UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Investigation of: *
*
HOUSE EXPLOSION IN FIRESTONE, *
COLORADO, APRIL 17, 2017 * Accident No.: DCA17FP005
*
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Interview of: JOE MacLAREN

Frederick-Firestone Fire Protection
District Business & Education
Center
Longmont, Colorado

Friday,
May 12, 2017

APPEARANCES:

RAVI CHHATRE, Investigator in Charge
National Transportation Safety Board

GBENGA AJIBOYE, General Engineer
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA)

MICHAEL LEONARD, Quality Assurance Professional
Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission

MATTHEW LEPORE, Director
Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission

DOUG PRUNK, Fire Investigator
Frederick-Firestone Fire Protection District

DAVID McBRIDE, Vice President of Health, Safety & Environment
Anadarko Petroleum Corporation

I N D E X

I N T E R V I E W

MR. CHHATRE: Good morning. Today is Friday, May 12, 2017. We are currently at Frederick-Firestone Fire Protection District Business & Education Center located at 8426 Kosmerl Place, Longmont, Colorado. We are meeting regarding the investigation of explosion of a house located at 6312 Twilight Avenue, Firestone, Colorado that occurred on April 17, 2017.

My name is Ravi Chhatre. I am with, I am with the National Transportation Safety Board in Washington, D.C., and I am investigator-in-charge of this accident. The NTSB investigation number for this accident is DCA17FP005.

I would like to start by notifying everyone present in this room that we are recording this interview, and we may transcribe it at a later date. Transcripts will be provided directly to the interviewee for review and identifying any typographical errors. The transcript may be posted in NTSB's public docket.

Also, I would like to inform Mr. Joe MacLaren that you are permitted to have one other person present with you during the interview. This is a person of your choice -- your supervisor, friend, family member or, if you choose, no one at all. Please state for the record your full name; spelling of your name; organization you work for and your title; business contact information, such as mailing address, telephone number, email; and whom you have chosen to be present with you during your interview.

MR. MacLAREN: My name is Joe MacLaren. I work for the

Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission.

MR. CHHATRE: Spell it.

MR. MacLAREN: MacLaren is spelled, M-A-C, capital L, A-R-E-N. And my title is engineering integrity inspector/engineering technician. I would request to have Director Matt Lepore stay present in the room with me.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. And your business contact information, please?

MR. MacLAREN: And my business contact information. My cell phone is (970) 382-1680.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Thank you very much. Now I'd like to go around the room and have each person introduce themselves. Please state your name, spelling of your name, your title and the organization that you represent, and your business contact information. Starting from my left.

MR. AJIBOYE: My name is Gbenga Ajiboye, spelt G-B-E-N-G-A, A-J-I-B-O-Y-E. I work for the DOT PHMSA with the Western Region. My cell phone number is [redacted]. My email address is first [redacted]. And I'm an engineer with PHMSA.

MR. PRUNK: Doug Prunk, division chief, Frederick-Firestone Fire Protection District, [redacted]. Area code [redacted]. Email address is [redacted].

MR. LEONARD: Mike Leonard. That's L-E-O-N-A-R-D, with the Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission. I'm the quality assurance professional. Email address is [redacted]

[redacted] Cell phone [redacted].

MR. LEPORE: My name is Matt Lepore. I am the director of the Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission. Business address is [redacted]. Telephone number is [redacted]. My email address is [redacted].

MR. McBRIDE: My name is David McBride. It's M-C, capital B, R-I-D-E. I am vice president of health, safety and environment for Anadarko Petroleum Corporation located in The Woodlands, Texas. My contact information is [redacted].com. Telephone number, [redacted]. Office line is [redacted].

MR. CHHATRE: Thank you.

INTERVIEW OF JOE MacLAREN

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Mr. MacLaren, for the record, just tell us your background, any formal education, informal trainings, formal trainings, and your work history.

A. Sure. I've got a Bachelor's of Science degree in geology from Fort Lewis College down in Durango, Colorado. I've worked in the oil and gas industry for about 25 years. And I've been on, mainly on the contract side. I've been with the Commission now for about 2½ years.

Q. And with your title, is it engineering technician? Is that correct?

A. Yes. Correct.

Q. Is that an OQ job? Operator qualification job? Did you need to --
A. It is -- there are qualifications that needed to be met for the application process. But no, it's not --
Q. OQ.
A. -- OQ.
Q. Okay. They do some yearly training to keep your qualifications current or --
A. Yes. Yes. I set training goals.
Q. Okay. So going back to April 17, the day of the accident, how was -- what was your involvement in that accident? What was going on?
A. Well, I was not aware of it on April 17. But on April 18, Tuesday, April 18, I became aware of it. I received a call from my supervisor, Mark Schlagenhauf.
Q. Spell the last name?
A. That's going to be --
MR. LEPORE: Good luck with that.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Just be, just be close enough, thanks. That'll be fine.
MR. MacLAREN: S-C-H-L-A-G-E-N-H-A-U-F. I think I hit it on the money.
MR. CHHATRE: Thank you.
MR. MacLAREN: And he informed me on Tuesday, April 18 of a house explosion in the Firestone area at about 10:30 a.m. in the

morning. He also informed me that there were flowlines and wells in relatively close proximity and asked me to stop by and take a look at the situation.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. So just walk me through your entire involvement.

A. Okay. I showed up at the police and fire barricade at approximately 11:45 Tuesday, April 18. And I took a look at the house and the devastation from the, from the police barricade. And at that point, I was just looking around the area and I noticed a well in relatively close proximity to the house. There were some, there were some -- what appeared to be workers around the wellhead on the location, conducting some work. And at that point, I decided to become engaged. I grabbed my notebook, my camera, my personal protective equipment, and I walked over to the well itself near the house.

At that point, I introduced myself to the folks that were actually closing the gate around the wellhead. And they were contract employees that had just finished up a flowline pressure test on the active flowline running between the wellhead and the separator. I asked them about the results of the test, and they said that it had passed, and had informed Anadarko personnel, who were no longer on the scene.

I requested to the contractors that I get in to take a look at the wellhead, and they opened the gate. I took a look at the well. I identified that active wellsite flowline. And then I

also noticed what appeared to be an abandoned 2-inch carbon steel flowline riser just south of the wellhead. And alongside of that riser was a 1-inch carbon steel riser that was connected to the wellhead by 3/8-inch stainless steel tubing. I asked the contractors whether they had addressed what appeared to be an abandoned flowline, referring to the 2-inch line, and whether that had been pressure tested or located. And they had said no, it wasn't pressure tested and they were unaware of whether or not it was located at that point. I also asked about the 1-inch line, and they were unaware of any kind of, any kind of investigation by company personnel regarding that line.

At that point, I walked away from the well and quickly met up with fire department personnel, Doug; Public Utility Commission personnel, Joe Malloy (ph.); the PHMSA folks; and the Black Hills Energy folks that had responded to the accident and were onsite conducting their investigations. I spoke with Joe Malloy and -- about what I had observed at the well and asked him if he -- and we discussed what Anadarko folks had responded to the incident. And he quickly picked up the phone and called one of the Anadarko supervisors, who came back to the location soon thereafter to address the questions that I had onsite. And that, and that was Bret Schissler.

I asked Bret -- I informed Bret that I would need to witness a pressure test conducted on the active wellsite flowline. I requested that the 2-inch abandoned line that I had observed with

the riser be located. And then I also asked that the 1-inch riser be located, and that it was confirmed that there was a tie-in down at the separator.

Bret had some other folks with him, employees, and they started to conduct that work. Took about a couple hours. I took some photos of the site, looked around. I walked down where the active wellsite flowline had been located. I observed a storm water drainage that was relatively deep along -- that was, that was in the area where that flowline, the active wellsite flowline, had passed. Made some general observations, waiting for them to do these locates and waiting for them to get prepared to run the pressure test, retest the wellsite flowline.

At that point, about, oh, another hour, 2 hours later, so at this time, about 2 o'clock p.m., they were able to locate the abandoned 2-inch carbon steel flowline. They were not able to locate the 1-inch line because it turned into polyethylene down belowground. There was no tracer wire with it, so they were not sure where it went. One thing they did confirm, though, was that they did not see a riser and tie-in at the horizontal separator west of the well. At that point, we became suspicious that, based on the two risers being located right next to one another, that they possibly ran in the same trench. We had located the 2-inch line. It went in a western direction for a short distance, where it turned back to the north and intersected the back fence and foundation area of the house, 6312 Twilight Avenue.

At that point in time, we still did not know where the 1-inch poly line ran. We were suspicious that it possibly paralleled and ran in the same trench with the 2-inch line, so we all decided to -- that the next step in the process would be to do some potholing with a hydro excavator to take a look at the 2-inch line and see if the 1-inch line was running in the trench with it. Anadarko made some calls to their contractors, and they, and they called in a hydro excavation truck. And so we waited for that to arrive. At that point in time, I ran the wellsite, the active wellsite flowline test between the wellhead and the separator. We metered it on both ends, and based on our rules, I deemed it satisfactory.

So time went by. I was down on -- at the facility that is associated with this well, where the horizontal separator and the tanks, the production tanks, are located. There are two additional wellheads down close to that facility. I decided to, while we were waiting for the hydro excavation to happen, I decided to take a look at those wells. On one of the wells, the core is 6-13. I noticed that there were, that there were two risers over there that were very similar to the ones that were observed on the core's 6-14 wellhead. I requested to the Anadarko personnel onsite that we locate those lines as well and get an idea of where those are running. At that point in time, they did the locates. They were once again able to locate the carbon steel 2-inch line. The 1-inch line turned to polyethylene underground, so they weren't able to locate it laterally. But we did locate

the 2-inch line, and it traveled in an eastern direction back towards 6312 Twilight Avenue.

They continued to trace that line. They traced it all the way back to the point where the abandoned flowline from the 6-14 turned in a north direction towards the house, and this one did the same thing. And we were assuming that it turned the corner and then was located in the same trench traveling in a northern direction towards the back foundation of the house. At that point, the hydro excavator showed up. At this time, it's about 6:00 p.m. Hydro excavation activities commenced at the, at the -- just adjacent to the privacy fence south of the foundation of 6312 Twilight Avenue. And by about 7 o'clock p.m., we were able to see two carbon steel 2-inch flowlines down in the excavation and one polyethylene 1-inch line traveling down in the excavation as well.

At that point, we weren't -- we were suspicious that this line was the one coming from the 6-14 wellhead, but we were not able to confirm it that day. And we did not see the ends of the lines that night. Any cut and no-cut ends of lines were observed that night.

Q. Do you mind maybe drawing a sketch and, kind of, go through what you saw, if you feel comfortable?

A. Sure.

Q. Showing those -- you know, the separators and all the different -- if you only -- you can use horizontally. It doesn't matter.

Q. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You want a pencil so you can erase?

MR. MacLAREN: I can (indiscernible). You know, I got it. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We could have Doug draw it for you. (Indiscernible). Take it home, put it on the fridge (indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you?

MR. MacLAREN: Oh, okay.

MR. LEPORE: Is that to scale?

MR. MacLAREN: Is this going to be adequate?

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah.

MR. MacLAREN: Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: We're supposed to get some drawing, but I mean, if we had a big drawing, I would have given it to you.

MR. MacLAREN: And actually, we do have that. Stuart Ellsworth, out -- who you're going to interview next, has that.

MR. CHHATRE: (Indiscernible)?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. (Indiscernible).

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah, he can go over.

MR. AJIBOYE: Where's he at?

MR. MacLAREN: He's out in the lobby.

MR. CHHATRE: (Indiscernible). Okay, hold on. We're going, we're going to destroy that and --

MR. MacLAREN: Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. That means (Indiscernible) you don't have to write so much stuff, then.

MR. MacLAREN: Exactly. The work's been done, and it's to scale.

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. Great. In the meantime, let me ask you a few questions.

MR. MacLAREN: Okay.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. But I don't want to disturb your chain of thought here. How do people knew it was a plastic poly line going underground? At least not exposed, but -- and I was there. The only thing you can really see is a carbon steel, right?

A. Correct.

Q. So how would they know that even the line goes anywhere (indiscernible) --

A. When they were, when they were unable to locate it, they were -- they became aware -- it's typical, it's typical construction for the industry, I think, for Anadarko. They've got other assemblies that are similar. So and then they confirmed that. When they were unable to locate it any distance laterally, then they assumed that it -- there was a carbon steel to poly transition down under the ground.

Q. Okay. So here are the sketches.

A. Yeah, so here are the sketches.

Q. I think there are more than one copy of --

A. So yeah, I think Keith (ph.) got -- let's see what he got here. (Indiscernible). Okay. I think this is best to work off, right?

