fraction of Pipeline Assessed Using this method	Repair Conditions Discovery Rate #/mile	Weighted Average Repair Conditions Discovered #/mile	BAU Fraction Repaired (remainder monitored)	BAU Conditions Repaired	BAU Conditions Monitored
ILI/upgrade to ILI	0.10	1.0	0.1	50%	0.05	0.05
Pressure Test	0.90	0.1	0.1	85%	0.08	0.01
Direct Assessment	0.00	0.1	0.0	85%	0.00	0.00
Total	1.0		0.2	67%	0.13	0.06
1. Business as Usual (BAU) are repairs that would occur without regulation. Note, this does not mean they would have occurred with the same time schedule						



Estimation of 180-Day Repair Conditions				
Component	Value			
Miles assessed per year	1,121			
Scheduled repair conditions per mile assessed	0.2			
Expected scheduled repair conditions per year	220			
180 conditions (% of scheduled conditions)	81%			
Expected 180-day 179 conditions per year				
1. 2004-2009 Gas Transmission scheduled repair rate, see Table C-2.				

Number of Anomalies in each Location						
	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East			
Percent of anomalies in Location	74%	2%	24%			
Number of anomalies in each Location	132	4	43			



Range of Typical Repair Costs							
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest1	South, West Coast	East2				
12-inch Diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800				
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400				
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800				
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000				
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000				
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600				
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600				
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000				
24-inch Diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700				
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600				
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700				
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000				
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500				
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400				
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400				
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000				
36-inch diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050				
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400				
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550				
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000				
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750				
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100				
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600				
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000				
Source: PHMSA best profession	onal judgment						
1. 80% of South/West Coast.							
2. 115% of South, West Coast							





Percent of Anomalies Repaired using Current Methodology							
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East				
12-inch Diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%				
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%				
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%				
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%				
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%				
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%				
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%				
24-inch Diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%				
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%				
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%				
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%				
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%				
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%				
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%				
36-inch diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%				
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%				
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%				
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%				
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%				
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%				
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%				



Number of Repairs Done using Methodology							
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East				
12-inch Diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	7	0	2				
Sleeve (5')	13	0	4				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2	0	1				
Material Verification (5')	22	1	7				
Composite Wrap (20')	7	0	2				
Sleeve (20')	13	0	4				
Pipe Replacement (20')	2	0	1				
Material Verification (20')	22	1	7				
24-inch Diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	7	0	2				
Sleeve (5')	13	0	4				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2	0	1				
Material Verification (5')	22	1	7				
Composite Wrap (20')	7	0	2				
Sleeve (20')	13	0	4				
Pipe Replacement (20')	2	0	1				
Material Verification (20')	22	1	7				
36-inch diameter							
Composite Wrap (5')	7	0	2				
Sleeve (5')	13	0	4				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2	0	1				
Material Verification (5')	22	1	7				
Composite Wrap (20')	7	0	2				
Sleeve (20')	13	0	4				
Pipe Replacement (20')	2	0	1				
Material Verification (20')	22	1	7				



Cost of Repairs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Total
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$63,486	\$2,372	\$29,570	\$95,429
Sleeve (5')	\$169,297	\$6,326	\$78,854	\$254,476
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$91,702	\$3,427	\$42,712	\$137,841
Material Verification (5')	\$44,088	\$1,318	\$14,285	\$59,691
Composite Wrap (20')	\$105,810	\$3,954	\$49,283	\$159,048
Sleeve (20')	\$253,945	\$9,489	\$118,280	\$381,714
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$112,864	\$4,217	\$52,569	\$169,651
Material Verification (20')	\$88,175	\$2,636	\$28,570	\$119,381
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$95,229	\$3,558	\$44,355	\$143,143
Sleeve (5')	\$253,945	\$9,489	\$118,280	\$381,714
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$137,553	\$5,140	\$64,068	\$206,762
Material Verification (5')	\$44,088	\$1,318	\$14,285	\$59,691
Composite Wrap (20')	\$158,716	\$5,931	\$73,925	\$238,571
Sleeve (20')	\$380,917	\$14,234	\$177,420	\$572,571
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$169,297	\$6,326	\$78,854	\$254,476
Material Verification (20')	\$88,175	\$2,636	\$28,570	\$119,381
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$142,844	\$5,338	\$66,533	\$214,714
Sleeve (5')	\$380,917	\$14,234	\$177,420	\$572,571
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$206,330	\$7,710	\$96,103	\$310,143
Material Verification (5')	\$44,088	\$1,318	\$14,285	\$59,691
Composite Wrap (20')	\$238,073	\$8,896	\$110,888	\$357,857
Sleeve (20')	\$571,376	\$21,351	\$266,131	\$858,857
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$253,945	\$9,489	\$118,280	\$381,714
Material Verification (20')	\$88,175	\$2,636	\$28,570	\$119,381
Total Cost	\$4,183,036	\$153,341	\$1,892,092	\$6,228,470

CONSULTI	NG

Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
Source: Bureau of Labor Stati Employee Compensation (Sep 1. Mean hourly wage plus mea	stics Occupational I stember 2015). an benefits (\$25.01	Employment Statist	ics (May 2014) and	l Employer Cost	of
		r			



Repair of Non- Immediate Conditions							
Estimate	7% Discount Rate	3% Discount Rate					
Cost of repairs	\$6,228,470	\$6,228,470					
Percent of anomalies that are repaired	67%	67%					
Cost of repairing anomalies on an accelerated schedule	\$4,183,672	\$4,183,672					
Cost of repairs delayed 4 years	\$3,191,704	\$3,717,139					
Difference for repaired anomalies (estimated cost of proposed rule)	\$991,969	\$466,534					
Time to monitor one anomaly (hours)	1	1					
Salary to monitor anomalies	\$55	\$55					
Average Ongoing anomalies in a given time period	441	441					
Cost for monitoring unrepaired anomalies	\$24,255	\$24,255					
Annual cost of rule	\$3,012,511	\$2,487,076					
G & A Cost	\$602,502	\$497,415					
1. Over the fifteen year period the average lifetime of an anomaly is 7.5 years if they are not repaired. Used the fraction of anomalies not repaired and the 7.5 average lifetime to determine the number of anomalies to monitor annually							

Present Value of Estimated Annual Cost of More Timely Repair of Non- Immediate Conditions

Present Value Costs			
7% Discount R	3% Discount Rate		
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)
\$35,229,998	\$2,348,667	\$36,697,524	\$2,446,502



2.8 Missing Cost for Construction for Gathering Pipeline

2.8.1 Cost Basis

Newly regulated new and existing gathering pipeline must comply with both installation and cover requirements under regulations 192.321 and 192.327. These requirements state that a plastic pipe may only operate above ground up to the manufacturer's recommended maximum period of exposure or two years, whichever is less. For all other plastic pipe, an operator must ensure the pipe is installed below ground. Additionally, an operator must ensure an installed pipeline has between 18 and 36 inches of minimum cover pending on class location and ground characteristics.

ICF considers a cost associated with following these requirements for both existing pipeline which now falls under regulation and regulated plastic pipeline that will be installed during the next 15 years (the time span of PHMSA's analysis). ICF considers these as a cost to bury existing pipeline that is now regulated and an incremental cost to bury and provide sufficient cover to installed plastic pipeline in the future. The 2014 INGAA study⁵ provides ICF's estimate of future gathering pipeline mileage. ICF considers the average diameter⁶ and an incremental cost per inch mile. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.8.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers both existing and newly installed Type A Area 2 gathering lines in this cost.
- ICF considers 12 inches as the average diameter of the pipe.
- ICF considers the operators incremental cost per inch mile of \$5,000 for regulated pipeline installed in the future.

2.8.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to comply with construction requirements for newly regulated pipeline. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage and the cost to comply, pending on whether the pipeline is existing and now regulated or installed in the future. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$86.9 million at a 7% discount rate (\$109.7 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from these installation requirements.

⁵ http://www.ingaa.org/Foundation/Foundation-Reports/27958.aspx

⁶ Based on API Survey



Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}

Gathering Pipelines 1,2						
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A Area 2						
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
Tota	al	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.						
2. The breakdown for categorie may be a conservative estimate Type A Area 2 high stress >8	es of pipe uses the same ratio a , as much of the added pipelin inch category	as presented ne from 2010	in the API so would be fr	urvey that v om shale re	was used by PH eserves and cou	IMSA, but this ild fall in the

Table 109

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2015)							
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Type B Miles ² Total Miles				
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367			
Class 3 and Class 4 Miles	2,812	7,873	7,844	301			
Source: PHMSA Pipeline D	ata Mart						
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.							
2. Metallic gathering line o allowable operating pressur	perating under 20% e is less than 125 po	specified minimum yield struurds per square inch in a Cla	ength or non-metallic pipe f ass 3. Class 4. or certain Cla	for which maximum ass 2 locations			

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579



Gathering Pipe by Diameter										
	NPS 4' or less	6''	8''	10''	12''	14''	16''	18''	20''	22''
Proxy Diameter	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
Type A Class 1	48,502	22,419	17,228	7,185	10,415	627	6,049	423	2,827	189
Type A Class 1 Unknown Pipe Diameter Apportioned using proportion of known pipe	5,517	2,550	1,960	817	1,185	71	688	48	322	21
Total	54,019	24,969	19,188	8,002	11,600	698	6,737	471	3,149	210

Gathering Pipe by Diameter										
	24''	26''	28''	30''	32''	34''	36''	38''	42''	48''
Proxy Diameter	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	48
Type A Class 1 Type A Class 1 Unknown Pipe Diameter Apportioned using	1,703 194	403	45	785 89	-	-	245 28	-	-	-
proportion of known pipe										
Total	1,897	449	50	874	-	-	273	-	-	-



Total Cost of N	Total Cost of New Regulation on Existing Plastic Pipes ¹										
Category	Mileage of Plastic Pipe in Category from API data	Scaled Mileage to encompass non API sources	Percent of Pipe that falls into the diameter category to be regulated	Percent of Plastic Pipe 8 inches and above	Mileage of plastic pipe in diameter category	Percentage of Pipe that will be expected to comply upon new construction	Percentage of existing plastic pipe that has been in operation for more than 2 years and above ground	Mileage of Plastic pipe this applies to	Cost to Follow Regulation	Total Cost for Existing Pipe	
Newly	7,117	11,469	40%	20%	927	100%	1%	9	\$75,000	\$695,446	
Regulated											
(Type A Area 2											
(high stress, $>$											
8")											
Total G & A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$139,089	
$\cos t^2$											
1. Plastic pipe must be installed below ground except when installed on a bridge or if the pipe is located in an unlikely place that would experience physical damage											
2. Assumed 20%	G &A Cost										



Total Cost of New Regulation on Future Plastic Pipes										
Category	Total Mileage of Existing Pipe for Type A Class 1	Miles of Plastic Pipe in Category	Percentage of Plastic Pipe	Future Pipe	Mileage of Future Plastic Pipe	Average diameter of affected pipe	Average additional Cost per inch mile	Total Cost of Added Regulation on Plastic Pipe		
Future (Type A,										
Area 2 (high stress,										
≥ 8")) pipe	132,586	11,469	9%	20,767	1,796	12	\$5,000	\$110,776,922		
Total G & A Cost ¹	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$22,155,384		
1. Assumed 20% G &	zA Cost									



Present Value Incremental Costs								
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)					
\$86,908,032	\$5,793,869	\$109,653,792	\$7,310,253					

2.9 Missing Cost for Design Pressure for Gathering Pipeline

2.9.1 Cost Basis

PHMSA proposes design requirements in paragraph 192.105. These requirements entail manufacturing specification requirements including regulation which may require higher grade material costs. For example, according to 192.123, polyethylene plastic gathering pipe will not be able to operate over 125 psig regardless of the wall thickness. Operators will have to either purchase larger diameter plastic pipe in the future to achieve the same volume throughput and reduce the pressure in the pipe or purchase steel pipe and conduct corrosion control measures. The incremental cost per inch mile to upgrade from using lower diameter plastic pipe to using higher diameter plastic pipe amounts to a significant \$5,000-\$15,000 per inch mile.

Plastic pipe is oftentimes used in areas with sour gas as this gas has a higher propensity to corrode, thereby making corrosion control in these areas expensive. Adding to the additional expense is that lower pressure pipe would require more compressors to transport the gas. Furthermore under 192.59, pipeline companies are not allowed to utilize reworked pipe pipe (imperfect product and wastes that are recycled within the pipe manufacturing process) in the manufacturing of plastic gathering pipe which can comprise 20% of the finished pipe. This will increase pipeline manufactures operating costs.

Operators must comply with these more stringent requirements when installing new steel and plastic pipeline that is regulated in the future. ICF determines an incremental cost to meet this higher standard for future pipe by using an average diameter and cost per inch mile to comply with this requirement. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.9.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers newly installed Type A Area 2 gathering lines in this cost.
- ICF considers 50% of installed pipe will require the use of higher grade pipe.
- ICF considers 12 inches as the average diameter of the pipe.
- ICF considers a conservative incremental cost per inch mile of \$5,000 to comply.

2.9.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to comply with design requirements for newly regulated new pipeline. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage and the cost to comply to characterize the proposed higher standards. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of



\$499 million at a 7% discount rate (\$630 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from these design requirements.

Table 116

Revised Estimates for 7 Cathering Pipelines ^{1,2}	Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}									
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years				
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767				
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605				
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844				
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724				
То	tal	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941				
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.										
2. The breakdown for categor may be a conservative estima Type A Area 2, high stress, >	 The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category 									

Table 117

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2015)									
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators					
Total Regulated Miles	s 7,844 3,580 11,423 30								
Class 3 and Class 4 Miles	2,812	7,873	7,844	301					
Source: PHMSA Pipeline D	ata Mart								
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.									
2. Metallic gathering line o allowable operating pressure	 Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations 								

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579



Gathering Pipe by Diameter										
	NPS 4' or less	6''	8''	10''	12''	14''	16''	18''	20''	22''
Proxy Diameter	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
Type A Class 1	48,502	22,419	17,228	7,185	10,415	627	6,049	423	2,827	189
Type A Class 1 Unknown Pipe Diameter Apportioned using proportion of known pipe	5,517	2,550	1,960	817	1,185	71	688	48	322	21
Total	54,019	24,969	19,188	8,002	11,600	698	6,737	471	3,149	210

Gathering Pipe by Diameter										
	24''	26''	28''	30''	32''	34''	36''	38''	42''	48''
Proxy Diameter	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	48
Type A Class 1 Type A Class 1 Unknown Pipe Diameter Apportioned using	1,703 194	403	45	785 89	-	-	245 28	-	-	-
proportion of known pipe										
Total	1,897	449	50	874	-	-	273	-	-	-



Total Cost for New Regulation on Pipe									
Category	Mileage	Percent of gathering line that would newly fall under this rule	Percentage of mileage that operators that will be required to use a higher grade pipe due to regulation ¹	Future mileage affected by regulation	Average diameter of affected pipe	Average Additional Cost per inch mile	Incremental cost for upgraded pipe		
Future (Type									
A, Area 2									
(high stress, \geq									
8")) pipe	20,767	100%	50%	10384	12	\$5,000	\$640,314,138		
Total G & A									
cost ²	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$128,062,828		
1. Assumed a combination of higher spec, thicker pipe, with more testing necessary on the pipe will cause companies to purchase a higher									
grade of pipe		- •			-		-		
2. Assumed 209	% G &A Co	st							

Present Value Incremental Costs									
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)						
\$499,212,875	\$33,280,858	\$629,867,958	\$41,991,197						



2.10 Missing Cost for Vaults for Gathering Pipeline

2.10.1 Cost Basis

Both newly regulated new and existing gathering pipeline under the proposed rule must comply with requirements specified in 192.183 when installing vaults. This cost include design requirements such as pressure regulation to protect installed equipment including valves, PRVs, and pressure regulating stations. ICF considers the incremental cost to comply based on an applicable mileage and number of vaults installed. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.10.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers Type A Area 2 gathering lines in this cost.
- ICF considers vaults to exist every 50 miles.
- ICF considers \$5,000 as the cost of housing.

2.10.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to comply with vault requirements for newly regulated pipeline. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage, the number of vault per mile, and the cost of each vault to determine costs. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$1.6 million at a 7% discount rate (\$2.0 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from vault requirements.

Table 123

Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}						
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A Area 2						
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
Tota	al	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941
1. Estimate based on using GIS	S mapping, HPDI well data, a	nd a count of	f processing	plants to de	etermine the mi	ileage necessary

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas

for gathering lines.

2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category



Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2015)						
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators		
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367		
Class 3 and Class 4 Miles	2,812	7,873	7,844	301		
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart						
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.						
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum						
allowable operating pressur	e is less than 125 po	ounds per square inch in a Cla	ass 3, Class 4, or certain Cla	ss 2 locations		

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579



Total Cost for New Regulation on Vaults								
Category	Mileage	Percentage of Pipe that will be expected to comply (Existing- retroactively and Future - upon new construction)	Percent of Pipe that is Newly Regulated	Mileage of Pipe that will need to install Vaults	Vaults are assumed to be every XX miles	Number of Vaults needed to be installed	Incremental Cost of Vaults under new regulation	Costing of Vaults
Future (Type A, Area 2		100%	100%		50	415	\$5,000	\$2,076,749
(high stress, ≥ 8 ")) pipe	20,767			20,767				
Total G & A cost ¹	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$415,350
Total	20,767			20,767	50	415	\$5,000	\$2,492,099
1. Assumed 20% G &A C	1. Assumed 20% G &A Cost							

Present Value Incremental Costs							
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)				
\$1,619,112	\$107,941	\$2,042,869	\$136,191				



2.11 Missing Cost for Moderate Consequence Area Assessment for Gathering Pipeline

2.11.1 Cost Basis

Defined in paragraph 192.3, a moderate consequence area (MCA) exists when an onshore area is within a potential impact circle containing five or more buildings intended for human occupancy, an occupied site, or a right-of-way for a designated interstate, freeway, expressway, or other principle 4-lane roadway. Sections 192.619 and 192.624 propose regulation for MAOP determination and verification, which apply to areas in moderate consequence areas. In order for an operator to know if a pipeline system must comply with these requirements, the operator must first identify if and where pipeline falls under the newly defined MCAs.

ICF considers the cost to identify MCAs by quantifying the purchase and implementation of a Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Currently under the proposed rule, GIS reporting requirements exclude gathering lines. As such, the cost to implement a GIS system to determine applicable MCA mileage would be a new cost for all pipeline. ICF considers a percentage of pipeline that do not have GISs and a cost to implement per mile. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.11.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers all regulated gathering lines in this cost.
- ICF considers 70% of pipelines do not have a GIS system for Type A Area 1, 90% of pipelines for Type A Area 2 and 70% of pipeline in Type B.
- ICF considers a cost of \$7,000 per mile to add GIS.

2.11.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to assess a pipeline system for moderate consequence areas. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage and the cost to implement a GIS system per mile to determine costs. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$543 million at a 7% discount rate (\$686 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from MCA determination and assessment.





Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}							
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years	
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767	
Type A -unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605	
Type A -unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844	
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724	
Tot	al	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941	
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.							
2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category							

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014)							
	Type A Miles1	Type B Miles2	Total Miles	Number of Operators	Future Pipe Type A miles	Future Pipe Type B miles	
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367	2,361	1,077	
Class 3 and Class 4 Miles	2,812	1,499	4,312	301	NA	NA	
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart							
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.							
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations							



Estimating Cost to add GIS Mapping to Determine MCA							
Туре	Estimated Mileage that would fall under this part	Percentage of Pipeline that do not have a GIS System	Mileage that need to add GIS	Cost to add GIS per Mile	Total Cost		
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, \geq							
8")	77,554	90%	69,798	\$7,000	\$488,588,769		
Type A, Area 1	7,844	70%	5,490	\$7,000	\$38,433,371		
Type B Area 1 and Area 2	3,580	70%	2,506	\$7,000	\$17,540,947		
Total	88,977	NA	77,795	NA	\$544,563,086		

Table 131

Estimating Cost to add GIS Mapping to Determine MCA for future pipe						
Туре	Estimated Mileage that would fall under this part	Percentage of Pipeline that would not have had a GIS system anyway	Mileage that need to add GIS	Cost to add GIS per Mile	Total Cost	
Future Type A Area						
1 and Area 2 and						
Type B Area 1 and						
Area 2	24,206	90%	21,785	\$7,000	\$152,495,608	

Estimating G&A Cost and the Total Cost of Determining						
MCA						
Total Cost	\$697,058,694					
G & A						
Cost	\$139,411,739					
Total Cost	\$836,470,432					
Annual						
Cost	\$55,764,695					
Note: Other costs associated with MCAs have been accounted for						
in the MAO	in the MAOP determination and the Corrosion					



Detailed Cost Discussion for Gathering

Table 133

Present Value Costs							
7% Discount Rate3% Discount Rate							
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)				
\$543,453,055	\$36,230,204	\$685,686,774	\$45,712,452				

2.12 Missing Cost for Leak Surveys for Gathering Pipeline

2.12.1 Cost Basis

According to 192.706, all newly regulated gathering lines (Type A Area 2) must comply with leak survey requirements. These regulations require that operators perform surveys at intervals not exceeding 15 months but at least once a calendar year. Costs include implementing, conducting, and continuing a leak survey program. ICF applies an average cost to survey per mile, considers the cost to occur annually, and determines net present value over a 15 year period. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.12.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers Type A Area 2 mileage (newly regulated gathering lines).
- ICF considers 37.5% of pipeline were already conducting surveys and therefore do not incur additional costs to comply.
- ICF considers a \$490 cost to conduct surveys per mile.

2.12.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to conduct leak surveys. ICF estimates a net present value cost of \$278 million at a 7% discount rate (\$350 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA.



Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines ^{1,2}

01						
Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A - unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A - unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
Tota	al	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941
1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.						
2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2,						

high stress, >8 inch category

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014) ³							
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators			
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367			
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Da	ata Mart						
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non- metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.							
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations							
3. Regulated Miles are from	2014 as that was	the most recent	year when the anal	ysis started			

Cost to Conduct Leak Surveys Per Mile							
Percent of Each Mile Unit Cost Weighted U Cost							
Aerial Leak Survey	95%	\$200	\$190				
Clearing Pipeline and Ariel Leak Survey	5%	\$6,000	\$300				
Weighted Unit Cost	NA	NA	\$490				

Table 137

Estimating Cost of Gathering Lines that Now have to Conduct Leak Surveys							
Туре	Estimated Mileage that would fall under this part	Percentage of Pipeline that were already conducting leak surveys	Mileage that need to begin conducting leak surveys	Cost to conduct leak survey per mile	Total Annual Cost	G&A Cost	
Type A Area 2							
	77,554	38%	48,471	\$490	\$23,750,843	\$4,750,169	

Table 138

Present Value Costs							
7% Discount R	late	3% Dis	count Rate				
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)				
\$277,755,695	\$18,517,046	\$350,450,522	\$23,363,368				

2.13 Missing Cost for Management of Change for Gathering Pipeline

2.13.1 Cost Basis

Due to requirements in 192.13, Type A Area 2 and Type B gathering lines must create and implement a management of change program. The program must address technical, design, physical, environmental, procedural, operational, maintenance, and organizational changes to the pipeline, whether permanent or temporary. Costs include total labor time, personnel requirements to set up a management of change program within the first year, and an annual implementation cost over the 15 year period. ICF determines the total time required, cost of personnel, and a net present value cost over 15 years to begin the program. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.



2.13.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers 500 total hours for an operator to implement requirements where no program currently exists and 100 hours to implement required changes to an existing program.
- ICF considers 100 operators of the 3,597 total estimate as large, and therefore already have a management of change program in place, with the remainder of companies having to establish a management of change program.

2.13.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to implement a management of change program. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$778 million at a 7% discount rate (\$907 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from management of change.

Table 139

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines^{1,2}

Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years	
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767	
Type A - unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605	
Type A - unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844	
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724	
Tota	al	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941	
 Estimate based of gathering lines. The breakdown for the b	 Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be 						

a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category



Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014) ³						
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators		
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367		
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart						
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.						
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations						
3. Regulated Miles are from 2014 as th	at was the most rec	cent year when the analysi	is started			

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579
Assumed Mileage per gathering system	111
Assumed Number of Systems	3,597
Assumed Large System	100



Labor Rates ¹					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ²
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
11-3071	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
13-1041	Compliance Officers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Compliance Officer	\$41	\$66
23-1011	Lawyers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Lawyers	\$76	\$101
	Contracted Compliance personnel ³	Oil and Gas Extraction	Contracted Compliance personnel	\$225	\$250
1. Source: Bureau of Lab Compensation (September	or Statistics Occupa er 2015).	tional Employment Sta	tistics (May 2014) and Em	ployer Cost of Employ	ree
2. Mean hourly wage plu	s mean benefits (\$2	5.01 per hour worked).			
3. Contracted Compliance	e personnel was an	assumption based on pl	none conversations		

Total Hours for Implementing a Management of Change System per				
Company				
Total Hours 50				



Estimated Time to Create a Management of Change Program ¹						
	Percent of Time by Labor Category	Total Labor Cost	Hours per Labor Category	Cost		
Sr. Engineer	17%	\$99	83	\$8,250.83		
Project engineer	17%	\$81	83	\$6,750.83		
Operator	17%	\$55	83	\$4,584.17		
Contracted Compliance personnel	50%	\$250	250	\$62,500.00		
Total	100%	NA	500	\$82,086		
1. All companies will have to evaluate if they must follow the existing regulation						

Table 145

Total Hours for Running a Management of				
Change system per Company				
Total Hours 100				

Table 146

Estimated Time to Create a Management of Change Program ¹						
	Percent of Time by Labor Category	Total Labor Cost2	Hours per Labor Category	Cost		
Sr. Engineer	17%	\$99	17	\$1,650.17		
Project engineer	17%	\$81	17	\$1,350.17		
Operator	17%	\$55	17	\$916.83		
Contracted Compliance personnel	50%	\$250	50	\$12,500.00		
Total	100%	NA	100	\$16,417		
1. All companies will have to evaluate	e if they must follow	the existing regulation				

Total Cost to Install a Management of Change Program								
Large Systems Smaller Systems Total								
Total Number of Systems								
	100	3,497	3,597					
Cost for Each System	\$16,417	\$82,086	NA					
Total Cost	\$1,641,717	\$287,054,968	\$288,696,684					



Per Event Cost of Implementing Management of Change Processes							
Activity	Labor Category	Labor Cost ¹ (\$/hour)	Hours	Cost			
Maintenance/operating personnel or engineer identifies a change, invoking the process	Operator	\$55	1	\$55			
Obtain approval to pursue change	Manager	\$86	1	\$86			
Evaluate and document technical and operational implications of the change	Sr. Engineer	\$99	12	\$1,188			
Obtain required work authorizations (e.g., hot work and lockout-tag out permits)	Project Engineer	\$81	3	\$243			
Formally institutionalize change in official "as-built" drawings, facilities lists, data books, and procedure manuals	Project Engineer	\$81	8	\$648			
Communicate change to all potentially affected parties	Manager	\$86	2	\$172			
Train and qualify involved personnel	Operator	\$55	20	\$1,100			
Total	NA	NA	47	\$3,492			
1. See Table Labor Rate	•						

Table 149

Present Value Costs ¹							
Component	Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)			
Onetime process development	\$288,696,684	\$19,246,445.63	\$288,696,684	\$19,246,446			
Annual implementation ²	\$489,707,778	\$32,647,185	\$617,875,167	\$41,191,678			
Note: Detail may not add to total due to rounding.							
1. Total is present value over 15 year compliance period; average annual is total divided by 15.							
2. Assumed each gathering company has four events per year, each with a cost of \$3,492							

Present Value Incremental Costs						
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)			
\$778,404,462	\$51,893,631	\$906,571,851	\$60,438,123			


2.14 Missing Cost for Corrosion Control and Test Stations for Gathering Pipeline

2.14.1 Cost Basis

Operators must consider requirements to ensure operating pipeline has sufficient corrosion monitoring in order to ensure public safety. The proposed regulation includes both internal and external corrosion testing and monitoring requirements. These requirements propose which methods to use and the frequency in which to perform these methods to ensure the pipeline remains in a safe operating condition. Operators must use coupons or other suitable means to inspect a pipeline for evidence of internal corrosion where the pipeline transports corrosive gas. Operators must perform cathodic protection level testing using surveys or test station readings to monitor external corrosion. If a test station reading indicates protection levels below the requirement in the proposed rule, close interval surveys must be performed.

For this requirement, ICF considers performing coating surveys, internal corrosion monitoring, and the addition of test stations for cathodic protection monitoring as a means to determine the magnitude of the cost to comply with corrosion control. ICF considers the cost to perform each survey, the frequency of each survey, and the percentage of regulated pipeline already in compliance with these requirements. In paragraph 192.469, pipeline under cathodic protection must have sufficient test stations or contact points for electrical measurement to continually ensure levels remain adequate. As such, ICF also determines the number of test stations an operator must build based on applicable mileage and the cost to build a station. These costs apply to all regulated gathering miles. According to the RIA, costs for internal and external corrosion are indicated. ICF considers PHMSA's methodology for surveying and monitoring required in the regulation for corrosion control. ICF's estimates represent an additional cost for gathering lines.

2.14.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers all regulated gathering lines must maintain corrosion control.
- ICF considers the cost and number of coating surveys based on class location.
- ICF considers the cost and compliance of internal monitoring based on class location.
- ICF considers the addition of 1 test station per mile at a cost of \$540 per station.

2.14.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost corrosion control and test stations. ICF considers the applicable pipeline mileage, the frequency and cost of each survey, and the cost of installed test stations to determine the cost to comply. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$68.9 million at a 7% discount rate (\$69.0 million, 3% discount rate) for corrosion control requirements.

Reported Gas Gathering Incidents Due to Corrosion (Onshore and Offshore)								
Year	Internal Corrosion	External Corrosion	Total Corrosion	Total All Causes				
2010	6	0	6	11				
2011	7	0	7	14				
2012	5	0	5	13				
2013	4	0	4	8				
2014	6	0	6	12				
2015	2	3	5	10				
Total	30	3	33	68				
Source: PHMSA Incident Reports				•				

Table 152

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines^{1,2}

Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A - unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A - unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records-assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
Tota	al	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941
1. Estimate based for gathering lines	on using GIS map	ping, HPDI well d	ata, and a count of	f processing plan	ts to determine the mil	eage necessary

2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category

Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014)								
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators				
Class 2	5,031	2,027	7,058					
Class 3	2,783	1,543	4,326					
Class 4	29	11	40					
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367				
Source: PHMSA Pipelin	e Data Mart							
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.								
2. Metallic gathering lin for which maximum allo Class 4, or certain Class	e operating under 20 wable operating pres 2 locations	% specified minimum ssure is less than 125	n yield strength or n pounds per square i	on-metallic pipe nch in a Class 3,				

Onshore Gas Trans	smission Mileag	ge by Percent SN	MYS		
Location	Total	<20% SMYS	20-30% SMYS	>30% SMYS	Percent >30% SMYS
Interstate					
Class 1	160,029	6,750	7,977	145,301	91%
Class 2	17,805	1,460	1,436	14,909	84%
Class 3	13,927	1,302	1,307	11,318	81%
Class 4	28.539	3.616	9.264	15.659	55%
Total	191,789	9,516	10,729	171,544	89%
Intrastate					
Class 1	72,719	6,250	8,293	58,176	80%
Class 2	12,839	1,038	2,762	9,040	70%
Class 3	19,730	1,953	5,671	12,107	61%
Class 4	879.598	20.454	428.344	430.8	49%
Total	106,169	9,261	17,154	79,754	75%
Source: 2014 PHMSA	Gas Transmission	n Annual Report S	MYS = specified	minimum yield s	trength



Estimatio	on of Coating S	Survey Costs					
Class	PHMSA Estimated Coating Survey Cost1	PHMSA Estimated Number of Surveys	Total Gas Transmission Lines	Total Gathering Mileage	Scaling Factor for total Cost	PHMSA Assumed Cost ¹	Gathering Costı
1	\$200	100			33.32%	\$20,000	\$6,664
			232,748	77,554			
2	\$400	70			23.03%	\$28,000	\$6,449
			30,645	7,058			
3	\$3,000	50			12.85%	\$150,000	\$19,278
			33,657	4,326			
4	\$5,000	20			4.39%	\$100,000	\$4,385
			908	40			
Total	NA	240			73.59%	\$298,000	\$36,776
			297,958	88,977		,	
Source: PH	MSA Best Profess	ional Judgment.	· ,	, , ,			
1. Based on	average survey les	ngth of 500 feet.	Actual costs will v	ary depending o	n environment, traffi	c control, and su	rvey length.

Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
Source: Bureau of Labor Statis Compensation (September 201 1. Mean hourly wage plus mea	tics Occupational Em 5). n benefits (\$25.01 per	ployment Statistic r hour worked).	s (May 2014) and	Employer Cost o	of Employee



Cost to Add T	est Stations ¹						
Total Miles	Percent of Pipe that will have to add test stations	Total Miles to add test stations	Stations Required per Mile	Baseline Compliance	New Stations Required	Cost per Test Station ²	Total Cost
77,554	30%	23,266	1	0%	23,266	\$540.08	\$12,565,572
HCA = high con	HCA = high consequence area						
1. Source: PHMSA annual reports.							
2. Unit cost repr	esents approximat	ely \$400 in labo	or (2 workers for h	nalf day) and \$10	0 in materials.		

Estimat	tion of Costs for 1	Internal Corrosic	on Monitoring					
Class	Monitoring Equipment Cost	Total Gathering Mileage	Monitors Per Mile ²	Total Number of Monitors Needed	% Current Compliance	Number of Monitors for Compliance	Gathering Cost ¹	
1	\$10,000				75%		\$38,776,886	
		77,554	0.2	15,511		3,878		
2	\$10,000				75%		\$3,528,978	
		7,058	0.2	1,412		353		
3	\$10,000				75%		\$2,162,776	
		4,326	0.2	865		216		
4	\$10,000				75%		\$19,912	
		40	0.2	8		2		
Total	NA	17795.42057	NA	4449	NA		\$44,488,551	
						4,449		
Source:	Source: PHMSA Best Professional Judgment							
1. Calcu	1. Calculated as total number of monitors needed \times (100% - % current compliance).							
2. Assu	med gathering line	es will have more	sour gas and will	need more monito	ors per mile for corro	sion		

Summary of Incremental Costs, Corrosion Control (Millions)							
Component	One-Time	Annual					
External Corrosion Coatings	\$0	\$0.04					
External Corrosion Monitoring	\$13	\$0					
Interference Current Surveys	\$0	\$0					
Internal Corrosion Monitoring\$44.5\$0							
Total	\$57	\$0.04					

	PMT	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
One Time Cost	NA	\$57	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Annual Cost	NA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
G & A in 7% case	NA	\$11	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01
G & A in 3% case	NA	\$11.42	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01
Total Cost 7%	NA	\$69	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Cost 3%	NA	\$69	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 161

	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
One Time Cost	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Annual Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
G & A in 7% case	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01
G & A in 3% case	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01	\$0.01
Total Cost 7%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Cost 3%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 162

Present Value Incremental Costs						
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)			
\$68,895,026	\$4,593,002	\$69,007,586	\$4,600,506			

2.15 Missing Cost for Pipeline Inspection Following Extreme Events for Gathering Pipeline

2.15.1 Cost Basis

According to requirements under 192.613, an operator must conduct continuing surveillance, and following an extreme weather event, must conduct an inspection of all onshore pipeline within 72 hours of the cessation of the event. This requirement applies to all regulated gathering line including Type A Area 1, Type A Area 2, Type B Area 1 and Type B Area 2. ICF considers this as the cost to develop a process and perform inspection following an extreme event. The cost to develop a process utilizes the same methodology as Topic Area 5 of the RIA, applied to gathering operators. ICF considers the



estimated miles of pipe that would be effected by an extreme event and applies a cost for inspecting the pipe. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.15.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers a \$1,188 to \$3,069 cost to develop a program for extreme events.
- ICF considers 50% of gathering operators to have regulated pipe and have to comply with 192.613.
- ICF considers 380 to 760 miles per year affected by an extreme weather event with a cost between \$350 to \$500 dollars per mile.

