

(ii) The basis on which you select at least two different, but complementary, indirect assessment tools to assess each ECDA region; and

(iii) If you utilize an indirect inspection method not described in Appendix A of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3), you must demonstrate the applicability, validation basis, equipment used, application procedure, and utilization of data for the inspection method.

(3) *Indirect examination.* In addition to the requirements in Section 4 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3), the procedures for indirect examination of the ECDA regions must include—

(i) Provisions for applying more restrictive criteria when conducting ECDA for the first time on a pipeline segment;

(ii) Criteria for identifying and documenting those indications that must be considered for excavation and direct examination, including at least the following:

(A) The known sensitivities of assessment tools;

(B) The procedures for using each tool; and

(C) The approach to be used for decreasing the physical spacing of indirect assessment tool readings when the presence of a defect is suspected;

(iii) For each indication identified during the indirect examination, criteria for—

(A) Defining the urgency of excavation and direct examination of the indication; and

(B) Defining the excavation urgency as immediate, scheduled, or monitored; and

(iv) Criteria for scheduling excavations of indications in each urgency level.

(4) *Direct examination.* In addition to the requirements in Section 5 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3), the procedures for direct examination of indications from the indirect examination must include—

(i) Provisions for applying more restrictive criteria when conducting ECDA for the first time on a pipeline segment;

(ii) Criteria for deciding what action should be taken if either:

(A) Corrosion defects are discovered that exceed allowable limits (Section 5.5.2.2 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3) provides guidance for criteria); or

(B) Root cause analysis reveals conditions for which ECDA is not suitable (Section 5.6.2 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3) provides guidance for criteria);

(iii) Criteria and notification procedures for any changes in the ECDA plan, including changes that affect the severity classification, the priority of direct examination, and the time frame for direct examination of indications; and

(iv) Criteria that describe how and on what basis you will reclassify and reprioritize any of the provisions specified in Section 5.9 of NACE SP0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3).

(5) *Post assessment and continuing evaluation.* In addition to the requirements in Section 6 of NACE SP 0502 (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3), the procedures for post assessment of the effectiveness of the ECDA process must include—

(i) Measures for evaluating the long-term effectiveness of ECDA in addressing external corrosion in pipeline segments; and

(ii) Criteria for evaluating whether conditions discovered by direct examination of indications in each ECDA region indicate a need for reassessment of the pipeline segment at an interval less than that specified in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of NACE SP0502 (*see* appendix D of NACE SP0502) (incorporated by reference, *see* §195.3).

[Amdt. 195-85, 70 FR 61576, Oct. 25, 2005, as amended by Amdt. 195-94, 75 FR 48607, Aug. 11, 2010]

§ 195.589 What corrosion control information do I have to maintain?

(a) You must maintain current records or maps to show the location of—

(1) Cathodically protected pipelines;

(2) Cathodic protection facilities, including galvanic anodes, installed after January 28, 2002; and

(3) Neighboring structures bonded to cathodic protection systems.

(b) Records or maps showing a stated number of anodes, installed in a stated

manner or spacing, need not show specific distances to each buried anode.

(c) You must maintain a record of each analysis, check, demonstration, examination, inspection, investigation, review, survey, and test required by this subpart in sufficient detail to demonstrate the adequacy of corrosion control measures or that corrosion requiring control measures does not exist. You must retain these records for at least 5 years, except that records related to §§ 195.569, 195.573(a) and (b), and 195.579(b)(3) and (c) must be retained for as long as the pipeline remains in service.

APPENDIX A TO PART 195—DELINEATION
BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE JURISDICTION—STATEMENT OF AGENCY
POLICY AND INTERPRETATION

In 1979, Congress enacted comprehensive safety legislation governing the transportation of hazardous liquids by pipeline, the Hazardous Liquids Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, 49 U.S.C. 2001 *et seq.* (HLPSPA). The HLPSPA expanded the existing statutory authority for safety regulation, which was limited to transportation by common carriers in interstate and foreign commerce, to transportation through facilities used in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce. It also added civil penalty, compliance order, and injunctive enforcement authorities to the existing criminal sanctions. Modeled largely on the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, 49 U.S.C. 1671 *et seq.* (NGPSA), the HLPSPA provides for a national hazardous liquid pipeline safety program with nationally uniform minimal standards and with enforcement administered through a Federal-State partnership. The HLPSPA leaves to exclusive Federal regulation and enforcement the “interstate pipeline facilities,” those used for the pipeline transportation of hazardous liquids in interstate or foreign commerce. For the remainder of the pipeline facilities, denominated “intrastate pipeline facilities,” the HLPSPA provides that the same Federal regulation and enforcement will apply unless a State certifies that it will assume those responsibilities. A certified State must adopt the same minimal standards but may adopt additional more stringent standards so long as they are compatible. Therefore, in States which participate in the hazardous liquid pipeline safety program through certification, it is necessary to distinguish the interstate from the intrastate pipeline facilities.

In deciding that an administratively practical approach was necessary in distinguishing between interstate and intrastate liquid pipeline facilities and in determining

how best to accomplish this, DOT has logically examined the approach used in the NGPSA. The NGPSA defines the interstate gas pipeline facilities subject to exclusive Federal jurisdiction as those subject to the economic regulatory jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Experience has proven this approach practical. Unlike the NGPSA however, the HLPSPA has no specific reference to FERC jurisdiction, but instead defines interstate liquid pipeline facilities by the more commonly used means of specifying the end points of the transportation involved. For example, the economic regulatory jurisdiction of FERC over the transportation of both gas and liquids by pipeline is defined in much the same way. In implementing the HLPSPA DOT has sought a practicable means of distinguishing between interstate and intrastate pipeline facilities that provide the requisite degree of certainty to Federal and State enforcement personnel and to the regulated entities. DOT intends that this statement of agency policy and interpretation provide that certainty.

In 1981, DOT decided that the inventory of liquid pipeline facilities identified as subject to the jurisdiction of FERC approximates the HLPSPA category of “interstate pipeline facilities.” Administrative use of the FERC inventory has the added benefit of avoiding the creation of a separate Federal scheme for determination of jurisdiction over the same regulated entities. DOT recognizes that the FERC inventory is only an approximation and may not be totally satisfactory without some modification. The difficulties stem from some significant differences in the economic regulation of liquid and of natural gas pipelines. There is an affirmative assertion of jurisdiction by FERC over natural gas pipelines through the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity prior to commencing operations. With liquid pipelines, there is only a rebuttable presumption of jurisdiction created by the filing by pipeline operators of tariffs (or concurrences) for movement of liquids through existing facilities. Although FERC does police the filings for such matters as compliance with the general duties of common carriers, the question of jurisdiction is normally only aired upon complaint. While any person, including State or Federal agencies, can avail themselves of the FERC forum by use of the complaint process, that process has only been rarely used to review jurisdictional matters (probably because of the infrequency of real disputes on the issue). Where the issue has arisen, the reviewing body has noted the need to examine various criteria primarily of an economic nature. DOT believes that, in most cases, the formal FERC forum can better receive and evaluate the type of information that is needed to make decisions of this nature than can DOT.