Q. Okay.

A. Yeah. So here is --

Q. (Indiscernible) Page 72 of 72 or -- what is the number here? I just need to look here. I cannot see from here. How do I identify this -- oh, right here. Yeah, 72 of 72. Okay. Go ahead. And now I need a pencil.

A. Okay. So here is 6312 Twilight Avenue.

Q. Okay, I can sight it. Yeah.

A. Right. Here is the existing gas well. This is the active wellsite flowline, then risers.

Q. Write down the well number on here so we know.

A. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) 6-14.

MR. MacLAREN: IJ?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I thought it was Ji.

MR. MacLAREN: Ji.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Capital J, little i.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Capital J, little i.

MR. MacLAREN: Okay. Okay.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

A. So here is the existing cores V6-14 Ji wellhead right here. The active flowline is marked here, and it runs adjacent to and

virtually parallel to a privacy fence that runs at the back of these residences. Here is 6312 Twilight Avenue. Okay?

Q. Let's make an X in there. Okay.

A. This was the line that I pressure tested as it ran from the production equipment here --

Q. Entirely from here to here.

A. From here to here. Okay? That's deemed satisfactory. This is the 2-inch carbon steel line in what we later found the 1-inch poly line running parallel with it that ran to the west and then swept up to the north. And ran --

Q. Okay. We're going to mark it down here as 2-inch. We can call it abandoned if you want.

A. Yeah.

Q. Right now, I am understanding what you're saying, but I'm not sure when I go back and look at it 3 weeks later. If you want to get your highlighter too.

MR. LEPORE: Did this (indiscernible) that we did the other day?

MR. CHHATRE: Yes --

MR. LEPORE: Are we able to get a copy of that?

MR. CHHATRE: I have an electronic copy of it, but I haven't been able to --

MR. LEPORE: No, that would be awesome if --

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. And like I said, (indiscernible). And we'll just send it to everybody. My problem here, I get so many

emails from headquarters and from everybody here that I haven't been able to catch up with the -- Sunday probably will be a good day for me to catch up with a lot of stuff because we have no interviews scheduled, so --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

MR. LEPORE: Well, I could if he sent it. I could probably print (indiscernible) print some of those.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay, I can do that during the break.

MR. LEPORE: Sure. Sure. Might be a little less (indiscernible).

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. I think it's a duplicate, right?

A. No, it's two sets.

Q. Oh, it's two different sets?

A. Yeah.

Q. Oh.

A. This is -- they call it Filing 2 and this one is Filing 1, I believe. Okay.

Q. Okay.

A. Okay, so --

Q. If you want to come --

MR. LEPORE: I know it.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay, okay.

MR. LEPORE: Been there done that.

MR. CHHATRE: I know.

MR. MacLAREN: Okay, so there's your wellhead, and then here's where we located that carbon steel line.

MR. CHHATRE: Right. Okay.

MR. MacLAREN: And then we did that potholing here up against the privacy fence that night. That's where we were able to identify --

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. So the first potholing was next to the privacy fence.

A. Correct. That's where we were able to locate this line. This is the other 2-inch abandoned line coming from this core 6-13. And then there was one poly line, 1-inch poly line, in the trench.

Q. So you could see all three.

A. All three.

Q. Actually, you could see all four or all three?

A. All three. Just, there was only one 1-inch poly. Okay?

Q. No, but I was thinking, what about the active 2-inch? Could you see that also in that pothole?

A. No. Oh, did we -- I don't know that I saw it. Okay?

Q. Okay.

A. Yeah, so I don't -- I left, and they continued to work towards the privacy fence that night. So I did not, I did not see it. What other questions do you have? This is -- yeah, so this --

Q. So you -- this pressure test was okay. And you saw this poly

here. And that's the thing I'm going to ask you about this case. So you continue now on that --

A. Right. Right. Okay.

Q. Before I interrupted you, you were saying you required the hydro test, the hydro test held.

A. Correct. Yeah.

Q. And then you had just the excavation going on, and then you located the three lines.

A. Correct. Yes.

Q. Okay. Then what happened? (Indiscernible), you said?

A. Yeah, it was late. I left at about 7:00 p.m. that night. I returned the next morning and met with Mike Leonard.

Q. Was there any game plan discussed for the next day before you left?

A. Yeah. During this whole, during my whole day's involvement, I communicated with COGC [sic.] staff at the Denver office and let them know what I was seeing and finding. And then we discussed a game plan for the next day, which included Mike Leonard meeting me onsite in the morning. We did that, and that was on Wednesday, April 19. I brought Mike up to speed on what -- on the events that had happened the previous day. That morning, there -- I observed a security fence had been installed around the perimeter of the entire, the entire disaster area, which included -- which encompassed the well and that excavation. So I believe we were not able to get in there that next morning to take a look at it

right away.

I brought Mike up to speed. We went over to the production facility. We started doing some investigation and some, and some research into looking into if there was an abandoned facility that had not yet been identified. We were working on that. And by about midmorning towards noon, I left the site and Mike took over from there.

Q. Okay. Now when you said earlier, separator, were you talking about this facility here?

A. Yes.

Q. And so if I --

A. Right. So Anadarko personnel assumed that the 1-inch line was a gas supply line and was tied into the horizontal separator down at this facility. When they went down to take a look, they could not find that tie-in. And then --

Q. You lost me. So yeah, which line here? And Anadarko was thinking the same line runs here?

A. Right. So the 1-inch -- we were looking for the other endpoint for the 1-inch line. And typically, that would be located down at the production facility at the horizontal separator, because they would be tying into a dry gas supply source to run dry dehydrated gas back to the wellhead to operate the production equipment at the wellhead. They were unable to locate that tie-in down there.

Q. But once you see a 1-inch poly here, do you still expect the

line to be near the wellhead here?
A. No, no. So that had taken place, and then when we saw the 1-inch poly here, we became suspicious that that was our line. We did not confirm it when I was out there. The goal -- the next step was going to be to find an endpoint on that line, and then use compressed air to blow back through the line in the direction of the wellhead to see if we had communication from end to end.
Q. Okay. Okay, so what happened after that? After 19, you investigated this and you are looking for the facility here, abandoned facility. Did you find it?
A. Yes. So we were able to, yeah. We looked, we looked at some historical field and -- COGCC field inspection reports. And one of them had indicated that this well in fact did produce to a tank battery facility located to the north. So we came up here, and this site had been abandoned and reclaimed, reclamation -- and gone through a final reclamation process. And a well that was up on this, on this site as well had been plugged. So we went up and took a look at that, and just made some general observations on that historical wellsite.
Q. You share what you found? I mean, anything --
A. Really all we saw was the monument for the well that had been plugged. There's a monument with some welded -- the welded well name and company name and some information like that. And then the flat location that had been revegetated or in process of being revegetated. And that's about all we saw up there.

Q. Okay. So on the April 18, what was your chain of thought? Did you suspect anything that this well might be supplying gas? Why you were doing all this investigation?
A. I was doing that investigation because, for me, just testing the active wellsite flowline wasn't going to be good enough. I was going to identify the roots and endpoints of all of the lines associated with this well, so we could either say this is still part of the investigation, or based on what I'm seeing through my field inspection process, we could start to rule out whether or not that was a contributing factor in the accident.
Q. So the purpose of the work then, if you (indiscernible) that means that there was a chain of thought that this may be, may be involved in the accident? Is that why you are doing the test?
A. Exactly.
Q. So that is a thought, that this could be a source of fuel. Is that --
A. Sure. Sure.
Q. But I don't -- the (indiscernible).
A. Yeah, so -- yeah.
Q. But I am just suspicious. I don't understand why you would do the testing here--
A. I'm doing that testing there because in, because -- yeah, I want to know. I've seen the two pipe risers that have not been addressed, so I want to know where those go. That's just part of my standard field inspection process. At this same point in time,

Black Hills Energy is doing their investigation. And all of the investigators out on the site are communicating some findings, and they are, they are becoming -- they are communicating to me that it does not look like they have an issue with the domestic gas supply on their side.

Q. So were you aware by that time, I think maybe 6:00 or 7 o'clock, that the Black Hills did the pressure test or pothole test, and they came out negative? Did you witness any of that, or were you aware of what Black Hills was doing?

A. Yeah, yeah. I was aware of what they were doing. I know they were doing soils, taking soils, gas readings. They were doing some pressure testing. I was not getting direct results from them because I was busy doing my own work.

Q. Sure. So you were aware that their test came out negative? Because I think you mentioned earlier --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- that you said looks like their gas is not involved, or something like that, right?

A. Yeah. They're telling me that -- they're giving me some tidbits of information. I'm hearing some hearsay, you know, some things that I'm not sure that could be confirmed. But they're saying that, yeah, their pressure test looks good. They've looked at records for gas consumption within the residence leading up to the accident and explosion. And it looked like the 2 days prior, from what I remember, there was no natural gas use by that house,

in that house. But I'm just looking, I'm looking at the wells in close proximity, this well in particular, the core of 6-14. And I want to make sure that I do my job with the production that's in the vicinity of the house explosion.

Q. So is this your routine? Are you assigned a certain area that you are responsible for the wells of that -- I'm confused as to what your assignments are.

A. Okay. So I am our engineering integrity inspector. We have a designated group of three of us that work as part of our engineering team. And we look at specific -- specifically at flowlines and production facilities, and work to -- work with operators to ensure compliance with our 1100 series rules regarding flowlines and integrity management.

Q. And you're responsibilities for -- what area?

A. I'm responsible for the field inspection part of what we do. And my responsibilities are statewide.

Q. Okay, so --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- the entire state you cover.

A. The entire state.

Q. Okay. Do you know roughly --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- how many wells that entails?

A. About 54,000. But I have assistants with our other staff. My primary, my primary workload exists here on the, on the front

range and in the Wattenburg DJ basin. We conduct integrity audits, flowline integrity audits with operators across the state.
Q. And how do you -- just for the record, what is a flowline? What is a return line? How do you define in your integrity management which is which?
A. So the way we define flowlines are they are, they are part of the production line that -- well, we define them different ways. A wellsite flowline is one that is a production line from the wellhead to a separator. Jurisdictionally, we cover everything up to a custody transfer point or where it turns into gathering. And then at that point, it becomes the jurisdiction of the Public Utility Commission.
Q. Okay. So from the wellhead through the separator.
A. Correct.
Q. And what is the endpoint then? And I understand from wellhead going to separator --
A. So then we --
Q. -- (indiscernible). Where the gas goes then?
A. So yeah, so then we oversee the dump lines that go from the separator to the production tanks.
Q. Tell me what a dump line is.
A. A dump line is -- there's a -- the separator separates gas and liquids, so a three-phase separator takes -- separates oil, produced water and gas. And the dump lines send the crude oil to the crude oil production tank and produced water to a produced

water vault. Tank.
Q. Now is the separator typically reverse flow or your gas coming in, reverse reaction and the moisture gets out? Or is it a dehydrator of some sort or --
A. Yeah. Exactly. So it helps to dehydrate the gas. And then from that point -- and it varies from operator to operator across the state -- that gas is then -- goes down a gas sales line to a gas meter. And then, from the gas meter, it's parted -- it ties into a gathering system that becomes the responsibility of the PUC.
Q. So in the integrity management program, just walk me through. When you say the flowlines are included in it, that's your primary responsibility.
A. Correct.
Q. What is it that you look for?
A. So we look for compliance with our 1100 series rules, which includes -- in particular, 1101-E is our pressure testing rule. We require that operators pressure test their flowlines annually. We want to ensure that operators are proactive in maintaining good integrity of their flowlines by implementing corrosion protection programs. We ensure that they are members of 811 Call.
Q. So they are required to be a member of 11 call.
A. Yes. Correct. And then we --
Q. Is that an 800 number or a --
A. 811.

Q. 811. Okay.
A. Yeah. And then we oversee, we oversee abandonment of flowlines as part of our 1103 rule. And then, and then also in that is maintenance, construction as part of the 1100 series rules as well.
Q. That's quite a bit of responsibility. For 55,000 wells, you said? Statewide?
A. Yeah. Well, we have -- yeah. So we have field inspection staff across the state. So yeah. It's what -- we are -- yeah, we are focused on reaching out to operators across the state. The inspection part of that, obviously, has its challenges.
Q. So who does the inspection? You said -- what do the field inspection staff do? What are, what are they responsible for?
A. Our field inspectors are responsible for inspecting wells and facilities across the state and ensuring compliance of all of our roles in this --
Q. So pretty much they do the same thing like you do, or they --
A. They do, but they look, they look at everything from drilling to completions to -- all the way through production to reclamation. So they have a lot more encompassed with what they do. Our group is more focused.
Q. We can, we can -- these are some questions for, I guess, somebody else. But do you know how many people are in that field inspection staff?
MR. MacLAREN: What do we have? Twenty-eight?