2.15.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost associated with pipeline inspections following an extreme weather event. ICF determines the applicable mileage and the cost of each test for each pipeline system, and then multiples by the cost of testing per applicable mile. ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$49.1 million at a 7% discount rate (\$61.5 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from pipeline assessment due to extreme weather events.

Table 163

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines^{1,2}

Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, \geq 8")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A - unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A - unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records- assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
	Total	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941

1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.

2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category



Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014) ³						
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators		
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367		
Source: PHMSA P	Pipeline Data Mar	t				
1 Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.						
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non- metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations						
3. Regulated Miles are from 2014 as that was the most recent year when the analysis started						

Number of Regulated Gathering Operators				
Total Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579			
Assumed Mileage per gathering system	111			
Assumed Number of Gathering Operators	3,597			
Percentage of Operators that will have regulated pipe	50%			
Assumed Number of Regulated Operators	1,799			

	-
CONCUL	TING
CONSUL	IING

			Labor	Mean	
Code	Occupation	Industry	Category	Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
11-3071	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
13-1041	Compliance Officers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Compliance Officer	\$41	\$66
23-1011	Lawyers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Lawyers	\$76	\$101
	Contracted Compliance personnel ²	Oil and Gas Extraction	Contracted Compliance personnel	\$225	\$250
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics (May 2014) and Employer Cost of Employee Compensation (September 2015).					
1. Total Labor Co	ost is mean hourly w	age plus mean benefi	ts (\$25.01 per hou	ir worked).	
2. Contracted cor	npliance personnel	was an assumption ba	sed on company in	nput	



Estimation of Costs for Process Development for Extreme Events								
Activity	Hours (Low)	Hours (High)	Cost per Operator (Low) ¹	Cost per Operator (High) ¹	Number of Regulated Operators	Total Cost (Low) ²	Total Cost (High) ²	Total Cost (Average)
Review existing surveillance and patrol procedures to validate adequacy for extreme events	2	1	198	99	1,799	178,070	89,035	133,552
Revise surveillance and patrol procedures	5	20	495	1,980	1,799	445,175	1,780,700	1,112,937
Notify involved personnel of new procedures, providing implementation guidance and instruction	5	10	495	990	1,799	445,175	890,350	667,762
Total	12	31	\$1,188	\$3,069	NA	\$1,068,420	\$2,760,085	\$1,914,252
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment 1. Calculated as hours × labor cost for senior engineer (\$99; see Table 3-66).								
2. Calculated as	cost per operat	or × number	operators x 50	% for assum	ed compliance	2		



72-hour Post-Event Incremental Inspection Costs Per Event								
Inspection Method	Base Cost	72 Hrs. Cost (Low)	72 Hrs. Cost (High)	Incremental Cost (Low)	Incremental Cost (High)	Incremental Cost (Avg.)		
Air patrol per Mile	\$25	\$38	\$157	\$13	\$132	\$72		
Ground patrol per Mile	\$100	\$150	\$800	\$50	\$700	\$375		
On- and Offshore Standup Test per Event	\$500	\$750	\$800	\$250	\$300	\$275		
Depth-of-Cover Survey per Event	\$500	\$750	\$2,381	\$250	\$1,881	\$1,066		
Underwater Depth- of-Cover Survey \$7,500 \$11,250 \$50,000 \$3,750 \$42,500 \$23,125								
Source: P-PIC compil based on operator high	Source: P-PIC compilation for API of Operator Base Costs. Low 72 hour cost based on 50% increase of baseline. High costs are based on operator high cost							

Table 169

72-hour Post-Event Incremental Inspection for Natural Gas Gathering Line						
	Low Estimate	High Estimate	Average			
Events per Year	10	30	20			
Miles Inspected per Event	380	760	570			
Extra Cost per Inspection in \$/mile	\$350	\$500	\$425			
Calculated Total \$1,330,000 \$11,400,000 \$4,845,000 Extra Cost in \$/Year \$1000000000000000000000000000000000000						
Source: Illustrative examples prepared by ICF to show approximate magnitude of costs.						

Table 170

Present Value Costs					
Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)		
\$49,131,045	\$3,275,403	\$61,488,727	\$4,099,248		

2.16 Missing Cost for Repairing Known Existing Conditions for Gathering Pipeline

2.16.1 Cost Basis

According to the proposed rule (192.711, 192.713), operators must repair pipeline conditions under a specified timeframe after the discovery of conditions. Under normal business as usual practices,



companies have been making repairs to some conditions, while monitoring other conditions. The backlog of conditions that have not been repaired, but are being monitored, will now have to be repaired under the new rule.

ICF considers the percent of conditions that are repaired based on feedback from industry, and uses the percent of conditions not repaired to determine the backlog of conditions across the pipe (as determined in the field repair of damages for Type A Area 1 gathering lines). ICF then considers an average cost per repair based on the distribution of gathering pipe in the various regions and the costs per repair. This average cost per repair is attributed to each condition from the backlog. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

2.16.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers a backlog of 294 of conditions that would have to be repaired. This value is after PHMSA's assumption that 81% of conditions would have to conduct repairs across gathering line sections.
- ICF considers an average cost of \$35 thousand dollars per repair

2.16.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$10.2 million at a 7% discount rate (\$10.2 million, 3% discount rate⁷) from non-HCA and non-MCA field repair of damages.

Estimated 5 Year Backlog of Conditions			
Section	Conditions	Percent repairs	Conditions not Repaired
Type A Area 1	179	67%	59
		Estimated 5 year backlog	294

⁷ The 7% and 3% discount value are the same because repairs would need to be done immediately under the existing rule.



Range of Typical Repair Costs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest ¹	South, West Coast	East ²	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800	
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000	
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600	
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700	
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500	
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400	
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050	
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750	
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600	
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment				
1. 80% of South/West Coast.				
2. 115% of South, West Coast.				





Percent of anomalies Repaired using Current methodology					
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East		
12-inch Diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%		
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%		
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%		
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%		
24-inch Diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%		
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%		
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%		
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%		
36-inch diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%		
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%		
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%		
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%		

Number of Anomalies in each Location			
	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East
Percent of anomalies in Location	74%	2%	24%

Table 175

Weighted Average Cost for 1 Anomaly per Region				
West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Total Cost Per Anomaly	
\$23,360	\$856	\$10,566	\$34,782	

Table 176

Cost of Repairs			
Number of Conditions		Average Cost Per Condition	Cost to Repair All Conditions
	294	\$34,782	\$10,223,987

Table 177

Present Value Costs			
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)
\$10,223,987	\$681,599	\$10,223,987	\$681,599

2.17 Revised Cost for Annual Reporting Requirements for Gathering Pipeline

2.17.1 Cost Basis

Due to requirements in 191.17, all gathering and transmission lines must submit annual reports to PHMSA. Operators must submit these reports each year, no later than March 15 for the preceding year. Annual reports include specific pipeline information from each operator and system including pipeline material, mileage, and incidents. ICF determines the total time required, cost of personnel, and a net present value cost over 15 years to create annual reports. ICF considers this cost to occur annually. PHMSA's proposed RIA represents this cost, but the values used are considered low.



2.17.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers that 50% of systems have regulated miles with the remaining 50% having only unregulated miles.
- ICF considers 250 hours to complete the reports for companies with regulated miles and 150 hours to complete the reports for nonregulated miles.

2.17.3 Cost Results

The tables below show the results of ICF's estimates for the cost to create and supply annual reports. PHMSA reports this cost in the RIA to be \$0.8 million at a 7% discount rate (\$1.1 million, 3% discount rate). ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$1.15 billion at a 7% discount rate (\$1.5 billion, 3% discount rate) from annual reporting requirements.

Table 178

Revised Estimates for Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines^{1,2}

Gathering Mile Designation	PHMSA designation Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2005	2010	2015	Miles from the past 5 years	Future Pipe over 15 years
Type A Area 2	Type A, Area 2 (high stress, \geq 8")	60,746	72,212	77,554	5,341	20,767
Type A - unregulated (high stress < 8)	High stress, < 8"	89,522	106,420	114,292	7,872	30,605
Type A - unregulated (high stress: with no diameter records- assumed to be less < 8)	Type A (assumed < 8")	17,094	20,320	21,823	1,503	5,844
Type B - unregulated (low stress, all sizes)	Low stress, all sizes	136,671	162,469	174,486	12,018	46,724
	Total	304,034	361,422	388,156	26,734	103,941

1. Estimate based on using GIS mapping, HPDI well data, and a count of processing plants to determine the mileage necessary for gathering lines.

2. The breakdown for categories of pipe uses the same ratio as presented in the API survey that was used by PHMSA, but this may be a conservative estimate, as much of the added pipeline from 2010 would be from shale reserves and could fall in the Type A Area 2, high stress, >8 inch category



Pipeline Infrastructure - Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering (2014) ³				
	Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators
Total Regulated Miles	7,844	3,580	11,423	367
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart				
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location.				
2. Metallic gathering line operating under 20% specified minimum yield strength or non-metallic pipe for which maximum allowable operating pressure is less than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 3, Class 4, or certain Class 2 locations				
3. Regulated Miles are from 2014 as that was the most recent year when the analysis started				

Total Gathering Mileage	
Gathering Pipeline Miles	399,579
Assumed Mileage per gathering system	111
Assumed Number of Systems	3,597
Percent of Systems that will have Regulated Miles	50%
Number of Systems that have Regulated Miles	1,799
Number of Systems that Don't have Regulated Miles	1,799

	_
	-
CONSUL	TING

Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
11-3071	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
13-1041	Compliance Officers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Compliance Officer	\$41	\$66
23-1011	Lawyers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Lawyers	\$76	\$101
	Contracted Compliance personnel ²	Oil and Gas Extraction	Contracted Compliance personnel	\$225	\$250
Source: Bureau of Employee Compe	Labor Statistics Od nsation (September	cupational Employm 2015).	ent Statistics (May	y 2014) and En	ployer Cost of
1. Total Labor Cos	st is mean hourly w	age plus mean benefit	ts (\$25.01 per hou	r worked).	

Table 182

Total Hours for Completing Annual Report with Regulated Miles

Total Hours	250
-------------	-----



Estimated Time to Complete Annual Reports				
	Percent of Time by Labor Category	Total Labor Cost2	Hours per Labor Category	Cost
Sr. Engineer	17%	\$99	42	\$4,125.42
Project engineer	17%	\$81	42	\$3,375.42
Operator	17%	\$55	42	\$2,292.08
Contracted Compliance personnel	50.00%	\$250	125	\$31,250.00
Total	100%	NA		\$41,043
			250	

Table 184

Total Hours for Completing Annual Report			
without Regulated Miles			
Total Hours	150		

Estimated Time to Complete Annual Reports ¹						
	Percent of Time by Labor Category	Total Labor Cost	Hours per Labor Category	Cost		
Sr. Engineer	17%	\$99	25	\$2,475.25		
Project engineer	17%	\$81	25	\$2,025.25		
Operator	17%	\$55	25	\$1,375.25		
Contracted Compliance personnel	50%	\$250	75	\$18,750.00		
Total	100%	NA	150	\$24,625.75		
1. All companies will have to evaluate	if they must follow	the existing regulation				



Total Cost to Complete and Submit Annual Reports					
	Number of Systems that have Regulated Miles	Number of Systems that Don't have Regulated Miles			
Total Number of Systems					
	1,799	1,799			
Cost for Each System	\$41,043	\$24,626			
Total Cost	\$73,815,888	\$44,289,533			

Table 187

Present Value Incremental Costs					
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)		
\$1,150,992,594	\$76,732,840	\$1,452,232,888	\$96,815,526		

2.18 Revised Assumption for Percent of Type A Area 2 Miles from Currently Regulated Companies (Table 3-89)

2.18.1 Cost Basis

In Table 3-89, PHMSA classifies 97% of gathering miles as "existing regulated lines (group 2)," and that 3% of gathering miles as "no existing regulated lines (group 1)," based on PHMSA best professional judgment.

As described in Section 2.1, ICF develops a list of gathering pipeline operators and their gathering miles for five states, namely: Kansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas. ICF filters PHMSA data to include onshore operators in the five aforementioned states and matches each PHMSA operator to an operator from the HPDI Database (if a match was possible). Out of the 217 unique onshore operators in the PHMSA database, 163 companies, or 73%, match operators in the HPDI database. These 163 companies in the five states that match between the PHMSA database and the HPDI database account for 6,259 miles in the PHMSA database. The total miles reported to PHMSA for gathering in the five states equaled 6,862 miles, indicating the mapping covers 91% of the miles reported to PHMSA.

The HPDI database includes a total of 192,907 miles and 1,576 unique gathering companies reported by the five states with data. Companies that report to PHMSA and mapped by ICF account for 34,323 miles or 18% of the total HPDI miles (ratio of miles associated with the five states reporting to PHMSA from the HPDI database and the total miles in the five states reported in the HPDI database). Because ICF mapped only 91% of PHMSA operator miles to the total HPDI miles, that percentage was scaled to 100% to adjust for the companies that were not matched. ICF then uses this ratio (100%/91%) to scale the



18% of miles from mapped companies in the five states to 20% to represent all companies reporting to PHMSA. Therefore, currently regulated companies account for 20% of existing unregulated gathering miles.

This analysis shows no basis in PHMSA's classification that 97% of Type A Area 2 miles would be from companies currently reporting. PHMSA states 367 reporting gathering companies with ICF estimating 3,597 unique gathering companies. Therefore 10% of existing companies report to PHMSA. The data indicates that the larger companies have a higher percentage of gathering miles, but doesn't support that 97% of miles will come from currently regulated companies. Rather ICF considers 20% of Type A Area 2 miles to come from existing reporting companies.

2.18.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- In Table 3-89: ICF considers 80% percentage of miles from the category "No existing regulated lines (group 1)" rather than 3%.
- In Table 3-89: ICF considers 20% percentage of miles from the category "Existing regulated lines (group 2)" rather than 97%.

2.18.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost of Topic Area 8 over 15 years of \$585 million at a 7% discount rate (\$699 million, 3% discount rate)⁸. This includes a combination of changes made throughout Topic Area 8, with the adjustment to Table 3-89 changing the unit cost for most gathering miles.

2.19 Revised Assumption of Utilizing Offshore Incidents to Represent Initial Incident Frequency from Newly Regulated Onshore Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-1)

2.19.1 Cost Basis

Table 6-1 lists the incident counts for offshore gathering pipelines in order to calculate an average preregulation incident rate for Type A Area 2 pipeline with a diameter of 8 inches or greater. ICF sees no reason to use the offshore incident rate as an estimate of onshore Type A Area 2 pipelines.

ICF revises Table 6-1 to obtain the counts for onshore gathering pipelines over the same time period. For onshore gathering pipelines, a total of 12 incidents occurred between 2001 and 2005 over a total of 84,476 gathering miles⁹ over the 5 year period. This results in an average of 0.144 incidents per year per 1,000 miles, compared to 0.329 incidents per year per 1,000 miles for offshore gathering pipelines.

2.19.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers onshore incidents as more representative of the pre-regulated incidents for Type A Area 2 pipelines. Therefore, ICF considers 0.144 incidents per year per 1000 miles as the existing incident rate for Type A Area 2 pipeline before regulation.

⁸ This cost estimate excludes certain annual reporting costs as ICF considers specific annual report costs using a different approach.

⁹ Each year, an average of 16,895 gathering miles exist over the 5 year period.



2.19.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates the net present value of benefits of Topic Area 8 over 15 years to equal \$43 million at a 7% discount rate (\$52 million, 3% discount rate). This includes a combination of changes made throughout Topic Area 8's benefits including adjustments to Table 6-1, Table 6-5, Table 6-6, and Table 6-8.

2.20 Revised Assumption of Utilizing Previously Regulated Type B Data to Model Type A Area 2 Miles (Table 6-5)

2.20.1 Cost Basis

Table 6-5 lists the incident counts for Type B pipelines and the onshore Type B pipeline miles in order to calculate an average incident rate for onshore Type B miles over the last 5 years. PHMSA makes the assumption that the newly regulated Type A Area 2 pipeline with a diameter of 8 inches or greater will behave most similarly to Type B Area 1 and Area 2 miles. ICF sees no reason that the high stress Type A miles in Class 1 locations would behave more like low stress pipelines in Class 2, 3, and 4 locations, and believes that Type A Area 1 pipelines (high stress in Class 2, 3, and 4 locations) to be a better approximation for the newly regulated Type A Area 2 pipelines.

ICF revises Table 6-5 to obtain the counts for onshore Type A natural gas gathering pipelines, which are high stress lines and susceptible to more incidents. For Type A pipelines, a total of two incidents occurred between 2010 and 2015 (both of which in 2012) over a total of 34,978 miles¹⁰ over the six-year period. This results in an average of 0.06 incidents per year per 1,000 miles, compared to 0.04 incidents per year per 1,000 miles for Type B gas gathering pipelines.

2.20.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers Type A Area 1 incidents to be more representative of the post regulated incidents for Type A Area 2 pipelines due to the high stress of Type A pipe. Therefore, ICF considers 0.06 incidents per year per 1000 miles for post regulation incidents.

2.20.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates the net present value of benefits of Topic Area 8 over 15 years to equal \$43 million at a 7% discount rate (\$52 million, 3% discount rate). This includes a combination of changes made throughout Topic Area 8's benefits including adjustments to Table 6-1, Table 6-5, Table 6-6, and Table 6-8.

2.21 Revised Assumption of Utilizing Onshore and Offshore Incidents to Represent Gas Lost from Newly Regulated Type A Area 2 Incidents (Table 6-8)

2.21.1 Cost Basis

Table 6-8 shows the total counts of gathering incidents and the quantities of gas released (MCF) from onshore and offshore incidents. The table lists out the incident counts for 2010 through 2015 and determines the average gas released per incident. Based on this data, each incident between 2010 and 2015 releases 3,351 MCF of gas on average. ICF revises Table 6-8 to only include incident counts and gas released for onshore, natural gas Type A and B gathering pipelines. For this type of pipe, five incidents have occurred over the six years, with 5,576 MCF of gas released on average per incident.

¹⁰ Each year, an average of 5,830 gathering miles exist over the 5 year period.



small sample size, ICF considers this pipe to be more representative of the newly regulated Type A Area 2 pipe.

2.21.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers an average gas released volume per incident of 5,576 MCF.

2.21.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates the net present value of benefits of Topic Area 8 over 15 years to equal \$43 million at a 7% discount rate (\$52 million, 3% discount rate). This includes a combination of changes made throughout Topic Area 8's benefits including adjustments to Table 6-1, Table 6-5, Table 6-6 and Table 6-8.



3 Detailed Cost Discussion for Transmission

3.1 Missing Cost for MCA Field Repair of Damages for Transmission Pipeline

3.1.1 Cost Basis

According to the proposed rule (192.933), PHMSA states HCA mileage must accelerate the timeframe for repair conditions under the integrity management program. Additionally, PHMSA states MCA mileage must perform pipeline assessment (192.710) and repair conditions under a proposed accelerated timeframe, similar to HCA mileage through integrity management. ICF considers this missing cost as the repair requirements specified (192.713) for MCAs. ICF follows PHMSA's RIA methodology under Topic Area 2 except where accounting for ICF's proposed revisions in the sections below. Field repair of damages for pipe in MCAs are not accounted for in PHMSA's proposed RIA.

3.1.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF assumes 0.9 repair condition per mile for MCA mileage.

3.1.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$591 million at a 7% discount rate (\$668 million, 3% discount rate) from MCA field repair of damages.



Estimated MCA Mileage

	Onshore GT Miles1	Non-HCA1,2	MCA % of Non-HCA3	MCA Miles4	Roadway MCA Miles5	Total MCA Miles6
Interstate						
Class 1	160,029	159,374	2%	3,187	1,372	4,559
Class 2	17,805	16,774	50%	8,387	144	8,531
Class 3	13,927	7,378	100%	7,378	0.0	7,378
Class 4	29	10	100%	10	0.0	10
Subtotal	191,789	183,536	NA	18,962	1,516	20,478
Intrastate						
Class 1	72,719	71,692	2%	1,434	617	2,051
Class 2	12,839	12,396	50%	6,198	107	6,305
Class 3	19,730	10,224	100%	10,224	0.0	10,224
Class 4	880	156	100%	156	0.0	156
Subtotal	106,169	94,468	NA	18,012	724	18,736
Total	· · · · · ·					
Class 1	232,748	231,066	2%	4,621	1,989	6,610
Class 2	30,645	29,170	50%	14,585	251	14,836
Class 3	33,657	17,602	100%	17,602	0.0	17,602
Class 4	908	166	100%	166	0.0	166
Grand Total	297,958	278,004	NA	36,974	2,240	39,214
HCA = high conse	equence area MCA =	moderate consequer	nce area			
1. Source: PHMSA 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report, Part Q. Total mileage shown for context only.						
2. Excludes mileage reported under inadequate maximum allowable operating pressure records.						
3. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment; based on homes and occupied sites in primary impact radius only.						
4. Non-HCA mileage multiplied by percentage MCA.						
5. 20% of total intersecting mileage. Total mileage based on overlay of Federal Highway Administration map with National Pipeline Mapping System pipeline data; 20% based on PHMSA best professional judgment.						

6. MCA miles plus additional roadway MCA miles.



Estimation of MCA Mileage Subject to Integrity Assessment Requirements							
Location	MCA Mileage ¹	% Piggable ²	Mileage Subject to Rule ³	Mileage Subject to Rule less Overlap ⁴	% MCA Currently Assessed ⁵	MCA not Previously Assessed ⁶	
Interstate					L		
Class 1	4,559	71%	3,237	2,622	50%	1,311	
Class 2	8,531	70%	5,972	5,434	70%	1,630	
Class 3	7,378	NA	7,378	6,490	80%	1,298	
Class 4	10	NA	10	10	90%	1	
Subtotal	20,478	NA	16,597	14,556	NA	4,240	
Intrastate	·			· · · · · ·			
Class 1	2,051	53%	1,087	1,011	50%	505	
Class 2	6,305	40%	2,522	2,371	70%	711	
Class 3	10,224	NA	10,224	9,500	80%	1,900	
Class 4	156	NA	156	155	90%	16	
Subtotal	18,736	NA	13,989	13,037	NA	3,132	
Total							
Class 1	6,610	66%	4,363	3,633	50%	1,817	
Class 2	14,836	57%	8,457	7,805	70%	2,341	
Class 3	17,602	NA	17,602	15,990	80%	3,198	
Class 4	166	NA	166	165	90%	17	
Grand Total	39,214	NA	30,587	27,593	NA	7,372	
MCA = moderate consequence area							
1. See Table 3-24.							
2. Assumed equal	to non-HCA percent	piggable based on	data from Part R of	the annual report (see	Table 3-3).		
3. MCA mileage t	imes percent piggabl	e.					
4. Excludes MCA mileage subject to MAOP verification provisions							
5. Assumed based on the overall reported assessed mileage and assessed mileage in HCAs							
6. Mileage subject	t to proposed rule less	s overlap with previ	ious other topic area	s multiplied by (100%	6-% not previously	assessed).	



Calculation of MCA Mileage, Topic Area 2					
Scope	Miles				
MCA Mileage	30,587				
MCA MAOP verification testing under Topic Area 1 ²	7,372				
MCA less Topic Area 1 mileage	23,215				
Average assessed per year ³	3,316				
1. Source: PHMSA Annual Reports					
2. See section 3.1.					
3. MCA miles less divided by 7 years	topic Area 1				

Table 191

Hazardous Liquid Scheduled Repair Conditions, 2004-2009						
Repair Condition	Number	Percent of Total				
60-day	4,673	19%				
conditions						
180-day	20,468	81%				
conditions						
Total	25,141	100%				
Source: 2004-2009	Hazardous Liquid	Annual Reports;				
see Table C-2	_	_				

Miles of Onshore Gas Transmission Pipeline for which Integrity Assessment was Conducted (2014)							
Year ILI Pressure Test Direct Assessment Total							
2014	45,454	1,815	3,632	50,900			
Percentage 89.30% 3.56% 7.13%							
Source: PHMSA C	Gas Transmission An	nual Reports: 2010-	-2014				



Transmission Conditions Identification							
	Fraction of Pipeline Assessed Using this method	Repair Conditions Discovery Rate #/mile	Weighted Average Repair Conditions Discovered #/mile	BAU Fraction Repaired (remainder monitored)	BAU Conditions Repaired	BAU Conditions Monitored	
ILI	0.89	1.0	0.89	50%	0.45	0.45	
Pressure Test	0.04	0.1	0.00	85%	0.00	0.00	
Direct	0.07	0.1	0.01	85%	0.01	0.00	
Assessment							
Total	1.0		0.9	50%	0.46	0.45	

Estimation of 18	80-Day Repair				
Conditions					
Component	Value				
MCA miles assessed per year	3,316				
Scheduled repair conditions per mile assessed	0.90				
Expected scheduled repair conditions per year	3000				
180 conditions (% of scheduled conditions)	81%				
Expected 180- day conditions per year	2442				
1. 2004-2009 Gas scheduled repair ra	Transmission ate, see Table C-2.				



Number of Anomalies in Each Location						
	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East			
Percent of anomalies in Location	75%	15%	10%			
Number of anomalies in each Location	1,831	366	244			

Range of Typical Repair Costs						
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest ¹	South, West Coast	East ²			
12-inch Diameter						
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800			
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400			
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800			
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000			
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000			
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600			
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600			
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000			
24-inch Diameter						
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700			
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600			
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700			



Range of Typical Repair Costs					
Material Verification ₁ (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500		
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400		
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400		
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000		
36-inch diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050		
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400		
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550		
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750		
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100		
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600		
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000		
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment					
1. 80% of South/W	Vest Coast.				
2. 115% of South, West Coast.					



Percent of anomalies Repaired using Current methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	
36-inch diameter	<u>.</u>			
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	



Percent of anom	Percent of anomalies Repaired using Current methodology				
Pipe	2%	2%	2%		
Replacement					
(5')					
Material	17%	17%	17%		
Verification (5')					
Composite Wrap	5%	5%	5%		
(20')					
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%		
Pipe	2%	2%	2%		
Replacement					
(20')					
Material	17%	17%	17%		
Verification					
(20')					

Number of Repairs Done using Methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	92	18	12	
Sleeve (5')	183	37	24	
Pipe Replacement (5')	31	6	4	
Material Verification (5')	305	61	41	
Composite Wrap (20')	92	18	12	
Sleeve (20')	183	37	24	
Pipe Replacement (20')	31	6	4	
Material Verification (20')	305	61	41	
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	92	18	12	
Sleeve (5')	183	37	24	
Pipe Replacement (5')	31	6	4	



Number of Repair	Number of Repairs Done using Methodology				
Material Verification (5')	305	61	41		
Composite Wrap (20')	92	18	12		
Sleeve (20')	183	37	24		
Pipe Replacement (20')	31	6	4		
Material Verification (20')	305	61	41		
36-inch diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	92	18	12		
Sleeve (5')	183	37	24		
Pipe Replacement (5')	31	6	4		
Material Verification (5')	305	61	41		
Composite Wrap (20')	92	18	12		
Sleeve (20')	183	37	24		
Pipe Replacement (20')	31	6	4		
Material Verification (20')	305	61	41		

Cost of Repairs						
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Total		
12-inch Diameter	12-inch Diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	\$879,119	\$219,780	\$168,498	\$1,267,397		
Sleeve (5')	\$2,344,318	\$586,080	\$449,328	\$3,379,726		
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$1,269,839	\$317,460	\$243,386	\$1,830,685		



Cost of Repairs				
Material Verification (5')	\$610,500	\$122,100	\$81,400	\$813,999
Composite Wrap	\$1,465,199	\$366,300	\$280,830	\$2,112,328
Sleeve (20')	\$3,516,477	\$879,119	\$673,992	\$5,069,588
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$1,562,879	\$390,720	\$299,552	\$2,253,150
Material Verification (20')	\$1,220,999	\$244,200	\$162,800	\$1,627,999
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$1,318,679	\$329,670	\$252,747	\$1,901,096
Sleeve (5')	\$3,516,477	\$879,119	\$673,992	\$5,069,588
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$1,904,759	\$476,190	\$365,079	\$2,746,027
Material Verification (5')	\$610,500	\$122,100	\$81,400	\$813,999
Composite Wrap (20')	\$2,197,798	\$549,450	\$421,245	\$3,168,493
Sleeve (20')	\$5,274,716	\$1,318,679	\$1,010,987	\$7,604,383
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$2,344,318	\$586,080	\$449,328	\$3,379,726
Material Verification (20')	\$1,220,999	\$244,200	\$162,800	\$1,627,999
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$1,978,019	\$494,505	\$379,120	\$2,851,643
Sleeve (5')	\$5,274,716	\$1,318,679	\$1,010,987	\$7,604,383
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$2,857,138	\$714,284	\$547,618	\$4,119,041
Material Verification (5')	\$610,500	\$122,100	\$81,400	\$813,999
Composite Wrap (20')	\$3,296,698	\$824,174	\$631,867	\$4,752,739
Sleeve (20')	\$7,912,074	\$1,978,019	\$1,516,481	\$11,406,574
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$3,516,477	\$879,119	\$673,992	\$5,069,588
Material Verification (20')	\$1,220,999	\$244,200	\$162,800	\$1,627,999
Total Cost	\$57,924,198	\$14,206,325	\$10,781,626	\$82,912,149



Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics (May 2014) and Employer Cost of Employee Compensation (September 2015).					
1. Mean hourly wage plus mean benefits (\$25.01 per hour worked).					

Present Value of Estimated Annual Cost of More Timely Repair of Non- Immediate Conditions (Millions)				
Estimate	7% Discount Rate	3% Discount Rate		
Cost of repairs	\$82.9	\$82.9		
Percent of anomalies that are repaired	50%	50%		
Cost of repairing anomalies on an accelerated schedule	\$41.8	\$41.8		
Cost of repairs delayed 4 years	\$31.9	\$37.2		
Difference for repaired anomalies (estimated cost of proposed rule)	\$9.9	\$4.7		



Present Value o	f Estimated Annu	al Cost of				
More Timely Re	epair of Non- Imr	nediate				
Conditions (Mil	Conditions (Millions)					
Time to monitor	1	1				
one anomaly						
(hours)						
Salary to	\$55	\$55				
monitor						
anomalies						
Average						
Ongoing	9,076	9,076				
anomalies in a						
given time						
period						
Cost for	\$0.50	\$0.50				
monitoring						
unrepaired						
anomalies						
Annual cost of	\$50.5	\$45.3				
rule						
G & A Cost	\$10.1	\$9.1				

Present Value Costs (Millions)					
7% Discount Rate			3% Discount Rate		
Total		Average Annual	Total Average Annual		
	\$591	\$39		\$668	\$45

3.2 Missing Cost for non-HCA and non-MCA Field Repair of Damages for Transmission Pipeline

3.2.1 Cost Basis

According to the proposed rule (192.713), operators must repair pipeline under a specified timeframe based on the discovered condition. ICF considers this cost to repair under the specified timeframe for regulated pipeline outside of HCA and MCAs. As the proposed rule has less requirements for the amount of assessments for non-HCA and non-MCA pipeline miles, a smaller percentage of anomalies will be found. ICF follows PHMSA's RIA methodology of this cost estimate except where accounting for ICF's proposed revisions in the sections below. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

3.2.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers this mileage to be surveyed half as frequently as HCA or MCA mileage.
- ICF considers these miles to have 50% of the amount anomalies determined in HCA or MCAs as there are less assessment requirements.
- ICF assumes 0.45 repair condition per mile for non-HCA or non-MCA mileage.


3.2.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$1.6 billion at a 7% discount rate (\$1.8 billion, 3% discount rate) from non-HCA and non-MCA field repair of damages.

Table 203

Onshore Gas Transmission Mileage			
Location	Total		
Interstate			
Class 1	160,029		
Class 2	17,805		
Class 3	13,927		
Class 4	28.539		
Total	191,789		
Intrastate			
Class 1	72,719		
Class 2	12,839		
Class 3	19,730		
Class 4	879.598		
Total	106,169		
Source: 2014 PHMSA Gas Transmission Annual Report SMYS = specified minimum yield strength			

Mileage for Repairs ¹			
Total Miles	297,958		
MCA Miles	30,587		
HCA Miles	16,837		
Total Miles not accounted for			
in repairs	250,533		
1. Miles that were not accounted for by PHMSA in the RIA even though they are subject to Repair Criteria			



Calculation of Mileage ¹			
Scope	Miles		
Total Mileage	250,533		
Average assessed per year ²	17,895		
1. Source: PHMSA Annual Reports			
2. Assumed non HCA, and non- MCA miles would be evaluated less frequently and for the purposes of the calculation assumed twice as long (14 years)			

Table 206

Hazardous Liquid Scheduled Repair Conditions, 2004-2009			
Repair Condition	Number	Percent of Total	
60-day conditions	4,673	19%	
180-day conditions	20,468	81%	
Total	25,141	100%	
Source: 2004-2009 Hazardous Liquid Annual Reports; see Table C-2			

Miles of Onshore Gas Transmission Pipeline for which Integrity Assessment was Conducted (2014)				
Year	ILI	Pressure Test	Direct Assessment	Total
2014	45,454	1,815	3,632	50,900
Percentage	89.30%	3.56%	7.13%	
Source: PHMSA Gas Transmission Annual Reports: 2010-2014				



Transmission Conditions Identification						
	Fraction of Pipeline Assessed Using this method	Repair Conditions Discovery Rate #/mile ¹	Weighted Average Repair Conditions Discovered #/mile	BAU Fraction Repaired (remainder monitored) ²	BAU Conditions Repaired	BAU Conditions Monitored
ILI	0.89	0.5	0.45	50%	0.22	0.22
Pressure Test	0.04	0.1	0.00	85%	0.00	0.00
Direct Assessment	0.07	0.1	0.00	85%	0.00	0.00
Total	1.0		0.5	50%	0.23	0.22
1. Assumed that 50% of conditions per mile would be found						
2. Business as Usual (BAU) are repairs that would occur without regulation. Note, this does not mean they would have occurred with the same time schedule						

Estimation of 180-Day Repair			
Conditions			
Component	Value		
Miles assessed per year	17,895		
Scheduled repair conditions per mile assessed ¹	0.45		
Expected scheduled repair conditions per year	8,093		
60-day conditions and 180 conditions (% of scheduled conditions)	81%		
Expected 180- day conditions per year	6,588		
1. 2004-2009 Gas Transmission scheduled repair rate, see Table C-2.			



Number of Conditions in each Location				
	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	East		
Percent of anomalies in Location	75%	15%	10%	
Number of anomalies in each Location	4,941	988	659	

Range of Typical Repair Costs					
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest ¹	South, West Coast	East ²		
12-inch Diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800		
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400		
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800		
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000		
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600		
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600		
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000		
24-inch Diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700		
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600		
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700		



Range of Typical Repair Costs			
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
36-inch diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Source: PHMSA b	est professional judg	gment	
1. 80% of South/West Coast.			
2. 115% of South,	West Coast.		

Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology					
Repair Method (Length)West (Except West Coast), Central, South, WestSouth, West CoastEast					
12-inch Diameter	12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%		
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%		



Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology			
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%
24-inch Diameter		I	
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%
36-inch diameter		l	
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%



Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology				
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	

Number of Repairs Done using Methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	247	49	33	
Sleeve (5')	494	99	66	
Pipe Replacement (5')	82	16	11	
Material Verification (5')	824	165	110	
Composite Wrap (20')	247	49	33	
Sleeve (20')	494	99	66	
Pipe Replacement (20')	82	16	11	
Material Verification (20')	824	165	110	
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	247	49	33	
Sleeve (5')	494	99	66	
Pipe Replacement (5')	82	16	11	
Material Verification (5')	824	165	110	
Composite Wrap (20')	247	49	33	
Sleeve (20')	494	99	66	
Pipe Replacement (20')	82	16	11	
Material Verification (20')	824	165	110	



Number of Repairs Done using Methodology				
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	247	49	33	
Sleeve (5')	494	99	66	
Pipe Replacement (5')	82	16	11	
Material Verification (5')	824	165	110	
Composite Wrap (20')	247	49	33	
Sleeve (20')	494	99	66	
Pipe Replacement (20')	82	16	11	
Material Verification (20')	824	165	110	

Cost of Repairs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Total
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$2,371,853	\$592,963	\$454,605	\$3,419,421
Sleeve (5')	\$6,324,941	\$1,581,235	\$1,212,280	\$9,118,457
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$3,426,010	\$856,502	\$656,652	\$4,939,164
Material Verification (5')	\$1,647,120	\$329,424	\$219,616	\$2,196,160
Composite Wrap (20')	\$3,953,088	\$988,272	\$757,675	\$5,699,036
Sleeve (20')	\$9,487,412	\$2,371,853	\$1,818,421	\$13,677,685
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$4,216,627	\$1,054,157	\$808,187	\$6,078,971
Material Verification (20')	\$3,294,240	\$658,848	\$439,232	\$4,392,320
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$3,557,779	\$889,445	\$681,908	\$5,129,132



Cost of Repairs				
Sleeve (5')	\$9,487,412	\$2,371,853	\$1,818,421	\$13,677,685
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$5,139,015	\$1,284,754	\$984,978	\$7,408,746
Material Verification (5')	\$1,647,120	\$329,424	\$219,616	\$2,196,160
Composite Wrap (20')	\$5,929,632	\$1,482,408	\$1,136,513	\$8,548,553
Sleeve (20')	\$14,231,118	\$3,557,779	\$2,727,631	\$20,516,528
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$6,324,941	\$1,581,235	\$1,212,280	\$9,118,457
Material Verification (20')	\$3,294,240	\$658,848	\$439,232	\$4,392,320
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$5,336,669	\$1,334,167	\$1,022,862	\$7,693,698
Sleeve (5')	\$14,231,118	\$3,557,779	\$2,727,631	\$20,516,528
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$7,708,522	\$1,927,131	\$1,477,467	\$11,113,119
Material Verification (5')	\$1,647,120	\$329,424	\$219,616	\$2,196,160
Composite Wrap (20')	\$8,894,448	\$2,223,612	\$1,704,769	\$12,822,830
Sleeve (20')	\$21,346,676	\$5,336,669	\$4,091,446	\$30,774,792
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$9,487,412	\$2,371,853	\$1,818,421	\$13,677,685
Material Verification (20')	\$3,294,240	\$658,848	\$439,232	\$4,392,320
Total Cost	\$156,278,754	\$38,328,485	\$29,088,690	\$223,695,929



Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics (May 2014) and Employer Cost of Employee Compensation (September 2015).					
1. Mean hourly wage plus mean benefits (\$25.01 per hour worked).					

Present Value of Estimated Annual Cost of More Timely Repair of Non- Immediate Conditions (Millions)				
Estimate	7% Discount Rate	3% Discount Rate		
Cost of repairs	\$223.7	\$223.7		
Percent of anomalies that are repaired	50%	50%		
Cost of repairing anomalies on an accelerated schedule	\$112.8	\$112.8		
Cost of repairs delayed 4 years	\$86.1	\$100.3		
Difference for repaired anomalies (estimated cost of proposed rule)	\$26.8	\$12.6		



Present Value of Estimated Annual Cost of More Timely Repair of Non- Immediate Conditions (Millions)				
Time to monitor one anomaly (hours)	1	1		
Salary to monitor anomalies	\$55	\$55		
Average Ongoing anomalies in a given time period	24,488	24,488		
Cost for monitoring unrepaired anomalies	\$1.35	\$1.35		
Annual cost of rule	\$136.3	\$122.1		
G & A Cost	\$27.3	\$24.4		

Table 217

Present Value Costs, (Millions)					
7% Discount Rate 3% Discount Rate					
Total	Average Annual	Total		Average Annual	
\$1,594	\$106		\$1,802		\$120

3.3 Missing Cost for Incidental Mileage for Transmission Pipeline

3.3.1 Cost Basis

According to the proposed rule (192.3), PHMSA revises the definition of regulated gathering lines to now consider lines downstream of certain defined endpoints as transmission pipelines. Under the new rule, PHMSA proposes more stringent requirements for this applicable mileage as a transmission line. ICF considers additional costs for operators of this newly classified pipeline to comply to include determining MAOP, more timely repairs, and corrosion control with other requirements captured by other sections. ICF follows PHMSA's RIA methodology of each cost estimate except where accounting for ICF's proposed revisions in the sections below. ICF considers all added incidental mileage when determining this missing cost.



3.3.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF estimates 81 processing plants to contain incidental transmission mileage, with each to have 20 applicable miles. Of these 20 miles, ICF considers the first as an MCA with the remainder of mileage as a Class 1 location.

3.3.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$270 million at a 7% discount rate (\$334 million, 3% discount rate) from incidental transmission mileage.

Table	218

Incidental Mileage			
	Miles		
Total	1,628		
Number of			
Processing Plants			
with Incidental			
Lines/Assumed			
number of			
Operators	81		
Class 1-non MCA	1,547		
Class 1- MCA	81		

Table 219

Estimated Assessment Method					
Туре	Estimated Mileage	Pipeline in Category that rule applies to	Percent of Incidental Transmission Lines that have MAOP records	Mileage in Class 1	
Class 1-non MCA	1,547	100%	20%	1,237	
Class 1- MCA	81	100%	20%	65	
Total	1,628	NA	NA	1,302	

Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-HCA Pipelines ¹				
	r	Гуре A, Area 2 (high s	tress, ≥ 8'')	
	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12'' ²	
Diameter (inches)	30	16	8	
Pipe thickness (inches)	0.4	0.4	0.3	
Segment Miles	60	60	60	



Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-HCA Pipelines¹

Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3				
Number of Bends	3	3	3				
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000				
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000				
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000				
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000				
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,676,000	\$1,718,000	\$875,000				
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$44,600	\$28,633	\$14,583				
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19				
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,203	\$327	\$79				
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%				
Cost to replace per	100.000	100.000					
inch mile	120,000	120,000	120,000				
G&A Cost'	st ⁷ 45,161 24,992 12,532						
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶ \$270,963 \$149,952 \$75,195							
HCA = high conseque	nce area MCF = thousar	nd cubic feet					
1. Based on best professional judgment of PHMSA staff, and includes excavation, permitting, construction, and cleanup costs. Unit cost of gas released based on incident reports.							
2. Pipelines below 4" generally cannot accommodate in-line inspection and will be exempt from requirements.							
3. Total upgrade cost calculated as cost of launcher plus cost of receiver plus cost per bend multiplied by number of bends plus cost per mainline valve and number of mainline valves.							
4. Based on Equation 1 using temperature (70 degrees F), pressure (14.7 PSIA at standard conditions; 50 PSI at blowdown conditions), and compressibility (factor of 0.88 at packed conditions) assumptions.							
5. Assumes a natural gas cost of \$4.21 per MCF, based on the cost of gas released intentionally during a controlled blowdown as part of a response to an incident (median of costs based on data for 294 incidents). Does not include the social cost of methane released.							
o. Opsilude costs per fille plus cost of gas released during blowdown per fille.							

7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs



Calculation of Weighted Average Unit Cost to Accommodate Inline Inspection Tools ¹							
Pipeline Diameter Weighted Average Cost per Mile							
Туре	ype > 26" 14" - 24" <12"						
Class 1-non MCA	11%	89%	0%	\$163,408			
Class 1- MCA	11%	89%	0%	\$163,408			
1. Assumed previously with 0% below 12 incl	1. Assumed previously designated gathering lines after processing plants would typically be larger and so portioned line with 0% below 12 inches and the remainder following the same ratio as gathering class 1 locations						

Estimated Unit Cost of ILI for 60 Mile Segments								
	Incidental	Incidental Transmission Pipelines (60-mile) Segment						
Component	26" - 48"	14" - 24"	4" - 12"					
Mobilization ¹	\$15,000	\$12,500	\$10,000					
Base MFL tool ²	\$90,000	\$72,000	\$54,000					
Additional combo tool (deformation & crack tools)	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000					
Reruns	\$63,000	\$50,400	\$37,800					
Analytical and data integration services	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000					
Operator preparation ³	\$27,000	\$23,050	\$19,100					
G&A Cost ⁴	\$123,000	\$111,990	\$100,980					
Total	\$738,000	\$671,940	\$605,880					
Source: PHMSA best	professional judgment.							
 Mobilization is the cost for mobilization and demobilization of the construction work crew, material and equipment to and from the work site. Regional differences may apply. Typically \$900 to \$1,500 per mile. 								
3. Includes analysis, s of cost of ILI and rela	3. Includes analysis, specifications, cleaning pigs, fatigue crack growth analysis, etc. Estimated as 10% of cost of ILI and related data analysis.							
4. G&A costs for reco costs	rd keeping, reporting, sc	heduling, working with	vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all					



Estimation of ILI Assessment Cost						
Segment Type	Less than 12'' Diameter	14" - 24"	Greater than 26'' Diameter	Weighted Average Cost Per Mile		
Class 1-non MCA	0%	89%	11%	\$11,321		
Class 1- MCA	0%	89%	11.1%	\$11,321		

Table 224

Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test (\$2015)						
Pipe Diameter	Segment Length (miles)					
(inches)	1	2	5	10		
12	\$297,205	\$325,730	\$399,940	\$877,272		
24	\$375,000	\$420,000	\$720,000	\$1,160,769		
36	\$578,424	\$738,787	\$1,018,202	\$2,053,359		
Source: T.D. Williamson, Inc., Houston, TX - was used to determine 24 inch pressure test costs						
Source: Greene's Ener Williamson's 24 inch o	gy Group, LLC (2013) diameter figures and de	Source: Greene's Energy Group, LLC (2013), - Ratios from Green's Energy Group report were used to take T.D. Williamson's 24 inch diameter figures and determine 12 inch and 36 inch pipe				

(inches) 1 12 48 24 192	2 96	5 240	10 481		
12 48 24 192	96	240	481		
48 24 192	96	240	481		
24 192					
192					
26	385	962	1,923		
30					
433	866	2,164	4,328		
MCF = thousand cubic feet					



Cost of Lost Gas ¹						
Din a Diamatan (in shas)		Seg	gment Length (m	niles)		
ripe Diameter (mcnes)	1 Mile	2 Mile	5 Mile	10 Mile	Average	
12	\$274	\$548	\$1,370	\$2,741	\$1,233	
24	\$1,096	\$2,193	\$5,482	\$10,964	\$4,934	
36	\$2,467	\$4,934	\$12,334	\$24,668	\$11,101	
1. Calculated based on volume lo (\$5.71 per thousand cubic feet).	ost (see Table Volu	me of Gas Lost D	Ouring Pressure Te	ests (MCF)) tim	es the cost of gas	

Total Pressure Test Assessment Cost: Incidental Transmission Pipeline Miles							
Commont		Segme	ent Length (miles))			
Component	1	2	5	10			
12 inch							
Pressure test ¹	\$356,646	\$390,876	\$479,928	\$1,052,726			
Lost gas ²	\$274	\$548	\$1,370	\$2,741			
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000			
Total	\$456,920	\$491,424	\$581,298	\$1,155,467			
24 inch							
Pressure test ¹	\$450,000	\$504,000	\$864,000	\$1,392,923			
Lost gas ²	\$1,096	\$2,193	\$5,482	\$10,964			
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000			
Total	\$551,096	\$606,193	\$969,482	\$1,503,887			
36 inch							
Pressure test ¹	\$694,109	\$886,544	\$1,221,843	\$2,464,030			
Lost gas ²	\$2,467	\$4,934	\$12,334	\$24,668			
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000			
Total	\$796,576	\$991,478	\$1,334,177	\$2,588,698			
1. Unit costs (see Ta	1. Unit costs (see Table Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test (\$2015)) plus 20% G&A						
2. See Cost of Lost	Gas						
3. Approximation o	f cost of temporary sup	pply (up to \$1 m	illion) for 10% of t	tests.			



Per Mile Pressure Test Costs							
Ding Diamator (inchas)	Segment Length (miles)						
ripe Diameter (menes)	1	2	5	10	Average		
Incidental Transmission Pipelines							
12	\$456,920	\$245,712	\$116,260	\$115,547	\$233,609		
24	\$551,096	\$303,096	\$193,896	\$150,389	\$299,619		
36	\$796,576	\$495,738.97	\$266,835.33	\$258,869.85	\$454,505		

Table 229

Estimated Assessment Method for Incidental Transmission Pipe						
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14"-34" Diameter	36''+ Diameter	Average Cost		
Class 1-non MCA	0%	98%	2%	\$302,472		
Class 1- MCA	0%	98%	2%	\$302,472		

Estimated Assessment Method for Incidental Transmission Pipe						
Location	ILI	Pressure Test	ILI and Upgrade	Total		
Class 1-non MCA						
	10%	85%	5%	1		
Class 1- MCA						
	10%	85%	5%	1		
Mileage Subject to Testing Class 1 -non						
MCA	124	1,052	62	1,237		
Mileage Subject to Testing Class 1 -						
MCA	7	55	3	65		
Total Annual Cost - Class 1-non MCA	\$93,385	\$21,207,066	\$720,631	\$22,021,082		
Total Annual Cost - Class 1 - MCA	\$4,915	\$1,116,161	\$37,928	\$1,159,004		



Natural Gas Composition			
Gas	Percent of Volume		
Methane (CH ₄)	96%		
Carbon dioxide (C0 ₂)	1%		
Other Fluids 3%			
Source: Estimated based on natural gas quality standards and operator reported measurements			
Enbridge Estimates: https://www.enbridgegas.com/gas- safety/about-natural-gas/components- natural-gas.aspx Spectra Estimates: https://www.uniongas.com/about-us/about- natural-gas/Chemical-Composition-of-			
Natural- Gas			

Proportion of Incidental Transmission Mileage by Diameter				
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14"-34" Diameter	36''+ Diameter	
Class 1-non MCA	0%	98%	2%	
Class 1- MCA 0% 98% 2%				
Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report				

Table 23	3

GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns				
Diameter (inches)	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)	
12				
	113	108	168	
24				
	424	406	631	
36				
	974	932	1,449	
Source: See Equation 1 and Natural Gas Composition Table lbs. = pounds				
MCF = thousand cubic	c feet			



GHG Emissions from Pressure Tests per Assessment Mile ¹				
Location	Gas Released per mile (MCF)	Methane Released per Mile (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide Released per Mile (lbs.)	
Class 1-non MCA				
	434	415	646	
Class 1- MCA				
	434	415	646	
lbs. = pounds				
MCF = thousand cubic feet				
1. Weighted average b	based on share of pipelin	e mileage by diameter.		

Table 235

Total GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns				
Item	PT Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)
Re-establish MAOP:				
Class 1 - non MCA	1052	456,568	436,936	679,008
Re-establish MAOP:				
Class 1 -MCA	55	24,030	22,997	35,737
Total				
	1,107	480,598	459,932	714,745
PT = pressure test				
MCF = thousand cubic feet				

Natural Gas Lost due to Blowdowns per Mile (MCF/Mile)				
Location	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 14" to 24"	Diameter 26" and above	
Class 1-non MCA	27.7	101.3	282.6	
Class 1- MCA	12.9	106.3	289.1	
MCF = thousand cubic feet				
Source: See Equation	1 in Section 3.1.4.3			

Average Diameter in range for Onshore miles				
	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 26'' and above		
Class 1-non MCA	9.6	18.2	29.8	
Class 1- MCA	6.7	18.6	30.2	

Table 238

Proportion of Incidental Transmission Mileage by Diameter				
Segment Type	≤ 12" Diameter	14"-24" Diameter	≥26"Diameter	
Class 1-non MCA	0%	89%	11%	
Class 1- MCA 0% 89% 11%				
Source: 2014 Gas Tra	Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Reports			

Table 239

GHG Emissions from Blowdowns, ILI Upgrade (per Mile)			
Location	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF)	CO2 Emissions (lbs.)
Class 1-non MCA	122	116	181
Class 1- MCA	127	121	188

Total GHG Emissions due to Blowdowns				
Item	ILI Upgrade Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	CO2 Emissions (lbs.)
Re-establish MAOP: Class 1 - non MCA	62	7,517	7,193	11,179
Re-establish MAOP: Class 1 -MCA	3	412	395	613
Total	65	7,929	7,588	11,792
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = methane$				
GHG = greenhouse gas				
HCA = high consequence area ILI = inline inspection				
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure MCF = thousand cubic feet				
SMYS = specified minimum	m yield strength			



Total Emissions Per Year				
Item	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	CO ₂ Emissions (lbs.)	
Re-establish	30,939	29,609	46,012	
MAOP: Class 1 -				
non MCA				
Re-establish	1,629	1,559	2,423	
MAOP: Class 1 -				
MCA				
Total	32,568	31,168	48,436	
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = methane$				
HCA = high consequence area lbs. = pounds				
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure MCF = thousand cubic feet				
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength				

Average Annual Social Cost of Gas Lost due to Blowdown (Millions 2015\$)					
Tonia Area 1 Saana	Average Annual Me	Average Annual			
Topic Area 1 Scope	ILI Upgrade	Pressure Test	Total	Social Cost 1	
Re-establish MAOP: Class 1 - non MCA	480	29,129	29,609	0.870	
Re-establish MAOP: Class 1 -MCA	26	1,533	1,559	0.046	
Subtotal	506	30,662	31,168	1	
MCF = thousand cubic feet					
1. Based on the values for social cost of methane and social cost of carbon calculated using a 3% discount rate (see Appendix B)					



	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Social cost of methane	25	25	26	26	26	27	28	29
Re-establish MAOP:								
Class 1 - non MCA	740,215	740,215	769,824	769,824	769,824	799,432	829,041	858,650
Re-establish MAOP:								
Class 1 -MCA	38,985	38,985	40,545	40,545	40,545	42,104	43,664	45,223

Table 244

	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Social cost of methane	30	31	32	33	34	34	35
Re-establish MAOP: Class 1 - non MCA	888,258	917,867	947,475	977,084	1,006,693	1,006,693	1,036,301
Re-establish MAOP: Class 1 - MCA	46,783	48,342	49,901	51,461	53,020	53,020	54,580

Table 245

Present Value Costs Discounted at 7%, (Millions 2015\$)							
	Total			Average Annual			
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	
Incidental Miles	\$225,900,785	\$916,340	\$226,817,125	\$15,060,052	\$61,089.3	\$15,121,142	

Present Value Costs Discounted at 3%, (Millions 2015\$)						
	Total			Average Annual		
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total
Incidental Miles	\$285,024,031	\$916,340	\$285,940,371	\$19,001,602	\$61,089.3	\$19,062,691

Present Value Incremental Costs					
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%)	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)		
\$226,817,125	\$15,121,142	\$285,940,371	\$19,062,691		

Table 248

Calculation of Incidental Mileage				
Scope Miles				
Total Miles	1,628			
Average assessed per year	233			

Table 249

Hazardous Liquid Scheduled Repair Conditions, 2004- 2009					
Repair Condition	Number	Percent of Total			
60-day conditions	4,673	19%			
180-day conditions	20,468	81%			
Total	25,141	100%			
Source: 2004-2009 Hazardous Liquid Annual Reports; see Table C-2					

Miles of Onshore Gas Transmission Pipeline for which Integrity Assessment was Conducted (2014)					
Year	ILI	Pressure Test	Direct Assessment	Total	
2014	45,454	1,815	3,632	50,900	
Percentage	89.30%	3.56%	7.13%		
Source: PHMSA Gas Transmission Annual Reports: 2010-2014					



Transmission Conditions Identification							
	Fraction of Pipeline Assessed Using this method	Repair Conditions Discovery Rate #/mile	Weighted Average Repair Conditions Discovered #/mile	BAU Fraction Repaired (remainder monitored)	BAU Conditions Repaired	BAU Conditions Monitored	
ILI	0.89	1.0	0.9	50%	0.45	0.45	
Pressure Test	0.04	0.1	0.0	85%	0.00	0.00	
Direct	0.07	0.1	0.0	85%	0.01	0.00	
Assessment							
Total	1.0		0.9	50%	0.46	0.45	

Table 3-62. Estimation of 180-DayRepair Conditions			
Component	Value		
Total miles assessed per year	233		
Scheduled repair conditions per mile assessed1	0.9		
Expected scheduled repair conditions per year	210		
180 conditions (% of scheduled conditions)	81%		
Expected 180-day conditions per year	171		
1. 2004-2009 Gas Transmission scheduled repair rate, see Table C-2.			



Number of Anomalies in Each Location					
	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East		
Percent of anomalies in Location	74%	2%	24%		
Number of anomalies in each Location	126	3.8	41		

Range of Typical Repair Costs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest ¹	South, West Coast	East ²	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800	
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000	
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600	
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	
24-inch Diameter	<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700	
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	



Range of Typical R	epair Costs		
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
36-inch diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Source: PHMSA best p	professional judgment		
1. 80% of South/West	Coast.		
2. 115% of South, Wes	st Coast.		

Percent of anomalies Repaired using Current methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	



Percent of anomali	es Repaired using Cu	rrent methodology	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%
24-inch Diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%
36-inch diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%



Number of Repairs Done using Methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	6	0	2	
Sleeve (5')	13	0	4	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2	0	1	
Material Verification (5')	21	1	7	
Composite Wrap (20')	6	0	2	
Sleeve (20')	13	0	4	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2	0	1	
Material Verification (20')	21	1	7	
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	6	0	2	
Sleeve (5')	13	0	4	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2	0	1	
Material Verification (5')	21	1	7	
Composite Wrap (20')	6	0	2	
Sleeve (20')	13	0	4	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2	0	1	
Material Verification (20')	21	1	7	
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	6	0	2	
Sleeve (5')	13	0	4	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2	0	1	
Material Verification (5')	21	1	7	
Composite Wrap (20')	6	0	2	
Sleeve (20')	13	0	4	



Number of Repairs	s Done using Method	ology	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2	0	1
Material Verification (20')	21	1	7

Cost of Repairs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Total
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$60,714	\$2,269	\$28,279	\$91,261
Sleeve (5')	\$161,903	\$6,050	\$75,410	\$243,362
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$87,697	\$3,277	\$40,847	\$131,821
Material Verification (5')	\$42,162	\$1,260	\$13,661	\$57,084
Composite Wrap (20')	\$101,189	\$3,781	\$47,131	\$152,102
Sleeve (20')	\$242,854	\$9,075	\$113,115	\$365,044
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$107,935	\$4,033	\$50,273	\$162,242
Material Verification (20')	\$84,324	\$2,521	\$27,322	\$114,168
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$91,070	\$3,403	\$42,418	\$136,891
Sleeve (5')	\$242,854	\$9,075	\$113,115	\$365,044
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$131,546	\$4,915	\$61,270	\$197,732
Material Verification (5')	\$42,162	\$1,260	\$13,661	\$57,084
Composite Wrap (20')	\$151,784	\$5,672	\$70,697	\$228,152
Sleeve (20')	\$364,282	\$13,612	\$169,672	\$547,566
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$161,903	\$6,050	\$75,410	\$243,362
Material Verification (20')	\$84,324	\$2,521	\$27,322	\$114,168
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$136,606	\$5,105	\$63,627	\$205,337
Sleeve (5')	\$364,282	\$13,612	\$169,672	\$547,566



Cost of Repairs				
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$197,319	\$7,373	\$91,906	\$296,598
Material Verification (5')	\$42,162	\$1,260	\$13,661	\$57,084
Composite Wrap (20')	\$227,676	\$8,508	\$106,045	\$342,228
Sleeve (20')	\$546,422	\$20,418	\$254,508	\$821,348
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$242,854	\$9,075	\$113,115	\$365,044
Material Verification (20')	\$84,324	\$2,521	\$27,322	\$114,168
Total Cost	\$4,000,351	\$146,645	\$1,809,459	\$5,956,454

Labor Rates					
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55
Source: Bureau Compensation (of Labor Statistics Occu September 2015).	pational Employment	Statistics (May 2014) a	nd Employer Cost of Emp	loyee
1. Mean hourly	wage plus mean benefit	s (\$25.01 per hour wor	ked).		



Present Value of Estimated Annual Cost of More Timely Repair of Non-Immediate Conditions (Millions)			
Estimate	7% Discount Rate	3% Discount Rate	
Cost of repairs	\$6.0	\$6.0	
Percent of anomalies that are repaired	50%	50%	
Cost of repairing anomalies on an accelerated schedule	\$3.0	\$3.0	
Cost of repairs delayed 4 years	\$2.3	\$2.7	
Difference for repaired anomalies (estimated cost of proposed rule)	\$0.7	\$0.3	
Time to monitor one anomaly (hours)	1	1	
Salary to monitor anomalies	\$55	\$55	
Average Ongoing anomalies in a given time period	637	637	
Cost for monitoring unrepaired anomalies	\$0.04	\$0.04	
Annual cost of rule	\$3.6	\$3.3	
G & A Cost	\$0.7	\$0.7	

Present Value Costs (Millions)					
7% Discount Rate 3% Discount Rate					
Total	Average Annual	Total Average Annual			
\$42	\$2.8	\$48	\$3.2		



Yea	ar Internal Corrosion	External Corrosion	Total Corrosion	Total All Causes
2003	11	11	22	93
2004	14	9	23	103
2005	7	12	19	160
2006	11	12	23	130
2007	18	17	35	110
2008	8	11	19	122
2009	10	9	19	105
2010	19	10	29	105
2011	14	4	18	114
2012	14	13	27	102
2013	13	5	18	103
2014	9	9	18	129
2015	13	8	21	129
Total	161	130	291	1,505

Onshore Gas Transmission Mileage									
Location	Total	<20% SMYS	20-30% SMYS	>30% SMYS	Percent >30% SMYS				
Interstate									
Class 1	160,029	6,750	7,977	145,301	91%				
Class 2	17,805	1,460	1,436	14,909	84%				
Class 3	13,927	1,302	1,307	11,318	81%				
Class 4	28.539	3.616	9.264	15.659	55%				
Total	191,789	9,516	10,729	171,544	89%				
Intrastate									
Class 1	72,719	6,250	8,293	58,176	80%				
Class 2	12,839	1,038	2,762	9,040	70%				
Class 3	19,730	1,953	5,671	12,107	61%				
Class 4	879.598	20.454	428.344	430.8	49%				
Total	106,169	9,261	17,154	79,754	75%				
Source: 2014 PH	MSA Gas Transn	nission Annual Report S	SMYS = specified min	imum yield strength					



Estimation of Coating Survey Costs ²											
Class	Coating Survey Cost ¹	Number of Surveys for Mileage PHMSA considered	Total Gas Transmission Lines	Total Incidental Mileage	Scaling Factor for total Cost	PHMSA Assumed Cost	Incremental Cost Associated with Incidental Miles				
1	\$200	100	232,748	1,628	1%	\$20,000	\$140				
G&A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$27.98				
Total	NA	100	232,748	1,628	1%	\$20,000	\$168				
Source: PHMS	A Best Professio	onal Judgment.					I				
 Based on average survey length of 500 feet. Actual costs will vary depending on environment, traffic control, and survey length. ICE took the incidental mileage divided by the total miles to determine the percentage of the cost to add for the incidental. 											
miles	2. ICF took the incidental mileage divided by the total miles to determine the percentage of the cost to add for the incidental miles										

Table 264

Gas Transmission Close Interval Survey

Class	Close Interval Survey Cost (\$/Mile) ¹	Mileage ²	Current Compliance ¹	Out of Specification Test Station Readings (Annual) ^{1,3}	Total Gas Transmission Lines	Total Incidental Mileage	Scaling Factor for total Cost	PHMSA Assumed Cost	Total Costs⁴		
1	\$2,000	232,635	15%	0.5%	232,748	1,628	1%	\$1,977,398	\$13,831		
G&A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$2,766.25		
Total	NA	232,635	NA	NA	232,748	1,628	1%	\$1,977,398	\$16,598		
1. Source: PH	1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment										
2. Source: PHMSA 2014 Annual Report via PDM											
3. Reflects lor	3. Reflects long-standing requirements for operators to have CP systems and check test stations annually, and PHMSA inspection experience.										
4. Calculated	as the product	of mileage, u	nit cost, out of sp	pec rate, and (1-c	ompliance rate).						



Cost to Add Test Station in HCA										
Miles	Stations Required per Mile	Baseline Compliance ¹	New Stations Required	Cost per Test Station ²	G&A cost	Total Cost				
1,628	1	80%	326	\$540.08	\$35,170	\$211,020				
HCA = high	HCA = high consequence area									
1. Source: PHMSA BPJ										
2. Unit cost	2. Unit cost represents approximately \$400 in labor (2 workers for half day) and \$100 in materials.									



Estimation of Costs for Interference Surveys											
Class	Interference Survey Cost1 (\$/mile)	Total Mileage ²	Current Compliance ¹	Incremental Need for Surveys ¹	Compliance Mileage ³	Total Gas Transmission Lines	Total Incidental Mileage	Scaling Factor for total Cost	PHMSA Assumed Cost (\$7/years)	Total Costs ⁴ (\$/7 years)	
1	\$4,000	232,726	10%	1%	2,095	222 748	1 629	1%	\$8,378,143	\$58,602	
G&A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$11,720	
Total	\$4,000	232,726	NA	NA	2,095	232,748	1.628	1%	8,378,143	\$70,323	
1. Source: PHMSA Best Professional Judgment											
2. Source: PHMSA 2014 Annual Report via PDM											
3. Calculated as total mileage \times (100% - current compliance) \times incremental need for surveys.											
4. Calcul	lated as compliand	xe mileage $ imes$	unit cost.								



Estimatio	Estimation of Costs for Internal Corrosion Monitoring										
Class	Monitoring Equipment Cost	Total Number of Monitors Needed	% Current Compliance	Number of Monitors for Compliance	Total Gas Transmission Lines	Total Incidental Mileage	Scaling Factor for Total Cost	PHMSA Assumed Cost (\$7/years) ¹	Costs		
1	\$10,000	250	95%	13	232,748		0.7%	\$125,000	\$874		
						1,628					
G&A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$175		
Total	NA	250	NA	12.5	232,748	1,628	0.7%	\$125,000	\$1,049		
Source: PH	Source: PHMSA Best Professional Judgment										
1. Calculate	1. Calculated as total number of monitors needed \times (100% - % current compliance).										


Summary of Incremental Costs, Corrosion Control				
Component	One-Time	Annual	Recurring (7 years)	
External Corrosion Coatings	\$0	\$168	\$0	
External Corrosion Monitoring	\$211,020	\$16,598	\$0	
Interference Current Surveys	\$0	\$0	\$70,323	
Internal Corrosion Monitoring	\$1,049	\$0	\$0	
Total	\$212,069	\$16,765	\$70,323	

Table 269

Present Value Incremental Costs ¹					
Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)		
\$502,621	\$33,508	\$557,007	\$37,134		
1. Calculated assuming one-time costs in year 1; annual costs in years 1-15; and 7-year recurring costs annualized over 7 years at the different discount rates. Total is present value over 15 years; average annual is total divided by 15.					



Summary of Present Value for 15 year period Benefits and Costs ^{1,2,3} (Millions; 2015\$)						
Tonio	7%	% Discount Ra	nte	3% Discount Rate		te
Area	Benefits - Low	Benefits - High	Costs	Benefits - Low	Benefits - High	Costs
1	\$0	\$0	\$227	\$0	\$0	\$286
2	\$0	\$0	\$42	\$0	\$0	\$48
3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	\$0	\$0	\$0.50	\$0	\$0	\$0.56
5	\$0	\$0	\$0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0.0
6	\$0	\$0	\$0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0.0
7	\$0	\$0	\$0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0.0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$270	\$0	\$0	\$334
n.e. = not estimates	stimated				1	
1. Total pre to exceed	esent value over 1	5-year study p	period divided by	y 15. Additional	l costs to states	estimated not
\$1.5 million	n per year. Range	of benefits ref	flects range in es	stimated defect	failure rates.	
2. Break ev areas, would	en value of bene d equate to appro	fits, based on t eximately one i	he average cons incident averted	equences for in over the 15-yea	cidents in high our study period.	consequence
3. Did not c Topic Area evaluate	calculate any ben 3,5,6,and 7 as fe	efits associated It they were eit	l with Incidental ther captured, sn	Miles. Also did nall, or if there	d not capture co was not enough	sts from time to

3.4 Missing Cost for Repairing Known Existing Conditions in Transmission

3.4.1 Cost Basis

According to the proposed rule (192.713), operators must repair pipeline conditions under a specified timeframe after the discovery of conditions. Under normal business as usual practices, companies have been making repairs to some conditions, while monitoring other conditions. ICF interpretation is that a portion of this backlog of conditions that have not been repaired, but are being monitored, will have to be repaired immediately under the new rule.

ICF considers the percent of conditions that are repaired (as determined in the field repair of damages for HCAs, MCAs, Incidental Mileage, and other pipe sections) based on feedback from industry, and uses the percent of conditions not repaired to determine the backlog of conditions across the various segments of pipe. ICF then considers an average cost per repair based on PHMSA's distribution of conditions and the costs per repair. This average cost per repair is attributed to each condition from the backlog. This cost for repairing the backlog of conditions is not accounted for in PHMSA's proposed RIA.



3.4.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF considers a backlog of conditions that would have to be repaired. This backlog is after PHMSA's assumption that 81% of conditions would have to conduct repairs across HCAs, MCAs, Incidental Mileage, and other pipe sections.
- ICF considers an average cost of \$34 thousand dollars per repair

3.4.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost over 15 years of \$923 million at a 7% discount rate (\$923 million, 3% discount rate¹¹) from non-HCA and non-MCA field repair of damages.

Та	ble	271

Estimated 5 Year Backlog of Conditions				
Section of Pipe	Conditions	Percent repairs	Annual Conditions not Repaired	
НСА	1,771	50%	878	
MCA	2,442	50%	1,210	
Non-MCA/Non-HCA	6,588	50%	3,265	
Incidental Miles	171	50%	85	
		Annual backlog	5,438	
		Estimated 5 year backlog	27,189	

Table 272

Range of Typical Repair Costs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest ¹	South, West Coast	East ²	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800	
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000	
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600	

¹¹ The 7% and 3% discount value are the same because repairs would need to be done immediately under the existing rule.



Range of Typical Repair	ir Costs		
Material Verification	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
(20 ²) 24 inch Diamatan			
24-Inch Diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
36-inch diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Source: PHMSA best profe	ssional judgment		
1. 80% of South/West Coa	st.		
2. 115% of South, West Co	past.		

Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	
24-inch Diameter				



Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	
36-inch diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	

Number of Conditions in each Location				
	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
Percent of anomalies in Location	75%	15%	10%	

Table 275

Weighted Average Cost for 1 Anomaly per Region				
West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Average Cost Per Anomaly	
\$23,720	\$5,818	\$4,415	\$33,953	

Weighted Average Cost for 1 Anomaly per Region				
Number of Conditions	Average Cost Per Condition	Cost to Repair All Conditions		
27,189	\$33,953	\$923,141,201		

Table 277

Present Value Costs						
Total (NPV with discount rate 7%) ¹	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 7% divided by 15)	Total (NPV with discount rate 3%) ¹	Average Annual (NPV with discount rate 3% divided by 15)			
\$923,141,201	\$61,542,747	\$923,141,201	\$61,542,747			
1. Since repairs of backlog	1. Since repairs of backlog would take place in year 1, assumed all costs were in year 1					

3.5 Revised Cost of Upgrading to ILI for Transmission Pipeline

3.5.1 Cost Basis

In the RIA, PHMSA calculates a cost for estimating the Class 1 and Class 2 non-HCA pipelines to upgrade to In-line Inspection in Table 3-6 and a cost for Class 3 and Class 4 HCA pipeline miles in Table 3-7. PHMSA states that stakeholders provided inputs on the average cost for upgrading to in-line inspection (ILI) testing as follows:

Stakeholder	Cost Estimate to for Average Pipeline to Upgrade to in-line inspection per Mile (Thousand \$ per mile)
Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)	\$153
Southern California Gas Company and San Diego Gas \$ Electric Company (SoCal)	\$4,400-\$4,700
Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA)	\$50-\$1,000

PHMSA then provides the methodology to determine the cost to upgrade to ILI in Tables 3-6 and 3-7 where the costs range from \$14.6 to \$168.7 thousand dollars depending on the diameter. When factoring in an average reported transmission diameter, the cost ranges from \$31.9 to \$86.2 thousand dollars which varies pending on each class location. This range of costs is not consistent with any approximation provided by stakeholders for the average cost to upgrade to ILI. ICF follows PHMSA's proposed methodology with one addition; an operator must replace a percentage of pipeline per mile.



