Who We Are
The Pipeline Safety Trust came into being after the 1999 pipeline tragedy in Bellingham Washington where nearly a quarter-million-gallons of unleaded gasoline ruptured from the Olympic pipeline and flowed two miles down a salmon stream through the middle of Bellingham. An eighteen-year-old man who was fly fishing in the creek was overcome by the fumes in the narrow canyon where he was fishing and fell into the gasoline filled stream and drowned. When the gasoline finally ignited it burned the entire two mile stretch of creek killing every living thing including two ten year old boys who were playing near the creek.

In the aftermath of that tragedy, while the community struggled to learn about pipelines and who regulates them, the parents who lost their children, the greater Bellingham community, and to a large degree the entire State of Washington came together to push for a number of significant pipeline safety improvements. One of those initiatives was the creation of an independent pipeline safety watchdog to keep an eye on both the pipeline industry and the regulators to ensure that such a tragedy would never happen again in this country. In the end the federal prosecutors who were in charge of the Olympic pipeline case, were so aghast at what the pipeline company had done in Bellingham, and what the regulators had failed to do, that they too came to believe in the importance of such an independent watchdog. As part of the 2003 multi-million dollar settlement in the case the federal courts set aside four million dollars for the creation of such an independent watchdog, and the Pipeline Safety Trust was born.

The parents formed the Trust as a federal non-profit, invested the money wisely as an endowment for future operations, and undertook a yearlong strategic planning process to figure out how the Trust could become the most effective organization possible. To learn more about the Bellingham tragedy click here. To download the Trust’s original strategic plan click here.

The Trust became the only non-profit focused on pipeline safety from a public perspective, and as such we found we were filling a void that no one else was. We were surprised and soon very busy responding to requests from the public, the pipeline industry, as well as regulators seeking out our “public” view on things. We have testified to Congress 15 times, as well as the National Transportation Safety Board, and have been responsible for significant changes to the federal
regulations. We have been invited to speak at every major pipeline industry conference, enlisted to be on multiple regulatory advisory committees, and regularly are contacted by local and national media for background and opinions on pipeline issues.

Throughout our short history we have strived to stay true to our mission and work with anyone in an effort to increase pipeline safety. We are not an anti-pipeline group, and try to avoid “us versus them” situations preferring a strong stance in support of greater safety.

**Pipeline Safety Trust’s Mission**
The Pipeline Safety Trust promotes fuel transportation safety through education and advocacy, by increasing access to information, and by building partnerships with residents, safety advocates, government, and industry, that result in safer communities and a healthier environment.

**What We Are Trying To Accomplish With This Group**
The federal judge noted when she awarded us the initial money that the Trust, with only 4 million dollars, was like "Bambi taking on Godzilla," but she chided the pipeline industry to listen to and work with the Pipeline Safety Trust so tragedies like Bellingham do not happen again. Unfortunately other tragedies have continued to occur and there is still more work to be done to eliminate such tragedies.

While the Trust has built a large reputation, and our services are in large demand, the reality is we are a small organization with only two and a half full time employees. We regularly are forced to pass up opportunities to help citizens on specific issues, talk with major news sources, and comment on state and local pipeline regulatory issues. To move greater pipeline safety forward we need help. We need more, well-informed public voices to help take advantages of all the opportunities.

We hope through this group effort that at some point in the near future at least some of you will be able to help us take advantage of more safety opportunities. We hope we can tap your particular expertise when others around the country are faced with issues you have already faced. We hope that we can direct reporters in your area to talk to you for a local source of information. And we hope when government agencies are considering new pipeline safety rules and initiatives that we can add some of your voices to our own to help ensure that the public interest is heard over what is often a deluge of industry voices.

**Where The Grant Money For This Effort Came From**
Every four years the national pipeline safety program administered by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) has to be reauthorized by Congress. During the reauthorization of 2002 those who would later form the Pipeline Safety Trust pushed for inclusion of a Community Technical Assistance Grant Program where local governments and citizen groups around the country could compete for grant funds so they could independently investigate pipeline
safety issues in their communities or to fund greater public involvement in various pipeline safety efforts.

This effort was successful in getting Congress to authorize such a grant program and a few years later we were successful again in getting Congress to actually fund the program to the tune of one million dollars a year. There have already been three years of this grant program awarded, and a number of people in this group (Libby Willis, Lynda Farrell, Eileen Juico, Anthony Moscarelli, John Gaadt, Robin Carbaugh, Dee Durham, Robert Hill, Roberta Winters) have received money through this grant program for efforts in their communities. Another round of these grants is about to open up for proposals in the next week. We will post the notice to the group when it comes out so if any of you are interested you can get an application in and ask those of us on the list for pointers on how to apply.

This effort is being funded in part by one of these Community Technical Assistance Grants from PHMSA for $48,700. The remainder of the money for this effort is coming directly from the Trust. To download the description of this grant that was submitted to PHMSA click here.

What We Can and Can’t Do With This Grant

When these grants were first authorized (49 USC 60130) Congress allowed the Secretary of Transportation to provide these grants “to local communities and groups of individuals (not including for-profit entities)” for “engineering and other scientific analysis of pipeline safety issues, including the promotion of public participation in official proceedings.”

This effort you are all now a part of falls mainly under the “promotion of public participation in official proceedings,” which is why we will be spending a good deal of time talking about what these “official proceedings” are. They include such things as state and federal rule makings, pipeline safety standards, public awareness requirements, emergency response planning, special permits, and other processes defined in the statutes.