MR. LEPORE: Thirty.

MR. MacLAREN: Thirty.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Now your integrity assessment on -- what is your title? Integrity (indiscernible) you are responsible for integrity?

A. My title?

Q. Yeah.

A. My official title -- I'm an engineering technician/engineering integrity inspector.

Q. Okay, okay. So if you go to a well, what you are looking for?

A. So what -- so I do different types of inspections. I witness flowline pressure testing.

Q. Okay. That yearly test? You do yearly test?

A. Yeah, that's part of the annual pressure testing requirement.

Q. So you witness those, is what you're saying.

A. Yeah. Yeah. So I witness those with operators. I do inspections to identify the root cause of flowline failures and document the mechanisms that cause failures of flowlines, resulting in spills. And then I document and verify repairs made on flowlines. I witness abandonments. And I do new construction inspections as well.

Q. Okay. So the regulation requires you to go and visit each well or a number of random wells? Or how does that -- what does the regulation look like? I don't have -- I mean, I was just

issued a copy of your regulation. So walk me through it, I mean, what the regulation requires you to do for the operators.
A. Well, we're a relatively new group, so we've only been -- the three of us have been working as part of the engineering integrity team for just, for about a year and a half.
Q. Okay. So are there any, are there any firm guidelines for you to do for each operator, each well? I'm trying to understand with --
A. Right. Yeah.
Q. -- what the regulation requires you to do as an integrity person. That you shall inspect so many number of wells each year or do so many inspections?
A. Right. So yeah.
Q. I'm just trying to understand what --
A. So I've got an inspection count goal as part of, as part of my performance and evaluation with my supervisor.
Q. Okay. And what that goal is? I mean, as of the date of the accident.
A. I can't say what my goal is. As far as --
Q. I guess -- I know there's the goal, but I don't know what that goal means.
A. Right. Right.
Q. That there's a certain number of wells you need to inspect, or the --
A. Yeah, so I've got a certain number of inspections to conduct

and then --
Q. And what that number is?
A. And then, and then I've also got -- and then I target response to reportable spills that come in as a result of flowline failures.
Q. So there's no -- I mean, that's your goal, but the regulation doesn't require you to --
A. No.
Q. -- conduct so many inspections per year?
A. There is not a hard count number for me, no.
Q. Okay. Now as far as the reportable incidences, what are, what are the criteria on -- what is a, what is a reportable incident and what is not a reportable incidence?
A. So we receive notices of -- to report of what we deem a reportable spill on a Form 19 spill report. And those come in, and those are spills, liquid spills, that are greater than one barrel outside of containment per our rule.
Q. One barrel outside the containment.
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And for the gas?
A. This is, this is just for liquids and --
Q. So who takes of the gas spills? What are, what --
A. Generally, the gas is addressed by our field inspection unit. I do some of that as well through FLIR camera documentation.
Q. Okay. So as a group of --

A. Right.
Q. -- (indiscernible) established in 18 months, that doesn't cover anything the gas spill?
A. That's not -- no, that's not true. I'm still looking at gas flowlines, but gas releases are pretty rare across the state historically, based on my experience. And so yes, I look at those as they come up and are reported to us via either an accident report or through some sort of spill reporting, or notice directly from an operator that there has been a flowline with an, with an associated gas release. So all -- I will do an inspection.
Q. But help me out. What an operator is required to do for a gas release? What does, what does the regulation require me as an operator -- what I'm required to report and what I do not have to report for the gas release? Is there, is there a regulation for that, or specific, or there is nothing?
A. They do report that --
Q. No, no. That's not my question. Does the regulation require them to report to you certain incidents, and certain incidences they don't have to report? I know what you do and what you may want to do, but --
A. I don't have the answer to that question.
Q. Okay. Should I take that as the regulation does not require?
A. No. No.
Q. Because if the regulation required --
A. Yes.

Q. -- you probably will know, right? I can give you the (indiscernible) to me. But unless I don't understand what the regulation requires and what the -- I mean, if an operator decides not to report a gas release. In this case, there's an accident. But if there's no accident, let us suppose. There is no blow up of the house. Were Anadarko required to report to you guys? Or they can just say, well, we took care of it? You see what I'm saying?

A. No, no, yeah.

Q. You see what I'm saying?

A. Right. Yes, I --

Q. So are they, are they (indiscernible) --

A. They are required to report to us. Unfortunately, I cannot cite that rule.

Q. Can you get back to me on that, if they do?

A. Can I ask, can I --

Q. I agree with you that you may not remember everything, and I --

A. Right.

Q. Don't take that wrong. I mean --

A. No, it's fine.

Q. I don't expect you to remember each and every sentence from this. What I'm really looking for is, if there is a regulation, (indiscernible). That's all I'm asking for. And you can get back to me. Leisurely. Like, 8,10 days.

A. Okay.
Q. Is that fair?
A. Yeah.
Q. But that's what I'm trying to understand.
A. I mean, there may be people in the room right now that can answer that question quickly.
Q. No. You are integrity person, right? So I want to know what you are absolutely required to do in that year and a half. I'm going to ask questions of everybody, but different questions. I just want to make sure. But I mean, you are the gatekeeper, the way I look at it, right? You go in the field. And you are enforcing the rules, correct?
A. Right. Yeah.
Q. So now --
A. I am noticed on gas releases, yeah. As far as rule-based, I just --
Q. I guess what I'm, what I'm really trying to find out is, if (indiscernible) an operator -- like take this incidence. If there is no devastating accident here, were the operator required to report to you as the regulator? Because there is no accident, the operator takes care of this, pinches line, plugs line, and that's the end of the story, is what I'm trying to understand.
A. Right. I'll get back to you. Yeah.
Q. So you get, you get what I'm saying?
A. Yeah.

Q. I don't expect you to remember, but if there is rule like that--
A. Right.
Q. -- then I'm hoping that you would remember -- I mean --
A. Right.
Q. -- you do have so much stuff. I'm very impressed, to be honest with you. So now going back to --
A. Fair enough. I'll get back, I'll get back to you on that.
Q. Yeah, please. Now going back to the integrity group, is there a requirement, a procedure that says, well, you shall do some surprise visits to the operator and actually find out that they are meeting your goal as a regulator?
A. Absolutely. Yeah. Random inspection. Yeah.
Q. Random inspection is part of the regulation.
A. Absolutely.
Q. And how many of those you conduct?
A. I've conducted in the last year and a half approximately 400 inspections.
Q. Random inspections. Okay.
A. As far -- percentage-wise? I would say about 50% of those --
Q. Are random.
A. -- are random.
Q. Okay. And going back to -- because this is a gas accident, I'm mainly focusing on gas, but this -- my question is to both gas and liquid. So don't just focus on gas, but --

A. Right.
Q. For the operator, do they require to submit annual reports to you as the regulating agency? Like fumes are required as an operator to submit annual report, do --
A. Production reporting?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yes.
Q. I mean, the incident reporting. What is the --
A. Yes.
Q. And what is the incident report criterion per se?
A. For in this case?
Q. Yeah.
A. For an accident report? They will file, they will file an accident report with us. I can't remember what form number it is.
Q. Okay. That's okay. That's okay.
A. But yes, the --
Q. Don't worry about the form numbers as long as there is a form.
A. Yes, that is required.
Q. Okay. Like, PHMSA requires an operator to file a report for a certain number. Release volume, or whatever the case may --
A. Right.
Q. So do you have certain regulations like that? The operator has to submit something for the gas? If there's a flowline release, there's a liquid line release --

A. Right.
Q. -- is there a number that --
A. Yeah. And I've given you the number for the liquid line. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Yeah. (Indiscernible). So there is a number for that.
A. Yeah.
Q. They are required to file a report to you guys. Annually? Every incident? How does that work?
A. Yeah. If it's, if it's a release, an expected release of gas or liquid, yes, then they report that to us.
Q. Now are they required to mark their buried lines -- and they're not gathering, but flowlines.
A. Flowlines?
Q. Like, PHMSA requires a gas line or a liquid line to be marked with markers.
A. Right.
Q. Are you required to have the operator mark the lines so that the public knows that there is something --
A. Yeah, that is part of our rule for -- we have a -- there's a section on that in our 1100 series rules. Typically for well signs and we -- well, flowlines that we deem offsite flowlines, that leave a well pad and travel a distance.
Q. And did you observe any markings in this particular case on your active 2-inch line?

A. No.
Q. Now is that a violation of your --
A. Well, we --
Q. Or it is not a violation of your rule?
A. We talk -- our rules, our 1100 series rules talk about pipeline markings. Generally speaking, flowlines across the industry are not marked. They become marked at that point where there's that custody transfer.
Q. Okay. Now tell me what a custody transfer is.
A. That's a change, that's a change in --
Q. (Indiscernible) trying to learn the --
A. That's a change in ownership of that petroleum asset or that product.
Q. But again, I'm -- going back with PHMSA, though, because I think I'm more familiar with those than your rules.
A. Right.
Q. But PHMSA requires, whether they did a custody transfer or not, the gas lines or the liquid lines be marked with markers. My question was before --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- are you guys required to have the flowlines being marked so that people know that there is something underground? And you said yes, right?
A. Well, I said that our 1100 series rules talk about pipeline marking. But we are -- no, we do not actively enforce marker --

flowline marking. No, we don't.
Q. But the regulation requires them to mark.
A. I would have to look back at how that rule reads. It talks pipeline and not flowline.
Q. So what is a, what is a pipeline, then? What would you consider a pipeline and what would you consider a flowline?
A. I would consider a pipeline --
Q. By regulation, not by your opinion, is what I'm asking.
A. Right.
Q. I'm really focusing on that. Yeah.
A. Yeah. Right. So that flowline, again, goes to a custody -- it's part of the production process from the wellhead through the production facility to a point of custody transfer. A pipeline would be part of the gathering and transportation of that --
Q. But then that's a PHMSA, right?
A. That's PUC or PHMSA, depending on the -- yeah.
Q. But no, I'm saying in your jurisdiction, you only control flowlines up to the --
A. That's -- right. Custody transfer.
Q. Yeah. Of the, of the product. Right? Because you are using the custody transfer also from the asset to asset. So I'm just trying to make sure, for the record. So when you say custody transfer, you are talking about the product from the production, either gas or liquid, going into the gathering line. So before -- so I guess I'm trying to understand. When you say define pipe,

than what is a pipe? In your regulation, you said your regulation says pipeline should be marked. Your regulations. In your regulations, what is a pipeline? Flowline, you said flowline is different than pipeline, right?

A. Right. Right.

Q. So what is a pipeline in your regulation?

A. The way that our rules were written and have developed over time, the language has changed. So where terms were stated as pipeline, they -- the heading of our 1100 series rules is labeled as pipeline rules, but our -- jurisdictionally, we oversee flowlines. There is some language discrepancy that has occurred during rulemaking, historically.

Q. Okay. So when does -- when you say rulemaking, so which -- when the rules were established? Historically even, how far back we are going? See, I mean -- maybe not. I know when PHMSA established. I know when NTSB established, right?

A. Right.

Q. So when you say historically, when the, when the rules started in general?

A. So our flowline rules were established -- yeah. Early '90s.

Q. 1990s.

A. Yeah. I mean, they were, they -- we had pipeline rules, I want to say, late '80s, early '90s. They started to -- they were, they were written and then they were modified through that early '90s period. Again modified in 2002, the abandonment rule. And

then have been left in place as is.
Q. So me as an operator, if I read the regulation -- and you guys are more familiar with that than I am, but if I read the regulation and it says pipelines should be marked, if I interpret that my flowlines need not be marked, am I wrong? I mean, you are integrity person. So I'm just asking you.
A. Right.
Q. If your regulations say as pipeline should be marked, and you are telling me the pipelines are different than flowlines. So me, if I am Anadarko, should I say that, well, I don't have to mark my pipelines because it's a flowline? Is that a correct interpretation, me as an operator?
A. I'd have to read back on the rule.
Q. But I thought you just told me that pipelines are different than flowlines.
A. They are.
Q. So what -- who is going to tell you differently than what I'm asking you?
A. Once again, because a pipeline is going to travel a distance across, you know, numerous surface owner properties to a central gathering point. So they travel a much greater distance, typically, than flowlines.
Q. I'm really lost. You've really got to get back to me on this. Because what distance has to do with the risk? I mean, the risk is still the same. So I --

A. Right. I mean, if you looked at the percentage of flowlines associated with production across the state, most of that is going to stay per well count. It's going to stay on that, on that individual well pad. Right? There are certain --
Q. Well, I mean, I don't know. Like I said, I mean --
A. Yeah. No, so there are circumstances where there are offsite flowlines as part of, say, a water flowline gathering system that occurs -- that travels some distance in terms of miles --
Q. And you can get back to me on this one.
A. -- to a point to where it gets on the (indiscernible). Sure.
Q. Because I'm really trying to understand the big distinction between a pipeline and a, and a flowline and the markings on this. So in your -- before a new group is established 18 months ago or so, who handled the responsibility of auditing, inspecting the various operators? For exactly the same thing you are doing. Surprise inspections, audits to make sure the lines, you know, look at the -- whatever. Abandoned lines --
A. That would have been our engineering group and our field inspection unit in combination.
Q. But they still follow the same rules that you are following now?
A. Correct.
Q. Correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So with your experience -- and you're here longer than

a year and a half. How many incidences where the -- you see the leaks in the flowlines, both gas and liquids? I mean, do you compile the data?