ICF considers a cost to replace the pipe per inch mile, multiplied by the applicable diameter of the pipe listed in the Tables 3-6 and 3-7 of the RIA.

3.5.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF assumes that 5% of pipe would have to be replaced in a mile segment.
- ICF considers a cost of \$120,000 per inch mile for replacement of pipe.

3.5.3 Cost Results

ICF's modification results in costs ranging from \$68.6 to \$348.7 thousand dollars. By using a weighted average pipeline diameter, the costs range between \$145.3-\$179.2 thousand dollars per mile for the various class locations. This range is more consistent with some costs provided in the RIA by PG&E and INGAA. However, these costs do not represent locations requiring replacement of significant portions of their pipeline to upgrade to ILI.

3.6 Revised Cost of Vendors for Transmission Pipeline

3.6.1 Cost Basis

Throughout the RIA, PHMSA assumes vendor costs for items like repairs and corrosion testing. These vendor costs must have an associated cost to the company for scheduling, implementing, and verifying the work. To account for these additional general and administration costs, ICF considers an additional factor to increase proposed vendor cost appropriately. ICF includes this revision throughout all applicable cost parameters estimated in this report.

3.6.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers 20% of the total cost as general and administration costs in Topic Area 1, Area 2, and Area 4.

3.6.3 Cost Results

ICF's modifications result in the costs for each topic area to increase by 20%.

3.7 Revised Cost for Field Repair of Damages for Transmission Pipeline

3.7.1 Cost Basis

According to the proposed rule (192.933), PHMSA states HCA mileage must accelerate the timeframe for repair conditions under the integrity management program. Because an operator must now repair a condition on a timeframe, an additional cost now exists to comply with this requirement. For the consideration of this cost, PHMSA assumes an operator's current practice as repairing a condition in five years on average rather than immediately as under the proposed rule. Through discussion with companies, ICF identifies that operators monitor conditions over the lifetime of the condition, but do not repair all conditions. ICF considers the cost of the proposed regulation in two parts. First, for all conditions companies would repair under normal business practices, ICF considers the cost for the proposed rule as the difference between the net present value from completing repairs five years from discovery and completing repairs immediately. Secondly, for conditions not repaired under normal business practices, ICF considers the cost of the proposed regulation as the cost to repair those conditions minus the cost to monitor those conditions.



3.7.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

- ICF assumes 50% of conditions identified in PHMSA's RIA Table 3-62 as monitored only and not repaired over the lifetime of the condition.
- ICF considers the cost for monitoring as 1 hour of labor per condition at \$55 dollars per hour.
- ICF follows PHMSA's proposed cost methodology for repair conditions and assumes immediate repair rather than a five year average.

3.7.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost of Topic Area 2 for HCA miles over 15 years of \$428 million at a 7% discount rate (\$484 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from pipeline assessment due to extreme weather events.

3.8 Revised Cost for Pipeline Inspection Following Extreme Events for Transmission Pipeline

3.8.1 Cost Basis

According to requirements under 192.613, an operator must conduct continuing surveillance, and following an extreme weather event, must conduct an inspection of all onshore pipeline within 72 hours of cessation of the event. Under Topic Area 5 of PHMSA's RIA, a cost for developing processes to deal with an extreme event is included. PHMSA's RIA does not consider the cost associated with inspections on the associated miles of pipe that would be effected by an extreme event. PHMSA's proposed RIA does not account for this cost.

3.8.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers 200 to 400 miles per year could be affected by an extreme weather event with a cost between \$350 to \$500 dollars per mile.

3.8.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost of Topic Area 5 over 15 years of \$63.2 million at a 7% discount rate (\$79.5 million, 3% discount rate) not included in the RIA from pipeline assessment due to extreme weather events.

3.9 Revised Cost of In-line Inspection

3.9.1 Cost Basis

In the RIA, PHMSA calculates a cost for conducting an In-line Inspection test. Table 3-9 calculates this cost for transmission pipelines, taking into account mobilization, base MFL tools, additional tools, reruns, analytical and data integration services, and operator preparation. ICF applies this same calculation for In-line Inspection cost to gathering miles. Based on discussions with industry partners, PHMSA's estimations underrepresent the true cost of additional tools such as spiral MFLs or crack tools. As such, ICF adjusts the cost of these two tools upward.

PHMSA is currently assuming that ILI technology can be used to determine the MAOP for the majority of transmission pipe now subject to the rule. Concerns have been raised on whether the ILI technology is advanced to the point where it can be used to determine the MAOP. If it is not possible to use ILI to determine the MAOP, then pressure testing would be used and the cost to determine the MAOP would



be approximately 15-25 times larger. ICF has applied PHMSA's assumption for the breakdown of ILI and pressure testing, but this assumption is dependent on the technology existing and being acceptable for companies to utilize.

3.9.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers a different value for the cost of additional tools necessary when completing an ILI test as outlined in the table below.

		Interstate (60-mile) Segment			Intrastate (30-mile) Segment		
Component	Component	26'' - 48''	14" - 24"	4" - 12"	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4" - 12"
PHMSA RIA	Additional combo tool (deformation & crack tools)	\$45,000	\$36,000	\$27,000	\$22,500	\$18,000	\$13,500
ICF Adjustment	Additional tools (Spiral MFL, Crack Tools, etc.)	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000

Table 278

3.9.3 Cost Results

The cost adjustment applied to ILI testing changes the range of ILI testing from \$121,550-\$297,000 to \$515,820- \$738,000 for a segment. After taking into account transmission pipe diameters and adjusting for a per mile basis, the cost per mile changes from \$4,324-\$4,594 to \$11,350-\$18,216.¹² ICF estimates a net present value cost of Topic Area 1 over 15 years of \$546 million at a 7% discount rate (\$684 million, 3% discount rate). This includes a combination of changes made throughout Topic Area 1 including adjustments to upgrading to ILI, ILI, and Pressure Testing. ICF also applies these values to the gathering segment.

3.10 Revised Cost of Pressure Testing

3.10.1 Cost Basis

In the RIA, PHMSA calculates a cost for conducting a pressure test in Table 3-11. PHMSA then adjusts this calculation for transmission pipelines in Table 3-16 and Table 3-17. The three tables account for "mobilization; safety training; equipment setup; fill and stabilize pipeline; 8-hour hydrostatic test; dewater pipeline with carbon media filtration; clean and dry pipeline; disassemble equipment; clean up and de-mobilize" with the adjustment in 3-16 and 3-17 accounting for "operator costs for engineering test plan, procurement of pipe materials, right of way and agent costs, manifold installation costs, engineering and operational oversight, right of way clean up, and return the line to service."

ICF adjusts the approach by using industry feedback for the cost of a pressure test. ICF then utilizes the ratio of costs from 12 inch to 24 inch and 36 inch to 24 inch pipe from the Greene study (from PHMSA's

¹² Cost range includes both interstate and intrastate costs





RIA) to estimate the cost from 12 inch and 36 inch pipe. ICF then applies a 20% G&A cost rather than the 75% multiplier that PHMSA considers.

3.10.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF considers a different cost for pressure testing as outlined below with the revised Pressure testing cost.

Table 279

Table 3-11. Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test (\$2015)					
PHMSA RIA Estimate					
Pipe Diameter	Pipe Diameter Segment Length (miles)				
(inches)	1	2	5	10	
12	\$156,550	\$159,706	\$191,114	\$286,355	
24	\$197,528	\$205,927	\$344,057	\$378,893	
36	\$304,680	\$362,229	\$486,555	\$670,248	
Source: Greene's Energy Group, LLC (2013), updated to 2015 dollars using the Bureau of Labor Statistics US All City Average Consumer Price Index (2013=233.5; 2015=237.8). Includes mobilization; safety training; equipment setup; fill and stabilize pipeline; 8-hour hydrostatic test; dewater pipeline with carbon media filtration; clean and dry pipeline; disassemble equipment; clean up and de-mobilize					



Table 3-11. Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test(\$2015)							
	Revised	l Estimate					
Pipe Diameter	Pipe Diameter Segment Length (miles)						
(inches)	1	1 2 5 10					
12	\$297,205	\$325,730	\$399,940	\$877,272			
24	\$375,000	\$420,000	\$720,000	\$1,160,769			
36	\$578,424	\$738,787	\$1,018,202	\$2,053,359			
Source: T.D. Williamson, Inc., Houston, TX - was used to determine 24 inch pressure test costs							
Source: Greene's I Energy Group repo diameter figures an	Energy Group, LL ort were used to tand to determine 12 in	C (2013), - ake T.D. Wi nch and 36 i	Ratios from C lliamson's 24 i nch pipe	breen's Inch			

• ICF then applies a 20% G&A cost rather than the 75% multiplier that PHMSA's RIA uses for the values presented in Tables 3-16 and 3-17.

3.10.3 Cost Results

The cost adjustment applied to Pressure Testing changes the weighted by diameter pressure test cost from \$203,556-\$226,939 to \$270,444-\$305,543 per mile. ICF estimates a net present value cost of Topic Area 1 over 15 years of \$546 million at a 7% discount rate (\$684 million, 3% discount rate). This includes a combination of changes made throughout Topic Area 1 including adjustments to upgrading to ILI, ILI, and Pressure Testing. ICF also applies these values to the gathering segment.

3.11 Revised Cost for Management of Change for Transmission Pipeline

3.11.1 Cost Basis

In the RIA, PHMSA calculates a cost for implementing a management of change program as well as a per event cost of implementing the management of change process. ICF adjusts the approach by using industry feedback to estimate the necessary time to implement a management of change program. ICF utilizes PHMSA's 70 companies that would need to implement a management of change program as well as 4 events per company. ICF determines the total time required, cost of personnel, and a net present value cost over 15 years to begin the program.

Industry feedback indicates that every company would be required to make adjustments to their management of change program and therefore incur a substantial cost associated with the time spent to adhere to the new requirements. Additionally, the number of events is estimated to be in the tens of thousands which is substantially higher than the 280 that PHMSA has accounted for. ICF did not have time to evaluate these two issues, but anticipates the Management of Change provision may have even more cost associated (than shown below) with it based on these two additional factors.

3.11.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF assumes the time to implement a management of change program would vary between 187 and 813 hours.



• ICF assumes the 70 operators that PHMSA considered having to establish a management of change program.

3.11.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value cost of Topic Area 3 over 15 years of \$12.3 million at a 7% discount rate (\$14.8 million, 3% discount rate).

3.12 Revised Benefits of Proposed Material Documentation Requirements for Transmission Pipeline

3.12.1 Basis

In Table 4-6 of the RIA, PHMSA proposes a cost benefit analysis for newly added regulation. In this analysis, benefits include considerations for newly proposed methods in the regulation to determine MAOP. One method for determining MAOP requires the excavation and testing of a pipeline for yield strength (192.107) as part of design pressure requirements. This requires operators to excavate to perform testing of the pipe. However, as PHMSA previously required operators to determine MAOP, any proposed method to avoid costs incurred by further regulation requirements does not truly constitute a benefit.

PHMSA assumes all pipeline miles must determine material records through excavation, with consideration of a cost of \$75,000 per coupon and a coupon taken every 400 feet. PHMSA assumes that all pipeline miles must excavate for testing, requiring a cost of \$75,000 per coupon and a coupon taken every 400 feet. This new regulation now requires a total cost to the operator to excavate as \$288 million dollars to comply. PHMSA then considers the difference between this value and the cost estimated for determining the MAOP evaluated under Topic Area 1 as a benefit (\$273.7 million over 15 years). As this is a new requirement, ICF does not believe it appropriate to claim any benefit associated with this portion of the regulation.

3.12.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF removed this calculation for benefits entirely.

3.12.3 Results

ICF's modification results in benefits decreasing by \$273.7 million over the 15 year period.

3.13 Power Law Recalculation of HCA Cost

3.13.1 Cost Basis

In the RIA on page 176, PHMSA calculated the average economic consequences (a.k.a. damages) for certain types of incidents related to HCAs in a table entitled "Table E-3. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectable by Modern Integrity Assessment Methods Located in HCAs (2003-2015; 2015\$)." This table takes a simple average of the consequences for 23 incidents that occurred over 13 years to compute an average of \$23.4 million per incident. An analysis of the underlying data indicates that a single incident contributed 98.9% of the total consequences from the 23 incidents. Because the sample size is so small and so heavily skewed, it raises the question of how random factor commonly referred to as the "luck of the draw" might have influenced the calculated average and what a more sophisticated analysis of the data might reveal is a better estimate of the

mean value for this variable. Such an analysis was conducted by ICF assuming that consequences follow a power law distribution.

3.13.1.1 Use of the Power Law Distribution for Consequences

The power law distribution is commonly used to analyze the distribution of consequences from natural disasters and accidents wherein a few occurrences account for the majority of the economic losses. An example of such analysis was published by Jana, a consulting company that provides performance validation and risk modeling services to the North American pipeline industry.¹³ The authors say "In this paper, the form of the distribution of consequences arising from pipeline incidents is examined and it is seen, in a variety of industries (gas distribution, pipelines, gas transmission pipelines, hazardous liquid pipelines and gas gathering pipelines), to follow a power law or Pareto type distribution."¹⁴

Table 281 shows the 23 HCA incidents that appear in RIA Table E-3 as recently extracted by ICF from the PHMSA incident database and converted to 2015 dollars. Although the average consequence is \$23.4 million, the distribution shows that 16 of the 23 incidences or 70% had consequences of approximately \$100,000 or less. The importance of the one outlier event is evident in that by excluding the highest cost event, the average of the remaining 22 incidents would be just \$0.3 million. This suggests that had that one random event not occurred, then the computed average would have been much different. The Jana authors warn of such a possibility by saying:

"... a history of only low consequence events is not an indication that only low consequence events will continue to occur. In fact, Power Law behavior implies that, with a significant number of low consequences events, there will be some associated number of higher consequence events that will eventually occur. This has been repeatedly observed in the pipeline industry where the same type of failure mode (e.g., corrosion, third party damage, etc.) that has previously resulted in only moderate incidents, results in an incident that causes significant damage, injuries or fatalities. Mapping the Power Law behavior of small incident in terms of frequency and severity can actually be used to develop this specific relationship and allow prediction of the likelihood of the low probability-high consequence events."¹⁵

Hence the authors suggest fitting the historical consequence data to power law distributions to help avoid incorrect conclusion that might be drawn if the particular sample of consequence which is available just happens to not contain a representative number of low probability-high consequence events.

Table 281

¹³ "Managing Low Probability – High Consequence Pipeline Risks," W. Bryce, P. Eng., K. Oliphant, Ph.D. P. Eng, Jana, Aurora Ontario. http://www.betterpiping.com/pdf/Managing-Low-Probability-High-Consequence-Pipeline-Risk.pdf

¹⁴ Ibid., page 1

¹⁵ Ibid., page 6.



The 23 HCA Incidents Contained in RIA						
PHMSA Incident Database						
(consequ	(consequences in 2015 million\$)					
Rank	Consequences (\$million)	Cumulative %				
1	\$0.0000	4%				
2	\$0.0001	9%				
3	\$0.0012	13%				
4	\$0.0019	17%				
5	\$0.0038	22%				
6	\$0.0038	26%				
7	\$0.0093	30%				
8	\$0.0176	35%				
9	\$0.0258	39%				
10	\$0.0259	43%				
11	\$0.0432	48%				
12	\$0.0593	52%				
13	\$0.0642	57%				
14	\$0.0732	61%				
15	\$0.0834	65%				
16	\$0.1032	70%				
17	\$0.1314	74%				
18	\$0.2713	78%				
19	\$0.2946	83%				
20	\$0.4351	87%				
21	\$0.9187	91%				
22	\$3.1119	96%				
23	\$532.9626	100%				
Sum	\$538.6413					
Average of All 1 to 23	\$23.4					
Average 1 to 22 Only	\$0.3					

The distribution of consequences for these 23 HCA incidents is shown graphically in Figure 2 as a green line. Also shown in Figure 2 is a hypothetical power law distribution that was selected to approximate the shape of the distribution of the 23 actual incidents. This hypothetical distribution has a high end that is about eight times larger than any of the 23 incidents (that is, the hypothetical high end is \$4.0 billion versus \$533 million for the largest consequences among the 23 actual cases). Even so, the average of the hypothetical distribution is only \$6.7 million versus the \$23.4 million because the



hypothetical distribution "fills in" the large number of small- and moderate-cost incidents that would be expected to accompany the few high-cost incidents.



Figure 2: The Distribution of Consequences for the 23 HCA Incidents and a Hypothetical Power Law Distribution with a Similar Pattern



The hypothetical power law distribution of the consequences in HCA areas is shown in tabular form in Table 282 where the number of incidents in each cost category are represented by the rows in the table. The number of incidents of each cost category sum to the arbitrary number of 1,000 so that the number of incidents at the high-cost end would be around 1 and the table easier to interpret. At 1.8 incidents per year (the value implied by RIA Table E-3 for 23 event over 13 years), the 1,000 incidents depicted in Table 282 would require more than 500 years to occur. The sum of the cost for the 1,000 incidents would be \$6.7 billion or an average of \$6.7 million per incident.



Hypothetical Power Law Distribution of HCA Consequences in Tabular Form					
Consequences per Incident (\$million)	Number of Incidents Out of 1,000	Total Damages for This Number of Incidents (\$million)	Cumulative Probability		
\$0.02	137.9	\$3	13.8%		
\$0.03	119.2	\$3	25.7%		
\$0.04	102.8	\$4	36.0%		
\$0.05	88.6	\$4	44.8%		
\$0.07	76.3	\$5	52.5%		
\$0.09	65.8	\$6	59.1%		
\$0.11	56.7	\$7	64.7%		
\$0.15	48.9	\$7	69.6%		
\$0.20	42.1	\$8	73.8%		
\$0.26	36.3	\$10	77.5%		
\$0.34	31.3	\$11	80.6%		
\$0.45	27.0	\$12	83.3%		
\$0.60	23.2	\$14	85.6%		
\$0.79	20.0	\$16	87.6%		
\$1.04	17.3	\$18	89.3%		
\$1.37	14.9	\$20	90.8%		
\$1.80	12.8	\$23	92.1%		
\$2.37	11.1	\$26	93.2%		
\$3.12	9.5	\$30	94.2%		
\$4.11	8.2	\$34	95.0%		
\$5.41	7.1	\$38	95.7%		
\$7.12	6.1	\$43	96.3%		
\$9.38	5.3	\$49	96.8%		
\$12.35	4.5	\$56	97.3%		
\$16.26	3.9	\$64	97.7%		
\$21.42	3.4	\$72	98.0%		
\$28.21	2.9	\$82	98.3%		
\$37.14	2.5	\$93	98.6%		
\$48.91	2.2	\$105	98.8%		
\$64.41	1.9	\$120	99.0%		

Hypothetical Power Law Distribution of HCA Consequences in Tabular Form					
Consequences per Incident (\$million)	Number of Incidents Out of 1,000	Total Damages for This Number of Incidents (\$million)	Cumulative Probability		
\$84.82	1.6	\$136	99.1%		
\$111.69	1.4	\$154	99.3%		
\$147.09	1.2	\$175	99.4%		
\$193.69	1.0	\$199	99.5%		
\$255.07	0.9	\$225	99.6%		
\$335.89	0.8	\$256	99.6%		
\$442.32	0.7	\$290	99.7%		
\$582.47	0.6	\$330	99.8%		
\$767.04	0.5	\$374	99.8%		
\$1,010.08	0.4	\$424	99.9%		
\$1,330.14	0.4	\$482	99.9%		
\$1,751.61	0.3	\$547	99.9%		
\$2,306.63	0.3	\$621	100.0%		
\$3,037.52	0.2	\$704	100.0%		
\$4,000.00	0.2	\$799	100.0%		
\$6.7	1,000	\$6,699			

An import characteristic of a power law distribution is that it appears as a straight line when both the number of occurrences (Y-axis) and the consequences (X-axis) are depicted in a log scale. This is shown in Figure 3 for the hypothetical power law distribution of the consequences in HCA areas.





Figure 3: Hypothetical Power Law Distribution of HCA Consequences in Log-Log Graphical Form

3.13.1.2 Sensitivity to Assumptions for Upper-End Consequence

As was discussed above, the hypothetical power law distribution of HCA consequences was created with the assumption that the highest-cost event would have consequences of \$4 billion or about 8 times the actual highest-cost event from 2003 to 2015. This \$4 billion value is equivalent to 200 fatalities (at \$9.4 million per fatality) plus \$2,120 million in property and other damages. This assumption for the highest-cost event yields the average of \$6.7 million per incident used in the recalculation of the cost-benefits.

If we were to have assumed that the highest cost event were only \$2 billion (100 fatalities plus \$1,060 million in property and other damages), then the average consequence would have been \$4.9 million per incident. On the other hand, an assumption that the highest-cost event that could be expected was \$8 billion (this about 16 times the historical maximum and equivalent to 400 fatalities plus \$4,240 million in property and other damages) would yield an average damage of \$9.2 million per incident, a number still well below the \$23.4 million produced by using a simple average of the 23 incidents.¹⁶

¹⁶ To create a hypothetical power law distribution with an average consequence of \$23.4 million would require assuming that the most catastrophic gas pipeline incident in an HCA would be over \$62 billion for that single highest-cost event.



3.13.2 Major Assumptions and Caveats

• ICF utilized the power law analysis to estimate of the average consequences to be expected from incidents in HCA areas from causes detectable by modern integrity assessment methods. ICF considers the average per incident to be equal to \$6.7 million rather than the \$23.4 million calculated by a simple average of the 23 incidents.

3.13.3 Cost Results

ICF estimates a net present value benefit over 15 years of \$97-275 million at a 7% discount rate (\$122-347 million, 3% discount rate) based on the power law average in Table 4-7. PHMSA's estimate for the net present value benefit over 15 years calculated in Table 4-7 was \$245-667 million at a 7% discount rate (\$310-842 million, 3% discount rate).



4 Significant Costs Lacking Data for Analysis

Through discussions with API Partners, ICF recognizes remaining costs for operators to comply with this regulation which could influence this analysis further. ICF does not include the parameters given here in the analysis outlined in this report, however further revisions could allow for a more complete and verifiable response to the proposed regulation. ICF discusses these further parameters below.

For compliance with excavation requirements, operators may inadvertently increase the risk of causing damage through testing of the pipe. This increased risk of damage creates further costs to repair. Operators would need to consider additional costs created by the action of complying with requirements. Through inspection and repair requirements, operators may need to shut in systems in order to comply. This creates a loss of revenue by decreasing production volumes. Due to this, operators of small systems may experience very high costs, forcing them to shut down or sell operations rather than pay the expenditure required to comply.

For operators of composite pipe (approximately 20,000 miles), if a line becomes relocated, replaced, or otherwise changed, the pipeline must comply with specified requirements under the rule. Because PHMSA does not specify design requirements for composite pipeline, operators would require the replacement to steel pipeline. This causes two impacts for operators. Existing plastic pipe will have to retire as changes occur over the next several years and operators must install steel pipe rather than composite in the future, with the cost difference being an additional burden. Considering replacement of 20,000 miles of existing composite pipe, operators may replace 50% up to a cost of \$120,000 per inch-mile.

PHMSA's incident reporting has a section entitled storage gathering, separate from Type A and B miles. If the revised definition of a regulated gathering line captures these miles under the new rule, this additional mileage of pipeline must comply with all specified requirements. The proposed rule also requires fracture mechanics modeling for failure stress analysis where a pipeline segment contains or may be susceptible to cracks. This cost includes performing an analysis using computer modeling and incorporating some year to year changes. This issue would include all pipeline, with HCA pipeline mileage requiring the testing every calendar year. Further, for operators of transmission lines, industry partners state substantial additional costs to identify MCAs even with an existing GIS system in place.

PHMSA's Topic Area 4 entitled corrosion control has a variety of assumptions for the percent already complying, the number of surveys that would be necessary, and the unit cost for a survey or monitor. ICF did not evaluate these assumptions for transmission but industry representatives state that PHMSA's corrosion costs are underestimated due to these factors.



Appendix A: Inconsistencies in Regulatory Impact Analysis

Throughout replicating the calculations, ICF determined a variety of issues with PHMSA's calculations. These issues include arithmetic, cross-reference and conceptual mistakes. ICF also identified some inconsistencies in the text that vary from what is displayed in the tables. Lastly, ICF could not replicate the values presented in the RIA for a variety of tables which could be because of incomplete documentation of PHMSA's methodology or arithmetic errors. The various errors ICF identified are displayed below:

Calculation Issues with PHMSA's RIA

- Table 2-1 and Table 2-2 state they are using 2015 values, but the values reflect the 2014 values. Additionally, the 2015 values only came out midway through the comment period.
- 2) Table 3-2:
 - a. Class 1 HCA > 30 SMYS does not match with the value presented in Appendix A-1. The value should be 56 instead of 59.
 - b. The percentage presented as the total percentage is misleading as it is not the percentage being used. This percentage should be the weighted average of Class 1-4.
- 3) Table 3-6 and Table 3-7 are not using the blowdown conditions stated in the table footnotes, but rather the ones displayed in Equation 1.
- 4) Table 3-12 and Table 3-13 are not using the inside pipe diameter to estimate gas loss from a pipe and are instead using the outside diameter.
- 5) Table 3-18 did not include the gas lost in interstate pipelines as they did in intrastate pipelines.
- 6) Table 3-39 subtotal is not of Class 1 and 2 as displayed but rather of all miles in Table 3-33.
- 7) Table References:
 - a. Table 3-33 states to "See Table 3-24" when it is referencing Table 3-32.
 - Table 3-35 states "based on Table 3-25 and 3-26" when actually referring to 3-33 and 3-34
 - c. Table 3-39 states "(Table 3-24)" when it is referring to either 3-32 or 3-33
 - d. Table 3-40 states "See Tables 3-30, 3-31, and 3-32" but using Tables 3-37, 3-38, and 3-39
 - e. Table 3-43 states "from Table 3-30" but using 3-37
 - f. Table 3-105 says "See Table 3-83" and "See Table 3-75" but actually using 3-99 and 3-104
- 8) Table 3-54 is incorrectly using Table 3-49's value for gas lost due to Pressure Testing instead of Table 3-53's value for gas lost due to upgrading to ILI.
- 9) Table 3-73 is assuming a labor cost of \$50 dollars per hour which is lower than the lowest cost presented in Table 3-66 on labor rates.
- 10) Table 3-78: Review existing surveillance and patrol procedures to validate adequacy for extreme events has 1 hour as the high and 2 hours as low. This appears to be a mistake.
- 11) Table 3-85: PHMSA did not apply the Consumer Price Index factors stated in the footnotes correctly to update 2006 dollars to 2015.
- 12) Table 3-90 states calculated as 0.5% in the footnotes, but is using 5% instead.
- 13) Table 3-92 does not include damage prevention costs outlined in Table 3-86.
- 14) Table 3-103's cost per operator is inconsistent with what is displayed in Table 3-66.
- 15) Table 3-104 is not capturing the total costs in Table 3-102.



- 16) Table 4-12: The average cost per incident listed in Table E-5 is not the same as what is listed in Table 4-12.
- 17) Table 6-1 pulled both onshore and offshore incidents and applied this to onshore miles.
- 18) Table 6-5 has pulled the incorrect value for 2014 Type B miles.
- 19) Table 6-6 has pulled the total cost and applied it as the other incident cost.
- 20) It is unclear why Table 7-2 varies from the value calculated in Table 3-106.
- 21) Appendix A-1: The sum of Class 1-4 does not add up to the total for HCA >30% SMYS interstate, intrastate and total.
- 22) Table B-3:
 - a. PHMSA pulled the total gas emissions for methane emissions
 - b. PHMSA calculated the SCM (3%) and utilized the 2015 value for the year 2016. Therefore, the social cost of methane was off by one year for all years.
 - c. PHMSA is using the 2007 social cost of carbon instead of the 2015 social cost of carbon.

Identified Text Inconsistencies

Throughout replicating the calculations, ICF identified a variety of issues with PHMSA's calculations including

- 1) Page 45: In the Total Cost to Re-establish MAOP work, PHMSA uses the average cost of one, two, five and eight miles but the tables display one, two, five and ten miles.
- 2) Page 62: "Error! Reference source not found."

Tables Unable to Replicate

- 1) ICF was unable to replicate Tables 3-20, 3-28 and 3-42. ICF replicated the mileage, the percentages of each test applied, and the costs per mile, but were unable to replicate the total costs per class. This is particularly relevant for upgrading to ILI.
- 2) ICF was unable to replicate Table 3-48. It is unclear why the gas released would be different than Tables 3-12 and 3-13 as they are using the same equation without specifying different conditions.
- 3) ICF was unable to replicate the intrastate pressure test miles stated in Tables 3-50.
- 4) ICF was unclear why Table 3-41 not match Table 3-40 mileage for Class 3 and 4 miles. It is our understanding that Table 3-41 is just allocating what test would occur for the mileage stated in Table 3-40.
- 5) ICF could not replicate the cost for repairs stated in Table 3-64.

Questionable Calculation Assumptions Made by PHMSA that ICF Did Not Address

- Table 3-60 excludes the mileage from Topic Area 1. The mileage accounted for in Topic Area 1 would also have to accelerate their repairs. It is not clear why PHMSA justified the removal of this mileage from Topic Area 2 as the only cost being evaluated is the cost of repair, and not an assessment cost.
- 2) Table 3-4 uses historical data for the miles of pipe that utilized various integrity assessment methods. It is not clear why PHMSA only considers ILI that utilize corrosion or metal loss tools and not dent or deformation tools, crack or long seam defect detection tools or other tools. It is also not clear why PHMSA only consider ECDA for Direct Assessment methods and not ICDA or SCCDA.



- 3) Equation 1's compressibility factor of 0.88 appears to be low compared to what would be expected on transmission and gathering lines under the average conditions in each of these respective industry segments.
- 4) The social cost of methane used in Table B-2 and throughout calculations inherently has a 3% discount rate associated with it. This social cost was used for both the 7% and the 3% discount rate.



Appendix B: All Recalculated Tables from the RIA for Gathering

Table B- 1

Table 2-2 Pipeline Infrastructure -Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering(2015)						
Type A Miles ¹	Type B Miles ²	Total Miles	Number of Operators			
7,844	3,580	11,423	367			
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart						
1. Metal gathering line operating at greater than 20% specified minimum yield strength or non- metallic line for which maximum allowable operating pressure is greater than 125 pounds per square inch in a Class 2, Class 3, or Class 4 location						
2. Metallic specified n metallic pi operating p square incl Class 2 loc	e gathering 1 ninimum yie pe for which pressure is le n in a Class 2 cations	ine operatin eld strength n maximum ess than 125 3, Class 4, o	g under 20% or non- allowable pounds per r certain			

Table 3-85. Unit Cost of 2006 Expanded Safety Provisions (\$ per mile)					
Component	Initial Capital Cost Component	Operating (Recurring) Costs (2006\$) ¹	Initial Capital Cost (2015\$) ²	Operating (Recurring) Costs (2015) ²	
Population survey	\$588	\$118	\$691	\$139	
Corrosion control	\$17,183	\$449	\$20,200	\$528	
Line markers	NA	\$153	NA	\$180	
Damage prevention	NA	\$259	NA	\$304	
Public education	NA	\$198	NA	\$233	
1. Source: IPAA, as cited in PHMSA, 2006, Final Regulatory Evaluation, Regulated Natural Gas Gathering Lines.					
2. Updated from 2006 do 2015 CPI: 237.0)	llars using the BLS A	All-City Consumer Pr	rice Index, averaged through N	lovember (2006 CPI: 201.6;	



Table 3-86. Summary of Estimated Unit Costs, Unregulated Onshore Gas Gathering Pipelines						
	Operators of Currently Unregulated Lines (Group 1)	Operators of Currently Regulated Lines (Group 2)	Operators of Lines with Cathodic Protection Subject to Damage Prevention Laws			
One-Time Capital						
Corrosion Control	\$17,183	\$12,887	\$0.0			
Recurring (7 years)						
Population Surveys	\$118	\$29	NA			
Recurring – Annual						
Corrosion control	\$449	\$337	\$22			
Line markers	\$153	\$76	NA			
Damage prevention	\$259	\$129	\$13			
Public awareness	\$198	\$20	NA			
МАОР	\$0.0	\$0.0	NA			
Design, installation, testing	\$0.0	\$0.0	NA			
Emergency plan	\$325	\$20	NA			
Source: PHMSA best p (2006) cost information	Source: PHMSA best professional judgment percentage adjustment (see text) of inflation-adjusted IPAA (2006) cost information.					

Table B- 4

Table 3-87. Currently Regulated Onshore Gas Gathering Infrastructure						
Type A Miles Type B Miles Total Miles						
7,844	3,580	11,423				
Source: 2014 Gas Gathering Annual Repor	Source: 2014 Gas Gathering Annual Report					

Table B- 5

Table 3-88. Estimation of Total Currently Unregulated and Proposed Newly Regulated Onshore Gas **Gathering Pipelines**

Type (Class 1 and Class 2)	2012 API Member Estimate ¹	Revised Estimate based on GIS Mapping	Difference ²		
Type A, Area 2 (high stress, ≥ 8 ")	48,124	77,554	29,430		
High stress, < 8"	70,921	114,292	43,371		
Type A (assumed $< 8'')^3$	13,542	21,823	8,281		
Low stress, all sizes	108,273	174,486	66,213		
Total	240,860	388,156	147,296		
1. Source: Letter from Amy Emmert, Policy Advisor, Upstream and Industry Operations, American Petroleum Institute, Re: Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission Pipelines (Docket No. PHMSA-2011-0023), October 23, 2012. Data from 45 operators.					
2. Calculated as total mileage	minus group 1 operator mileage.				

Table 3-89. Estimation of Newly Regulated Mileage by Operator Group				
Operator Type	Percent of Total Mileage ¹	Newly Regulated Type A Area 2 Miles	All other Unregulated Miles	
No existing regulated lines (group 1)	80%	62,419	249,986	
Existing regulated lines (group 2)	20%	15,135	60,616	
Total	100%	77,554	310,602	
1. Source: PHMSA best profe	essional judgment			

Table B- 7

Table 3-90. Estimation of One-Time Costs for Corrosion Control for Newly Regulated Gas Gathering Line					
Operator Type	Newly Regulated Mileage	Mileage without Cathodic Protection ¹	One-Time Corrosion Control Unit Cost per Mile ²	Total One-Time Corrosion Control Cost	
Group 1	62,419	3,121	17,183	53,627,059	
Group 2	15,135	757	12,887	9,752,260	
Total	77,554	3,878	NA	63,379,319	
1. Calculated as 0.5% of newly regulated mileage.					
2. Source: see Table 3-86	ő				

Table 3-91. Estimation of Total Costs for Right-of-Way Surveillance for Newly Regulated Gas Gathering Lines						
Operator Type	Newly Regulated Mileage	Periodic Right- Of- Way Surveillance Unit Cost ¹	Periodic Surveillance Costs (every 3 years) ²	Annualized Surveillance Cost ³		
Group 1	62,419	\$118	7,365,411	\$2,455,137		
Group 2	15,135	\$29	438,916	\$146,305		
Total	77,554	NA	\$7,804,327	\$2,601,442		
1. Source: see Table 3-86)					
2. Unit costs times mileage	ge.					
3. Periodic costs divided	by three.					



