

**OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL
Pipeline Safety Division**P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460(916) 445-8477
Fax: (916) 445-8526
Website: www.fire.ca.gov**PSAC Meeting Minutes****October 16, 2001 Bakersfield**

The 16 October 2001 PSAC meeting was held at the Doubletree Hotel in Bakersfield. Pipeline Safety Division Chief Glenn Tong opened the meeting by having everyone introduce him or herself. In attendance were Nancy Wolfe, Bob Gorham, Gary Shepherd, Tom Lael, Kevin Olson, Stephen Johnson, Hap Hatch, Tony Semenza, Keith Richter, Jerry Engelhardt, and Linda Zigler. Missing was Chuck Samo.

The first issue discussed was how best to get pipeline operators and their local fire departments to meet annually so that they can exchange information, train together, etc. It states in the California Government Code Section 51015 (c) that "Every pipeline operator shall offer to meet with the local fire department having fire suppression responsibilities at least once each calendar year to discuss and review contingency plans for pipeline emergencies". Many times this is difficult to do because the individual fire department does not have the budget or the staff to conduct drills with each pipeline operator. Suggestions that were offered included:

- (1) Try to get to know the chiefs of the larger fire departments.
- (2) Encourage at least the training officers to visit the pipeline operators
- (3) Meet with the county's health regulating agencies/committees, State OES, County OES, etc.
- (4) Have a pipeline operator as a guest speaker at a Fire Chiefs group.
- (5) Have someone from SFM Pipeline Safety give presentation to fire departments that have pipelines within their response areas.
- (6) Use the new 9 minute video that Jerry Englehardt showed as a general overview and then build on that according to the audience.
- (7) Create a new pipeline safety training video that focused on what fire departments need to know and distribute them.
- (8) Keep in mind that training needs to be tailored to the specific fire department and what it needs. Some would get enough information from a website while others may get more out of a joint drill.
- (9) At a later date, CSFM could provide mapping information of the pipeline locations for all the fire departments by putting it on a local disk.

The second issue discussed was the status of the CSFM pipeline mapping project. The GIS maps are about 75% complete. The process takes time because the data must be reviewed with the pipeline operators for accuracy. CSFM is trying to identify each fire department and its geographic jurisdiction. (CFIRS and Firescope do not have this information). The water board is to show

where the drinking water wells are. (They are working on this project but have other more pressing items to work on). The concern has been pipelines leaking MTBE and hydrocarbons – but the water board is more concerned with tanks than pipelines. They may be looking at re-locating some water wells because as many as this could affect as many as 22,000 wells. Many municipalities have wells that are from 8 to 1200 feet deep and the draw down volume may be high enough to draw in a petroleum plume. The third issue discussed was the CDF/CSFM homepage and what additional information could be posted. Some ideas included:

- (1) Training opportunities
- (2) Emergency contact numbers for the pipeline operators (as long as it was also clearly stated that these numbers were for “emergency use only”)
- (3) Information from the CSFM Pipeline Safety Workshops so that those who could not attend could still read about the topics that were presented

The fourth issue discussed was whether there were any up and coming house or senate bills. Not at this time as there is a reluctance to open up the law. One of these days there will have to some changes because state law is getting more out of sync with federal law – an example is that starting next year DOT’s regulations may be more stringent than ours regarding hydrostatic testing. The question is whether or not the state would have the authority to overrule the feds? Regardless of this, the state could still require hydrotesting. CSFM is waiting to see what OPS does. California could do its hydrotests for eight hours so there would be no conflict with federal law.

The fifth issue regarded State OES notifications. SFM issued an information bulletin outlining the new reporting guidelines. This is to eliminate nuisance notifications. The next PSAC meeting will probably be in conjunction with the next CSFM Pipeline Safety Seminar in either April or May 2002.