A. Yes, I do. Yes. Yeah. And we've got that in our database as part of our public record. But I -- how many incidents have I personally seen in my, in my tenure? That's your question.

Q. Well, my question was, number one, do you keep the data as to how many leaks are happening per year.

A. Yes, we do.

Q. Number one. And you already answered that, yes.

A. Right.

Q. You had the database. And number two I asked, I am asking you is how many you have seen in your tenure in last -- I would say go back only for 18 months, because that's what you are part of that group. How many you have seen for the gas and liquid leaks?

A. So total number of reportable spills? You know, I leave -- I mean, our integrity engineer --

Q. Just ballpark number. I mean, less than 100? Thousands and are only --

A. Hundreds.

Q. Hundreds. Okay. And that's for gas and liquid together --

A. Um-hum.

Q. -- or just gas and then -- okay.

A. Primarily liquids.

Q. Primarily liquids. What about gas? How many gas leaks --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- have you guys seen?
A. Less than 100.
Q. Okay. In the 18 months. Okay. And are they on the flowlines some distance away from the well? Are they -- can you just give me a general idea as to where they are generally and --
A. Yeah. I mean, I would say -- and it's far less than 100. I'd say -- I've only seen a handful of gas releases.
Q. And is the operator then required to analyze and find out why or what happened?
A. Absolutely. I mean, that's part of -- so I would respond to that, once noticed, either by someone within the commission or the operator directly, where that release happened and what well it was associated with, I'd respond to it via field inspection, schedule permitting. And then look at root cause, again, root cause of failure leading into release.
Q. Does that require to file a report to your office, that leak -- this particular line was caused by corrosion, third-party damage, whatever the reason may be? But the regulation requires, then, if there's a release, that they shall analyze it for the root case? Operator? Or the regulation does not require them to find the root cause?
A. The regulation requires them to maintain integrity.
Q. Yeah, but I mean, that's different.

A. No.
Q. What I'm saying is --
A. There is no language in our rules that says find root cause.
Q. Find root case. Okay. So then of course there is no language. That means they don't have to --
A. In the rules. As part of our program and our outreach, yes, there is that language.
Q. Okay. So what's the difference? Outreach versus regulation?
A. Well, you know, within the commission, we go through rulemaking. You know, in the relatively near future, we're moving in the direction to have rulemaking for our flowline rules, right? That language would be incorporated, and that and other languages would be incorporated at that point in time. But at this point in time, what we're doing now as we're outreaching to operators, the three of us within our integrity group requesting that this information is documented and sent to us.
Q. So do you remember -- and maybe I asked you and maybe I did not, because -- what is the reporting criteria for a gas release? What kind of release -- liquid, I know. But do you ever get --
A. You've already asked, you've already asked me that question.
Q. Let me back up. Yeah. So let me, let me back up. Do you ever get calls from the operators telling you that, hey, I had a gas release and I took care of it? Or do they file an electronic reporting to you? In the last 18 months, have you seen any? Any operator telling you that --

A. Yeah. You know, it depends. We will, we will use our FLIR camera as part of the field inspection process to identify gas release. Then we will, we will put that down as documentation on a field inspection report as an action required item, indicating that we've identified a gas release at this well or facility and repairs need to be made to prevent it -- stop and prevent the release from occurring.

Q. Okay. But you -- let me repeat the question. In your 18 months in the integrity group, do you recall any operator calling you, saying hey, forget about -- you trace the leak and you call the operator. But have you ever (indiscernible) an operator saying, excuse me, but I had a gas release --

A. Yeah.

Q. -- and I fixed it. On their own. Not because you followed through your --

A. Well, we had a -- yeah. We had a gas release resulting in a fire. And that was provided to us as part of our accident reporting program. And then I responded to that to identify --

Q. Maybe I'm not asking the question right. Did the fire -- and there's an accident, right?

A. Right.

Q. So operator reported it.

A. Right.

Q. If the operator wouldn't, somebody else would. What I'm saying is, if an operator has a gas release, they find out --

A. I'm going to have to get back to you on that. Like we discussed before.
Q. I'm losing track of how many things we'll get back from you, but (indiscernible) --
A. That's the, that's the same question.
Q. Okay.
MR. LEPORE: May I?
MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Identify.
MR. LEPORE: Oh, sorry. This is Matt Lepore.
MR. CHHATRE: So the transcriber can --
MR. LEPORE: Sure. Matt Lepore from the COGCC. I think it might be useful, Ravi, if you would define what you mean by a gas release or a gas spill.
MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Okay, let the --
MR. LEPORE: So because --
MR. CHHATRE: Go ahead.
MR. LEPORE: -- there are fugitive emissions of gas from connections on equipment, for example, and from storage tanks. Those things occur routinely, I guess I would say, and Joe referenced the use of FLIR cameras to identify those. So there's not a quantitative amount that an operator is required to report to us.
MR. CHHATRE: But that's all, that's all I'm asking. Okay.
MR. LEPORE: Right.
MR. CHHATRE: Exactly what I'm asking.

MR. LEPORE: So that's very different, I think -- in our thoughts, a liquid spill is easy to quantify, and we have quantification requirements. Gas spills -- and that's why, that's why I'm asking you to define.

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Yeah.

MR. LEPORE: There's a fugitive emission, comes off a tank. We identify that with a FLIR camera. For one thing, that's not in the COGCC's jurisdiction. That's in the Department of Public Health and Environment's jurisdiction. So they have specific regulations about frequency of those inspections with the FLIR cameras and so forth. So I think, I think the trick -- the hard part here is help us understand what you're talking about as a gas release --

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Okay. I mean, that's what I was --

MR. LEPORE: -- and we would respond to it and that, and that operators would tell us about.

MR. CHHATRE: Fair enough. Fair enough. Fair enough.

MR. LEPORE: Does that help?

MR. CHHATRE: (Indiscernible). Yeah.

MR. LEPORE: Because I can think of loss of well control incidents --

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Sure.

MR. LEPORE: -- pipeline hits with equipment that -- those get reported to us.

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. Fair enough. Yeah. Like I said, in

this case -- let us take this case --

MR. LEPORE: Yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: -- where there is a gas release. Unfortunately, there is an ignition and there is an explosion, whatever. If you take a similar incidence, and I'm not even assuming at this point that this release caused --

MR. LEPORE: Sure.

MR. CHHATRE: -- the explosion. I'm not even assuming that.

MR. LEPORE: Right.

MR. CHHATRE: But for the sake of argument, in this case, and there's a gas release and there is no explosion. There are no fatalities. In similar situations like that, how many cases -- calls you get or reports you get saying, I had a gas release? Or this release then will fall under the Health or whatever the other regulation you said? That is all I'm asking. Am I, am I clear now?

MR. LEPORE: Yeah, and Joe can answer to the best of his ability and (indiscernible).

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. Sure. Am I clear now? And your comment is well-taken.

MR. LEPORE: Yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: I mean, I just want to make sure that --

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. So many of those calls you get from the operator ever? Or no? I mean, I'm just trying to get some magnitude here.

A. A fewer amount than liquid releases.
Q. You do get. I mean, there is, there is some kind of a record that you got a call from a certain operator that there was a release, and you guys, and the integrity group took some action. And if there is none, there is none.
A. Right. Yeah.
Q. I mean, you know, I'm not saying there has to be or something. I'm just trying to -- this is, that's a gathering thing for me. So I'm just trying to find out if this thing happened or it doesn't happen.
A. It happens in some circumstances. I don't think it always happens.
Q. Okay. Okay, fair enough. So what's your inspection when you go on -- what do you inspect when you go to an operator? Do you inspect their operating and maintenance procedure for flowlines as a regulator?
A. Um-hum. When we meet with an operator or a field, or a field inspection?
Q. No, I'm just trying to understand what -- (indiscernible) field inspections, field -- whatever terminology you use.
A. Yeah.
Q. But if you go to an operator and you are looking at a wellhead's flowlines, what you are looking for? What you ask them question-wise?
A. We look at everything from operating parameters, pressures,

flow regime, materials used, integrity management program. We want to know how -- you know, we want to know historically what's occurred on these lines. Have they had issues with failures? Root causes? Have we replaced, repaired lines? All of the above. And do we have abandonments taking place.

Q. Okay. But they are not required to tell you if the certain lines are abandoned per your regulation?

A. Yeah, they -- yes, they do. They do report that to us on a Form 42.

Q. Okay, great. Okay. So that is covered.

A. Yes.

Q. Is covered. Okay. Now does your flowline require to have cathodic protection if it's a carbon steel?

A. No.

Q. They are not required.

A. No.

Q. Do you have any idea as to how many corrosion leaks these lines, the flowlines have in different failures?

A. It depends upon the age of the well. It depends upon a lot of different factors. Age of well, production, volumes -- yeah.

Q. But that -- I guess my question is do you see any corrosion leaks? But I -- no, I'll take it back, because they are not required to do analysis, so you would not even know what the --

A. But I'm --

Q. -- cause of the release is.

A. But I'm responding to some of those, so yes, I know that -- I do see corrosion leaks.
Q. But there is no CP requirement on the lines?
A. I'm not going to say blanket no. Some operators, yes, in certain parts of the state do use cathodic protection. Not all operators.
Q. True. But I mean, regulation-wise, they are not required.
A. Yeah. Correct.
Q. Okay.
MR. CHHATRE: I'm going to stop right now. I'm still going to digest, but I'll just pass onto PHMSA.
MR. AJIBOYE: Yeah, I have -- this is Gbenga from PHMSA. I just have a couple of questions for you.
BY MR. AJIBOYE:
Q. Can you please elaborate on your abandonment procedure? Can you walk us through what --
A. Sure.
Q. -- they are required to do?
A. So operators are required to disconnect, isolate the flowline, purge the flowline of any hydrocarbons, cut the flowline 3 feet below grade, and cap and seal the ends.
Q. Now they are meant to report that to you guys once all this is done?
A. Yeah. So yes. Once a flowline is properly abandoned, then yes, we require that notice of flowline abandonment.

Q. And how long has this abandonment procedure been in place, this --
A. To the best of my knowledge, since 2002.
Q. Okay. 2002. Okay. So you also said, in the custody transfer, the operators are required to mark the lines. That's where the line markers are required by the code, right?
A. You'd have to ask PUC or PHMSA that question, but yes.
Q. But you mentioned that, though. That's -- during the custody transfer from --
A. I meant -- yeah, I mentioned that based on my industry experience that that's typical. Yes.
Q. Oh, not based on COGCC requirement?
A. No, we have no jurisdiction beyond the custody transfer.
Q. Okay. For flowlines --
A. Correct.
Q. -- there's a custody transfer from one operator to the other. Are you guys required to -- do you guys require them to identify the lines, whether abandoned or active?
A. We have that pipeline marking section. I would have to look back and read the rule. It's not typical for flowlines to be marked unless they're offsite flowlines traveling a distance. In that case, as part of a flowline gathering system, we would expect to see markers.
Q. I guess my -- I probably misunderstood something. Because when you were talking about chain of custody transfer, it sounded

to me as if the code required the operators to mark the flowlines at that point. That's what I gather from what you explained earlier.

MR. AJIBOYE: Ravi, is that the impression you got?

MR. MacLAREN: Can we read the rule?

MR. AJIBOYE: Okay.

MR. LEPORE: So read -- tell the transcript what you're reading.

MR. MacLAREN: I'm reading the COGCC Rule 1102-C: Marking.

MR. AJIBOYE: Okay.

MR. MacLAREN: "In designated setback locations and where crossing public right-of-way where the utilities met, markers shall be installed and maintained and identifying the location of pipelines.