Table 3-92. Estimation of Recurring Costs for Newly Regulated Gas Gathering Lines							
		Unit Costs ²					Total
Mileage Type	Mileage	Corrosion Control	Line Markers	Damage Prev.	Public Awareness	Emergency Plan	Annual Cost ¹
Operator Group 1							
Total	62,419	0.0	153	0.0	198	325	42,195,067
Steel lines; cathodic protection	59,298	22	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	2,075,423
Steel lines; no cathodic protection	3,121	449	0.0	259.0	0.0	0.0	2,209,623
Operator Group 2							
Total	15,135	0.0	76	0	20	20	1,755,664
Steel lines; cathodic protection	14,378	22	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	503,240
Steel lines; no cathodic protection	757	337	0.0	129.0	0.0	0.0	352,646
Total	77,554	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49,091,664
1. Calculated as mileage times the sum of applicable unit costs.							
2. See Table 3-86							



Table 3-93. Present Value of Compliance Costs, Gas Gathering Safety Provisions ¹						
Component	Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)		
One-time	\$63,379,319	\$4,225,288	\$63,379,319	\$4,225,288		
Annualized periodic	\$25,352,273	\$1,690,152	\$31,987,526	\$2,132,502		
Annual	\$478,421,237	\$31,894,749	\$603,634,687	\$40,242,312		
Total \$567,152,829 \$37,810,189 \$699,001,531 \$46,600,102						
1. Total is present value over 15 year study period; average annual is total divided by 15.						

Table B- 11

Table 3-94. Gas Gatherin	Table 3-94. Gas Gathering Pipeline Reporting Requirements					
Regulation	Regulation Description					
191.5	Immediate notice of certain incidents	Upon event				
191.15	Incident report	Upon event				
191.17	Annual report (i.e., pipeline summary data)	Annually				
191.22(a)	Operation identification request	Once				
191.22(c)	Notification of changes	Upon event				
191.23	Safety-related condition report	Upon event				

Table 3-95. Proposed Reporting Requirements				
Regulation	Description	Type A, Area 2 Lines	All Other Currently Unregulated Lines	
191.5	Immediate Notice of certain incidents	√	\checkmark	
191.15	Incident Reports	V	ν	
191.17	Annual Reports (i.e., pipeline summary data)	V	V	
191.22(a)	OPID Request		\checkmark	
191.22(c)	Notification of Changes	√	NA	
191.23	Safety-Related Condition Reports	√	NA	
NA = not applicable				



Table 3-96. Estimates of Unit Cost for Reporting Provisions (Per report)						
Component	Group 1 One-Time	Group 1 Per Event	Group 2 One-Time	Group 2 Per Event	Group 1,2 Annual	
Immediate notice	\$1,300	\$100	\$100	\$100	NA	
Incident report	\$2,580	\$1,400	\$180	\$1,400	NA	
SRC report	\$2,900	\$340	\$180	\$340	NA	
Annual report	\$1,780	NA	\$620	NA	\$280	
OPID request	\$520	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Notification of change \$980 \$85 \$180 \$85 NA						
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment Group 1 = operators without pre-existing lines.						
Group 2 = operators with pre-existing regulated lines.						
See Table 3-98 for reporting 1	requirements applicable	to Group 1 and Group 2	mileage			

Table 3-97. Summary of Mileages by Operator Group					
Type A, Area 2 Lines All Other Currently Unregulated Lines ¹					
Group 1 Group 2 Group 1 Group 2					
62,419	15,135	249,986	60,616		
Group 1 = operators without existing regulated lines. Group 2 = operators of existing regulated lines.					
1. Total estimated currently u	nregulated mileage minu	us Type A, Area 2 curren	ntly estimated unregulated.		



Table 3-98. Reporting Requirements by Operator Group						
Deculation	Description	Type A, Area 2 Lines		G 10 0		
Regulation Description	Description	Group 1	Group 2	Group I Group 2		
191.5	Immediate notice			$\sqrt{\sqrt{1-1}}$	Upon event	
191.15	Incident report			√ √	Upon event	
191.17	Annual report	V		<u>الم</u>	Annually	
191.22(a)	OPID request	V		√ √	Once	
191.22(c)	Notification of changes			NA	Upon event	
191.23Safety-related condition report $$ NAUpon event						
Group 1 = operators without existing regulated lines Group 2 = operators of existing regulated lines						
NA = not applicable	NA = not applicable					

Table 3-99: One Time Compliance Costs of Gathering Line Reporting Requirements						
Category	Miles	Cost per Mile	Total One-Time Costs			
Type A, Area 2 Lines ¹						
Group 1	62,419	\$174	\$10,846,504			
Group 2	15,135	\$5	\$76,583			
Subtotal	77,554	NA	\$10,923,087			
All Other Currently Unre	All Other Currently Unregulated Lines ²					
Group 1	249,986	\$27	\$6,662,133			
Group 2	60,616	\$0	\$4,849			
Subtotals	310,602	NA	\$6,666,983			
Total	388,156	NA	\$17,590,070			
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment Group 1 = operators without existing regulated lines Group 2 = operators of existing regulated lines 1. Immediate notice, incident, SRC, annual, OPID request, notification of change reporting.						

Table B- 17

Table 3-100. Cost of Incident Reporting for Newly Regulated Gas Gathering Pipelines						
Year	Incidents per 1,000 Miles ¹	Cost per Incident ²	Annual Cost per 1,000 Miles	Costs per Year ³		
1	0.2	\$1,500	\$300	\$23,266		
2-5	0.1	\$1,500	\$150	\$11,633		
6-15	0.0	\$1,500	\$60	\$4,653		
1. Source: PHMSA best p	1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment. See benefits analysis.					
2. Table 3-86, \$1,400 for incident report, \$100 for immediate notification per incident						
3. Cost per 1,000 miles \times	68.749 thousand Typ	pe A Area 2 miles.				

Table 3-101. Annual Costs for Safety Related Condition Reports							
Reports per 1000 Miles ¹	Unit Cost per Report ²	Cost per 1000 Miles ³	Total Annual Costs ⁴				
0.2	\$340	\$78	\$6,065				
1. Source: Estimated based on historical reporting levels.							
2. Source: PHMSA best profe	2. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment.						
3. Calculated as reports times unit cost.							
4. Calculated as cost per 1000 miles times thousands of Type A Area 2 miles (Table 3-96).							



Table 3-102. Costs for Annual Reporting ¹						
Group	Miles	Annual Cost Per 1000 Miles	Total Annual Costs			
Type A Area 2	77,554	\$0	\$0			
All other regulated	310,602	\$0	\$0			
Total	388,156	NA	\$0			
1. Zeroed Values as this cost is being accounted for as a separate item with a different methodology						

Table B- 20

Table 3-103. Recurring Incremental Compliance Costs for National Registry Reporting						
Operator Group	Number of Operators ¹	Annual Costs per Operator ¹	Total Annual Costs			
Constructing 10 or more miles of pipelines	92	\$86	\$7,913			
Acquisition, divestiture, merger, and entity changes	31	\$86	\$2,666			
Total	123	\$86	\$10,579			
1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment						

Table 3-104. Present Value of Recurring Reporting Costs					
Develoter	7% Discount Rate	<u>,</u>	3% Discount Rate		
Provision	Total ¹	Average Annual ²	Total ¹	Average Annual ²	
Incident reporting	\$87,603	\$5,840	\$101,774	\$6,785	
SRC reporting	\$59,103	\$3,940	\$74,572	\$4,971	
Annual reporting ³	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
National Registry Reporting	\$103,100	\$6,873	\$130,083	\$8,672	
Total	\$249,806	\$16,654	\$306,429	\$20,429	
1. Represents 15-year str	udy period.				
2. Total divided by 15.					
3. Accounted for annual	portion of annual repo	orting as a separate c	ost item		



Table 3-105. Present Value of Reporting Provision Costs						
Tune of Ducyician	7% Discount Rate		3% Discount Rate			
Type of Provision	Total	Average Annual	Total	Average Annual		
Recurring ¹	\$249,806	\$16,654	\$306,429	\$20,429		
One-time ²	\$17,590,070	\$1,172,671	\$17,590,070	\$1,172,671		
Total	\$17,839,876	\$1,189,325	\$17,896,499	\$1,193,100		
1. Source: See Table 3-99.						
2. Source: See Table 3-1	104.					

Table 6-1. Safety Performance BaselineCalculation					
Year	Corrosion and Excavation Damage Incidents ¹	Onshore Gathering Miles ²	Incidents per 1000 Miles ³		
2001	1	17,516.0	0.1		
2002	3	16,994.0	0.2		
2003	2	16,414.0	0.1		
2004	2	17,401.0	0.1		
2005	4	16,151.0	0.2		
Total	12	84,476.0	0.1		
 Source: Gas Transmission and Gas Gathering Incident Reports, onshore gathering lines corrosion and excavation damage Gas Gathering Annual Report 					
3. Incidents	s divided by mi	ileage times 1,000) miles.		



Table 6-2. I	Table 6-2. Baseline Incident Rate				
Estimated Corrosion and Excavation Damage Incident Rate (per	Unregulated Higher- Stress, Larger- Diameter Onshore Gas	Estimated Corrosion and Excavation Damage Incidents per Year on Unregulated			
1,000 miles	Gathering	Lines			
per year)	Mileage	(incidents			
		per year)			
0.1	77,554	11			

Table B- 25

Table 6-3. Average Consequencesper Incident on Gas TransmissionSystems in Class 1 and 2 Locationsfrom Corrosion or ExcavationDamage					
Category	Number	Value			
Fatalities ¹	0.03	264,375.00			
Injuries ¹	0.06	61,625.00			
Evacuations ² 11.68 17,517.19					
Other	NA	175,447.19			
Total	NA	518,964.38			
Source: See A	ppendix E (T	able E-7)			
1. DOT VSL guidance, \$9.4M VSL, factor .105 for serious injury.					
2. Based on es of \$1,500 per o	stimate of app evacuation.	proximate cost			

Table 6-4. Estimated Baseline Consequences Per Year							
Incidents	Fatalities ¹ (Count)	Injuries ² (Count)	Evacuation Cost (Count)	Other Incident Costs	Total Costs		
11	\$2,944,555	\$686,367	\$195,103	\$1,954,095	\$5,780,120		
	0.3	1	130				
VSL= Value of Statistical Life							
1. Valued using a VSL of \$9.4M per Departmental guidance (https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/VSL2015_0.pdf).							
2. Valued u	sing 0.105 tim	es the VSL (\$987	7,000), also per	Departmental	guidance.		

Table 6-5: Safety Performance of Type A Gas Gathering Pipelines					
Year	Corrosion and Excavation Damage Incidents ¹	Type A Miles ²	Incidents per 1000 Miles ³		
2010	0.0	6,297.0	0.0		
2011	0/0	6,781.0	0.0		
2012	2.0	6,633.0	0.3		
2013	0.0	7,624.0	0.0		
2014	0.0	7,643.2	0.0		
Total	2.0	34,978.2	0.1		
1. Gas Transmission and Gas Gathering Incident Reports, onshore gathering lines corrosion and excavation damage.					
2. Gas Gathering Annual Report.					
3. Incidents of	livided by mileage times 1	,000 miles.			

Table B- 28

Table 6-6. Calculation of Safety Benefits, Topic Area 8 (Millions 2015\$ per year)							
Period	Incidents per 1000 Miles Assumed	Incidents Avoided per year	Value of Avoided Fatalities ¹	Injuries ²	Evacuations ³	Other Incident Costs ⁴	Average Benefits Per Year
Year 1	0.10	3	\$0.80	\$0.19	\$0.05	\$0.53	\$1.56
Years 2-5	0.07	5	\$1.41	\$0.33	\$0.09	\$0.94	\$2.78
Years 6- 15	0.06	7	\$1.77	\$0.41	\$0.12	\$1.18	\$3.48
1. Calculate	1. Calculated as incidents avoided times VSL (\$9.4 million in 2015\$).						
2. Calculated as incidents avoided times VSL (\$9.4 million in 2015\$) times 0.105.							
3. Calculated as number of evacuations times \$1,500 (PHMSA best professional judgment).							
4. Calculate	ed as average of	other incident dan	nages times in	cidents averted	(see Table E-7).		

Table 6-7: Summary of Safety Benefits for Expanded Gathering Line Regulations ¹			
Average Annual (7%)	Total (7%)	Average Annual (3%)	Total (3%)
\$2	\$30	\$3	\$38
1. Based on expected stream of benefits from Table 6-4. Average annual is total discounted benefits divided by 15 years.			


Table 6-8. Type A and Type B Gathering Line						
Incidents						
Year	Incidents Gas Released (MCF)		Average per Incident			
2010	0	0	0			
2011	2	14,311	7,156			
2012	3	13,570	4,523			
2013	0	0	0			
2014	0	0	0			
2015	0	0	0			
Total 5 27,881 5,576						
Source: PH Incident Re	Source: PHMSA Gas Transmission and Gas Gathering Incident Reports for onshore, natural gas, Type A and					

Type B incidents.

Table 6-9. Estimate of Reductions in NaturalGas, Methane, and Carbon Dioxide Released1				
Annual Releases Averted				
Period	Natural Gas (MCF) ¹	Methane (MCF) ²	Carbon Dioxide (MT) ³	
Year 1	16,801	15,121	26	
Years 2-5	29,825	26,843	46	
Years 6- 15	37,379	33,642	58	
15-Yr Total	84,006 75,605 13			
MCF = thouse the second seco	usand cubic fe	et MT = metric to	ns	
1. Calculated as average incidents avoided per year times historical average natural gas releases from gas gathering incidents.				
2. Calculate	ed as natural g	as released times (0.90.	
3. Calculate 114.4 lbs./N	ed as natural g ACF carbon di	as released times (oxide.	0.03 times	



Table 6-10. Calculation of Benefits Per Year Based on Reductions in					
Volumes 1	Emitted (3%	Discount Rate)		
	Methane		Carbon Dio	xide	Average
Period	MCF	Average Benefit	Benefits Per Year		
Year 1	15,121	\$378,027	26	\$1,125	\$379,152
Years 2-5	26,843	\$691,204	46	\$2,159	\$693,363
Years 6- 15	33,642	\$1,052,979	58	\$3,078	\$1,056,058
MCF = thousand cubic feet					
Emissions calculated as expected incidents avoided times emission per incident.					
Values are	the average of	the product of em	issions and the	e SCC/SCM val	ue over the
identified y	ear range				

Table B- 33

Table 6-11. Total Environmental Benefits					
Pollutant	Emissions	Social Benefit (3%)			
Methane (MCF)	458,908	\$13,672,639			
Carbon dioxide (MT)	794	\$40,543			
Total NA \$13,713,182					
MCF = thousand cubic feet MT = metric ton					

Table 7-1. Summary of Benefits for Topic Area 8 (Millions 2015\$) ¹					
Benefit	Average	Total (7%)	Average	Total	
	Annual (7%)		Annual (3%)	(3%)	
Safety benefits ²	\$2	\$30	\$3	\$38	
GHG emissions	\$1	\$14	\$1	\$14	
reductions					
Total	\$3	\$43	\$3	\$52	
1. Total is over 15-year study period; annual is total divided by 15 years.					
2. Sum of expected incidents averted times average incident consequence (see					
Table E-7).					



Table 7-2 Summary of Compliance andReporting Costs for Topic Area 8 (Millions2015\$)1						
Average Annual (7%)	Total (7%)Average Annual (3%)Total (3%)					
\$39\$585\$47\$6991. Total is over 15-year study period; annual is total divided by 15 years.						

Table B- 36

Table 8-1. Mileages, InspectionUnits, and New Operators for theNewly-Regulated GatheringLines					
Mileage Group DescriptionsEstimate of MilesEstimated of Inspection Units1					
Type A, Area 2	77,554	388			
Operator group 1	62,419	312			
Operator 15,135 76 group 2					
1. Calculated as miles divided by 200.					

Table 8-2. Unit Cost for StatePipeline Safety Programs in 2012				
Total State Program ExpensesEstimated Number of Inspection- DaysUnit Cost per Inspection- Day				
\$50,209,656 39,473 \$1,272				
Source: State reports				



Table 8-3. Estimated Routine Field InspectionCosts to the States for Newly-RegulatedGathering Lines Subject to Safety Provisions(Type A, Area 2)

Estimated Inspection Units	No. of Inspection- Days per Unit	Total Field Inspection- Days	Total Field Inspection Costs (\$ / 2 years)
356	5	1,780	\$2,264,160

Table B- 39

Table 8-4. Company Headquarter Inspection Costs to the States forNewly-Regulated Operators Subject to Safety Provisions						
No. of Operators	No. of Inspection- Days per Operator	Total HQ Inspection- Days	Cost per Year, Recurring 5- Year Cycle ³			
75	7	525	\$667,800	\$222,600	\$133,560	
100	7	700	\$890,400	\$296,800	\$178,080	
125	7	875	\$1,113,000	\$371,000	\$222,600	
HQ = headquarters						
1. Inspection-days times unit cost per day (\$1,272, see Table 8-2).						
2. Total divided by 3.						
3. Total divi	ided by 5.					

Table 8-5. Total Annual Costs to the States for Newly-RegulatedGathering Lines Subject to Safety Provisions, First Three Years(Millions)						
Field Inspections -Low	Field Inspections -High Company HQ Inspections1- Low Company HQ Inspections1 -High					
\$1 \$1 0.2 0.4 1 1						
1. Based on between 75 and 125 newly regulated operators, for example.						



Appendix C: All Recalculated Tables from the RIA for Transmission

Table 2-1 Pipeline Infrastructure - GasTransmission (2015)						
SystemOnshoreTotalNumber ofTypeMilesMilesOperators ¹						
Interstate	191,813	195,621	160			
Intrastate	106,165	106,254	892			
Total	297,979	301,875	1019			
Source: PHMSA Pipeline Data Mart						
1. Entities may operate both inter- and						
intrastate pipelines. There are 1,019 total						
operators.						



Table 3-1. Onshore Gas Transmission Mileage by Percent SMYS								
Location	Total	tal <20% SMYS 20-30% SMYS >30% SMYS		>30% SMYS	Percent >30% SMYS			
INTERSTATE								
Class 1	160,029	6,750	7,977	145,301	91%			
Class 2	17,805	1,460	1,436	14,909	84%			
Class 3	13,927	1,302	1,307	11,318	81%			
Class 4	28.539	3.616	9.264	15.659	55%			
Total	191,789	9,516	10,729	171,544	89%			
Intrastate			······································					
Class 1	72,719	6,250	8,293	58,176	80%			
Class 2	12,839	1,038	2,762	9,040	70%			
Class 3	19,730	1,953	5,671	12,107	61%			
Class 4	880	20.454	428.344	430.8	49%			
Total	106,169	9,261	17,154	79,754	75%			
Source: 2014 PHMSA Gas Tr	ansmission Annual Repo	ort SMYS = specified m	inimum yield strength					



Table 3-2. Estimate of Previously Untested Onshore Gas Transmission Mileage in HCAs Out 100 (SNVS)							
Operating at Greater tha	n 30% SMYS Previously Untested HCA ¹	Percent >30% SMYS	HCA≥30% SMYS ²				
Interstate							
Class 1	62	91%	56				
Class 2	23	84%	19				
Class 3	439	81%	357				
Class 4	0	55%	0.0				
Total	524	83%	432				
Intrastate							
Class 1	13	80%	10				
Class 2	18	70%	13				
Class 3	749	61%	460				
Class 4	5	49%	2				
Total	785	62%	485				
HCA = High consequence are	ea						
SMYS = specified minimum	yield strength						
1. Source: PHMSA 2014 Ann	nual Report						
2. See Appendix A.							

Table 3-3: Percent of Miles Capable of Accepting an InlineInspection Tool						
Class Location	НСА	Non- HCA				
Interstate	I					
Class 1	95%	71%				
Class 2	94%	70%				
Class 3	89%	60%				
Class 4	94%	56%				
Intrastate						
Class 1	68%	53%				
Class 2	66%	40%				
Class 3	55%	33%				
Class 4	49%	62%				
Source: PHMSA 2014 Gas Tra	ansmission Annual Repor	t				



Year	ILI	Pressure Test	Direct	Other	Total
Interstate					
2010	15,308	567	177	85	16,13
2011	17,366	829	157	29	18,38
2012	18,656	846	126	42	19,670
2013	15,687	739	106	144	16,670
2014	15,820	1,008	116	11	16,954
Total	82,837	3,989	682	311	87,813
Percentage	94%	5%	1%	0.4%	
Intrastate		·			
2010	4,792	826	1,539	1,191	8,348
2011	3,920	858	1,842	1,046	7,660
2012	5,041	1,232	2,085	2,570	10,92
2013	5,663	763	1,894	782	9,102
2014	5,801	807	1,641	750	8,998
Total	25,217	4,486	9,001	6,339	45,042
Percentage	56%	10%	20%	14%	



Table 3-5. Estimated Assessment Method for Previously Untested Pipe in High Consequence Areas (Percent of Mileage)						
Location	ILI ¹	Pressure Test2	ILI Upgrade ²			
Interstate		L				
Class 1	95%	5%	0.0%			
Class 2	94%	5%	1%			
Class 3	89%	5%	6%			
Class 4	94%	0.0%	6%			
Intrastate						
Class 1	68%	10%	22%			
Class 2	66%	20%	14%			
Class 3	55%	20%	25%			
Class 4	49%	21%	30%			
1. Source: PHMSA 2014 Gas	Transmission Annual Re	eport				
2. PHMSA best professional and 3- 4).	judgment based on histor	ical piggability and assessn	nent methods (Tables 3-3			



Table 3-6. Estimated A	Table 3-6. Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-HCA Pipelines ¹								
		Interstate Segme	nt	Intras	Intrastate Segment				
	26'' - 48''	14" - 24"	4'' - 12'' ²	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12'' ²			
Diameter (inches)	30	16	8	30	16	8			
Pipe thickness (inches)	0.38	0.38	0.25	0.38	0.38	0.25			
Segment Miles	60	60	60	30	30	30			
Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3	2	2	2			
Number of Bends	3	3	3	3	3	3			
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000			
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000			
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000			
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000			
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,676,000	\$1,718,000	\$875,000	\$2,338,000	\$1,498,000	\$786,000			
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$44,600	\$28,633	\$14,583	\$77,933	\$49,933	\$26,200			
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19	190	52	13			
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,202.78	\$326.95	\$79.08	\$801.86	\$217.96	\$52.72			
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%			
Cost to replace per inch mile	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000			
G&A Cost ⁷	\$45,161	\$24,992	\$12,532	\$51,747	\$29,230	\$14,851			



Table 3-6. Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 1 and Class 2 Non-HCA Pipelines ¹								
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶	\$270,963	\$149,952	\$75,195	\$310,482	\$175,382	\$89,103		
HCA = high consequence	area MCF = thousand cu	bic feet						
1. Based on best professi reports.	onal judgment of PHMSA	A staff, and include	es excavation, permitting, cons	truction, and cleanup costs. Unit c	ost of gas released b	ased on incident		
2. Pipelines below 4" ger	nerally cannot accommod	ate in-line inspecti	on and will be exempt from re-	quirements.				
3. Total upgrade cost cale mainline valves.	culated as cost of launche	r plus cost of recei	iver plus cost per bend multipli	ed by number of bends plus cost p	er mainline valve an	d number of		
4. Based on Equation 1 u at packed conditions) assu	sing temperature (70 deg umptions.	rees F), pressure (1	14.7 PSIA at standard condition	ns; 50 PSI at blowdown conditions	s), and compressibili	ty (factor of 0.88		
5. Assumes a natural gas of costs based on data for	cost of \$4.21 per MCF, b 294 incidents). Does not	ased on the cost of include the social	f gas released intentionally dur cost of methane released.	ing a controlled blowdown as part	t of a response to an i	ncident (median		
6. Upgrade costs per mile	plus cost of gas released	during blowdown	per mile.					
7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs								



	Interstate Segment			Intrastate Segment		
	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12''2	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12'' ²
Diameter (inches) ²	30	16	8	30	16	8
Segment Miles	45	45	45	15	15	15
Number of Mainline Valves	3	3	3	2	2	2
Number of Bends	6	6	6	6	6	6
Cost per Mainline Valve	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000	\$338,000	\$220,000	\$89,000
Cost per Bend	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000	\$60,000	\$32,000	\$16,000
Cost of Launcher	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000
Cost of Receiver	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000	\$741,000	\$481,000	\$280,000
Total Upgrade Cost ³	\$2,856,000	\$1,814,000	\$923,000	\$2,518,000	\$1,594,000	\$834,000
Upgrade Costs per Mile	\$63,467	\$40,311	\$20,511	\$167,867	\$106,267	\$55,600
Gas Released per Mile (MCF) ⁴	286	78	19	190	52	13
Cost of Gas Released per Mile ⁵	\$1,203	\$327	\$79	\$802	\$218	\$53
Percentage of pipe that would have to be replaced	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Cost to replace per inch mile	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000
G&A Cost ⁷	\$48,934	\$27,328	\$13,718	\$69,734	\$40,497	\$20,731
Total Unit Cost (per mile) ⁶	\$244,669	\$136,638	\$68,590	\$348,669	\$202,485	\$103,653



Table 3-7. Estimated Average Unit Cost of Upgrade to Accommodate In-line Inspection Tools, Class 3 and Class 4 Pipelines and Class 1 and Class 2 HCA Pipelines¹

1. Based on best professional judgment of PHMSA staff, and includes excavation, permitting, construction, and cleanup costs. Unit cost of gas released based on incident reports.

2. Pipelines below 4" generally cannot accommodate in-line inspection and will be exempt from requirements.

3. Total upgrade cost calculated as cost of launcher plus cost of receiver plus cost per bend multiplied by number of bends plus cost per mainline valve and number of mainline valves.

4. Based on Equation 1 using temperature (70 degrees F), pressure (14.7 PSIA at standard conditions; 50 PSI at blowdown conditions), and compressibility (factor of 0.88 at packed conditions) assumptions.

5. Assumes a natural gas cost of \$4.21 per MCF, based on the cost of gas released intentionally during a controlled blowdown as part of a response to an incident (median of costs based on data for 294 incidents). Does not include the social cost of methane released.

6. Upgrade cost plus cost per mile plus the cost of gas release per mile.

7. G&A costs for record keeping, reporting, scheduling, working with vendors, etc. equal to 20% of all costs

Table C-9

Table 3-8. Calculation of Weighted Average Unit Cost to Accommodate Inline Inspection Tools								
		Pipeline Diamet	Weighted Average Cost per Mile ²					
Туре	> 26''	14'' - 24''	<12''	Class 1, 2, Non-HCA	Class 3, 4, HCA			
Interstate	41%	32%	27%	\$179,175	\$162,369			
Intrastate	14%	29%	57%	\$145,308	\$166,827			
1. Source: PHMSA 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report								
2. Based on Tables 3-6 and 3-	-7.							

Table 3-9. Estimated Unit Cost of ILI							
		Interstate (60-mile)	Segment	Intrastate	(30-mile) Segment		
Component	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4'' - 12''	26'' - 48''	14'' - 24''	4" - 12"	

Table 3-9. Estimated U	nit Cost of ILI					
Mobilization ¹	\$15,000	\$12,500	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$12,500	\$10,000
Base MFL tool ²	\$90,000	\$72,000	\$54,000	\$45,000	\$36,000	\$27,000
Additional tools (Spiral MFL, Crack Tools, etc.)	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000	\$340,000	\$322,000	\$304,000
Reruns	\$63,000	\$50,400	\$37,800	\$63,000	\$50,400	\$37,800
Analytical and data integration services	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Operator preparation ³	\$27,000	\$23,050	\$19,100	\$16,250	\$13,650	\$11,050
G&A Cost ⁴	\$123,000	\$111,990	\$100,980	\$103,850	\$94,910	\$85,970
Total	\$738,000	\$671,940	\$605,880	\$623,100	\$569,460	\$515,820
Source: PHMSA best profe	essional judgment.	I	1	I		
 Mobilization is the cost apply. Typically \$900 to \$1,500 	for mobilization and den	nobilization of the constru	iction work crew, material and eq	uipment to and from the w	ork site. Regional di	fferences may
3. Includes analysis, specifi	ications, cleaning pigs, fa	tigue crack growth analy	sis, etc. Estimated as 10% of cost	t of ILI and related data ana	ılysis.	
4. G&A costs for record ke	eping, reporting, schedul	ing, working with vendor	s, etc. equal to 20% of all costs			



Table 3-10. Estimation of ILI Assessment Cost ¹								
Segment Type	Less than 12'' Diameter	14" - 24" Diameter	Greater than 26'' Diameter	Weighted Average Cost Per Mile				
Interstate (60-mile segment)	27%	32%	41%	\$11,350				
Intrastate (30-mile segment)	57%	29%	14%	\$18,216				
1. Weighted average based on unit costs (see Table 3-9) and percentages of gas transmission mileage by diameter for inter and intrastate pipe from the 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report								

Table C- 12

3-11 Estimated Cost of Conducting Pressure Test (\$2015)				
Pipe Diameter	Diameter Segment Length (miles)			
(inches)	1	2	5	10
12	\$297,205	\$325,730	\$399,940	\$877,272
24	\$375,000	\$420,000	\$720,000	\$1,160,769
36	\$578,424	\$738,787	\$1,018,202	\$2,053,359
Source: T.D. Williamson, Inc., Houston, TX - was used to determine 24 inch pressure test costs				
Source: Greene's Energy Group, LLC (2013), - Ratios from Green's Energy Group report were used to take T.D. Williamson's				
24 inch diameter figures a	and determine 12 incl	h and 36 inch pipe.		

Table 3-12. Volume of O	f Gas Lost During Pressure Tests (MCF): Interstate Pipelines ¹				
(inches)	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				
12	44	88	221	442	
24	181	361	903	1805	
36	415	830	2075	4149	
MCF = thousand cubic feet					
1. Estimated using Equation 1.					



Table 3-13. Volume of Gas Lost During Pressure Tests (MCF): Intrastate Pipelines ¹					
Pipe Diameter	Segment Length (miles)				
(inches)	1	2	5	10	
12	29	59	147	294	
24	120	241	602	1,203	
36	271	542	1,354	2,708	
MCF = thousand cubic feet					
1. Estimated using Equation 1.					

Table 3-14. Cost of Lost Gas: Interstate Pipelines ¹					
Pipe Diameter	Segment Length (miles)				
(inches)	1 Mile	2 Mile	5 Mile	10 Mile	Average
12	\$252	\$504	\$1,261	\$2,522	\$1,135
24	\$1,031	\$2,061	\$5,154	\$10,307	\$4,638
36	\$2,369	\$4,738	\$11,846	\$23,692	\$10,662
1. Calculated based on volume lost (see Table 3-12) times the cost of gas (\$5.71 per thousand cubic feet).					



Table 3-15. Costs of Lost of Gas: Intrastate Pipelines ¹						
Pipe Diameter		Segment Length (miles)				
(inches)	1 Mile	2 Mile	5 Mile	10 Mile	Average	
12	\$168	\$336	\$841	\$1,681	\$756	
24	\$687	\$1,374	\$3,436	\$6,871	\$3,092	
36	\$1,546	\$3,092	\$7,730	\$15,461	\$6,957	
1. Based on volume lost (see Table 3-13) times the cost of gas (\$5.71 per thousand cubic feet).						



Table 3-16. Total Pressure Test Assessment Cost: Interstate Pipelines						
Component	Segment Length (miles)					
Component	1	2	5	10		
12 inch						
Pressure test ¹	\$356,646	\$390,876	\$479,928	\$1,052,726		
Lost gas ²	\$252	\$504	\$1,261	\$2,522		
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Total	\$456,898	\$491,380	\$581,189	\$1,155,248		
24 inch						
Pressure test ¹	\$450,000	\$504,000	\$864,000	\$1,392,923		
Lost gas ²	\$1,031	\$2,061	\$5,154	\$10,307		
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Total	\$551,031	\$606,061	\$969,154	\$1,503,230		
36 inch						
Pressure test ¹	\$694,109	\$886,544	\$1,221,843	\$2,464,030		
Lost gas ²	\$2,369	\$4,738	\$11,846	\$23,692		
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Total	\$796,478	\$991,283	\$1,333,689	\$2,587,723		
1. Unit costs (see Table 3-11) plus 20% G&A.						
2. See Tables 3-14.						
3. Approximation of cost	of temporary supply (up	to \$1 million) for 109	% of tests.			



Table 3-17. Total Pressure Test Assessment Cost: Intrastate Pipelines						
Component	Segment Length (miles)					
Component	1	2	5	10		
12 inch						
Pressure test ¹	\$356,646	\$390,876	\$479,928	\$1,052,726		
Lost gas ²	\$168	\$336	\$841	\$1,681		
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Total	\$456,814	\$491,212	\$580,768	\$1,154,407		
24 inch	·		·			
Pressure test ¹	\$450,000	\$504,000	\$864,000	\$1,392,923		
Lost gas ²	\$687	\$1,374	\$3,436	\$6,871		
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Total	\$550,687	\$605,374	\$967,436	\$1,499,794		
36 inch						
Pressure test ¹	\$694,109	\$886,544	\$1,221,843	\$2,464,030		
Lost gas ²	\$1,546	\$3,092	\$7,730	\$15,461		
Alternative supply ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		
Total \$795,655 \$989,636 \$1,329,573 \$2,579,491						
1. Unit costs (see Table 3-11) plus 20% G&A.						
2. See Tables 3-15.						
3. Approximation of cost of temporary supply (up to \$1 million) for 10% of tests.						



Table 3-18. Per Mile Pressure Test Costs							
Pine Diameter			Segment Length (m	iles)			
(inches)	1	2	5	10	Average		
Interstate							
12	\$456,898	\$245,690	\$116,238	\$115,525	\$233,588		
24	\$551,031	\$303,031	\$193,831	\$150,323	\$299,554		
36	\$796,478	\$495,641	\$266,738	\$258,772	\$454,407		
Intrastate	Intrastate						
12	\$456,814	\$245,606	\$116,154	\$115,441	\$233,503		
24	\$550,687	\$302,687	\$193,487	\$149,979	\$299,210		
36	\$795,655	\$494,818	\$265,915	\$257,949	\$453,584		
Source: Tables 3-16 a	nd 3-17 divided b	y miles per segme	ent.				

Table 3-19 Weighted Average Unit Pressure Test Assessment Cost Per Mile ¹					
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14''-34'' Diameter	36''+ Diameter	Average Cost	
Interstate	27%	57%	16%	\$305,543	
Intrastate	57%	37%	6%	\$270,444	
1. Weighted average based on unit costs (see Table 3-18) and percentages of gas transmission mileage by diameter for inter and intrastate pipe from the 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report.					