Some within the pipeline industry and Congress have expressed concern that these community grants amount to funding people to fight particular pipelines and stand in the way of energy development. The Pipeline Safety Trust had to defend these grants a number of times over the past year because of these concerns. In the bill that passed Congress in December new language was inserted into the federal statute to ensure that these grants will “not be used for lobbying, for direct advocacy for or against a pipeline construction or expansion project, or in direct support of litigation.” That certainly does not preclude any of you from continuing to be part of FERC proceedings or other particular pipeline issues, just that we can not get into the particulars of those specific pipeline projects with this grant money.
Some Survey Results
Thanks to all of you who took our brief survey. For those of you who didn’t if you still want to it is still available by clicking here.

Many of the questions were just meant to give us a sense of how much people already know about different aspects of pipeline safety. Turns out that on many of the questions less than 50% of us knew the correct answer, and in some cases less than 25%. We have pasted the result at the bottom for those of you interested. We have not indicated the correct answers because we need to use this survey again in a few months to see how successful we have been in raising people’s awareness.

There were a couple of questions we asked that had no correct answer, but gave us a glimpse of the group’s opinion on a couple subjects. The most interesting one was the question about how much we would trust information about pipeline safety from a variety of different groups. We asked that same question of a number of individuals from industry and pipeline regulatory agencies as well. The comparison is below. As you will see our group trusts the pipeline industry and regulators much less than they trust each other, and they trust the groups we tend to trust the most – such as environmental groups – much less than we do.
So why does that matter? It matters because the reality is that the regulators and industry hold nearly all the expertise and information about pipeline safety. If we don’t trust them then how are we ever going to get the information we need to form our own opinions about pipeline safety? The chairwoman of the National Transportation Safety Board recently chided pipeline safety regulators that they needed to adopt more of a “trust but verify” attitude toward the pipeline industry. That sentiment would probably serve this group as well. The Pipeline Safety Trust is not a highly technical organization, and we don’t claim to know everything about pipeline safety. It is our hope that as we provide more and more information about increasingly complicated issues that you will question and verify what we say. We will also be asking some trusted members from regulatory agencies and the pipeline industry to also verify what we are saying, and from time to time to chime in to provide other perspectives on issues where there is no single correct answer.

Hopefully this effort to include other voices, and verify what is being said, will lead us all to trust each other more so when we come to have a significant disagreement that disagreement can be over possible policies to improve pipeline safety and not over the underlying data that makes a discussion about the possible need for better policies necessary.

So in that vein, if any of you have questions or concerns about anything in this paper please get those questions on the table now, via the listserv, so we as a group can consider the concerns, clarify the information, or have a good discussion about it. In the end our discussions over the grey areas of pipeline safety may be more educational than the presentations you will receive in these papers.

\textbf{Results from Initial Pipeline Safety Survey}

There are over 2.5 million miles of pipelines in the U.S. Of the major types of pipelines which one clearly has the most mileage? 27 correct /52 answers \textbf{51.9\% correct}

A gas "main" is part of which type of pipeline system? 22/52 \textbf{42.3\% correct}

Which of the following are transported through Hazardous Liquid Pipelines? Mark all that apply.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Crude Oil \hspace{1cm} 47/52 \textbf{90.4\% correct}
  \item Gasoline \hspace{1cm} 44/52 \textbf{84.6\% correct}
  \item Propane \hspace{1cm} 31/52 \textbf{59.6\% correct}
  \item Anhydrous Ammonia \hspace{1cm} 34/52 \textbf{65.4\% correct}
  \item Methane \hspace{1cm} 29/52 \textbf{55.8\% correct}
  \item Butane \hspace{1cm} 24/52 \textbf{46.2\% correct}
  \item Process Wastewater \hspace{1cm} 27/52 \textbf{51.9\% correct}
\end{itemize}

Which one of the following does not develop statutes, rules or standards that are part of the federal pipeline safety regulations? 10/52 \textbf{19.2\% correct}

When considering the federal regulations for gas transmission pipelines which one of the following is true? 12/52 \textbf{23.1\% correct}

Which of the following is the cause of the most pipeline incidents that were reported to the federal government from all the different types of pipelines over the last five years? 5/52 \textbf{9.6\% correct}
Which of the following is the cause of the most injuries or deaths from pipeline incidents over the last five years? 18/52  **34.6% correct**

Which of the following is true for a state pipeline safety agency? 25/52  **48.1% correct**

True or False - The width of the right-of-way for a 42 inch gas transmission pipeline is required by regulation to be wider than the right-of-way for a 12 inch gas transmission pipeline? 37/52  **71.2% correct**

True or False - The regulations for a 24 inch crude oil interstate pipeline are the same as for a 24 inch jet fuel interstate pipeline? 33/52  **63.5% correct**

Over the past five years which type of pipeline was responsible for the most injuries and deaths? 22/52  **42.3% correct**

Over the past five years which type of pipeline was responsible for the most total property damage? 8/52  **15.4% correct**

The Common Ground Alliance is primarily concerned with which of the following? 15/52  **28.8% correct**

The National Association of Pipeline Safety Representatives is made up of? 15/52  **28.8% correct**

Which answer is true for pipelines in the U.S. that carry diluted bitumen from Alberta? 8/52  **15.4% correct**