"Number 2. The following shall be written legibly on a background of sharply contrasting color on each line marker: Warning, Caution or Danger; followed by the words Gas or name of natural gas or petroleum transported; Pipeline. In letters at least 1 inch high with 1/4 inch stroke and the name of the operator and the telephone number where the operator can be reached at all times."

MR. AJIBOYE: Okay.

BY MR. AJIBOYE:

Q. So now going back to abandonment procedure, right? You just mentioned that the line is going to be disconnected, isolated and

cut above grade, right?
A. Below grade.
Q. Below grade.
A. Yes.
Q. And once that is done, are those records transported to COGCC?
A. Correct.
Q. So in the case of this particular where we are talking about, do you guys have record of the abandonment procedure being followed? Was it inspected by you guys?
A. We do not have record of it.
Q. Okay. You also said you are -- your background -- okay. When you went to identify the flowlines up north, you said that the monument has the historical -- it has the name of the --
A. A well that had been plugged.
Q. Do you remember the name of the operator when you went to physically inspect?
A. I've got a photo of that. I do not recall what was on the monument.
Q. Then my last question is, your background is -- you say you have a geologist's background, right?
A. Right.
Q. And so you probably know some few things about soil? Can you describe to us when the line, the line that was dug, the soil that was dug behind the privacy fence that you witnessed, can you walk

us through what your observation, or what you think the soil looks like when it was being dug? Is that typical of that area, the kind of soil that was excavated?

A. Well, it looked like there had been some imported fill brought into the area. You know, based on a couple of things: depth of cover and compaction of the soil. So we know there was a percentage of imported fill, or we suspect that, as part of the development of that subdivision. As far as -- if you want a -- geologically speaking, I mean, soil was relatively granular. You had a moderate water content to it. And relatively low cohesion.

Q. Okay.

MR. AJIBOYE: Yeah, that's all my questions.

MR. CHHATRE: You can ask questions. You are a part of the --

MR. LEONARD: I'm next? Doug's not next?

MR. CHHATRE: I'm just following my --

MR. LEONARD: Oh, okay. Sorry.

MR. CHHATRE: -- routine thing, and we are now going to go around the table.

MR. LEONARD: Yeah, I mean, I do, I do have some questions.

MR. LEPORE: Can I ask a clarifying question, Ravi?

MR. CHHATRE: Sure, sure.

MR. LEPORE: As his representative, am I also asking questions? Okay.

MR. CHHATRE: Party rep can ask questions.

MR. LEPORE: Okay. Can we take a break?

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Absolutely. I mean, any time you need a break, you tell me. Just (indiscernible). Off the record.

(Off the record)

(On the record)

MR. CHHATRE: Back on the record. I'm sorry. I do not remember did I say that or not. The person will not otherwise create the transcript, so go back and ask the questions again.

MR. LEONARD: Start over.

MR. CHHATRE: Yes, sir.

MR. LEONARD: Okay. All right. So Mike Leonard again.

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. So Joe, in the rules, in the COGCC regulations, the term flowline and pipeline are used -- are interchangeable; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. At the time that this line -- we know the well was drilled in 1993. We assume the lines were put in at the same time. At that time, would there have been any requirement to mark that line?

A. I do not believe so.

Q. Okay. So currently, if that line were to be installed under the current regulations, would it have to be marked?

A. Yes.

Q. Because it is in --

A. It crosses a public right-of-way and designated setback location.
Q. Okay. And there is a definition of designated setbacks in COGCC's rules, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I don't think we need to read that. That can be followed up on. There was a question earlier about corrosion prevention, I believe?
A. Um-hum.
Q. So in the 1102 rules -- and I'll just show you the rule here -- does it not say each operator shall take reasonable precautions to prevent failures, leakage and corrosion?
A. Correct.
Q. So I think you stated that -- you may have stated that --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- there was no rule, but there actually is a rule.
A. Yeah, there is a rule.
Q. You take some type -- and it's not specified what they use to prevent that corrosion, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Going back to the reporting requirements -- oh, okay. Yeah, let me, let me ask one more question about the flowlines. So if an operator -- again, the rule says whenever an operator discovers a condition that would adversely affect, they have to -- the pipeline they have to correct that within a reasonable time.

A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. That's in the rules. Okay. Let me go back to the reporting. There was some question about reporting of gas leaks -- or gas releases. I'm sorry. Leak is the wrong word. So the rules -- Rule 906, I believe. Does it not indicate that operators should report anything that could be a significant impact?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And in this instance, this would be considered a significant impact, right?
A. Absolutely.
Q. So if this happened in another place, the operator would have to notify of that gas leak.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So you have been flowline integrity inspector for the last 18 months, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And prior to that, what was your job title with COGCC?
A. Southwest field inspector.
Q. So you were a -- I hate to use the word normal, but a normal, a normal field inspector.
A. That is correct.
Q. And your duties included more than just flowline inspection, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So you looked at the whole gamut of production, drilling.

But during your production inspections or during your, potentially, construction inspections, you did look for -- and a, and a normal inspector would look for flowline connections, potentially flowline leaks?

A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Okay. So there are other people out there looking at this on a daily basis.

A. Right.

Q. Okay. You mentioned that you did not see the active flowline in the trench that was exposed the night that you all exposed that trench. Did you see that active flowline the next day when you met with me?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. So it was, and it was running --

MR. PRUNK: (Indiscernible).

MR. LEONARD: I got to look at Doug, because he's doing the -- we did the map thing yesterday.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) perpendicular.

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. So it was perpendicular to the other two lines, correct?

A. That is, that is correct.

Q. And within, would you say, close proximity?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Within inches, feet of the other two lines?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Yes. Inches, feet. Yes. All right. So --

MR. CHHATRE: Wait, was it inches -- this is Ravi. Was it inches or was it feet?

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. Yeah, in inches or feet. Yeah. I mean, you best guess.

A. Probably inches.

Q. Within inches. Okay. So probably -- and I know you may not be able to answer this, but probably in the laying of the new flowline, they would have exposed the old ones.

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. Is this -- and I'm going to show you a photo. Is this, is this the photo you took of the wellhead?

A. Yes, it is.

MR. CHHATRE: Write down the date.

MR. LEONARD: It's timestamped on the -- it's timestamped.

MR. AJIBOYE: It's timestamped.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay, no, no, no. Today's date.

MR. LEONARD: Oh, today's date.

MR. CHHATRE: And your name on it, because it'll go in an exhibit, then, attached to the transcript.

MR. MacLAREN: Twelve.

MR. LEONARD: Today's --

MR. MacLAREN: Or 12, yeah.

MR. LEONARD: So the -- yeah, the 12th. They all run together for me, so don't ask me. So this is an accurate -- I

mean, this is how you found the wellhead when you did the second pressure test? I mean, when you did the witness pressure test, this is the way you found the wellhead.

MR. MacLAREN: That is correct.

MR. LEONARD: Okay. Did you -- my first question is, did you ask them to alter that wellhead in any way before you left? Let me back up. Did you ask them to alter the 1-inch line in any way before you left?

MR. CHHATRE: Can you clarify as to who them is?

MR. LEONARD: Did you, did you ask Anadarko or Anadarko's representatives to change the configuration of that in any way?

MR. MacLAREN: Of the 1-inch line.

MR. LEONARD: Yeah.

MR. MacLAREN: After we -- when we could not find the endpoint of the 1-inch line, I asked them to disconnect the gas supply to the 1-inch line.

MR. LEONARD: Okay, so -- and just to be --

MR. MacLAREN: And of all tie-in connections.

MR. LEONARD: Specific for the people in the room, can you point to the lines you want -- you asked them to disconnect?

MR. MacLAREN: Yes. All of the 3/8 stainless steel tubing tie-in.

MR. CHHATRE: Why don't you just circle somewhere on the line and that way we'll know which ones you are showing?

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. So all of those tie-ins were -- what about the positioning of the valve? Did you, did you ask for the valve to be left closed or open?
A. I asked for the valve to be left open.
Q. Okay. And your thought process there was --
A. My thought process was, if there was any residual gas in that line that was still moving in a direction -- possibly moving in a direction towards the neighborhood, the house, that that would prevent any migration of additional residual gas and relieve any pressure in the line.
Q. Okay. Did you -- and I don't know. Did you notice any pressure on that line when it was opened? Was there any --
A. I did.
Q. So can you give us an estimate? I mean, there was no gauge on it, but is (indiscernible) --
A. I asked Anadarko personnel to -- after I had completed witnessing the active flowline pressure test, I returned to the wellhead. The valve was in a closed position. I asked that it be moved to an open position, and at that time, there was a puff of gas released from the 1-inch valve.
Q. So it was an audible gas release?
A. It was something that you could smell.
Q. And something you could smell. Okay. Earlier, you said that you noticed workers down around the wellhead, in the wellhead area. And as you approached they were leaving, and you asked them

to re-access that. Was there -- did they have to unlock the gate to get in? Do you remember --

MR. CHHATRE: Excuse me. They meaning, again --

MR. LEONARD: I'm sorry. The Anadarko workers.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Only because there are too many people on the scene, so I just want to make sure.

MR. LEONARD: I get it. Yeah.

MR. MacLAREN: Yeah.

MR. LEONARD: I'm sorry.

MR. MacLAREN: Anadarko contract personnel. Yes, I believe they opened the gate. They were in the process of locking it.

MR. LEONARD: They were in the process of placing the lock?

MR. MacLAREN: They were closing the gate. Yes, they had completed their pressure test. They were carrying the remainder of their tools and supplies out, and they were closing the door.

MR. LEONARD: But you don't know if they physically put a lock on the gate.

MR. MacLAREN: I don't remember that.

MR. LEONARD: Okay. I think that's about all I have at the moment.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PRUNK: I have nothing. That last little bit went back to the wellhead. That's what I wanted to just --

MR. CHHATRE: Anadarko?

MR. McBRIDE: Hi, this is David McBride.

BY MR. McBRIDE:

Q. I want to go back to some of the discussion around the poly lines in general. And you mentioned that the start of that was a steel line at the service, then they go down a few feet and it turns into a poly line. Is that something you've seen in common practice that was used in the old field --

A. Yes.

Q. -- in your experience?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it associated with a particular type of well, or is that still used today in newer wells, or is that associated with older wells? Just in your experience and seeing -- doing inspections.

A. Based on my experience, it's primarily associated with older wells. However, the practice is still in place where poly line is needed to surface for whatever reason on well production for well production purposes. The surfacing of that line will result in -- generally results in the addition of the carbon steel riser.

Q. Okay. You said the what kind? What surfacing of that?

A. The operation of the well. Surface.

Q. Surfacing. Okay. Because I was wondering why you would use a carbon steel -- I guess we can ask somebody else that question if you don't know, but why use carbon steel at the surface and poly below? I didn't know if it was from a frost line issue or something like that or --

A. It would (indiscernible) --

Q. If you don't know, it's okay.
A. Well, no, you -- because you know, based on my experience, you need the structural, the strength --
Q. Oh, the strength.
A. -- of the, of the carbon steel riser --
Q. Got you.
A. -- to allow you to tie in or access --
Q. Got you.
A. -- the contents of that poly line.
Q. Thank you. Okay. And typically, I understand those lines do run in the same trench or next to the steel, 2-inch flowlines; is that right?
A. I think that varies, but --
Q. Okay. Are you -- do you know if they do run trace on those lines or -- and when I say trace, that's something that's steel wire that you can run so you can detect it with a magnetometer or a line locator? Is that something that's in common practice on the newer ones?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Because I'm aware that the older ones typically don't have that feature associated with them; is that right? Or is that something you know or don't know?
A. That's correct. I would say that that's correct.
Q. Was that an engineering practice that COGCC --
MR. CHHATRE: Excuse me. This is Ravi. What is correct,

that you do not know or --

MR. MacLAREN: No, that there was no tracer wire historically installed on older wells. Newer wells, it's required.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

BY MR. McBRIDE:

Q. So the development of that practice of time, are you aware of how that came about? Was it just a good engineering practice, a best practice, or was that a suggestion or a practice that evolved out of COGCC? You know, how did that come about, or do you know?

A. I do not know.

Q. Okay. When you respond to a leak or do an investigation of a flowline leak or a problem with an operator and you guys work together to figure out what happened, which I know you guys do, right?

A. Um-hum.

Q. And you resolve an issue and -- do you resolve things to the point where you would come up with a root cause analysis or corrective actions that an operator would need to take to remedy a problem?

A. Yes. So we look for a root cause analysis, and we request that information in as much detail as we can get from the operator, if lab analysis is involved in that interpretation, that assessment.