Table 3-20. Annual Costs to Re-establish MAOP, Previously Untested Pipe Operating at Greater than 30%					
SMYS in a HCA					
Location	ILI	PT	Upgrade and ILI	Total	
Interstate					
Class 1	40,466	57,334	0.0	97,800	
Class 2	13,698	19,615	2,230	35,543	
Class 3	240,253	363,351	247,904	851,508	
Class 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Subtotal	294,417	440,300	250,134	984,851	
Intrastate					
Class 1	8,588	18,751	28,226	55,565	
Class 2	10,158	45,699	21,887	77,744	
Class 3	306,968	1,657,232	1,417,384	3,381,585	
Class 4	1,457	9,272	9,063	19,792	
Subtotal	327,172	1,730,954	1,476,560	3,534,686	
Total			· · · · · ·		
Class 1	49,054	76,085	28,226	153,365	
Class 2	23,856	65,313	24,118	113,287	
Class 3	547,221	2,020,583	1,665,288	4,233,093	
Class 4	1,457	9,272	9,063	19,792	
Grand Total	621,588	2,171,254	1,726,695	4,519,537	
ILI = inline inspection					
HCA = high consequence	e area				
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure PT = pressure test					
SMYS = specified minim	um yield strength				

Table C- 22

powered by perspective



Table 3-21 Estimated Unit Cost of Direct Assessment (\$ per mile)						
Phase	Low Estimate	Mid Estimate	High Estimate			
Pre-assessment	\$5,000	\$7,500	\$10,000			
Indirect inspection	\$2,500	\$10,250	\$18,000			
Direct examination	\$15,000	\$17,500	\$20,000			
Post-assessment	\$5,000	\$7,500	\$10,000			
Total \$27,500 \$42,750 \$58,000						
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment						

Table 3-22. Integrity Assessment Methods						
Location	Inline Inspection	Pressure Test	Direct Assessment and Other Methods			
Interstate	94%	5%	1%			
Intrastate	56%	10%	34%			
Source: 2010-2014 PHMSA Annual Report part F.						



Table 3-23. Estimated Annual Baseline Assessments of HCA Segments Operating at Greater than 30% SMYS					
Location	Total HCA	ILI Miles	PT Miles	DA and Other Miles	
Interstate	29	27	1	0.3	
Intrastate	32	18	3	11	
HCA = high consequence area					
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength					
Source: Total mileage from Table 3-2 divided by 15 and multiplied by rates shown in Table 3-22.					

Table C- 25

Table 3-24. Estimated Baseline Costs Per Year on Previously Untested HCA Segments Operating atGreater than 30% SMYS						
Annual CostInline InspectionsPressure TestsDirect Assessment and Other MethodsTotal						
Interstate	\$308,560	\$399,987	\$13,925	\$722,472		
Intrastate	\$329,824	\$871,018	\$470,834	\$1,671,676		
Total	\$638,384	\$1,271,005	\$484,759	\$2,394,148		

Table 3-25. Net Average Annual Costs to Assess Previously Untested HCA SegmentsOperating at Greater than 30% SMYS						
Component Interstate Intrastate Total						
Compliance costs	\$984,851	\$3,534,686	\$4,519,537			
Baseline integrity management costs	(\$722,472)	(\$1,671,676)	(\$2,394,148)			
Net costs	Net costs \$262,379 \$1,863,009 \$2,125,388					
HCA = high consequence area						
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength						



Table 3-26. Mileage of Pipe for which Records are Inadequate						
Location	НСА	Class 3 and Class 4 Non-HCA	Total			
Interstate						
Class 1	79	0.0	79			
~						
Class 2	97	0.0	97			
Class 3	437	672	1,109			
Class 4	1	0.2	1			
Subtotal	613	673	1,286			
Intrastate						
Class 1	32	0.0	32			
Class 2	34	0.0	34			
Class 3	1,044	1,841	2,886			
Class 4	125	1	126			
Subtotal	1,235	1,843	3,077			
Total						
Class 1	111	0.0	111			
Class 2	130	0.0	130			
Class 3	1,481	2,514	3,995			
Class 4	125	2	127			
Grand Total	1,848	2,515	4,363			
HCA = high consequence area						
Source: PHMSA 2014 Gas Tr class location and HCA status	ansmission Annual Rep	ort: Part Q Sum of "Incor	mplete Records" columns by			



Table 3-28. Annual CClass 3 and 4 Non-HC	Table 3-28. Annual Costs to Re-establish MAOP, Segments with Inadequate Records Located in HCAs and Class 3 and 4 Non-HCAs					
Location	ILI	РТ	Upgrade and ILI	Total		
Interstate						
Class 1	\$56,747	\$80,402	\$0.0	\$137,148		
Class 2	\$68,741	\$98,432	\$11,193	\$178,365		
Class 3	\$599,584	\$1,129,921	\$3,029,037	\$4,758,543		
Class 4	\$570	\$0.0	\$1,353	\$1,923		
Subtotal	\$725,642	\$1,308,754	\$3,041,583	\$5,075,979		
Intrastate			·			
Class 1	\$26,572	\$58,014	\$87,327	\$171,913		
Class 2	\$26,979	\$121,375	\$58,133	\$206,487		
Class 3	\$1,435,387	\$10,405,262	\$13,896,904	\$25,737,552		
Class 4	\$75,199	\$477,109	\$464,171	\$1,016,479		
Subtotal	\$1,564,137	\$11,061,760	\$14,506,534	\$27,132,431		
Total			· · · · ·			
Class 1	\$83,318	\$138,415	\$87,327	\$309,061		
Class 2	\$95,719	\$219,807	\$69,326	\$384,852		
Class 3	\$2,034,972	\$11,535,183	\$16,925,941	\$30,496,095		
Class 4	\$75,769	\$477,109	\$465,524	\$1,018,402		
Grand Total	\$2,289,778	\$12,370,514	\$17,548,117	\$32,208,409		
ILI = inline inspection						
HCA = high consequence	e area					
MAOP = maximum allow test	vable operating pressure	e PT = pressure				
SNIYS = specified minim	ium yield strength					



Table 3-29. Estimated miles of HCA Segments with Inadequate MAOP Records Assessed per Year by						
Baseline Assessment Method						
Miles Total HCA ILI Miles PT Miles DA and Other Miles						
Interstate	41	39	2	0.5		
Intrastate 82 46 8 28						
Source: HCA miles from Table 3-26 divided by 15 years and multiplied by the HCA assessment rates in Table 3-22.						

Table C- 30

Table 3-30. Estimated Annual Costs for Baseline Assessments of HCA Segments: Inadequate Records					
LocationInline InspectionsPressure TestsDirect Assessment and Other MethodsTe					
Interstate	\$437,785	\$567,503	\$19,757	\$1,025,044	
Intrastate	\$839,443	\$2,216,846	\$1,198,330	\$4,254,618	
Total	\$1,277,227	\$2,784,349	\$1,218,087	\$5,279,663	

Table 3-31. Net Average Annual Costs to Assess HCA Segments: Inadequate Records					
Component	Interstate	Intrastate	Total		
Compliance costs	\$5,075,979	\$27,132,431	\$32,208,409		
Baseline integrity management costs	(\$1,025,044)	(\$4,254,618)	(\$5,279,663)		
Net costs	\$4,050,934	\$22,877,812	\$26,928,747		



Table 3-32. Estimated MCA Mileage						
	Onshore GT Miles ¹	Non-HCA ^{1,2}	MCA % of Non-HCA ³	MCA Miles ⁴	Roadway MCA Miles ⁵	Total MCA Miles ⁶
Interstate						
Class 1	160,029	159,374	2%	3,187	1,372	4,559
Class 2	17,805	16,774	50%	8,387	144	8,531
Class 3	13,927	7,378	100%	7,378	0.0	7,378
Class 4	29	10	100%	10	0.0	10
Subtotal	191,789	183,536	NA	18,962	1,516	20,478
Intrastate						
Class 1	72,719	71,692	2%	1,434	617	2,051
Class 2	12,839	12,396	50%	6,198	107	6,305
Class 3	19,730	10,224	100%	10,224	0.0	10,224
Class 4	880	156	100%	156	0.0	156
Subtotal	106,169	94,468	NA	18,012	724	18,736
Total						
Class 1	232,748	231,066	2%	4,621	1,989	6,610
Class 2	30,645	29,170	50%	14,585	251	14,836
Class 3	33,657	17,602	100%	17,602	0.0	17,602
Class 4	908	166	100%	166	0.0	166
Grand Total	297,958	278,004	NA	36,974	2,240	39,214
HCA = high conseque	ence area MCA = moderate	consequence area				
1. Source: PHMSA 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report, Part Q. Total mileage shown for context only.						
2. Excludes mileage reported under inadequate maximum allowable operating pressure records.						
3. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment; based on homes and occupied sites in primary impact radius only.						
4. Non-HCA mileage	4. Non-HCA mileage multiplied by percentage MCA.					
5. 20% of total interse	ecting mileage. Total milea	ge based on overlay o	of Federal Highway Administra	ation map with National Pipeline	Mapping System pipe	line data; 20%
based on PHMSA bes	t protessional judgment.	1				
6. MCA miles plus ad	5. MCA miles plus additional roadway MCA miles.					



Table 3-33. Estimation of MCA Mileage Subject to Integrity Assessment Requirements							
Location	MCA Mileage ¹	% Piggable ²	Mileage Subject to Rule ³	Mileage Subject to Rule less Overlap ⁴	% MCA Currently Assessed ⁵	MCA not Previously Assessed ⁶	
Interstate							
Class 1	4,559	71%	3,237	2,622	50%	1,311	
Class 2	8,531	70%	5,972	5,434	70%	1,630	
Class 3	7,378	NA	7,378	6,490	80%	1,298	
Class 4	10	NA	10	10	90%	1	
Subtotal	20,478	NA	16,597	14,556	NA	4,240	
Intrastate							
Class 1	2,051	53%	1,087	1,011	50%	505.429518	
Class 2	6,305	40%	2,522	2,371	70%	711.204	
Class 3	10,224	NA	10,224	9,500	80%	1900	
Class 4	156	NA	156	155	90%	15.5	
Subtotal	18,736	NA	13,989	13,037	NA	3,132	
Total						I	
Class 1	6,610	66%	4,363	3,633	50%	1,817	
Class 2	14,836	57%	8,457	7,805	70%	2,341	
Class 3	17,602	NA	17,602	15,990	80%	3,198	
Class 4	166	NA	166	165	90%	17	
Grand Total	39,214	NA	30,587	27,593	NA	7,372	
MCA = moderate cons	equence area						
1. See Table 3-32							
2. Assumed equal to non-HCA percent piggable based on data from Part R of the annual report (see Table 3-3).							
3. MCA mileage times percent piggable.							
4. Excludes MCA mile	eage subject to MAOP ver	ification provisions					
5. Assumed based on t	he overall reported assesse	ed mileage and asses	sed mileage in HCAs				
6. Mileage subject to p	proposed rule less overlap	with previous other t	opic areas multiplied by (100%	-% not previously asses	sed).		

Table 3-34. Estimated MCA Integrity Assessment Methods									
Location	ILI ¹	PT ²	DA and Other Methods ³						
Interstate	Interstate								
Class 1	100%	0%	0.0%						
Class 2	100%	0%	0.0%						
Class 3	60%	5%	35%						
Class 4	55%	5%	40%						
Intrastate									
Class 1	100%	0%	0.0%						
Class 2	100%	0%	0.0%						
Class 3	33%	10%	57%						
Class 4	62%	10%	28%						
1. PHMSA assumed operators will use ILI where possible.									
2. 2010-2014 PHMSA Annual Report part F. Historical rates of pressure testing in integrity assessments. The proposed rule requires assessment of pipelines in Class 1 and Class 2 locations only if piggable.									
3. PHMSA assumed direct a	3. PHMSA assumed direct assessment of remaining pipelines.								

Table 3-35. Estimated Assessment Methods for MCA Integrity Assessments (Miles)					
	ILI	РТ	DA & Other	Total	
Interstate					
Class 1	1,311	0.0	0.0	1,311	
Class 2	1,630	0.0	0.0	1,630	
Class 3	779	65	454	1,298	
Class 4	1	0.1	0.4	1	
Subtotal	3,721	65	455	4,240	
Intrastate					
Class 1	505	0.0	0.0	505	
Class 2	711	0.0	0.0	711	
Class 3	627	190	1,083	1,900	
Class 4	10	2	4	16	
Subtotal	1,853	192	1,087	3,132	
Total					
Class 1	1,817	0.0	0.0	1,817	
Class 2	2,341	0.0	0.0	2,341	
Class 3	1,406	255	1,537	3,198	
Class 4	10	2	5	17	
Grand Total	5,574	257	1,542	7,372	



Table 3-35. Estimated Assessment Methods for MCA Integrity Assessments (Miles)

Source: Based on Table 3-33 and Table 3-34. DA = direct assessment

ILI = inline inspection

MCA = moderate consequence area PT = pressure test

Table 3-36. Estimated Annual Costs for Expansion of Integrity Assessments Outside of HCAs				
	ILI	РТ	DA & Other	Total
Interstate			·	
Class 1	\$992,044	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$992,044
Class 2	\$1,233,567	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,233,567
Class 3	\$589,289	\$1,321,981	\$1,294,755	\$3,206,025
Class 4	\$416	\$1,018	\$1,140	\$2,575
Subtotal	\$2,815,316	\$1,323,000	\$1,295,895	\$5,434,211
Intrastate				
Class 1	\$613,796	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$613,796
Class 2	\$863,690	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$863,690
Class 3	\$761,432	\$3,425,625	\$3,086,550	\$7,273,608
Class 4	\$11,670	\$27,946	\$12,369	\$51,985
Subtotal	\$2,250,589	\$3,453,571	\$3,098,919	\$8,803,079
Total		L		
Class 1	\$1,605,840	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,605,840
Class 2	\$2,097,257	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2,097,257
Class 3	\$1,350,721	\$4,747,607	\$4,381,305	\$10,479,633
Class 4	\$12,087	\$28,964	\$13,509	\$54,560
Grand Total	\$5,065,905	\$4,776,571	\$4,394,814	\$14,237,290
DA = direct assessment I	LI = inline inspection			
HCA = high consequence	e area PT = pressure test			



Table 3-37. Estimated Mileage of Previously Untested Pipe Operating at 20-30% SMYS in HCAs					
Location	Previously Untested HCA Miles ¹	Percent of all Pipe Operating at 20- 30% SMYS ¹	HCA Miles 20-30% SMYS ²		
Interstate					
Class 1	62	5%	3		
Class 2	23	8%	2		
Class 3	439	9%	41		
Class 4	0.0	32%	0.0		
Subtotal	524	NA	46		
Intrastate					
Class 1	13	11%	1		
Class 2	18	22%	4		
Class 3	749	29%	215		
Class 4	5	49%	2		
Subtotal	785	NA	223		
Total					
Class 1	75	7%	4		
Class 2	41	14%	6		
Class 3	1,188	21%	256		
Class 4	5	48%	2		
Grand Total	1,309	NA	269		
HCA = high consequence are	a.				
SMYS = specified minimum	yield strength.				
1. Source: 2014 PHMSA Gas	s Transmission Annual R	leport.			
2. Calculated as untested HC	A mileage times percent	of all pipe operated at 2	0-30% SMYS.		



Table 3-38. Previously Untested Non-HCA		
Pipe in Class 3 and 4 Locations		
Location	Mileage	
Interstate		
Class 3	888	
Class 4	0.0	
Subtotal	888	
Class 3	724	
Class 4	1	
Subtotal	725	
Total		
Class 3	1,612	
Class 4	1	
Grand Total	1,613	
Source: 2014 PHMSA Gas Transmission Annual		
Report.		

Table 3-39. Estimation of Piggable MCA Mileage in Class 1 and 2 Locations					
Location	Piggable MCA ¹	Percent of Non- HCA Mileage Previously Untested ²	Previously Untested Piggable MCA Mileage ³		
Interstate					
Class 1	3,237	0.2	615		
Class 2	5,972	0.1	537		
Subtotal	9,209	NA	1,153		
Intrastate					
Class 1	1,087	0.1	76		
Class 2	2,522	0.1	151		
Subtotal	3,609	NA	227		
Total					
Class 1	4,324	NA	691		
Class 2	8,494	NA	689		
Grand Total	12,818	NA	1,380		
MCA = moderate consequence area.					
1. Estimated as MCA (Table	e 3-33) times % piggable	non-HCA (Table 3-3).			
2. Source: 2014 PHMSA Gas Transmission Annual Report.					
3. Calculated as piggable MCA mileage multiplied by percent untested non-HCA mileage.					



Table 3-40. Summary of Applicable Previously Untested Mileage				
Location	HCA Operating at 20-30% SMYS	Class 3 and 4 Non- HCA	Piggable Class 1 and 2 MCA	Total
Interstate				
Class 1	3	0	615	618
Class 2	2	0	537	539
Class 3	41	888	0.0	929
Class 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	46	888	1,153	2,087
Intrastate				
Class 1	1	0.0	76	78
Class 2	4	0.0	151	155
Class 3	215	724	0.0	939
Class 4	2	1	0.0	3
Subtotal	223	725	227	1,175
Total				
Class 1	4	0.0	691	696
Class 2	6	0.0	689	694
Class 3	256	1,612	0.0	1,868
Class 4	2	1	0.0	3
Grand Total	269	1,613	1,380	3,262
Source: See Tables 3-37, 3-38, and 3-39. HCA = high consequence area				
MCA = moderate consequence area SMYS = specified minimum yield strength				



Table 3-41. Miles by Estimated Assessment Method				
Location	Total ILI	РТ	Upgrade and ILI	Total
Interstate				
Class 1	618	0.0	0.0	618
Class 2	539	0.0	0.0	539
Class 3	558	46	325	929
Class 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	1,715	46	325	2,087
Intrastate	· · · · ·			
Class 1	78	0.0	0.0	78
Class 2	153	0.4	2	155
Class 3	582	94	263	939
Class 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	813	94	265	1,172
Total	· · · · ·			
Class 1	696	0.0	0.0	696
Class 2	692	0.4	2	694
Class 3	1,140	140	588	1,868
Class 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grand Total	2,527	141	590	3,259



Table 3-42. Annual Cat Greater than 30%	osts to Re-establish N SMYS	AOP, Previousl	y Untested Segments Other t	han HCA Operating
Location	ILI	РТ	Upgrade and ILI	Total
Interstate				
Class 1	\$467,688	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$467,688
Class 2	\$408,074	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$408,074
Class 3	\$421,852	\$946,361	\$3,766,438	\$5,134,652
Class 4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal	\$1,297,613	\$946,361	\$3,766,438	\$6,010,413
Intrastate	· · ·			
Class 1	\$94,198	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$94,198
Class 2	\$185,316	\$6,981	\$24,060	\$216,356
Class 3	\$707,217	\$1,693,495	\$3,244,413	\$5,645,125
Class 4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal	\$986,731	\$1,700,476	\$3,268,473	\$5,955,679
Total				
Class 1	\$561,885	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$561,885
Class 2	\$593,389	\$6,981	\$24,060	\$624,430
Class 3	\$1,129,069	\$2,639,856	\$7,010,851	\$10,779,777
Class 4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Grand Total	\$2,284,344	\$2,646,837	\$7,034,911	\$11,966,092
ILI = inline inspection	'	· ·	I	
HCA = high consequence	e area			
MAOP = maximum allow	wable operating pressure	PT = pressure test		
SMYS = specified minin	num yield strength			

Table C- 43

Table 3-43. Estimated Miles of Previously Untested HCA Segments Operating at 20%- 30% SMYS Assessed per Year by Baseline Assessment Method				
Location	Total HCA	Inline Inspection	Pressure Test	Direct Assessment and Other Methods
Interstate	3	3	0.1	0.0
Intrastate	15	8	1	5
HCA = high consequence area.				
SMYS = specified minimum vield strength.				

Source: HCA mileage from Table 3-37 divided by 15 and multiplied by the baseline HCA assessment rates from Table 3-22.



Table 3-44. Estimated Baseline Costs Per Year on HCA Segments Operating at 20%-30% SMYS Assessedper Year by Baseline Assessment Method

Location	Inline Inspections	Pressure Tests	Direct Assessment and Other Methods	Total
Interstate	\$32,880	\$42,623	\$1,484	\$76,987
Intrastate	\$151,667	\$400,530	\$216,509	\$768,705
Total	\$184,547	\$443,153	\$217,993	\$845,693

Table C- 45

Table 3-45. Net Average Annual Costs to Assess HCA Segments Operating at 20-30% Specified Minimum Yield Strength				
Component	Interstate	Intrastate	Total	
Compliance costs	\$6,010,413	\$5,955,679	\$11,966,092	
Baseline integrity management costs	(\$76,987)	(\$768,705)	(\$845,693)	
Net costs	\$5,933,426	\$5,186,974	\$11,120,399	

Table 3-46. Natural Gas Composition				
Gas	Percent of Volume			
Methane (CH ₄)	96%			
Carbon dioxide (C02)	1%			
Other Fluids	3%			
Source: Estimated based on natural gas quality standards and operator reported measurements				
Enbridge Estimates: https://www.enbridgegas.com/gas-safety/about- natural-gas/components-natural-gas.aspx Spectra Estimates: https://www.uniongas.com/about- us/about-natural-gas/Chemical-Composition-of- Natural- Gas				


Table 3-47. Proportion of Gas Transmission Mileage by Diameter										
Segment Type	<12" Diameter	14''-34'' Diameter	36''+ Diameter							
Interstate	27%	57%	16%							
Intrastate	57%	37%	6%							
Source: 2014 Gas Transmissi	on Annual Report		Source: 2014 Gas Transmission Annual Report							

Table C- 48

Table 3-48. GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns						
Diameter (inches)	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide (lbs.)			
12						
	113	108	168			
24						
	424	406	631			
36						
	974	932	1,449			
Source: See Equation 1 and Table 3-46 lbs. = pounds						
MCF = thousand cubic feet						

Table 3-49. GHG Emissions from Pressure Tests per Assessment Mile						
Location	Gas Released per mile (MCF)	Methane Released per Mile (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide Released per Mile (lbs.)			
Interstate	424.3	406.1	631.0			
Intrastate	277.7	265.8	413.0			
lbs. = pounds						
MCF = thousand cubic feet						
1. Weighted average based or	n share of pipeline milea	ge by diameter.				



Table 3-50. Total GHG Emissions from Pressure Test Blowdowns								
Item	PT Miles	PT Miles	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane (MCF)	Carbon			
	(Interstate)	(Intrastate)			Dioxide (lbs.)			
Re-establish	2	48	14,086	13,480	20,949			
MAOP: HCA >								
30% SMYS ¹								
Re-establish	36	491	151.687	145,164	225,589			
MAOP: Inadequate			,		,			
Records ²								
Integrity	65	192	80,758	77,285	120,103			
Assessment: Non-								
HCA ¹								
Re-establish	44	72	38,850	37,180	57,778			
MAOP: HCA 20-								
HCA Class 3 and								
4: Non-HCA Class								
1 and 2 piggable ¹								
Total	1/18	802	285 381	273 100	121 118			
DT - massume test	140	002	203,301	273,107	424,410			
MCF = thousand cubic feet.								
1. Miles pressure test	ed for compliance	e with MAOP rev	erification requirements i	minus baseline HCA pressu	re test miles.			
2. MCA miles pressu	re tested for comp	pliance with MCA	A integrity assessment req	uirements.				

Table C- 51

Table 3-51. Natural Gas Lost due to Blowdowns per Mile (MCF/Mile)						
Location	Diameter 12" or less	Diameter 14" to 24"	Diameter 26'' and above			
Interstate	18.6	130.3	332.3			
Intrastate	19.9	114.3	344.3			
MCF = thousand cubic feet.						
Source: See Equation 1 in Se	ection 3.1.4.3.					

Table 3-52. Proportion of Gas Transmission Mileage by Diameter					
Segment Type ≤ 12 " Diameter 14 "-24" Diameter ≥ 26 "Diameter					
Interstate	27%	32%	41%		
Intrastate	57%	29%	14%		
Source: 2014 Gas Transmissi	on Annual Reports				



Table 3-53. GHG Emissions from Blowdowns, ILI Upgrade (per Mile)							
Location	Gas Released (MCF) ¹ (MCF) ² C0 ₂ Emissions (MCF) ²						
Interstate	183	175	272				
Intrastate	93	89	319				
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = 1$	methane		I				
GHG = greenhouse gas							
HCA = high consequence are	ea ILI = inline inspection						
ILI = inline inspection							
lbs =pounds							
1. Weighted Average based of data	on natural gas emissions	due to upgrade by diame	eter and annual report diameter				
2. Gas emissions multiplied b	by 95.7% methane						
3. Gas Emissions multiplied	by 1.3% CO ² and 114.4	lbs/MCF CO ²					



Table 3-54. Total GHG Emissions due to Blowdowns							
Item	ILI Upgrade Miles (Interstate)	ILI Upgrade Miles (Intrastate)	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	C02 Emissions (lbs.)		
Re-establish MAOP: HCA > 30% SMYS	22	120	15,078	14,429	44,073		
Re-establish MAOP: Inadequate Records	263	1,176	157,344	150,578	446,704		
Integrity Assessment: Non- HCA	0	0	0	0	0		
Re-establish MAOP: HCA 20- 30% SMYS; Non-HCA Class 3 and 4; Non-HCA Class 1 and 2 piggable	325	265	84,073	80,458	173,004		
Total	609	1,561	256,495	245,466	663,781		
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = methane$							
GHG = greenhouse gas							
HCA = high consequence area ILI = inline inspection							
MAOP = maximum allowable	e operating pressure MC	CF = thousand cubic feet					
SMYS = specified minimum	yield strength						



Table 3-55. Total Emissions Per Year							
Item	Gas Released (MCF)	Methane Emissions (MCF CH4)	C02 Emissions (lbs.)				
Re-establish MAOP: HCA > 30% SMYS	1,944	1,861	4,335				
Re-establish MAOP: Inadequate Records	20,602	19,716	44,819				
Integrity Assessment: Non- HCA	5,384	5,152	8,007				
Re-establish MAOP: HCA 20-30% SMYS; Non-HCA Class 3 and 4; Non-HCA Class 1 and 2 piggable	8,195	7,843	15,385				
Total	36,125	34,572	72,547				
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide CH_4 = r$	nethane						
HCA = high consequence area lbs. = pounds							
MAOP = maximum allowable	e operating pressure MC	EF = thousand cubic feet					
SMYS = specified minimum	yield strength						

Table 3-56. Average Annual Social Cost of Gas Lost due to Blowdown (Millions 2015\$)							
Tania Anas 1 Saana	Average Annu	Average Annual Methane Lost from Blowdown (MCF)					
Topic Area 1 Scope	ILI Upgrade	Pressure Test	Total	Social Cost ¹			
Previously untested in HCA	962.0	898.7	1,860.6	0.1			
HCA and Class 3 and 4 with inadequate records	10,038.5	9,677.6	19,716.2	0.6			
Applicable MCA	0.0	5,152.4	5,152.4	0.2			
Previously other HCA and non-HCA	5,363.9	2,478.6	7,842.5	0.2			
Subtotal	16,364.4	18,207.3	34,571.7	1.0			
MCF = thousand cubic fe	eet						
1. Based on the values fo Appendix B).	r social cost of meth	ane and social cost of c	carbon calculated using a 39	% discount rate (see			



Table 3-57. Present Value Costs Discounted at 7%, Topic Area 1 (Millions 2015\$) ¹							
		Total		Average Annual			
Scope	Compliance Cost	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total Cost	Annual Compliance Cost	Annual Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Average Annual Cost	
Re-establish MAOP: HCA > 30% SMYS	\$21	\$1	\$22	\$1	\$0.1	\$1	
Re-establish MAOP: Inadequate Records	\$262	\$9	\$271	\$17	\$1	\$18	
Integrity Assessment: Non - HCA	\$139	\$2	\$141	\$9	\$0.2	\$9	
Re-establish MAOP: HCA 20-30% SMYS; Non-HCA Class 3 and 4; Non-HCA Class 1 and 2 piggable	\$108	\$3	\$112	\$7	\$0.2	\$7	
Total	\$530	\$15	\$546	\$35	\$1	\$36	
GHG = greenhouse gas.							
HCA = high consequence area.							
MAOP = maximum allow	MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure. SMYS = specific minimum yield strength.						
1. Total is of the 15 year of	1. Total is of the 15 year compliance period; average annual is total divided by 15.						



Table 3-58. Present Value Costs Discounted at 3%, Topic Area 1 (Millions 2015\$) ¹								
		Total		Average Annual				
Scope	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total	Compliance	Social Cost of GHG Emissions	Total		
Re-establish MAOP: HCA > 30% SMYS	\$26	\$1	\$27	\$2	\$0.1	\$2		
Re-establish MAOP: Inadequate Records	\$331	\$9	\$340	\$22	\$1	\$23		
Integrity Assessment: Non - HCA	\$175	\$2	\$177	\$12	\$0.2	\$12		
Re-establish MAOP: HCA 20-30% SMYS; Non-HCA Class 3 and 4; Non-HCA Class 1 and 2 piggable	\$137	\$3	\$140	\$9	\$0.2	\$9		
Total	\$669	\$15	\$684	\$45	\$1	\$46		
HCA = high consequence area								
MAOP = maximum allow	MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure SMYS = specific minimum yield strength							
1. Total is of the 15 year c	ompliance period; av	erage annual is total d	ivided by 15.					



Table 3-60. Calculation of HCA Mileage,Topic Area 2			
Scope	Miles		
HCA ¹	19,872		
HCA MAOP verification testing under Topic Area 1 ²	3,035		
HCA less Topic Area 1 mileage	16,837		
Average assessed per year ³	2,405		
1. Source: PHMSA Annual Reports.			
2. See section 3.1.			
3. HCA miles less topic Area 1 divided by 7 years.			

Table C- 60

Table 3-61. Hazardous Liquid Scheduled Repair Conditions,2004-2009				
Repair Condition	Number	Percent of Total		
60-day conditions	4,673	19%		
180-day conditions	20,468	81%		
Total	25,141	100%		
Source: 2004-2009 Hazardous Liquid Annual Reports; see Table C-2.				

Table 3-62. Estimation of 180-Day RepairConditions			
Component	Value		
HCA miles assessed per year	2,405		
Scheduled repair conditions per mile assessed ¹	0.9		
Expected scheduled repair conditions per year	2176		

Table 3-62. Estimation of 180-Day Repair		
Conditions		
180 conditions (% of	81%	
scheduled conditions)		
Expected 180-day	1,771	
conditions per year		
1. 2004-2009 Gas Transmission	on scheduled repair	
rate, see Table C-2.	-	

Table 3-63. Range of Typical Repair Costs				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East ¹	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	\$9,600	\$12,000	\$13,800	
Sleeve (5')	\$12,800	\$16,000	\$18,400	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$41,600	\$52,000	\$59,800	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$23,000	
Sleeve (20')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$51,200	\$64,000	\$73,600	
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	
24-inch Diameter		I		
Composite Wrap (5')	\$14,400	\$18,000	\$20,700	
Sleeve (5')	\$19,200	\$24,000	\$27,600	
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$62,400	\$78,000	\$89,700	
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	
Composite Wrap (20')	\$24,000	\$30,000	\$34,500	
Sleeve (20')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400	
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$76,800	\$96,000	\$110,400	



Table 3-63. Range of Typical	Repair Costs		
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
36-inch diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	\$21,600	\$27,000	\$31,050
Sleeve (5')	\$28,800	\$36,000	\$41,400
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$93,600	\$117,000	\$134,550
Material Verification (5')	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Composite Wrap (20')	\$36,000	\$45,000	\$51,750
Sleeve (20')	\$43,200	\$54,000	\$62,100
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$115,200	\$144,000	\$165,600
Material Verification (20')	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Source: PHMSA best professional	judgment		
1. 115% of South, West Coast.			

Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	
24-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	



Percent of Conditions Repaired using Current Methodology				
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	
36-inch diameter	I	I		
Composite Wrap (5')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (5')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (5')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (5')	17%	17%	17%	
Composite Wrap (20')	5%	5%	5%	
Sleeve (20')	10%	10%	10%	
Pipe Replacement (20')	2%	2%	2%	
Material Verification (20')	17%	17%	17%	

Number of Repairs Done using Methodology				
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	
12-inch Diameter				
Composite Wrap (5')	66	13	9	
Sleeve (5')	133	27	18	
Pipe Replacement (5')	22	4	3	
Material Verification (5')	221	44	30	
Composite Wrap (20')	66	13	9	
Sleeve (20')	133	27	18	
Pipe Replacement (20')	22	4	3	



Material Verification1 (20')	221	44	30
24-inch Diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	66	13	9
Sleeve (5')	133	27	18
Pipe Replacement (5')	22	4	3
Material Verification1 (5')	221	44	30
Composite Wrap (20')	66	13	9
Sleeve (20')	133	27	18
Pipe Replacement (20')	22	4	3
Material Verification1 (20')	221	44	30
36-inch diameter			
Composite Wrap (5')	66	13	9
Sleeve (5')	133	27	18
Pipe Replacement (5')	22	4	3
Material Verification1 (5')	221	44	30
Composite Wrap (20')	66	13	9
Sleeve (20')	133	27	18
Pipe Replacement (20')	22	4	3
Material Verification1 (20')	221	44	30

Cost of Repairs					
Repair Method (Length)	West (Except West Coast), Central, Southwest	South, West Coast	East	Total	
12-inch Diameter					
Composite Wrap (5')	\$637,614	\$159,404	\$122,209	\$919,227	
Sleeve (5')	\$1,700,305	\$425,076	\$325,892	\$2,451,273	



Cost of Repairs	s			
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$920,998	\$230,250	\$176,525	\$1,327,773
Material Verification (5')	\$442,788	\$88,558	\$59,038	\$590,384
Composite Wrap (20')	\$1,062,691	\$265,673	\$203,682	\$1,532,046
Sleeve (20')	\$2,550,457	\$637,614	\$488,838	\$3,676,909
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$1,133,537	\$283,384	\$217,261	\$1,634,182
Material Verification (20')	\$885,575	\$177,115	\$118,077	\$1,180,767
24-inch Diamete	r			
Composite Wrap (5')	\$956,422	\$239,105	\$183,314	\$1,378,841
Sleeve (5')	\$2,550,457	\$637,614	\$488,838	\$3,676,909
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$1,381,498	\$345,374	\$264,787	\$1,991,659
Material Verification(5')	\$442,788	\$88,558	\$59,038	\$590,384
Composite Wrap (20')	\$1,594,036	\$398,509	\$305,524	\$2,298,068
Sleeve (20')	\$3,825,686	\$956,422	\$733,256	\$5,515,364
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$1,700,305	\$425,076	\$325,892	\$2,451,273
Material Verification (20')	\$885,575	\$177,115	\$118,077	\$1,180,767
36-inch diameter	r r	L	L	
Composite Wrap (5')	\$1,434,632	\$358,658	\$274,971	\$2,068,261



Cost of Repai	rs			
Sleeve (5')	\$3,825,686	\$956,422	\$733,256	\$5,515,364
Pipe Replacement (5')	\$2,072,247	\$518,062	\$397,181	\$2,987,489
Material Verification (5')	\$442,788	\$88,558	\$59,038	\$590,384
Composite Wrap (20')	\$2,391,054	\$597,763	\$458,285	\$3,447,102
Sleeve (20')	\$5,738,529	\$1,434,632	\$1,099,885	\$8,273,046
Pipe Replacement (20')	\$2,550,457	\$637,614	\$488,838	\$3,676,909
Material Verification (20')	\$885,575	\$177,115	\$118,077	\$1,180,767
Total Cost	\$42,011,700	\$10,303,671	\$7,819,779	\$60,135,150

Labor Rates						
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost1	
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99	
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86	
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81	
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55	
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics (May 2014) and Employer Cost of Employee Compensation (September 2015).						
1. Mean hourly wa	age plus mean benef	its (\$25.01 per ho	ur worked).			



Table 3-64. Present Value of Estimated Annual Cost of More Timely Repair of Non- Immediate Conditions (Millions)					
Estimate	7% Discount Rate	3% Discount Rate			
Cost of repairs	\$60.1	\$60.1			
Percent of anomalies that are repaired	50.4%	50.4%			
Cost of repairing anomalies on an accelerated schedule	\$30.3	\$30.3			
Cost of repairs delayed 4 years	\$23.1	\$27.0			
Difference for repaired anomalies (estimated cost of proposed rule)	\$7.2	\$3.4			
Time to monitor one anomaly (hours)	1.0	1.0			
Salary to monitor anomalies	\$55.0	\$55.0			
Average Ongoing anomalies in a given time period	6,583.0	6,583.0			
Cost for monitoring unrepaired anomalies	\$0.4	\$0.4			
Annual cost of rule	\$36.6	\$32.8			
G & A Cost	\$7.3	\$6.6			

Table 3-65. Present Value Costs, Topic Area 2 (Millions) ¹						
7% Discount Rate3% Discount Rate						
Total	Average Annual	Total	Average Annual			
\$428	\$29	\$484	\$32			
1. Total is of the 15 year compliance period; average annual is total divided by 15.						