Q. Because I'm trying to get a better understanding of the cycle that happens, okay? So let me just put the, you know, theoretical

that I'm sure it's based in reality and just tell me -- walk through this. Operator has a leaky flowline, okay? And let's say it's a liquids leak in this case. And they discover it and call you and have to report it, because it's a reportable event, okay? And I would assume that you would, you would get involved as the integrity, you know, manager for the, for the department and do an inspection and verify it, and then would, you know, start an enforcement action or something on that, and you would have to go through some type of analysis of what happened, right? And wouldn't there be a process in place where an operator would have to submit to the agency a plan, a corrective plan to keep it from happening again, or what they were going to do to remedy that situation or --

A. Yeah, so what I would do is I would conduct the field inspection part of that.

Q. Yeah.

A. I would make observations and identify what was available onsite at that time and add that information to my field inspection report. Depending upon the situation, then there could be corrective actions that are required by the operator to complete, including communicating the root cause of failure, a description of all repairs made, measures taken to prevent the accident from, the issue from reoccurring again, and follow-up pressure testing to confirm the integrity of the repairs completed.

Q. Okay. Now would you stay with that project completely yourself, or would that be something that you might hand off to an enforcement person or somebody else at a different group? I mean, I'm just trying to get a better understanding of your (indiscernible).
A. Generally speaking, my goal is to stick with that project myself. Again, with time constraints, it could be -- somebody else could be involved.
Q. So multiple folks from within COGCC could be involved.
A. Could be involved, yes.
Q. Okay. And last thing about that. When you guys go through that process and you come out with a recommended action and an operator incorporates it, is there any methodology that you use to help share that learning within the industry or encouragement that an operator use some format to share that learning? You know, if there are learnings that come out of that event, to share it within the industry or --
A. Absolutely. Yeah.
Q. How do you, how do you do that?
A. We do that through industry outreach meetings. We've got our GORT meeting, what we call our GORT regulatory meeting down in the southwest part of the state.
Q. What is that again?
A. It's called GORT.
MR. LEONARD: For clarification, that's the -- this is Mike

Leonard. That's the gas and oil regulatory team meeting that is required by COGCC order to be held -- I believe it's four times a year.

MR. McBRIDE: Okay.

BY MR. McBRIDE:

Q. And do operators attend that?

A. Yeah. We have, we have a similar meeting on the west -- for western slope operators in Rifle, Colorado. And then we do the same thing on the eastern slope.

Q. Okay. Good, thank you. Are the poly lines treated any differently than flowlines under the rules?

A. No.

Q. I mean, prior to this event?

A. The only way that a poly line would be treated differently is if it falls under a 15 PSI operating maximum, where it would be exempt from pressure testing requirements per our rule 1101-E. However, that carbon steel line could fall under that same guideline. We have a 15 PSI exemption. Any lines that operate under that pressure don't -- we don't have the requirement for the annual pressure testing.

Q. Now when an operator does their annual pressure test, do they have to submit those records to COGCC?

A. We request that they do in certain -- they are not required to. As part of our integrity outreach, we request records and we are conducting audits and reviewing records that are held within

-- in-house.
Q. Okay. And is mapping of flowlines required by COGCC?
A. Mapping of flowlines is not required under rule as we sit at this point in time, but we are moving in that direction.
Q. Okay. You know, when an operator -- and I want to go to the concept of abandonment at this point, okay?
A. Okay.
Q. And I've heard, you know, some discussion. I'm sure we'll have more as we go, but I want to get a little insight from you on what your experience has been.
MR. McBRIDE: Yes, sir.
MR. CHHATRE: Speak louder.
MR. McBRIDE: Okay, I'll speak louder.
BY MR. McBRIDE:
Q. I wanted to go to the concept of an abandonment here and kind of get some insight from you on what your experience has been. When we -- when I think of an oil field upstream facility, I think of the wells, the flowlines, these 1-inch return lines. Everything that's connectivity between those wells and the first level of processing, which typically is separators, tanks, and everything within what we'll call containment, which is that SPCC or spill prevention countermeasures and controls facility, okay? The firewall that's built around the, that's built around a facility.
So given that, just that piece of the oil field for right

now, there's a number of different pipes and risers and things that'll connect up those things. And in my experience, sometimes operators will abandon or semi-abandon pipes and things so that the facility is not abandoned, the well is not abandoned, but they'll replace lines, replace equipment and different pieces and parts of that facility that might be regulated. Is that -- what part of that is considered abandonment by COGCC? Is it an individual line? Is it the whole facility? Is it a well? So the concept around abandonment, I'm trying to get a better handle on.
A. Well, we approach that in numerous ways. I mean, there's well abandonment, where a well is plugged and abandoned, and the (indiscernible) process is pursued by an operator in that case. Flowline abandonment is -- it can be part of that and is done, and then we're notified on the Form 42. So there's well abandonment, facility abandonment and flowline abandonment.
Q. Okay. Well, if an operator was going to abandon the flowline, are they required to notify COGCC before they do the abandonment?
A. No, once the abandonment's complete.
Q. So it's only upon completion.
A. Um-hum.
Q. So theoretically, could an abandonment of a flowline or a well or a facility occur across multiple operators, and COGCC be unaware?
A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Okay. We use --
A. But unaware, let me, let me clarify that. I mean, based on timing, sure, but we still require that notification.
Q. At the end, once the abandonment's complete.
A. Once the abandonment's been completed.
Q. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, because I was trying to, trying to understand --
A. So this --
Q. -- if there was, like, a trigger point at the beginning when you were notified that an operator was going to commence an abandonment process, which would then start a clock.
A. Well, that trigger point would be -- could be the plugging and abandoning of the wells.
Q. Yeah.
A. And at that point in time, that would start a clock and that would be on our radar.
Q. Okay, and would it -- is there a clock, really, within COGCC that says once you start an abandonment, you must complete it by XYZ date? And if you don't know, it's okay.
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. I mean, if there is one, we can get to it later if you don't know the answer.
A. I don't know specifically, but yes, I believe so.
Q. Yeah. Yeah, we can, we can follow up with that, you know, at some point. I heard you mention about flowline integrity, and you

used the term reasonable precautions. Can you tell me what reasonable means?
A. Reasonable would be -- I don't know how descriptive I should be on this, but reasonable would be reacting to known flowline integrity issues, circumstances of multiple failures appropriately would be maintaining the -- using maintenance practices to maintain the integrity of flowlines and infrastructure.
Q. Somewhat negotiated with the operator on a case-by-case basis, or is it something that's -- that an operator -- how does an operator know what reasonable means to COGCC?
A. I think that it means that they're following the industry best practices, and they are, they are minimizing integrity risks on their wells, flowlines and systems. And they are reacting to issues that they're seeing in the field.
Q. Okay. The other thing you mentioned about gas releases in Rule 906, you said anything that could cause a significant impact. And my question is similar there. How does an operator know what a significant impact is? You know, what a small impact, medium impact and large impact? I mean, I'm -- you know, I'm not, and I'm not being facetious --
A. Well, it's written for liquid releases.
Q. Yeah. Okay.
A. And for gas releases as identified, you know, it's -- we rely on the industry's expertise to recognize what would be deemed significant and follow through with the appropriate reporting.

Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the CDPHE?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us what that stands for?
A. Colorado Department of Health and Environment.
Q. And they do have a significant level of authority over area missions; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Yeah. So a lot of the gas-associated regulation is actually in the CDPHE's authority, if I'm correct.
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So I just wanted to --
A. Yeah. Yeah.
Q. -- let, you know, folks here know that there's another agency that also regulates the gas side of the equation, so it's -- CDPHE and COGCC regulate, kind of, with each other as far as an operator goes. So there's another agency involved as well, so we have Reg 7 to deal with. We can get -- we'll talk about that.
MR. McBRIDE: That's all I got. Thank you, Joe. Appreciate it.
MR. MacLAREN: You bet.
MR. CHHATRE: This is -- go ahead.
MR. LEONARD: So yeah, I just, I have a few follow-up questions.
MR CHHATRE: Identify.
MR. LEONARD: Oh, I'm sorry. Mike Leonard. I have a few

follow-up questions.

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. So Joe, just to clarify, in the 1100 series rules, COGCC rules, pipeline and flowline are an interchangeable word; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. So when an operator reports that they've had a flowline leak to you, do you -- the root cause analysis, how is that reported? Is there a, is there a form that you ask them to fill out?

A. Correct. Yes, I ask them to add that information to our Supplemental Form 19 report.

Q. Your Supplemental Form 19 report.

A. But I may ask for that to be conveyed directly to me and/or the other members of the integrity group.

Q. But it is documented in the database --

A. Yes.

Q. -- the root cause.

A. Yes.

Q. You were talking about poly lines, and you said that they're treated differently only in the pressure testing. But do they have to be marked, tracer wire marked?

A. Yes.

Q. So if they're alone in the ditch, no other metallic pipes, they have to have a tracer wire to mark them?

A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. I'll get to this other one in just a second. So we were talking about -- David was talking about unused lines or lines that were taken out of service. Would those lines be, under COGCC rules, considered unused equipment and required to be removed?
A. Removed or properly abandoned.
Q. Yeah. Removed or properly abandoned.
A. Right.
Q. So it basically falls under an unused equipment rule --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and they don't -- they're not allowed to be there. And we were talking about abandonment of wells and equipment. In the 1104 series rules, the reclamation rule, it does state that flowline risers have to be removed within 3 months of the plugging of the well, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that would include removal of the, of the other end of the riser at the separators or any production equipment, something like that.
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So COGCC, as stated before, doesn't regulate air emissions, right?
A. Correct.
Q. But a release or a leak would be considered a violation of

the 600 series safety rules, mechanical -- I don't remember the rule right offhand, but where it says all pipes and fittings must be maintained --

A. Correct. I believe it's 603-G, and yes, that is --

Q. So all pipes and fittings have to be maintained. I believe the rule says fastened, which is interpreted to mean screwed together properly, properly plumbed.

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. Lastly, we've talked about custody transfer a lot, and we just want to, want to clarify that. So there's three common terms used in the industry: upstream, midstream and downstream. Correct?

A. Correct.

Q. So the upstream, the production -- the exploration and production portion of it, when that product, whether it be gas, oil or even in the case of water, becomes the product of another party, that is the custody transfer; is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. So when it, when Anadarko sells or transfers through that meter run to DCP, that is no longer Anadarko's product; that's DCP's product. That's now in a different phase --

A. That is correct.

Q. -- and that's the custody transfer.

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. We were talking about outreach a little bit. Have you

heard of cases or instances where, as part of a settlement hearing, the operator has been required to present at COGCC hearings or at other venues, public venues, the root cause of the incident?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And that's happened for -- to the best of your knowledge, that has happened for pipeline, flowline incidents?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay.

MR. LEONARD: That's all I have for right now.

MR. AJIBOYE: Yeah, I have a follow-up question.

MR. CHHATRE: Identify.

MR. AJIBOYE: This is Gbenga from PHMSA.

BY MR. AJIBOYE:

MR. AJIBOYE: You just talked about running tracer wire if the poly line is by itself. So is that historical, or is that --

MR. MacLAREN: Tracer wire is required with poly line regardless of what else is in the trench.

MR. AJIBOYE: Yeah, but you said that was not a historical practice before?

MR. LEPORE: Do you know when that requirement began?

MR. MacLAREN: I do not. There was -- yeah. That was added during rulemaking historically. I'm not sure of the date.

MR. AJIBOYE: Okay, and --

MR. LEPORE: We can find out the date if you would like.

MR. AJIBOYE: Okay.

BY MR. AJIBOYE:

Q. And when the flowline is abandoned, is there a form that the operator needs to fill and send to COGCC?

A. Form 42.

Q. Okay. And in that form, they will state what has been isolated, do they?

A. No, they would, they would just mark a box that says, notice of flowline abandonment.

Q. So is this something you guys follow up in time of inspection, to verify that a form is correct to --

A. Sure. Absolutely.

Q. If a line is abandoned, it should not be connected in any way.

A. Correct. There should be no -- yeah, no risers.

Q. No riser, no connection to it, nothing.

A. Right.

Q. And say in the future, a line is abandoned and somebody peradventure leaves a riser behind and is about to be put in use, is there a procedure that they have to take to put that abandoned well back in use or line, or flowline?

A. To put it back in service?

Q. Yeah, just back in service, yeah.

A. If they were to approach something like that, we would require -- we would want to have them run a pressure test to

reconfirm that the line's got adequate integrity to be put back in service.

Q. Okay. Okay.

MR. AJIBOYE: That's my question.

MR. PRUNK: Okay. (Indiscernible) can I --

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Identify.

MR. PRUNK: Yeah. Doug Prunk with the fire department.