Table 3-66. Labor Rates								
Occupation Code	Occupation	Industry	Labor Category	Mean Hourly Wage	Total Labor Cost ¹			
17-2141	Mechanical Engineers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Sr. Engineer	\$74	\$99			
Nov-71	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution Managers	Oil and Gas Extraction	Manager	\$61	\$86			
17-2111	Health and Safety Engineers, Except Mining Safety Engineers and Inspectors	Oil and Gas Extraction	Project engineer	\$56	\$81			
47-5013	Service Unit Operators, Oil, Gas, and Mining	Pipeline Transportation of Natural Gas	Operator	\$30	\$55			
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics (May 2014) and Employer Cost of Employee Compensation (September 2015).								
1. Mean hourly wage	plus mean benefit	s (\$25.01 per hour	r worked).					

Table 3-67. Onetime Cost of Management of Change Process Development ¹							
	Low Est	imate	High Estimate				
Activity	Hours	Cost ²	Hours	Cost ²			
Review existing MoC	24	\$2,415	0	\$0			
procedures for IMP-							
and Control Center-							
related changes							
Revise and expand	130	\$12,879	0	\$0			
scope of procedures							
Establish procedures	0	\$0	650	\$52,689			
Notify personnel and	33	\$3,220	163	\$8,945			
provide implementation							
guidance and							
instruction							
Total	187	\$18,514	813	\$61,634			
1. Source: PHMSA best pr	1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment. Low estimate reflects nominally formal existing processes and high estimate						
reflects only minimal exist	reflects only minimal existing processes.						
2. Feedback from partners	indicated the time to	set up a managemer	nt of change program would be	e closer to 500 hours and so			
made adjustment							



Table 3-68. Per Event	Table 3-68. Per Event Cost of Implementing Management of Change Processes						
Activity	Labor Category	Labor Cost ¹ (\$/hour)	Hours	Cost			
Maintenance/operating personnel or engineer identifies a change, invoking the process	Operator	\$55	1	\$55			
Obtain approval to pursue change	Manager	\$86	1	\$86			
Evaluate and document technical and operational implications of the change	Sr. Engineer	\$99	12	\$1,188			
Obtain required work authorizations (e.g., hot work and lockout-tag out permits)	Project Engineer	\$81	3	\$243			
Formally institutionalize change in official "as-built" drawings, facilities lists, data books, and procedure manuals	Project Engineer	\$81	8	\$648			
Communicate change to all potentially affected parties	Manager	\$86	2	\$172			
Train and qualify involved personnel	Operator	\$55	20	\$1,100			
Total	NA	NA	47	\$3,492			
1. See Table 3-66.							

Table 3-69. Present Value Costs, Topic Area 3 ¹							
Component	Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)			
Onetime process development	\$2,805,187	\$187,012	\$2,805,187	\$187,012			
Annual implementation (\$977,760)	\$9,530,011	\$635,334	\$12,024,227	\$801,615			
Note: Detail may not add to total due to rounding.							
1. Total is present value o	ver 15 year complian	ce period; average an	nual is total divided by 15.				



Table 3-70. Reported Gas Transmission Incidents Due to Corrosion (Onshore and Offshore)							
Year	Internal Corrosion	External Corrosion	Total Corrosion	Total All Causes			
2003	11	11	22	93			
2004	14	9	23	103			
2005	7	12	19	160			
2006	11	12	23	130			
2007	18	17	35	110			
2008	8	11	19	122			
2009	10	9	19	105			
2010	19	10	29	105			
2011	14	4	18	114			
2012	14	13	27	102			
2013	13	5	18	103			
2014	9	9	18	129			
2015	13	8	21	129			
Total	161	130	291	1,505			
Source: PHMSA Incident	Reports						

Table 3-71. Estimation of Coating Survey Costs						
Class	Coating Survey Cost ¹	Number of Surveys	Cost ¹			
1	\$200	100	\$20,000			
2	\$400	70	\$28,000			
3	\$3,000	50	\$150,000			
4	\$5,000	20	\$100,000			
G &A Cost	NA	NA	\$59,600			
Total	NA	240	\$357,600			
Source: PHMSA Best Professional Judgment.						
1. Based on average survey length of 500 feet. Actual costs will vary depending on environment, traffic control, and survey length.						



Table 3-72. Gas Transmission Close Interval Survey							
Class	Close Interval Survey Cost (\$/Mile) ¹	Mileage ²	Current Compliance ¹	Out of Specification Test Station Readings (Annual) ^{1,3}	Total Costs ⁴		
1	\$2,000	232,635	15%	0.5%	\$1,977,398		
2	\$3,000	30,631	10%	0.5%	\$413,519		
3	\$25,000	33,652	5%	0.5%	\$3,996,175		
4	\$50,000	908	5%	0.5%	\$215,650		
G &A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$1,320,548		
Total	NA	297,826	NA	NA	\$7,923,289		
1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment							
2. Source: PHMSA 2014 Annual Report via PDM							
3. Reflects long-standing requirements for operators to have CP systems and check test stations annually, and PHMSA inspection experience.							
4. Calculated as the product of	of mileage, unit cost, out of	f spec rate, and (1-com	pliance rate).				

Table 3-73. Cost to Add Test Station in HCA								
HCA Miles ¹	Stations Required per Mile	Baseline Compliance ²	New Stations Required	Cost per Test Station ³	G&A cost	Total Cost		
19,872	2	80%	7,949	\$540	\$858,599	\$5,151,592		
HCA = high consequence area								
1. Source: PHMSA annual reports.								
2. Source: PHMSA BPJ	2. Source: PHMSA BPJ							
3. Unit cost represents app	proximately \$400 in la	bor (2 workers for ha	lf day) and \$100 in materials.					



Table 3-74. Estimation of Costs for Interference Surveys								
Class	Interference Survey Cost ¹ (\$/mile)	Total Mileage ²	Current Compliance ¹	Incremental Need for Surveys ¹	Compliance Mileage ³	Total Costs ⁴ (\$/7 years)		
1	4,000	232,726	10%	1%	2,095	\$8,378,143		
2	5,000	30,645	10%	1%	276	\$1,379,005		
3	10,000	33,657	70%	3%	303	\$3,029,158		
4	10,000	908	90%	3%	3	\$27,244		
G &A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$2,562,710		
Total	NA	297,936	NA	NA	2,676	\$15,376,260		
1. Source: PHMSA Best Professional Judgment								
2. Source: PHMSA 2014 Annual Report via PDM								
3. Calculated as total mile	$eage \times (100\% - current)$	t compliance) × increm	mental need for surveys.					
4. Calculated as complian	ce mileage × unit cost							



Table 3-75. Estimation of Costs for Internal Corrosion Monitoring							
Class	Monitoring Equipment Cost	Total Number of Monitors Needed	% Current Compliance	Number of Monitors for Compliance ¹	Costs		
1	\$10,000	250	95%	13	\$125,000		
2	\$10,000	50	80%	10	\$100,000		
3	\$10,000	150	95%	8	\$75,000		
4	\$10,000	200	95%	10	\$100,000		
G &A Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$80,000		
Total	NA	650	NA	40	\$480,000		
Source: PHMSA Best Professional Judgment							
1. Calculated as total i	number of monitor	rs needed \times (100%)	- % current compliance).				

Table C- 79

Table 3-76. Summary of Incremental Costs, Corrosion Control (Millions)					
Component	One-Time	Annual	Recurring (7 years)		
External Corrosion Coatings	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.0		
External Corrosion Monitoring	\$5.2	\$7.9	\$0.0		
Interference Current Surveys	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$15.4		
Internal Corrosion Monitoring	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0		
Total	\$5.6	\$8.3	\$15.4		

Table C- 80

Table 3-77. Present Value Incremental Costs, Topic Area 4 ¹					
Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)		
\$114,137,670	\$7,609,178	\$137,800,566	\$9,186,704		
1 Coloulated accuming one ti	ma ageta in year 1. anny	al agente in visione 1 15, a	nd 7 waan naawiin a aaata		

1. Calculated assuming one-time costs in year 1; annual costs in years 1-15; and 7-year recurring costs annualized over 7 years at the different discount rates. Total is present value over 15 years; average annual is total divided by 15.



Table 3-78. Estimation of Costs for Process Development for Extreme Events								
Activity	Hours (Low)	Hours (High)	Cost per Operator (Low) ¹	Cost per Operator (High) ¹	Total Cost (Low) ²	Total Cost (High) ²	Total Cost (Average)	
Review existing surveillance and patrol procedures to validate adequacy for extreme events	2	1	198	99	100,693	50,347	75,520	
Revise surveillance and patrol procedures	5	20	495	1,980	251,733	1,006,932	629,332	
Notify involved personnel of new procedures, providing implementation guidance and instruction	5	10	495	990	251,733	503,466	377,599	
Total	12	31	1,188	3,069	604,159	1,560,744	1,082,452	
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment								
1. Calculated as hours \times	labor cost for senior	r engineer (\$99; see	Table 3-66).					
2. Calculated as cost per	operator \times 50% \times 1	,017 operators.						



72-hour Post-Event Incremental Inspection for Natural Gas Transmission Line						
	Low Estimate	High Estimate	Average			
Events per Year	25	75	50			
Miles per Event	200	400	300			
Extra Cost per Inspection in \$/mile	\$350	\$500	\$425			
Calculated Total Extra Cost in \$/Year	\$1,750,000	\$15,000,000	\$6,375,000			
Source: Illustrative examples prepared by ICF to show approximate magnitude of costs.						

Table 3-79. Present Value Costs, Topic Area 51					
Total (7%)	Average Annual (7%)	Total (3%)	Average Annual (3%)		
63,209,810	4,213,987	79,469,918	5,297,995		
1. Total is present value over 15 year study period; average annual is total divided by 15 years.					



Table 3-80. MAOP Exceedance Reportsfrom Gas Facilities				
Year	MAOP Exceedance Reports			
2012	5			
2013	21			
2014	21			
2015	17			
Source: PHMSA Safety Related Condition Reports: MAOP exceedance reports on gas transmission pipelines				

Table C- 85

Table 3-81. Previously Incurred Compliance Costs (2015\$)						
Year	MAOP Exceedance Reporting ¹	Records Verification ²	Total at Current Labor Rates	Estimated Cost Incurred ³		
2012	\$2,970	\$2,851,488	\$2,854,458	\$2,765,332		
2013	\$12,475	\$0.0	\$12,475	\$12,265		
2014	\$12,475	\$0.0	\$12,475	\$12,459		
2015	\$10,099	\$0.0	\$10,099	\$10,099		
Total	\$38,020	\$2,851,488	\$2,889,508	\$2,800,155		
NA = not applicable						
1. Reports from Table 3-80 times six hours times \$99/hour labor rate from Table 3-66.						
2. 1,440 reports times 20 hours times \$99/hour labor rate from Table 3-66.						
3. Cost at labor rates in ye Consumers (average annu	ear occurred approxin al value for 2015: 23'	nated using the Burea 7.0; 2014: 236.7; 201	u of Labor Statistics Consume 3: 233.0; 2012: 229.6).	r Price Index – All Urban		

Table 3-82. Present Value Costs, Topic Area 6 (2015\$)1					
Total (7%)Average Annual (7%)Total (3%)Average Annual (3%)					
\$2,898,575	\$193,238	\$2,930,815	\$195,388		
1. Total is present value over 15 year study period; average annual is total divided by 15 years.					



Table 3-83. Estimation of Costs for Creating Launcher and Receiver Pressure Specifications						
Activity	Hours	Cost ¹	Number of Systems	Total Cost		
Review existing design, installation, and testing specifications for launcher/receiver facilities.	1	\$99	10	\$990		
Revise specifications to comply with new §192.750.	24	\$2,376	10	\$23,762		
Total	25	\$2,475	20	\$24,753		
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment						
1. Calculated as hours \times labor cost for senior engineer (\$99; see	Table 3-6	6).				

Table C- 88

Table 3-84. Estimation of Costs for Launcher and Receiver Safety Device Installation							
Component	Cost per Small Line ¹ (<16")	Cost per Large Line ² (>16")	Incremental Number of Devices, Small Lines	Incremental Number of Devices, Large Lines	Total Cost		
Closure	\$7,000	\$25,000	5	5	\$160,000		
Trap	\$10,000	\$25,000	5	5	\$175,000		
Total	\$17,000	\$50,000	10	10	\$335,000		
Source: PHMSA							
best professional		ļ					
judgment							
1. Pressure relieving c	closure for 8" line s	size with 12" trap	including installation and	testing.			
2. Pressure relieving c	closure for 30" line	size with 36" trap	p including installation and	d testing.			

Table 3-106. Summary of Present Value Compliance Costs (Millions 2015\$) ¹						
Topic Area	7% Disco	ount Rate	3% Disc	ount Rate		
	Total	Average Annual	Total	Average Annual		
1	\$546	\$36	\$684	\$46		
2	\$428	\$29	\$484	\$32		
3	\$12	\$1	\$15	\$1		
4	\$114	\$8	\$138	\$9		
5	\$63	\$4.2	\$79	\$5		
6	\$3	\$0.2	\$3	\$0.2		
7	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.0		
8	\$585	\$39	\$699	\$47		
Total	\$1,752	\$117	\$2,103	\$140		
1. Total present value over 15 study period; average annual calculated by dividing total by 15.						
2. PHMSA analyzed this component with a pre-statutory baseline, however most operators are expected to be in compliance with the Act						



Table 3-107. Summary of Present Value Total Costs (Millions 2015\$) ¹						
Component	7% Discount Rate		3% Discount Rate			
Component	Total	Average Annual	Total	Average Annual		
Compliance costs	\$1,737	\$116	\$2,088	\$139		
Social cost of methane ²	\$15	\$1	\$15	\$1		
Total \$1,752 \$117 \$2,103 \$14						
1. Total present value over 15 study period; average annual calculated by dividing total by 15.						
2. Based on 3% value. Se	e Appendix B for dis	scussion of other estin	nated values.			

Table 3-108. Breakdown of Present Value Costs, Topic Area 1 (Millions 2015\$)						
Subtanta Anas	7% Discour	nt Rate	3% Disc	ount Rate		
Subtopic Area	Average Annual	Total	Average Annual	Total		
Re-establish MAOP:	\$1	\$22	\$2	\$27		
HCA > 30% SMYS						
Re-establish MAOP:	\$18	\$271	\$23	\$340		
Inadequate Records						
Integrity Assessment:	\$9	\$141	\$12	\$177		
Non - HCA						
Re-establish MAOP:	\$7	\$112	\$9	\$140		
HCA 20-30% SMYS;						
Non-HCA Class 3 and						
4; Non-HCA Class 1						
and 2 piggable						
Total	\$36	\$546	\$46	\$684		
HCA = high consequence area						
MAOP = maximum allow	MAOP = maximum allowable operating pressure SMYS = specific minimum yield strength					



Table 4-1. Summary of Estimated Defect Discovery Rates (per Mile)							
Requirement	Defect Discovery Rate ILI, DA (immediate)	Defect Discovery Rate ILI, DA (scheduled)	Defect Discovery Rate PT	Description			
Integrity verification, previously assessed pipe (HCA) ¹	0.0	0.4	0.0	Represents difference between hazardous liquid and gas transmission discovery rates (see Appendix C) since proposed gas transmission requirements resemble existing requirements for hazardous liquid pipe.			
Non-HCA integrity verification and MCA assessments of previously unassessed pipe ²	0.1	0.5	0.0	Represents hazardous liquid baseline discovery rate since proposed repair criteria and assessment requirements are similar.			
1. Re-establishing MAOP for previously untested pipe and pipe for which records are inadequate.							
2. Includes required outside of HCA	uirements addressing As.	g previously unte	sted pipe, inadequat	e records, and integrity assessments			

Table 4-2. Estimated Percent of Defects Which Would Have ResultedIn Failure							
Method	Low	High					
Inline and direct assessment (immediate repair)	3%	13%					
Inline and direct assessment (scheduled repair)	0.3%	1%					
Pressure test	33%	50%					
Source: PHMSA best professional judgment considering that immediate repair criteria represent a calculated failure pressure less than 1.1 times operating pressure or pipe wall lost greater than 80% loss, and other factors including overpressure protection, safety margin for combined stresses, and 180 days for results to represent immediate discovery. Pressure tests are very effective at finding defects (wall loss, dents, or cracking) that would not otherwise have been abated.							



Table 4-3. Estimated Incidents Averted, Topic Area 1												
	Milea	ge	НС	A %		Incidents	Averted ¹					
Scope	ILI and DA	РТ	НСА	Non- HCA	ILI and DA, Immediate - Low	ILI and DA, Immediate -High	ILI and DA, Scheduled - Low	ILI and DA, Scheduled - High	PT - Low	PT - High	Total - Low	Total - High
HCA >30% SYMS	800	118	1	0.0	1	5	1	2	1	2	3	9
HCA; Class 3 and 4 non- HCA	3686	678	0.4	1	9	37	5	8	8	12	22	57
MCA Class 3 and 4; MCA Class 1 and 2 (piggable)	7116	257	0.0	1	22	92	10	17	3	4	35	114
HCA 20- 30% SMYS; non-HCA Class 3 and 4; MCA Class 1 and 2 (piggable)	3118	141	0.1	1	9	38	4	7	2	2	15	48
Total	14,719	1,193	NA	NA	41	173	21	34	14	21	76	228
DA = direct	DA = direct assessment											
HCA = high	consequence area	a ILI = inline	inspection									
MCA = mod	erate consequenc	e area PT = p	ressure test									
SMYS = spectrum spe	cified minimum	yield strength	by defect disco	very rate and ran	ge of percentar	re of defects th	at would have	e resulted in f	ailure abse	ont the prov	nosed rule	
1. Based on multiplying estimated inheage by delect discovery rate and range of percentage of delects that would have resulted in failure absent the proposed rule.												

Table 4-4. Causes of Incidents Detectable by Modern Integrity Assessment Methods					
2003-2009	2010-present				
External corrosion	External corrosion				
Internal corrosion	Internal corrosion				
Rupture of previously damaged pipe	Previous damage due to excavation activity				
Body of pipe; pipe seam weld	Original manufacturing-related (not girth weld or other welds formed in the field)				
Joint; butt weld; fillet weld	Construction-, installation-, or fabrication- related				
NA	Environmental cracking-related				
Source: PHMSA Incident Report Form					

Table 4-5. Estimated Average Per Incident Consequences, Topic Area 1 (2015\$)							
Subtopic Area	НСА	Non-HCA					
MAOP verification for segments within HCA	\$6,699,452	NA					
MAOP verification for segments with inadequate records within HCA and Class 3 and Class 4	\$6,699,452	147,800					
Integrity assessments for segments within MCA in Class 3 and Class 4, and Class 1 and Class (piggable)	N/Aı	\$1,085,614					
MAOP verification for segments within HCA (operating between 20%-30% SMYS) and MCA (Class 3 and Class 4; Class 1 and Class 2 piggable)	\$6,699,452	\$1,085,614					
Source: PHMSA Gas Transmission Incident 6. HCA = high consequence area	Reports summarized in '	Tables E-3 through E-					
MCA = moderate consequence area							
MAOP = maximum allowable operating pres	ssure NA = not applicabl	e					
PT = pressure test							
SMYS = specified minimum yield strength							
1. Based on HCA incidents from 2003-2015	(see Table E-3).						
2. Based on Class 3 and 4 non-HCA inciden	ts from 2003-2015 (see]	Table E-8).					
3. Based on estimate of incidents that may re	epresent MCA incidents	(see Table E-4).					



Table 4-6. Estimation of Average	Annual Cost Savings of Proposed			
Material Documentation Require	ments ¹			
a c				
Component	Average Annual Cost (Millions 2015\$)			
Enjetia e na enjerante (enterte) ²	0			
Existing requirements (cutouts) ²	0			
Proposed rule (IVP) ³	\$0.00			
Cost savings (over 15 years)	\$0.00			
IVP = integrity verification program N	A = not applicable			
1. Based on 291 miles of pipe for whic	h there are incomplete, missing, or inadequate			
records to substantiate maximum allow	able operating pressure as indicated in the 2014			
Gas Transmission Annual Report. The	proposed requirements would provide			
comparable safety with a pressure test a	at or above 1.25 times maximum allowable			
operating pressure and with all anomal	y dig-outs pipe properties confirmed through			
either destructive or non- destructive m	ethods.			
2. Calculated as mileage multiplied by 13.2 cutouts per mile and \$75,000 per cutout.				
3. Average annual cost to re-establish l	MAOP for segments with inadequate MAOP			
records using methods permitted in the	proposed rule (see Section 3.1.5).			



Table 4-7. Present Value of Safety Benefits, Topic Area 1 (Millions \$2015)								
		7% Dis	count Rate			3% Disco	ount Rate	
Component	Total ¹ -Low	Average Annual ² =- Low	Total ¹ -High	Average Annual ² - High	Total ¹ -	Average Annual ² =-Low	Total ¹ - _{High}	Average Annual ² - High
MAOP verification for segments within HCA	15	1	37	2	19	1	47	3
MAOP verification for segments with inadequate records within HCA + Class 3 & 4	41	3	108	7	52	3	136	9
Integrity assessments for segments within MCA in Class 3&4 and Class 1&2 (piggable)	25	2	80	5	32	2	101	7
MAOP verification for segments within HCA(20%- 30% SMYS) + MCA (Class 3&4,Class 1&2 piggable)	16	1	50	3	20	1	63	4
Total	97	6	275	18	122	8	347	23
MAOP = max	imum allowable	operating pres	ssure					
1. Present val	ue over 15-year	study period.						
2. Total divid	ed by 15.							



Table 4-8. Present Value of Cost Savings Benefits, TopicArea 1 (Millions, 2015\$)1							
7% Discount Rate3% Discount Rate			count Rate				
Total	Average Annual	l Total Average Annual					
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0				
MAOP = maxin	mum allowable oper	ating pressure					
1. Associated with MAOP verification for segments for which records are inadequate within high consequence area and Class 3 and 4 locations. Material verification cost savings would provide comparable safety with a pressure test at or above 1.25 times MAOP and with all anomaly dig-outs pipe properties confirmed through either destructive or non-destructive methods. Total is present value over 15-year study period; average annual is total divided by 15.							

Table C- 100

Table 4-9. Breakeven Analysis, Topic Area 2							
Scenario	Annual Cost ¹	Average HCA Incident Consequences ²	Break-Even Number of Incidents per Year ³				
7% interest rate	\$30,333,999	\$6,699,452	\$5				
3% interest rate	\$30,333,999	\$6,699,452	\$5				
1. See Table 3-43. Annual cost represents the change in time value of money of expedited repairs for the given interest rate							
2. See Table E-3.							
3. Calculated a consequences.	as annual cost divide	ed by average incid	ent				

Table 4-10. Calculation of Safety Benefits,Topic Area 3 (Millions 2015\$)				
Incidents Averted per Year1Average Cost per Incident2Annual Benefits3				
1	1 \$0.8 \$0.8			
1. Source: PHN	MSA best profession	al judgment		
2. See Table E-1				
3. Calculated a per incident.	as incidents averted >	× average cost		

Table 4-11. Present Value of Benefits, Topic Area 3					
(Millions 201	.5\$)				
7% Dis	7% Discount Rate 3% Discount Rate				
Total ¹	Average Annual ²	Total ¹ Average Annual ²			
\$8	\$1	\$10	\$1		
1. Present value over 15-year study period.					
2. Total divide	d by 15.				

Table C- 103

Table 4-12. Calculation of Safety Benefits, Topic Area 4(Millions, 2015\$)					
Incidents Averted per Year1Average Cost per Incident2Annual Benefits3					
7	\$0.5	\$4			
1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment $(4.0 + 0.2 + 3.0)$					
2. See Table E-5.					
3. Calculated as incidents averted × average cost per incident.					

Table C- 104

Table 4-13. Present Value of Benefits, Topic Area 4(Millions 2015\$)						
7% Dis	7% Discount Rate 3% Discount Rate					
Total ¹	Average Annual ²	Total ¹ Averag				
\$36	\$2 \$46 \$3					
1. Present value over 15-year study period.						
2. Total divide	d by 15.					

Table 4-14. Calculation of Safety Benefits,					
Topic Area 5 (2015	5)				
Incidents Averted per	Average Cost	Annual			
Year	per Incident ²	Benefits ³			
0.5 \$114,077 \$57,039					
1. Source: PHMSA best professional judgment					
2. See Table E-6.					
3. Calculated as incidents averted \times average cost per					
incident.					



Table 4-15. Present Value of Benefits, Topic Area 5(Millions 2015\$)					
7% Dis	7% Discount Rate 3% Discount Rate				
Total ¹	Average Annual ²	Average Annual2Total1Average Annual2			
\$555,869	\$37,058 \$701,352 \$4				
1. Present value over 15-year study period.					
2. Total divide	d by 15.				

Table C- 107

Table 4-16. Calculation of Safety Benefits,					
Topic Area 7					
Total		Total			
Incidents	VSL (millions) ²	Benefits			
Averted ¹		(millions) ³			
1	1 \$9 \$9				
VSL = value of	f statistical life				
1. Source: PHN	MSA best profession	al judgment			
2. Approximately \$9.4 million (2015\$; per					
Department of Transportation internal guidance).					
3. Over the 15-year study period. Calculated as incidents averted \times VSL.					

Table 4-17. Present Value of Benefits, Topic Area 7(Millions 2015\$)					
7% Dis	7% Discount Rate 3% Discount Rate				
Total ¹	Average Annual ²	Total ¹ Averag			
\$6	\$0.4	.4 \$8 \$1			
1. Present value over 15-year study period.					
2. Total divide	d by 15.				



Table 4-18. S	Table 4-18. Summary of Estimated Incidents Averted, Topic Areas 1-7									
				Topic Area						
Estimate	1 - Low 1-High 2 3 4 5 6 7						Total Low	Total High		
Annual	5	15	n.e.	1	7	1	n.e.	0.1	14	24
Total ¹	76	228	n.e.	15	108	8	n.e.	1	207	359
Note: detail may not add to total due to independent rounding.										
n.e. = not estimated										
1. Calculated as	s annual estimate tin	nes 15 years.								

Table 4-19. Gas Released During Gas Transmission PipelineIncidents (2010 – 2014)						
Year	Incidents	Natural Gas Released (MCF)	Average per Incident (MCF)			
2010	105	2,351,022	22,391			
2011	114	2,718,692	23,848			
2012	102	2,105,292	20,640			
2013	103	1,688,265	16,391			
2014	129	2,467,085	19,125			
Total 553 11330356 20,479						
Source: Gas Transmission Incident Reports. MCF = thousand cubic feet.						



Table 4-20. Ignition or Explosion of Gas Released During Gas Transmission Pipeline Incidents (2010 – 2014)					
Year	Ignition or Explosion	No Ignition or Explosion	Ignition or Explosion	No Ignition or Explosion	
2010	19	86	1	NA	
2011	13	101			
2012	15	87			
2013	11	92			
2014	16	113			
Total (%)	74	479	13%	87%	
Source: Gas Tr	ansmission Incident	Reports			

Table 4-21. Greenhouse Gas Emissions per MCF of Natural Gas Released					
Gas	Methane (MCF)	Carbon Dioxide(lbs.)			
No ignition or explosion ¹	1.0	1.5			
Ignition ²	0.6	41.7			
lbs. = pounds					
MCF = thousand cubic fee	t CH ₄ = methane				
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide$					
1. MCF CH ₄ = 1 MCF gas \times 96% methane; lbs. CO ₂ = 1 MCF gas \times 1.3% CO ₂ \times 114.4 lbs./MCF.					
2. MCF CH ₄ = 1 MCF gas \times 96% methane \times 1-0.35 combustion efficiency factor); lbs. CO ₂ = (1 MCF gas \times 1.3% CO ₂ \times 114.4 lbs./MCF) + (1 MCH methane \times 96% methane \times 0.35 combustion efficiency factor).					


Table 4-22. Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions Per Year							
Scenario ¹	ario ¹ Natural Gas Combusted (MCF) ² Natural Gas Not Combusted (MCF) ³		CH4 Emissions Reduction (MCF) ⁴	C02 Emissions Reduction (lbs.) ⁵			
Low	\$37,895	\$245,293	\$258,318	\$1,944,306			
High	\$65,658	\$425,005	\$447,573	\$3,368,788			
MCF = thousar	nd cubic feet $CH_4 = r$	nethane					
$CO_2 = carbon d$	ioxide						
1. Low scenario scenario reflect	o reflects low assum s high assumption o	ption of defect fa f defect failures a	ilures and avoided ind avoided incident	ncidents; high s.			
2. Gas released	$l \times 13\%$						
3. Gas released \times 87%							
4. (Combusted \times 0.62) + (not combusted \times 0.96); see tables 4-19 and 4-20.							
5. (Combusted gas \times 116 lbs. C02/MCF gas) + (not combusted gas \times 1.5 lbs. C02).							

Table 4-23. Summary of Total Climate Benefits, Topic Areas 1-7 (Millions2015\$)1							
Pollutant	Avoided Emissions -Low	Avoided Emissions - High	Social Cost (3%) - Low	Social Cost (3%) - High			
Methane (MCF)	\$3,874,768	\$6,713,590	\$114	\$197			
Carbon dioxide (MT)	\$13,229	\$22,921	\$1	\$1			
Total	NA	NA	\$115	\$199			
MCH = thousand cubic feet MT = metric tons							
1. Total over 15-year period calculated as emissions from Table 4-22 multiplied by 15 years and valued using the estimates in Appendix B.							



		7% Dis	count Rate			3% Disco	ount Rate	
Topic Area	Total ¹ - Low	Total ¹ - High	Annual ² - Low	Annual ² - High	Total ¹ - Low	Total ¹ - _{High}	Annual ² -	Annual ² - High
1	\$97	\$275	\$6	\$18	\$122	\$347	\$8	\$23
2	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
3	\$8	\$8	\$1	\$1	\$10	\$10	\$1	\$1
4	\$36	\$36	\$2	\$2	\$46	\$46	\$3	\$3
5	\$1	\$1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1	\$1	\$0.0	\$0.0
6	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
7	\$6	\$6	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$8	\$8	\$1	\$1
Total	\$148	\$326	\$10	\$22	\$187	\$412	\$12	\$27
n.e. = not e	estimated	1					<u> </u>	
1. Present	value over 15-year	r study period.						

Table 4-25. Climate Change Benefits, Topic Areas 1-7 (Millions 2015\$)						
	Total ¹ -Low	\mathbf{Total}^1 - High	Annual ² - Low	\mathbf{Annual}^2 - High		
1	\$42	\$126	\$3	\$8		
2	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.		
3	\$8	\$8	\$1	\$1		
4	\$60	\$60	\$4	\$4		
5	\$4	\$4	\$0.3	\$0.3		
6	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.		
7	\$1	\$1	\$0.0	\$0.0		
Total	\$115	\$199	\$8	\$13		
n.e. = not estim	nated					
1. Total value	over 15-year study pe	eriod.				
2. Total divide	d by 15.					



Table 4-26	Table 4-26. Present Value of Total Benefits, Topic Areas 1-7 (Millions 2015\$) ¹								
	7% Discount Rate				3% Discount Rate				
Benefits Category	Total -Low	Total - High	Average Annual - Low	Average Annual - High	Total - Low	Total - High	Average Annual - Low	Average Annual - High	
Safety	\$148	\$326	\$10	\$22	\$187	\$412	\$12	\$27	
Cost savings	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Climate change	\$115	\$199	\$8	\$13	\$115	\$199	\$8	\$13	
Total	\$263	\$525	\$18	\$35	\$301	\$610	\$20	\$41	
1. Total is pr	1. Total is present value over 15-year study period; average annual is total divided by 15.								

Table 5-1. Summary of Average Annual Present ValueCosts, Topic Areas 1-7, 7% Discount Rate (Millions 2015\$)							
Topic Area	Compliance	Social Cost of Methane ¹	Total				
1	\$35.4	\$1.0	\$36.4				
2	\$28.6	\$0.0	\$28.6				
3	\$0.8	\$0.0	\$0.8				
4	\$7.6	\$0.0	\$7.6				
5	\$4.2	\$0.0	\$4.2				
6	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.2				
7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0				
Total	\$76.8	\$1.0	\$77.8				
1. Using 3% discounted values (see Appendix B).							



Table 5-2. Summary of Average Annual Present ValueCosts, Topic Areas 1-7, 3% Discount Rate (Millions 2015\$)								
Topic Area	Compliance	Social Cost of Methane	Total					
1	\$44.6	\$1.0	\$45.6					
2	\$32.3	\$0.0	\$32.3					
3	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$1.0					
4	\$9.2	\$0.0	\$9.2					
5	\$5.3	\$0.0	\$5.3					
6	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.2					
7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0					
Total	\$92.6	\$1.0	\$93.6					



Table 5-3. Summary of Average Annual Present Value Benefits, Topic Areas 1-7, 7% Discount Rate							
Topic Area	Safety-Low	Safety - High	Cost Savings ¹	Climate ² -	Climate ² -High	Total - Low	Total - High
1 ³	\$6.5	\$18.3	\$0.0	\$2.8	\$8.4	\$9.2	\$26.7
2	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
3	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$1.1	\$1.1
4	\$2.4	\$2.4	\$0.0	\$4.0	\$4.0	\$6.4	\$6.4
5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3
6	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
7	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.4
Total	\$9.9	\$21.8	\$0.0	\$7.6	\$13.2	\$17.5	\$35.0
			φ0.0			-	

n.e. = not estimated

1. Material verification cost savings would provide comparable safety with a pressure test at or above 1.25 times maximum allowable operating pressure and with all anomaly dig-outs pipe properties confirmed through either destructive or non-destructive methods.

2. Using 3% discounted values. TA 1 includes range for uncertainty.

3. Range reflects uncertainty in incidents averted rates, see Table 4-2 and Table 4-3. for Topic Area 1 Safety and Climate

Table C- 121

Table 5-4. Summary of Average Annual Present Value Benefits, Topic Areas 1-7, 3% Discount Rate (Millions 2015\$)

Topic Area	Safety-Low	Safety - High	Cost Savings ¹	Climate ² -	Climate ² -High	Total - Low	Total - High
1 ³	\$8.1	\$23.1	\$0.0	\$2.8	\$8.4	\$10.9	\$31.5
2	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
3	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$1.2	\$1.2
4	\$3.1	\$3.1	\$0.0	\$4.0	\$4.0	\$7.0	\$7.0
5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.3
6	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
7	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.6
Total	\$12.4	\$27.5	\$0.0	\$7.6	\$13.2	\$20.1	\$40.7
na – not astir	natad	•	•	•	•	•	•

n.e. = not estimated

1. Material verification cost savings would provide comparable safety with a pressure test at or above 1.25 times maximum allowable operating pressure and with all anomaly dig-outs pipe properties confirmed through either destructive or non-destructive methods.

2. Using 3% discounted values. TA 1 includes range for uncertainty in incidents averted rates (see Table 4-2 and Table 4-3).

3. Range reflects uncertainty in incidents averted rates, see Table 4-2 and Table 4-3.



Areas 1-7, 7 Topic Area	Average Annual Benefits- Low	Average Annual Benefits- High	Average Annual Costs	Benefit: Cost Ratio - Low	Benefit: Cost Ratio - High			
11	\$9.2	\$26.7	\$36.4	\$0.3	\$0.7			
2 ²	n.e.	n.e.	\$28.6	n.e.	n.e.			
3	\$1.1	\$1.1	\$0.8	\$1.3	\$1.3			
4	\$6.4	\$6.4	\$7.6	\$0.8	\$0.8			
5	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$4.2	\$0.1	\$0.1			
6	n.e.	n.e.	\$0	n.e.	n.e.			
7	\$0.4	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$18.5	\$18.5			
Total	\$17.5	\$35.0	\$77.8	\$21.0	\$0.4			
n.e. = not estimated.								
1. Reflects uncertainty in incident averted rates for topic area 1. See Tables 4-2 and 4-3.								
2. Break even 15-year study	2. Break even value of benefits would equate to approximately one incident averted over the 15-year study period.							