BY MR. PRUNK:

Q. I'm really enthralled with all this regulation. Can I ask about the scene that day real quick? You said you met with the contractor, Anadarko, and then Bret Schissler was requested to come back, and that was -- was he your main contact from Anadarko that day?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you describe any conversation that you had had about well maintenance or anything with that particular -- the core's V 13 well? Was there any discussion with him about maintenance issues or anything -- is it 13?

A. Are you talking about the well in question? That's the V 14.

Q. 14. Sorry.

A. Because 13 is the west one so --

Q. Yes. So the one that's next to the house. Was there any discussion about maintenance or any discussions at all with Bret?

A. At that point in time, we just discussed the situation at hand, and the lines that were being tested and located.

Q. Okay.

MR. PRUNK: Okay. All right, thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: This is Ravi, NTSB. Just want to clarify the question real quick. I think the question was did you discuss maintenance of that well, and you are saying -- the short answer is yes or no?

MR. MacLAREN: Maintenance of the well?

MR. CHHATRE: Wasn't that the question?

MR. PRUNK: Maintenance, or if there was any recent issues noted with that well.

MR. CHHATRE: So would -- the answer is yes or no? You discussed that with -- whatever the gentleman's name --

MR. PRUNK: Bret. Bret Schissler.

MR. MacLAREN: With Bret?

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah. Did you discuss about the maintenance and -- was that the question?

MR. PRUNK: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: What is the short answer, yes or no? Not the lines and all that. The well is the question.

MR. PRUNK: Yeah. Any problems discussed about maintenance or mechanical issues in the well confinement?

MR. MacLAREN: Yes. And we had some general discussion about the well. Limited information was communicated. Bret didn't have well history readily available.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. Can you tell us what you asked him?
A. So I was specific about the lines in question. Specifically, maintenance of the flowline.
Q. No, not -- forget the lines. We are talking about the well. You said you asked him -- there was discussion about general. So what -- do you remember what you asked him?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. So there was no discussion on the well, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So now going back to regulations, 1100 you're referring to a lot. Do you know when they became effective? You are enforcing it, so I'm just trying to understand. Do you, do you when it became effective?
A. I know that they'd been in place for over, for over 20 years.
Q. And if you don't know, if you don't know, you don't know. But I'm --
A. But I don't know when that rulemaking, the actual rulemaking, took place.
Q. Rulemaking takes a long time.
A. Right.
Q. I'm just asking when it became effective that, as a guardian of --
A. Many years.

Q. -- or gatekeeper, when you had to start following that? What is the effective date of 1100? Do you know or you don't know?
A. Twenty-plus years.
Q. You don't know. Right? Twenty-plus can be 30 years, can be 50 years. Right?
A. Sure.
MR. LEONARD: This is Mike Leonard. I believe he's asking, Joe, do you know the specific date when these --
MR. CHHATRE: I don't need to know the day and month.
MR. MacLAREN: Yes.
MR. CHHATRE: I just need to know the year.
MR. LEONARD: The year.
MR. MacLAREN: I'm going to say 1992. Three. Two or three.
MR. LEONARD: So to the best of your knowledge, approximately 1992.
MR. MacLAREN: That is correct.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Okay.
BY MR. CHHATRE:
Q. Now when you went back to your office, do you generally do any paperwork of your work on the scene for a day, day and a half, whatever you were?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we get a copy of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Have you done any past inspections on this well in

question?
A. No.
Q. Has anybody, to you knowledge, in your organization has done this inspection on this particular well?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who did it?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Can you find out and get back to us?
A. Uh-huh. I know it was inspected in 2014.
Q. 2014. Okay. As the party coordinator, can you get that person so we can talk to that person? I mean, not (indiscernible), like, now, but --
A. If that person, if that person is still with the agency, yes.
Q. Okay. If not, can we get any documentation that person may have generated?
A. We do -- there is a field inspection report in the database.
Q. Okay. If we can get a copy of that?
A. Sure. No problem.
Q. And any and all. I mean, just --
A. I'm sorry? You can have any document that is in our database that relates to that well.
Q. Yeah. That would be great.
A. Any single -- yeah, anything.
Q. Yeah, that would be great. Now when you -- you said something about enforcement actions in your audits, that you guys

take enforcement actions?
A. We can.
Q. Have you done any of the enforcement actions in the past 18 months to any operator?
A. Regarding audits? No.
Q. Yeah. So you have not found any fault with any of the operators in the 18 months that you had to take, as an agency, enforcement actions.
A. Well, I've issued action required items on a field inspection report.
Q. Okay, then --
MR. LEPORE: Explain.
BY MR. CHHATRE:
Q. Educate me.
A. Once again, what I --
Q. Tell me what an, what an enforcement action is to you.
A. An enforcement action, to me, would be documented noncompliance that goes before the commission as part of a hearing that may result in a fine.
Q. Okay. And so is there enforcement action taken on any and every regulation (indiscernible)? So what triggers enforcement actions?
A. Documented noncompliance.
Q. Give me a specific example, because that's very generalized (indiscernible).

A. Yes. So an operator has a reportable release from a flowline, and there is documented -- through our inspection process and involvement with our -- with both our engineering group, environmental group and other parts of our organization, we conclude that he -- the operator has not met the requirements of the rule in this circumstance and/or has not met a deadline for an action required item outlined on a field inspection report, and there is, there is -- we'd look at that as a noncompliance, and that would lead to an enforcement action and notice of alleged --

Q. Please help me out, please help me out --

A. -- and notice of alleged violation, and then what we call an NOAV. We would write an NOAV, and then that would be reviewed, and then it would be -- it could go, it could go -- then it is referred to the enforcement group team.

Q. Help me out. Again, to me, it's extremely general, because you are saying if this -- give me a particular example. It can be an imaginary example if you want, but give me a simple example that, if an operator did this, this and this, then it becomes an enforceable action. Just give me -- I'm going to get my arms around the general statements you made.

A. Okay. And in a --

MR. LEPORE: Can I make a suggestion?

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Identify.

MR. LEPORE: Yeah. There are a couple --

MR. CHHATRE: Identify.

MR. LEPORE: Sorry. Matt Lepore, COGCC, and I just want to suggest that Joe describe for you a couple of different terms that we use. I think it'll help. So corrective action, warning letters and notices of alleged violations, which all three arise from an observed noncompliance, an observed failure to be 100% in compliance with the rule. But the agency tends to take each of those steps in sequence.

MR. CHHATRE: Understand that.

MR. LEPORE: So an observed violation might result in, that's not appropriate; you need to fix it --

MR. CHHATRE: Correct it. Yeah.

MR. LEPORE: -- within the next 30, 20, 10, 5 days.

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Yeah.

MR. LEPORE: I think if he steps through that a little more --

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah, that's what I was just -- yeah.

MR. LEPORE: -- specifically -- yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: Walk me through. I mean, because the way you described it, to be honest with you, I didn't get anything, I mean, as to what really triggers it. I have no step-by-step model.

MR. MacLAREN: You need to listen harder.

MR. CHHATRE: No, I'm listening. Here, the same rules apply. Like I told you, ask me questions 10 times if you don't understand.

MR. MacLAREN: Right.

MR. CHHATRE: I'm going to ask you the same question 10 times if I don't understand the response. It's not just one-way flow. But go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. MacLAREN: Okay. I go out and conduct a field inspection. And I notice that some valves associated with a well and flowline have not been maintained properly. I indicate that on a field inspection report. This may be part of a release that was reported. I indicate that on part of the field inspection report. I indicate the observations made and then the corrective actions required to remedy those action, to remedy the problem and the rule violation. And I outline a date that those actions must be completed.

I go out to reinspect. The actions required have not been met by the date outlined. The operator -- we write a warning letter to the operator documenting noncompliance. We go out and reinspect again. The operator has not fixed the situation and is still out of compliance. Then we would move to writing a notice of alleged violation, which would be referred to our enforcement group.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. So going back to the very first step, that you find a deficiency and you tell them to correct it, right? That's a first step. Now then are you automatically required by your regulation to go back after that period and make sure that they have or they

have not done that work?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then next step follow the same way, that if they haven't corrected and you give them notice or whatever your terminology is, then you again go back. So all your steps are -- require you to go back and visit the same operator to ensure compliance, it's complied.
A. And we conduct follow-up inspections.
Q. Okay. So I guess, then, in your tenure, have you ever initiated any of these procedures for any operator?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. To enforcement actions that results in fine or whatever. You have.
A. Um-hum.
Q. And has any of that thing has happened with Anadarko? Not necessarily this particular well, but anywhere where there are (indiscernible) thousands of wells they may own or operate.
A. Me personally, through my inspections?
Q. Your agency. Do you know any actions taken?
A. Well, I would say yes.
Q. Okay. Can we, can we get a copy of that action, enforcement actions? You have, you have a record of that or you don't?
MR. LEPORE: This is Matt Lepore from COGCC. Yes, we have records of every single enforcement action ever taken -- well, not ever, historically -- against any operator. I guess I want to

have a conversation about the relevance of every single enforcement action ever taken against Anadarko, or any other operator for that matter.

MR. CHHATRE: Well, what we are -- I'm just trying to find out --

MR. LEPORE: They are publicly available documents.

MR. CHHATRE: They are publicly available. Okay.

MR. LEPORE: Yes.

MR. CHHATRE: Great. Okay. I'm just, I'm just looking at, like, last 5 years, maybe. I mean, I don't want to get thousands of documentation from you, but --

MR. LEPORE: (Indiscernible).

MR. AJIBOYE: (Indiscernible).

MR. CHHATRE: I just want to find out, in the last 5 years, how many are taken against this particular operator.

MR. LEPORE: And I think you understand now from Joe's response -- Matt Lepore, COGCC -- there's a spectrum of both severity of violations and severity of consequences which dictate whether we take all three of those -- corrective action, warning letter, enforcement -- or whether we just say, sorry, this was bad (indiscernible).

MR. CHHATRE: No, he didn't say that. He only said, he said he goes through three steps.

MR. LEPORE: Okay, so --

MR. CHHATRE: I mean, that's not what he said, and he's the

gatekeeper, right?

MR. LEPORE: I wouldn't characterize it that way either.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. So I mean, he's your eyes and he --

MR. LEPORE: He's a gatekeeper on a very narrow slice, a very specific --

MR. CHHATRE: Okay, that's what I'm saying here, I guess. You guys are seeing, when he goes for the inspection, you are seeing through his eyes what is happening in the field; is it not?

MR. LEPORE: I think you're seeing through his eyes through your questions.

MR. CHHATRE: No, I'm saying you as an, as an agency. If he goes and inspects something, you are seeing that inspection through his eyes; are you not?

MR. LEPORE: Yes, but I mean -- I don't feel it's my job to ask follow-up questions, so --

MR. CHHATRE: No, no. I'm not saying that. I'm saying it's your job.

MR. LEPORE: But I think there are follow-up questions that would clarify what I'm letting you know.

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Maybe you can ask the follow-up questions after I'm done.

MR. LEPORE: There's just, there's just the scope of --

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah, sure.

MR. LEPORE: -- that is actually formalized --

MR. CHHATRE: No, I'm trying, I'm trying to understand

procedures. So anything that clarifies that is fine.

MR. LEPORE: Yes. Yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: But okay.

So we took care of enforcement actions. Now I think there's a reference made about the best practices that the operator is supposed to follow. You mentioned some best practices that operators are required to follow. Are those mentioned in your regulations by reference? Because I guess the question was, what is significant, and actually that was the question I was going to ask you. What is significant? Because it's all relative. So did you refer to some industry practices?

MR. MacLAREN: Um-hum.

MR. CHHATRE: Now is that practice referenced in your regulations so the operator knows what is significant? Or that is not referenced in your regulation? Because if it is not referenced in your regulation, how would and why would anybody go and look at that document? I asked a simple question. Is it yes or no? Like, is it referenced --

MR. MacLAREN: Right.

MR. CHHATRE: -- in your regulation or not?

MR. LEONARD: This is Mike Leonard. I just want to clarify your question. So are you asking if the term industry best management practices is stipulated in the regulations?

MR. CHHATRE: Yes, my question is very simple that, I guess -- earlier question came up. That was something about what is

significant, what is not significant, or what is -- I guess you had that question, correct? And that was your question. And the answer you want was, is it industry practice that the operator is supposed to follow that identifies significant, or whatever that question may be. And my simple question is, granted, if industry practice is what they are supposed to follow, is that practice referenced in your regulation, that significant events should be reported? I'm just giving an example. So a footnote saying, follow this industry practice, if that is --

MR. MacLAREN: No.

MR. CHHATRE: That is not. Okay.

MR. MacLAREN: No.