Table 5-6. Summary of Average Annual Present Value Benefits and Costs, TopicAreas 1-7, 3% Discount Rate (Millions \$2015)										
Topic Area	Average Annual Benefits - Low	Average Annual Benefits - High	Average Annual Costs	Benefit: Cost Ratio - Low	Benefit: Cost Ratio - High					
1 ¹	\$10.9	\$31.5	\$45.6	\$0.2	\$0.7					
2^{2}	n.e.	n.e.	\$32.3	\$0.0	\$0.0					
3	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$1.0	\$1.3	\$1.3					
4	\$7.0	\$7.0	\$9.2	\$0.8	\$0.8					
5	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$5.3	\$0.1	\$0.1					
6	n.e.	n.e.	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.0					
7	\$0.6	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$23.0	\$23.0					
Total	\$20.1	\$40.7	\$93.6	\$25.3	\$0.4					
n.e. = not estin	nated.									
1. Reflects und	1. Reflects uncertainty in incident averted rates. See Tables 4-2 and 4-3.									
2. Break even study period.	2. Break even value of benefits would equate to less than one incident averted over the 15-year study period.									



Appendix D: All Recalculated Tables from the RIA Appendix

A-1. Calculation of HCA Mileage Operating at Pressure Greater than 30 Percent SMYS								
Location	Onshore Gas Transmission Miles ¹	HCA Mileage ²	Total >30% SMYS	% >30% SMYS	HCA >30% SMYS			
Interstate	· · · · · ·	·						
Class 1	160,029	62	145,301	91%	56			
Class 2	17,805	23	14,909	84%	19			
Class 3	13,927	439	11,318	81%	357			
Class 4	29	0.0	16	55%	0.0			
Total	191,789	524	171,544		432			
Intrastate								
Class 1	72,719	13	58,176	80%	10			
Class 2	12,839	18	9,040	70%	13			
Class 3	19,730	749	12,107	61%	460			
Class 4	880	5	431	49%	2			
Total	106,169	785	79,754		485			
Total Onshore								
Class 1	232,748	75	203,477	89%	67			
Class 2	30,645	41	23,949	78%	32			
Class 3	33,657	1,188	23,424	69%	816			
Class 4	908	5	446	49%	2			
Total	297,958	1,309	251,297		917			
Source: 2014 PHM	SA Annual Report							
1. Part K								
2. Part Q GF HCA								



A-2. Calculation	of HCA Mileage O	perating at Pressur	re 20-30% SMYS		
Location	Onshore Gas Transmission Miles ¹	HCA Mileage ²	Total 20-30% SMYS	% >30% SMYS	HCA >30% SMYS
Interstate					
Class 1	160,029	62	7,977	5%	3
Class 2	17,805	23	1,436	8%	2
Class 3	13,927	439	1,307	9%	41
Class 4	29	0.0	9	32%	0.0
Total	191,789	524	10,729		46
Intrastate					
Class 1	72,719	13	8,293	11%	1
Class 2	12,839	18	2,762	22%	4
Class 3	19,730	749	5,671	29%	215
Class 4	880	5	428	49%	2
Total	106,169	785	17,154		223
Total Onshore					
Class 1	232,748	75	16,270	6%	5
Class 2	30,645	41	4,198	14%	6
Class 3	33,657	1,188	6,978	22%	256
Class 4	908	5	438	49%	2
Total	297,958	1,309	27,883		269
Source: 2014 PHM	SA Annual Report.				
1. Part K					
2. Part Q GF HCA					



Table B-1. Social Cost of Carbon Based on IWG (2015) ¹							
Year	SCC (per metric ton CO2; 2007\$)	SCC (per metric ton CO2; 2015\$)					
2015	\$36	\$41					
2016	\$38	\$43					
2017	\$39	\$45					
2018	\$40	\$46					
2019	\$41	\$47					
2020	\$42	\$48					
2021	\$42	\$48					
2022	\$43	\$49					
2023	\$44	\$50					
2024	\$45	\$51					
2025	\$46	\$53					
2026	\$47	\$54					
2027	\$48	\$55					
2028	\$49	\$56					
2029	\$49	\$56					
2030	\$50	\$57					
Source:							
1. Based on 3% discount	rate. $CO_2 = carbon dioxide$						
IWG = The Interagency V	Working Group on Social Co	ost of Carbon					
SCC = social cost of carbon							

Table B-2. Social Cost of Methane Based on Marten et al., (2014)						
Year	SC per metric ton methane (2007\$)	SC per MCF methane (2015\$)				
2015	\$1,100	\$24				
2016	\$1,120	\$25				
2017	\$1,140	\$25				
2018	\$1,160	\$26				
2019	\$1,180	\$26				
2020	\$1,200	\$26				
2021	\$1,240	\$27				
2022	\$1,280	\$28				
2023	\$1,320	\$29				
2024	\$1,360	\$30				
2025	\$1,400	\$31				
2026	\$1,440	\$32				
2027	\$1,480	\$33				
2028	\$1,520	\$34				
2029	\$1,560	\$34				
2030	\$1,600	\$35				
Source: Marten, A.L., E.A. Kopits, C.W. Griffiths, S.C. Newbold, and A. Wolverton. 2014. Incremental CH4 and N20 Mitigation Benefits Consistent with the US Government's SC-CO2 Estimates. Climate Policy. Inflated to 2015 based on 2015 average CPI of 237.0						
SC = Social cost MCF = 1.000 fts of a gas a	at standard temperature and	pressure				
ivici" – 1,000 no or a gas at stanuaru temperature anu pressure						



Table B-3. Total So	Table B-3. Total Social Cost of GHG Emissions due to Pressure Test and ILI Upgrade related Blowdowns (3%)									
Year	Methane Emissions (MCF)	SCM (3%)	C02 Emissions (lbs.)	C02 Emissions (metric tons)	SCC	Social Cost of GHG Emissions				
2016	34,572	\$864,292	72,547	33	\$1,414.98	\$865,707				
2017	34,572	\$864,292	72,547	33	\$1,480.80	\$865,772				
2018	34,572	\$898,863	72,547	33	\$1,513.70	\$900,377				
2019	34,572	\$898,863	72,547	33	\$1,546.61	\$900,410				
2020	34,572	\$898,863	72,547	33	\$1,579.52	\$900,443				
2021	34,572	\$933,435	72,547	33	\$1,579.52	\$935,014				
2022	34,572	\$968,007	72,547	33	\$1,612.42	\$969,619				
2023	34,572	\$1,002,578	72,547	33	\$1,645.33	\$1,004,224				
2024	34,572	\$1,037,150	72,547	33	\$1,678.24	\$1,038,828				
2025	34,572	\$1,071,722	72,547	33	\$1,744.05	\$1,073,466				
2026	34,572	\$1,106,293	72,547	33	\$1,776.96	\$1,108,070				
2027	34,572	\$1,140,865	72,547	33	\$1,809.86	\$1,142,675				
2028	34,572	\$1,175,437	72,547	33	\$1,842.77	\$1,177,279				
2029	34,572	\$1,175,437	72,547	33	\$1,842.77	\$1,177,279				
2030	34,572	\$1,210,008	72,547	33	\$1,875.67	\$1,211,884				
Total	518,575	\$15,246,104	1,088,200	494	\$24,943	\$15,271,047				
$CO_2 = carbon dioxide$	GHG = greenhouse gas lbs. = por	unds				•				
MCF = thousand cubi	c feet MT = metric ton									
SCC = social cost of c	arbon SCM = social cost of meth	ane								



Table B-5. Social Benefits of Avoided Gathering Line GHG Emissions (3%)									
Year	Avoided CH4 emissions (MCF)	SCM (3%)	Avoided CO ₂ Emissions(lbs.)	CO ₂ Emissions (MT)	SCC	Social Cost of GHG Emissions			
2016	15,121	\$378,027	57,662	26	\$1,125	\$379,152			
2017	26,843	\$671,072	102,361	46	\$2,089	\$673,161			
2018	26,843	\$697,915	102,361	46	\$2,136	\$700,051			
2019	26,843	\$697,915	102,361	46	\$2,182	\$700,097			
2020	26,843	\$697,915	102,361	46	\$2,229	\$700,144			
2021	33,642	\$908,321	128,286	58	\$2,793	\$911,114			
2022	33,642	\$941,962	128,286	58	\$2,851	\$944,814			
2023	33,642	\$975,604	128,286	58	\$2,909	\$978,513			
2024	33,642	\$1,009,245	128,286	58	\$2,968	\$1,012,213			
2025	33,642	\$1,042,887	128,286	58	\$3,084	\$1,045,971			
2026	33,642	\$1,076,529	128,286	58	\$3,142	\$1,079,671			
2027	33,642	\$1,110,170	128,286	58	\$3,200	\$1,113,370			
2028	33,642	\$1,143,812	128,286	58	\$3,259	\$1,147,070			
2029	33,642	\$1,143,812	128,286	58	\$3,259	\$1,147,070			
2030	33,642	\$1,177,453	128,286	58	\$3,317	\$1,180,770			
Total	458,908	\$13,672,639	1,749,968	794	\$40,543	\$13,713,182			
CH ₄ = methane				L					
CO ₂ = carbon dioxide GH	G = greenhouse gas lbs. = p	oounds							
MCF = thousand cubic fe	et MT = metric ton								
SCC = social cost of carbo	on SCM = social cost of me	thane							



Table C-1. Estimated Immediate Condition Repair Rates for Previously Unassessed Pipe andPreviously Assessed Pipe									
Year	Hazardous Lio Immo	quid Integrity N ediate Repair R	Ianagement ate	Gas Tra Managemen	GT Estimated Immediate Repair Rate for				
	Total HL Assessment Miles	HL HCA Immediate Repairs	HL Immediate Repair Rate ¹	Total GT Assessment Miles	GT HCA Immediate Repairs	GT HCA Immediate Repair Rate	Previously Assessed Pipe		
2004	65,565.0	1,701.0	0.0	3,998.0	104.0	0.0	0.0		
2005	17,501.0	1,369.0	0.1	2,906.0	261.0	0.1	0.0		
2006	12,411.0	941.0	0.1	3,500.0	158.0	0.0	0.0		
2007	9,240.0	880.0	0.1	4,663.0	258.0	0.1	0.0		
2008	5,916.0	888.0	0.2	2,858.0	181.0	0.1	0.1		
2009	3,372.0	660.0	0.2	3,288.0	144.0	0.0	0.2		
Average rate ²	NA	NA	0.1	NA	NA	0.1	0.0		
Source: Ga	s Transmission a	nd Hazardous Li	quid Annual Re	eports GT = gas	transmission				
HCA = hig	sh consequence ar	ea HL = hazardo	ous liquid						
NA = not applicable									
1. Assume	d gas transmissio	n repair rate for	previously unas	sessed pipe.					
2. Average	e of 2004-2009 rat	tes							



Table C-2. Estimated Scheduled Condition Repair Rates for Previously Unassessed Pipe and Previously Assessed Pipe										
	Hazardous	Liquid Integri	ty Managemer	Gas Tra Managemen	GT Estimated Scheduled					
Year	Total HL Assessed Miles	HL HCA 60-Day Repairs	HL 60-day Repair Rate	HL HCA 180-day Repairs	HL 180- day Repair Rate	HL Total HCA Scheduled Repair Rate ¹	Total Assessed Miles	Total Scheduled Repairs	Scheduled Repair Rate	Repair Rate for Previously Assessed Pipe
2004	65,565	647	0	3,178	0	0	3,998	599	0	0
2005	17,501	1,109	0	5,278	0	0	2,907	378	0	0
2006	12,411	861	0	2,748	0	0	3,501	344	0	0
2007	9,240	580	0	2,139	0	0	4,663	452	0	0
2008	5,916	1,022	0	4,037	1	1	2,858	252	0	1
2009	3,372	454	0	3,088	1	1	3,288	266	0	1
Avg. rate ²	NA	NA	0.1	NA	0.4	0.5	NA	NA	0.1	0.4
Source: G	as Transmission ar	ıd Hazardous Li	quid Annual Re	ports GT = gas t	transmission					
HCA = hig	gh consequence are	ea HL = hazardc	ous liquid							
NA = not	applicable									
1. Assume	ed gas transmissior	ı repair rate for j	previously unas	sessed pipe.						
2. Average	e of 2004-2009 rat	.es								



Table C-3. Pressure Test Failures 2010-2013								
Year ¹	Miles Pressure Tested	Failures both in and out HCA	Test Failure Rate per Mile					
2013	1,502	54	0.04					
2012	2,078	52	0.03					
2011	1,687	71	0.04					
2010	1,393	51	0.04					
Average Rate ²	NA	NA	0.03					
1. Operators were not required to report pressure test failures prior to 2010.								
2. Average	2. Average of 2010-2013 rates							

Table D-1. Summary of Consequences Associated with the 2010 San Bruno Pipeline Incident								
Consequence	Value	Source						
Deaths, injuries, and property damage	\$565,000,000	PG&E Annual Reports						
Cost of gas lost	\$263,000	PG&E Incident Report						
Emergency response (PG&E)	\$250,000	NTSB Report, PHMSA estimate						
Emergency response (public)	\$50,000,000	NTSB Report, University of Delaware, PG&E Annual Reports						
Disaster relief and evacuations	\$64,987,210	PG&E Annual Reports, University of Delaware, American Red Cross						
Mandatory pressure reduction	Not quantified	California Public Utilities Commission						
Total	\$680,500,210	See above						



Table E-1. Historical Consequences of Onshore Gas Transmission Incidents Due to All Causes (2003-2015; 2015\$)										
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident
2003	81	1	\$9,400,000	8	\$7,888,000	\$26,002,183	439	\$658,500	\$43,948,683	\$542,576
2004	83	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$4,027,541	1,036	\$1,554,000	\$7,553,541	\$91,007
2005	106	0	\$0	5	\$4,930,000	\$110,676,449	1,996	\$2,994,000	\$118,600,449	\$1,118,872
2006	108	3	\$28,200,000	3	\$2,958,000	\$8,419,432	995	\$1,492,500	\$41,069,932	\$380,277
2007	86	2	\$18,800,000	7	\$6,902,000	\$14,434,410	1,174	\$1,761,000	\$41,897,410	\$487,179
2008	93	0	\$0	5	\$4,930,000	\$12,154,890	635	\$952,500	\$18,037,390	\$193,950
2009	92	0	\$0	11	\$10,846,000	\$7,767,011	727	\$1,090,500	\$19,703,511	\$214,169
2010	82	10	\$94,000,000	61	\$60,146,000	\$418,615,646	265	\$397,500	\$573,159,146	\$6,989,746
2011	101	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$22,200,196	870	\$1,305,000	\$24,491,196	\$242,487
2012	87	0	\$0	7	\$6,902,000	\$13,710,727	904	\$1,356,000	\$21,968,727	\$252,514
2013	93	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$13,876,259	3,103	\$4,654,500	\$20,502,759	\$220,460
2014	116	1	\$9,400,000	1	\$986,000	\$14,867,441	1,445	\$2,167,500	\$27,420,941	\$236,387
2015	117	6	\$56,400,000	14	\$13,804,000	\$11,885,205	503	\$754,500	\$82,843,705	\$708,066
Total	1245	23	\$216,200,000	\$127	\$125,222,000	\$678,637,390	\$14,092	\$21,138,000	\$1,041,197,390	\$836,303
VSL = va	lue of statist	ical life								
Source: I	ncident data	from PHMS	A gas transmissi	on incident	reports, 2003-20	15, see http://ww	ww.phmsa.dot.	gov/pipeline/libr	ary/data-stats/flagg	ged-data-files
1. Based	on DOT 20	15 Guideline	s for Value of St	atistical Life	e (VSL; \$9.4 mil	lion in 2015 doll	ars).			
2. Based	2. Based on DOT 2015 Guidelines for VSL (serious injury value; \$0.986 million in 2015 dollars).									
3. Converted from \$2013 to \$2015 (2013 Consumer Price Index- 233.5; 2015 Consumer Price Index-237.0). Includes all reported operator incident expenses										
(3rd party	damage, ope	erator emerge	ency response, lo	ost gas, etc.)	less operator pro	operty damage ar	nd repair costs			
4. Based	on multiply	ing the numb	er of persons eva	acuated by a	a best profession	al judgment estin	nate of per per	son evacuation c	cost (approximately	(\$1,500).



Methods	Methods1 (2003-2015; 2015\$)												
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident			
2003	33	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$15,854,155	171	\$256,500	\$16,110,655	\$488,202			
2004	26	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,108,283	229	\$343,500	\$1,451,783	\$55,838			
2005	27	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$105,697,938	384	\$576,000	\$106,273,938	\$3,936,072			
2006	44	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,802,314	52	\$78,000	\$2,880,314	\$65,462			
2007	38	1	\$9,400,000	3	\$2,958,000	\$11,941,122	263	\$394,500	\$24,693,622	\$649,832			
2008	30	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$8,200,877	331	\$496,500	\$9,683,377	\$322,779			
2009	32	0	\$0	3	\$2,958,000	\$2,494,681	278	\$417,000	\$5,869,681	\$183,428			
2010	28	8	\$75,200,000	51	\$50,286,000	\$412,056,506	29	\$43,500	\$537,586,006	\$19,199,500			
2011	29	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$8,020,221	66	\$99,000	\$8,119,221	\$279,973			
2012	26	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$7,585,658	524	\$786,000	\$8,371,658	\$321,987			
2013	27	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$8,124,268	451	\$676,500	\$10,772,768	\$398,991			
2014	31	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$5,359,479	598	\$897,000	\$6,256,479	\$201,822			
2015	28	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,961,837	366	\$549,000	\$4,510,837	\$161,101			
Total	399	9	\$84,600,000	60	\$59,160,000	\$593,207,339	3,742	\$5,613,000	\$742,580,339	\$1,861,104			
VSL = val	lue of statistic	al life	·										
Source: In	ncident data fr	om PHMSA	gas transmissio	on incident r	reports, 2003-20	015, see http://ww	ww.phmsa.dot	.gov/pipeline/lib	rary/data-stats/flag	gged-data-files			
1. Inline	inspection, pr	essure testing	g, direct assessr	ment, and ot	her technology.								
2. Based	on DOT 2015	Guidelines	for Value of Sta	atistical Life	e (VSL; \$9.4 mi	llion in 2015 dol	lars).						
3. Based	on DOT 2015	Guidelines	for VSL (seriou	ıs injury val	ue; \$0.986 milli	ion in 2015 dolla	rs).						
4. Conver	rted from \$20	13 to \$2015	(2013 Consume	er Price Inde	ex- 233.5; 2015	Consumer Price	Index-237.0).	Includes all repo	orted operator inci	dent expenses			
(3rd party o	damage, oper	ator emergen	cy response, lo	st gas, etc.)	less operator pr	operty damage a	nd repair costs			1 01 500			
5. Based	on multiplyin	g the numbe	r of persons eva	acuated by a	best profession	al judgment esti-	mate of per pe	rson evacuation	cost (approximate	ly \$1,500).			

 Table E-2. Historical Consequences of Onshore Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectable by Modern Integrity Assessment



Table E-3 Methods1	Table E-3. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectable by Modern Integrity Assessment Methods1 Located in HCAs (2003-2015; 2015\$)											
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident		
2003	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,065,772	0	\$0	\$3,065,772	\$1,532,886		
2004	3	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$90,612	28	\$42,000	\$132,612	\$44,204		
2005	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,056	0	\$0	\$1,056	\$1,056		
2006	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$20,187	0	\$0	\$20,187	\$10,094		
2007	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$267,564	200	\$300,000	\$567,564	\$283,782		
2008	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$15,577	30	\$45,000	\$60,577	\$60,577		
2009	0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
2010	2	8	\$75,200,000	51	\$50,286,000	\$407,516,568	0	\$0	\$533,002,568	\$266,501,284		
2011	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$302,089	0	\$0	\$302,089	\$151,045		
2012	3	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$280,668	500	\$750,000	\$1,030,668	\$343,556		
2013	0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
2014	4	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$141,019	18	\$27,000	\$168,019	\$42,005		
2015	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$58	0	\$0	\$58	\$58		
Total	23	8	\$75,200,000	51	\$50,286,000	\$411,701,170	776	\$1,164,000	\$538,351,170	\$23,406,573		
Power Law	v Average			•						\$6,699,452		
HCA = hig	h consequent	ce area VSL	= value of stati	stical life								
Source: Inc	ident data fro	om PHMSA	gas transmissio	n incident r	eports, 2003-20	15, see http://ww	ww.phmsa.dot	.gov/pipeline/lib	ary/data-stats/fla	gged-data-files		
1. Inline in	nspection, pr	essure testing	g, direct assessr	ment, and ot	her technology.							
2. Based of	on DOT 2015	Guidelines	for Value of Sta	atistical Life	e (VSL; \$9.4 mi	llion in 2015 do	llars).					
3. Based of	on DOT 2015	Guidelines	for VSL (seriou	ıs injury val	ue; \$0.986 mill	ion in 2015 dolla	ars).					
4. Conver (3rd party c	ted from \$20 lamage, oper	13 to \$2015 ator emerger	(2013 Consume ncy response, lo	er Price Inde ost gas, etc.)	ex- 233.5; 2015 less operator pr	Consumer Price roperty damage a	e Index-237.0) and repair cost	. Includes all rep	orted operator inc	cident expenses		



Table E-4 Methods1	Table E-4. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectable by Modern Integrity Assessment Methods1 Located in Proposed MCA (2003-2015; 2015\$)											
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident		
2003	11	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$12,977,374	13	\$19,500	\$12,996,874	\$1,181,534		
2004	7	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$216,205	0	\$0	\$216,205	\$30,886		
2005	5	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$102,653,637	240	\$360,000	\$103,013,637	\$20,602,727		
2006	14	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$926,494	33	\$49,500	\$975,994	\$69,714		
2007	16	1	\$9,400,000	3	\$2,958,000	\$8,312,698	63	\$94,500	\$20,765,198	\$1,297,825		
2008	13	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$6,913,847	298	\$447,000	\$7,360,847	\$566,219		
2009	9	0	\$0	3	\$2,958,000	\$873,649	207	\$310,500	\$4,142,149	\$460,239		
2010	10	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,651,682	0	\$0	\$2,651,682	\$265,168		
2011	11	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$16,123,614	35	\$52,500	\$16,176,114	\$1,470,556		
2012	11	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,334,972	22	\$33,000	\$3,367,972	\$306,179		
2013	12	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$8,702,995	451	\$676,500	\$11,351,495	\$945,958		
2014	27	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,534,887	27	\$40,500	\$2,575,387	\$95,385		
2015	27	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,177,212	27	\$40,500	\$2,217,712	\$82,137		
Total	173	1	\$9,400,000	8	\$7,888,000	\$168,399,266	1,416	\$2,124,000	\$187,811,266	\$1,085,614		
MCA = mc	oderate conse	quence area	(five building	in the potent	ial impact radi	us criterion) VSI	L = value of sta	atistical life				
Source: Inc	Source: Incident data from PHMSA gas transmission incident reports, 2003-2015, see http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/library/data-stats/flagged-data-files											
1. Inline in	spection, pre	essure testing	, direct assess	ment, and oth	her technology							
2. Based of	on DOT 2015	Guidelines f	or Value of Sta	atistical Life	e (VSL; \$9.4 m	illion in 2015 do	llars).					
3. Based of	on DOT 2015	Guidelines f	or VSL (seriou	is injury val	ue; \$0.986 mill	ion in 2015 dolla	ars).					
4. Convert (3rd party d	ted from \$202 amage, opera	13 to \$2015 (tor emergend	2013 Consumery response, lo	er Price Inde st gas, etc.)	ex- 233.5; 2015 less operator pr	Consumer Price operty damage a	e Index-237.0) and repair cost	. Includes all rep s	orted operator inc	ident expenses		



Table E-5	Table E-5. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Corrosion (2003-2015; 2015\$)												
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident			
2003	21	1	\$9,400,000	1	\$986,000	\$10,202,074	171	\$256,500	\$20,844,574	\$992,599			
2004	26	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$1,171,118	262	\$393,000	\$2,550,118	\$98,081			
2005	26	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$1,958,592	44	\$66,000	\$3,010,592	\$115,792			
2006	32	3	\$28,200,000	0	\$0	\$2,458,396	33	\$49,500	\$30,707,896	\$959,622			
2007	34	2	\$18,800,000	3	\$2,958,000	\$5,538,624	138	\$207,000	\$27,503,624	\$808,930			
2008	25	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$7,808,619	295	\$442,500	\$9,237,119	\$369,485			
2009	17	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,246,324	83	\$124,500	\$1,370,824	\$80,637			
2010	24	2	\$18,800,000	7	\$6,902,000	\$5,372,531	6	\$9,000	\$31,083,531	\$1,295,147			
2011	24	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,935,920	65	\$97,500	\$4,033,420	\$168,059			
2012	20	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$6,509,273	12	\$18,000	\$8,499,273	\$424,964			
2013	25	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$4,820,896	2567	\$3,850,500	\$10,643,396	\$425,736			
2014	22	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,216,570	15	\$22,500	\$2,239,070	\$101,776			
2015	24	1	\$9,400,000	2	\$1,972,000	\$2,904,165	46	\$69,000	\$14,345,165	\$597,715			
Total	320	9	\$84,600,000	20	\$19,720,000	\$56,143,102	3,737	\$5,605,500	\$166,068,602	\$518,964			
VSL = valu	e of statistica	al life											
Source: Incident data from PHMSA gas transmission incident reports, 2003-2015, see http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/pipeline/library/data-stats/flagged-data-files													
1. Based or	1. Based on DOT 2015 Guidelines for Value of Statistical Life (VSL; \$9.4 million in 2015 dollars).												
2. Based or	n DOT 2015	Guidelines f	or VSL (serious	s injury valu	e; \$0.986 millio	on in 2015 dolla	urs).						

3. Converted from \$2013 to \$2015 (2013 Consumer Price Index- 233.5; 2015 Consumer Price Index-237.0). Includes all reported operator incident expenses (3rd party damage, operator emergency response, lost gas, etc.) less operator property damage and repair costs

4. Based on multiplying the number of persons evacuated by a best professional judgment estimate of per person evacuation cost (approximately \$1,500).



Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident
2003	3	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$124,874	0	\$0	\$124,874	\$41,625
2004	5	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$240,779	0	\$0	\$240,779	\$48,156
2005	22	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,151,038	0	\$0	\$1,151,038	\$52,320
2006	4	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$108,107	10	\$15,000	\$123,107	\$30,777
2007	6	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$236,541	206	\$309,000	\$545,541	\$90,924
2008	12	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$695,379	0	\$0	\$695,379	\$57,948
2009	9	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$605,516	138	\$207,000	\$812,516	\$90,280
2010	6	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$340,174	0	\$0	\$340,174	\$56,696
2011	16	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,566,551	141	\$211,500	\$3,778,051	\$236,128
2012	5	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,129,508	30	\$45,000	\$1,174,508	\$234,902
2013	7	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$279,537	0	\$0	\$279,537	\$39,934
2014	13	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,026,390	510	\$765,000	\$3,791,390	\$291,645
2015	10	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$404,247	0	\$0	\$404,247	\$40,425
Total	118	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$11,908,641	1,035	\$1,552,500	\$13,461,141	\$114,077
VSL = value	of statistical	life				•		L		
Source: Incid	lent data fron	n PHMSA ga	s transmissio	n incident rej	ports, 2003-20	15, see http://w	ww.phmsa.do	t.gov/pipeline/lib	orary/data-stats/flag	gged-data-files
1. Based on	DOT 2015 G	uidelines for	Value of Stat	tistical Life (VSL; \$9.4 mil	lion in 2015 do	llars).			
2. Based on	DOT 2015 G	uidelines for	VSL (serious	s injury value	e; \$0.986 milli	on in 2015 dolla	ars).			
3. Convertee (3rd party dar	d from \$2013 nage, operato	to \$2015 (20 r emergency	13 Consumer response, los	r Price Index t gas, etc.) le	- 233.5; 2015 ss operator pro	Consumer Price operty damage a	e Index-237.0) and repair cost). Includes all rep	orted operator inci	ident expenses



 Table E-7. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Pipe Failure due to Corrosion and Excavation Damage in Class 1 and Class 2 Locations. (2003-2015; 2015\$)

Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident	
2003	21	1	\$9,400,000	1	\$986,000	\$10,202,074	171	\$256,500	\$20,844,574	\$992,599	
2004	26	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$1,171,118	262	\$393,000	\$2,550,118	\$98,081	
2005	26	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$1,958,592	44	\$66,000	\$3,010,592	\$115,792	
2006	32	3	\$28,200,000	0	\$0	\$2,458,396	33	\$49,500	\$30,707,896	\$959,622	
2007	34	2	\$18,800,000	3	\$2,958,000	\$5,538,624	138	\$207,000	\$27,503,624	\$808,930	
2008	25	0	\$0	1	\$986,000	\$7,808,619	295	\$442,500	\$9,237,119	\$369,485	
2009	17	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,246,324	83	\$124,500	\$1,370,824	\$80,637	
2010	24	2	\$18,800,000	7	\$6,902,000	\$5,372,531	6	\$9,000	\$31,083,531	\$1,295,147	
2011	24	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,935,920	65	\$97,500	\$4,033,420	\$168,059	
2012	20	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$6,509,273	12	\$18,000	\$8,499,273	\$424,964	
2013	25	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$4,820,896	2567	\$3,850,500	\$10,643,396	\$425,736	
2014	22	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,216,570	15	\$22,500	\$2,239,070	\$101,776	
2015	24	1	\$9,400,000	2	\$1,972,000	\$2,904,165	46	\$69,000	\$14,345,165	\$597,715	
Total	320	9	\$84,600,000	20	\$19,720,000	\$56,143,102	3,737	\$5,605,500	\$166,068,602	\$518,964	
VSL = valu	e of statistica	al life									
Source: Inc	ident data fro	om PHMSA	gas transmissio	n incident re	ports, 2003-202	15, see http://ww	ww.phmsa.dot	.gov/pipeline/lib	rary/data-stats/flag	ged-data-files	
1. Based on	n DOT 2015	Guidelines f	or Value of Stat	tistical Life	(VSL; \$9.4 mill	ion in 2015 dol	llars).				
2. Based on	2. Based on DOT 2015 Guidelines for VSL (serious injury value; \$0.986 million in 2015 dollars).										
3. Converte	3. Converted from \$2013 to \$2015 (2013 Consumer Price Index- 233.5; 2015 Consumer Price Index-237.0). Includes all reported operator incident expenses										
4. Based or	n multiplying	the number	of persons evad	cuated by a l	best professiona	l judgment esti	mate of per pe	erson evacuation	cost (approximate)	ly \$1,500).	

 Table E-8. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectible by Modern Integrity Management

 Methods1 Located in Non-HCA Class 3 and Class 4 (2003-2015; 2015\$)

Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident		
2003	0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	#DIV/0!		
2004	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$13,506	1	\$1,500	\$15,006	\$7,503		
2005	3	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$40,964	100	\$150,000	\$190,964	\$63,655		
2006	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$93,107	0	\$0	\$93,107	\$46,554		
2007	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$48	0	\$0	\$48	\$48		
2008	3	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$6,409	2	\$3,000	\$9,409	\$3,136		
2009	3	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$147,752	99	\$148,500	\$296,252	\$98,751		
2010	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$8,907	0	\$0	\$8,907	\$8,907		
2011	0	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
2012	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$4,188	0	\$0	\$4,188	\$2,094		
2013	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,540,149	175	\$262,500	\$1,802,649	\$1,802,649		
2014	2	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$652,110	20	\$30,000	\$682,110	\$341,055		
2015	1	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,152	0	\$0	\$1,152	\$1,152		
Total	21	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$2,508,292	397	\$595,500	\$3,103,792	\$147,800		
VSL = value	of statistical	life										
Source: Incid	ent data fron	n PHMSA ga	is transmission	n incident re	ports, 2003-20	15, see http://w	ww.phmsa.do	t.gov/pipeline/lit	orary/data-stats/fla	ugged-data-files		
1. Based on I	DOT 2015 G	uidelines for	Value of Stat	tistical Life	(VSL; \$9.4 mil)	lion in 2015 do	llars).					
2. Based on I	2. Based on DOT 2015 Guidelines for VSL (serious injury value; \$0.986 million in 2015 dollars).											
3. Converted	3. Converted from \$2013 to \$2015 (2013 Consumer Price Index- 233.5; 2015 Consumer Price Index-237.0). Includes all reported operator incident expenses											
(Srd party dam	age, operato	r emergency	response, los	t gas, etc.) le	ess operator pro	operty damage a	and repair cost	.s		1 (1 (200))		

4. Based on multiplying the number of persons evacuated by a best professional judgment estimate of per person evacuation cost (approximately \$1,500).



Table E-9 Methods	Table E-9. Historical Consequences of Gas Transmission Incidents due to Causes Detectible by Modern Integrity Management Methods (ILI, Pressure Testing, Direct Assessment, Other Technology) Located Alternate 1 Structure PIR MCA (2003-2013; 2015\$)											
Year	Number of Incidents	Number of Fatalities	VSL ¹	Number of Injuries	VSL Serious Injury ²	Other Costs of Accident ³	Number of Persons Evacuated	Estimated Cost of Evacuations ⁴	Total Cost of Incidents	Average Cost per Incident		
2003	26	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$13,155,941	13	\$19,500	\$13,175,441	\$506,748		
2004	17	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$219,159	0	\$0	\$219,159	\$12,892		
2005	23	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$103,043,595	280	\$420,000	\$103,463,595	\$4,498,417		
2006	27	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$1,063,038	42	\$63,000	\$1,126,038	\$41,705		
2007	28	1	\$9,400,000	3	\$2,958,000	\$8,478,907	263	\$394,500	\$21,231,407	\$758,265		
2008	18	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$6,921,409	300	\$450,000	\$7,371,409	\$409,523		
2009	24	0	\$0	3	\$2,958,000	\$923,407	207	\$310,500	\$4,191,907	\$174,663		
2010	25	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$3,359,001	0	\$0	\$3,359,001	\$134,360		
2011	25	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$16,123,614	35	\$52,500	\$16,176,114	\$647,045		
2012	23	0	\$0	0	\$0	\$4,506,211	24	\$36,000	\$4,542,211	\$197,487		
2013	26	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$8,702,995	451	\$676,500	\$11,351,495	\$436,596		
2014	10	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$11,240,623	10	\$15,000	\$13,227,623	\$1,322,762		
2015	6	0	\$0	2	\$1,972,000	\$3,732,419	6	\$9,000	\$5,713,419	\$952,237		
Total	278	1	\$9,400,000	12	\$11,832,000	\$181,470,319	1,631	\$2,446,500	\$205,148,819	\$737,945		
VSL = valu	VSL = value of statistical life											
Source: Inc	ident data fro	om PHMSA	gas transmissio	on incident r	eports, 2003-20	015, see http://ww	ww.phmsa.dot	.gov/pipeline/lib	rary/data-stats/flag	gged-data-files		

1. Based on DOT 2015 Guidelines for Value of Statistical Life (VSL; \$9.4 million in 2015 dollars).

2. Based on DOT 2015 Guidelines for VSL (serious injury value; \$0.986 million in 2015 dollars).

3. Converted from \$2013 to \$2015 (2013 Consumer Price Index- 233.5; 2015 Consumer Price Index-237.0). Includes all reported operator incident expenses (3rd party damage, operator emergency response, lost gas, etc.) less operator property damage and repair costs

4. Based on multiplying the number of persons evacuated by a best professional judgment estimate of per person evacuation cost (approximately \$1,500).