MR. CHHATRE: Now the other discussion earlier was, I guess, there are two agencies that control the natural gas flowlines. Did I get that correct? Health and --

MR. MacLAREN: CDPHE.

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah --

MR. LEPORE: Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

MR. CHHATRE: All right.

MR. MacLAREN: I've got a question for you.

MR. CHHATRE: Sure.

MR. MacLAREN: Would you like to save some of your questions for the later interviews? These are all great questions for our engineering manager.

MR. CHHATRE: Believe me, if I (indiscernible) today, I'm going to ask those of everybody. I'm trying to find out, you know, the regulations and how much of those regulations people follow and are -- you know, if there is any region that needs to be (indiscernible). I mean, I'm not trying to put anybody through any torture here. I'm just trying to understand. If I am an operator, if I understand what the -- regulation has to be specific for me to comply to you, right? If I am not sure what a significant is, how me as an operator -- significant to you may be different completely than if somebody else goes to inspect. So I'm just trying to review the subjective part of it. You follow what I'm saying?

MR. MacLAREN: Yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: Good. But if you need to take a break, we can.

MR. MacLAREN: No. Keep going. So I'm seeing you're at the end of your page.

MR. CHHATRE: Oh, no, no. I have three pages.

MR. LEPORE: This is Matt Lepore, COGCC. My recollection of Joe's response about industry best practices was that he was responding to what is reasonable. So David McBride asked questions about what is reasonable, because the rule says take reasonable precautions.

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah, but I don't remember the specific question. What I'm saying is, if it isn't referenced to industry practice, is it referenced in regulation? That's all I'm really

asking.

MR. LEPORE: Right. And I just want to clarify that the reasonableness and -- best practices was about reasonableness, not about what is significant.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. Again, what I'm -- I may have posed the question a little bit differently, but my -- really, the crux here, if you refer something to any industry practice for any reason in your regulation and that is through interpretation, is it referenced in the regulation?

MR. LEPORE: I understand.

BY MR. CHHATRE:

Q. I mean, you can use any -- and that was -- I guess the answer was no or yes?

A. Referenced? No.

Q. Okay. And I guess -- I'm still trying to understand. Because I think the description already made earlier also that the gas releases are controlled or regulated by Health, that CDPH --

A. E. Gas emissions.

Q. Yes. Gas emissions are. So gas release or leak, for example, will be considered a gas release, I believe. Who will control that? I mean, who --

A. CDPHE.

Q. So with your regulations, gas release by a gas flowline, you are not responsible for it. CDPHE would be. And again, I'm not trying to -- I'm just trying to understand who the guardian will

be for that. Who is responsible? And then are we supposed to report a leak to you guys or to CDPH [sic.]?

A. They would report to both.

Q. But if you are not -- if I understand you correctly, and I don't know how report works. But you said CDPH [sic.] is controlling the gas lines, flowlines.

A. No, I did not say.

Q. They are not. Okay. So whose regulations I'm supposed to follow? Both or yours only or --

A. Both.

Q. Both. Okay. And have you guys compared your regulations with them?

A. Yes.

Q. Are those regulations same, similar, different or -- I mean, educate me on that, because I --

MR. LEONARD: May I, may I clarify? This is Mike Leonard.

MR. CHHATRE: Sure. Please.

MR. LEONARD: Okay. Mike Leonard. The leak itself, the actual mechanical leak, the hole in the line, is regulated by COGCC, okay? So the emission of the gas into the atmosphere is regulated by CDPHE, because that's an air quality issue. They would not have -- I mean, I don't know what their rules say. I don't know if they could say, well, you got to fix that leak. But we have the authority over the leak, over the --

MR. CHHATRE: So the integrity part has to be followed per

your regulation; am I correct?

MR. LEONARD: Correct.

MR. MacLAREN: Yes.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

By MR. CHHATRE:

Q. And earlier, I guess, you know, clarification question was that flow and pipeline are interchangeable words?

A. Correct. In our 1100 series rules.

Q. Okay. And I thought when I asked earlier question on the flowline and markings, and you said the markings are required for pipelines but not for the flowlines. So now, again, I'm going to ask the same question again --

A. We clarified that.

Q. Okay. Please.

A. Yes. So the markings are required at public right-of-way crossings and designated setback areas.

Q. Only for the public crossings, not to the entire length of the pipeline.

A. Correct.

Q. Okay. So if a line is running through the farm, is that line required to be marked or not?

A. No.

Q. Okay. So in this case, when I was at the scene 3 weeks later -- so my question is, you guys were here earlier. Did you see any markings between the two wells or the, I guess, the well and the

receipt point of the, I don't know, separator or whatever terms you guys use. Did you guys see any markings?

MR. LEPORE: Can I ask a clarifying question?

MR. CHHATRE: Yeah, sure.

MR. LEPORE: For the active flowlines that are being used today?

MR. CHHATRE: Yes. Yes, no. Only for active. Yeah.

MR. MacLAREN: Yeah, the active flowline was marked.

MR. CHHATRE: By the operator, like --

MR. MacLAREN: Yeah, at a road, at the road crossing.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay. It was marked.

MR. MacLAREN: Yeah.

MR. CHHATRE: That's all I have. Thank you so much. I'll pass it (indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, we'll let him do clarifying questions.

MR. LEONARD: Okay. Yeah, this is Mike Leonard. I have a few clarifying questions.

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. So Joe, to the best of your knowledge, the 1100 series rules, the flowline/pipeline rules, have they changed overtime?

A. Yes.

Q. So there's been modifications to that rule.

A. Correct.

Q. After you -- if you do an inspection and find an issue and issue a corrective action, can you recommend that for enforcement right away, or do you have to do another inspection?
A. I can recommend that for enforcement right away.
Q. Okay. But you can only recommend for enforcement. You yourself as an inspector cannot bring enforcement.
A. Correct.
Q. Correct. Okay. And is -- does COGCC have an enforcement policy matrix and penalty matrix?
A. Correct. Yes, we do.
Q. And that's publicly available on the website.
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. So there are certain issues that, if found, they are automatically -- so there are mandatory -- or the other side of it, discretionary rule violations. There are mandatory rule violations that an NOAV has to be issued.
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay.
MR. LEONARD: I think that's all I have now.
MR. CHHATRE: Okay.
MR. PRUNK: Doug Prunk with the fire department.
BY MR. PRUNK:
Q. Joe, you said that previous to this position you were a normal operator? Normal inspector. You were a normal inspector.
A. I was a southwest field inspector.

Q. So in that timeframe, it's probably safe to say that you've seen hundreds or thousands of wells.
A. Thousands of wells.
Q. Yeah, absolutely. How common is this setup of this type well? Like, the aboveground configuration of -- just, you know, I'm talking just in the confinement, like this. Yeah.
MR. LEPORE: Like what is shown in the picture that was previously marked as an exhibit?
MR. PRUNK: Yeah.
MR. MacLAREN: This is uncommon. The reason I -- the way that the --
BY MR. PRUNK:
Q. What are you saying, this? What you're pointing at is --
A. Well, what I'm pointing at is -- the 1-inch line back to the wellhead can be fairly common. The way that the 1-inch line is tied into the wellhead and is used for production operations is not as common. You want me to clarify?
Q. No, no, I think I understand. Yeah.
A. The reason that it is -- this is an uncommon situation is that the gas flow in the 1-inch line is multidirectional. It can go to the separator to supply fuel gas to the burner to heat the separator vessel, or the line can go the other direction to supply fuel gas to operate the motor valve and the plunger lift system on the wellhead. So it's multidirectional. We do not commonly see that.

Q. Okay. In your history, your experience on a normal -- well, let me ask the first question first. How often -- what type of rotation -- or what's the goal to try to have an onsite visit of wellheads by your organization? Is there a -- each well is looked at hopefully every 4 years, or is there any type of --
A. Ultimately, our goal -- well, we -- a couple of things go into play. We have wells that are deemed priority inspections based on a risk model that has been created by the agency. Ultimately, our goal will be to inspect wells annually.
Q. Is the risk model -- you're saying all 55,000 wells annually are hopefully (indiscernible) and are looked at.
A. That's, you know -- we're working in that direction. I'm not saying --
Q. So the risk model is based on close to buildings or something like that?
A. Sensitive areas, yeah. Those factors come into play.
Q. Yeah, EPA-type stuff.
A. Yeah, a number of variables including, yes, proximity to populated structures, sensitive areas like wetlands.
Q. Okay. So I think earlier you --
A. Reach of well.
Q. -- said that this -- the last record that we have for this well to be inspected was '14, is what we're showing. Would it be fair to say or would you -- how do I say this? Is this something that would have probably been noticed by all inspectors, this

oddity that you spoke of, or is it just based on your, you know, extensive knowledge of wells?

A. It's based on my specific knowledge of flowlines and wells.

Q. So it would be -- there's a possibility that, if I were to sample any of the other inspectors, they may or may not catch that.

A. Correct.

MR. PRUNK: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. LEONARD: I have a couple questions now. Sorry.

BY MR. LEONARD:

Q. So when you say this is not a common configuration for wellheads, are you speaking statewide or for this specific DJ basin?

A. I'm speaking statewide.

Q. Statewide. But it -- potentially, it could be a common configuration in the Denver Julesburg Basin?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. And would there be -- I'm sorry. This is Mike Leonard, if I didn't do that. I always forget, as well as everybody else. Chief Prunk asked, you know, if another inspector would notice these lines. Could there be a reasonable or regular use for these lines that they would be in place?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. So it's not something that would stand out to a normal inspector because there could be some configuration somewhere else

that these lines would, at some point in time, be needed.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Speaking as far as inspection frequency, is there not a flag in the system that, if a well hasn't been inspected in 3 years, it's flagged --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as to be inspected? Okay. And that's the current agency standard, is if it hasn't been looked at in 3 years, there's a flag --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- that flags it for inspection, and that -- and it may also raise it on the priority list or -- yeah.
A. Yeah, that's correct.
MR. PRUNK: And one more clarification. Doug Prunk. This well, by history, we know that it was shut in from December of '15 through January of '17. Would that -- does the, does your organization know about those type of shut-ins?
MR. MacLAREN: Yes.
MR. PRUNK: That would suspend your inspection as well at all --
MR. MacLAREN: No.
MR. PRUNK: -- or it would be -- if it was shut in, it would still get looked at if it was on the route or that schedule?
MR. MacLAREN: Yes.
MR. PRUNK: Okay, so that had nothing to do with from '14 to

'17 or --

MR. MacLAREN: No.

MR. PRUNK: Okay. Is there any -- was there -- is this on a schedule for '17 that we know of? Is there already a -- was it already -- prior to this event. Obviously it's been inspected plenty now. Prior to this event, would it have been looked at in '17?

MR. LEONARD: This is Mike Leonard and I can answer that. Yes. Because of its -- so on the website in presentations, there is a prioritization of well inspections. Presentation that actually shows the formula shows how it's calculated, how the scores are calculated. And this well would have been flagged. And it gets flagged the day -- so 3 years from, 3 years and a day after the last inspection, it would be flagged for inspection.

MR. LEPORE: Do you know what month the last inspection was?

MR. LEONARD: I'd have to look. I can look, but --

MR. CHHATRE: What is the question?

MR. LEPORE: I asked him if he knew what month in 2014 the well was last inspected. My recollection is August, but --

MR. LEONARD: I believe it was August or September. I mean, I could look that up. And that will come -- that will be part of the well file that COGCC will provide you.

MR. CHHATRE: Send us. Yeah. Any other follow-up questions?

MR. McBRIDE: No, sir.

MR. CHHATRE: Okay.

MR. McBRIDE: Thank you, Joe.

MR. CHHATRE: Just for the record, I just want to ask one question here. When you say it's not common, that doesn't make it unsafe, does it? I mean, it may be uncommon, but that doesn't mean it's unsafe practice.

MR. MacLAREN: That's correct.

MR. CHHATRE: Just want to make sure that we don't get a wrong impression on the, on the record, so -- okay. That's all I have. If not, appreciate you spending a long time with us and answering all the questions. I don't know if (indiscernible), but you really helped. You helped significantly.

MR. MacLAREN: Thank you.

MR. CHHATRE: Thank you so much.

MR. MacLAREN: You bet.

MR. CHHATRE: Off the record.

(Whereupon, the interview was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:	HOUSE EXPLOSION IN FIRESTONE, COLORADO, APRIL 17, 2017 Interview of Joe MacLaren
ACCIDENT NUMBER:	DCA17FP005
PLACE:	Longmont, Colorado
DATE:	May 12, 2017

was held according to the record, and that this is the original, complete, true and accurate transcript which has been transcribed to the best of my skill and ability.

_____

Eileen Gonzalez
Transcriber