



# National Transportation Safety Board

Washington, D.C. 20594

Name: BART MADERIOS

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 2-28-2019

I have reviewed my transcript(s) from the above referenced accident and:

I have no comments to make.

My comments are submitted herewith.

My comments are marked on the attached copy.



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

\* \* \* \* \*

Investigation of: \*

\*

MERRIMACK VALLEY RESIDENTIAL GAS \*

FIRES AND EXPLOSIONS \* Accident No.: PLD18MR003

SEPTEMBER 13, 2018 \*

\*

\* \* \* \* \*

Interview of: BART MADERIOS

Courtyard by Marriott  
Andover, Massachusetts

Thursday,  
February 28, 2019

## APPEARANCES:

RACHAEL GUNARATNAM, Hazmat Investigator  
National Transportation Safety Board

ANNE GARCIA, Human Performance Investigator  
National Transportation Safety Board

ROGER EVANS, Investigator in Charge  
National Transportation Safety Board

STEPHEN JENNER, Ph.D., Accident Investigator  
National Transportation Safety Board

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>I N D E X</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Interview of Bart Maderios:		
By Ms. Gunaratnam		4
By Ms. Garcia		37
By Ms. Gunaratnam		55
By Mr. Evans		58
By Dr. Jenner		64
By Ms. Gunaratnam		72
By Dr. Jenner		74
By Ms. Gunaratnam		77

I N T E R V I E W

1  
2 MS. GUNARATNAM: I'm starting now. Okay.

3 It is February 28, 2019. We are here today to conduct an  
4 interview regarding the natural gas explosions in Lawrence,  
5 Massachusetts in the Merrimack Valley area with regard to  
6 investigation PLD18MR003. We are doing the interviews at the  
7 Courtyard Boston Andover Hotel at 10 Campanelli Street, Andover,  
8 Massachusetts.

9 My name is Rachael Gunaratnam, spelled R-a-c-h-a-e-l, G-u-n-  
10 a-r-a-t-n-a-m, a hazmat investigator. And I am here with --

11 MS. GARCIA: Anne Garcia, G-a-r-c-i-a, human performance  
12 investigator for the NTSB.

13 MR. MADERIOS: My name is Bart, Barton Maderios, B-a-r-t-o-n,  
14 M-a-d-e-r-i-o-s, former employee of Columbia Gas in Massachusetts.

15 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay. Thanks, Bart, for coming to meet with  
16 us.

INTERVIEW OF BART MADERIOS

17  
18 BY MS. GUNARATNAM:

19 Q. I just wanted to just start off with your background. You  
20 just said you were a former employee of CMA. How about you start  
21 with, you know, some of your education and positions you've held.  
22 And --

23 A. I started with Columbia Gas in 1977, January 17th, as a  
24 distribution operator working, repairing main line leaks in the  
25 road, in the street. I worked there for a year and a half, and

1 then I transitioned into the gas operations department, which was  
2 pressure control and operating and maintaining the LPG and LNG  
3 plants at the Lawrence, Massachusetts facility.

4 In 1988, I became the general supervisor of operations for  
5 Bay State Gas at the time, and held a supervisory role through  
6 May, through actually -- I officially retired July 1st of 2018,  
7 where I retired as a supervisor of gas operations.

8 Q. Okay. And what were your responsibilities in your most  
9 recent role?

10 A. In my most recent role, I was responsible for pressure  
11 control, which was the gate stations, regulator stations for the  
12 entire four towns, which is Lawrence, Andover, North Andover, and  
13 Methuen. And also responsible for operation, maintaining the  
14 liquefied petroleum gas plant, LP air plant, and liquefied natural  
15 gas plant, the LNG plant, at the 55 Marston Street facility.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. Took care of the facility, the building -- buildings and  
18 grounds in the facility, and also took care of the measurement for  
19 the large volume customers and the elevated pressure customers  
20 that we, my department was responsible for.

21 A. And when you say measurement, are you measuring --

22 Q. Measuring natural gas.

23 A. Natural gas? Okay.

24 Q. The measurement of natural gas. And who were the customers  
25 under your supervision?

1 A. The customers under my --


2 Q. Yeah. Well, you -- was it the Lawrence area?

3 A. Yes. The Lawrence, Andover, North Andover, and Methuen. And  
4 -- but let me step back. In 1988, they -- Bay State Gas had  
5 bought Northern Utilities, and I was responsible for the  
6 Portsmouth operation as well as the Lawrence operation. And we  
7 had 23 towns in New Hampshire and the four towns in Massachusetts.  
8 And for a short period of time, I also took care of the Portland  
9 Division, which was Portland, Lewiston facility, took care of the  
10 LNG plant up there for a short period time as well as the propane-  
11 air plant in Portland, Maine. We had a propane-air plant in  
12 Portsmouth, New Hampshire as well.

13 Q. Okay. But specifically in the last -- leading up to the  
14 accident, as gas operations supervisor, you dealt mostly with  
15 Lawrence?

16 A. I dealt only with the four towns in the Merrimack valley.

17 Q. All right.

18 A. They sold -- I think NiSource sold off   
19 utilities, I want to say in 2009.

20 Q. Okay. All right. So can you describe -- I know you talked  
21 about what you oversaw. Specifically with -- I guess we'll start  
22 talking about the emergency response duties that you may have had  
23 with the fire department. Can you just tell us what you would,  
24 what kind of things you would do with the fire department on  
25 training and interaction coordination?

1 A. With the liquefied natural gas [REDACTED] we had -- there was a  
2 specific CFR for LNG. And one of the requirements was to maintain  
3 communication and a liaison with the emergency response for the  
4 territory. And I would perform natural gas emergency response for  
5 emergency responders. And it was one of the classes that I  
6 enjoyed, I enjoyed doing very much. And it was well taken.

7 The emergency responders really appreciated the fact that I  
8 would take the time to, you know, give them the nuts and bolts as  
9 to natural gas emergency response.

10 Q. So how often would you, like, maintain communications with  
11 them? What --

12 A. Every year. Annually I'd be in contact with -- well, now I  
13 say annually, but it was way more than annually. I mean, I was on  
14 a first-name basis with most of the fire chiefs and the  
15 firefighters. I tried to do the, you know, formal training every  
16 2 years, and -- particularly in Lawrence. And I would actually  
17 bring them through the plants, do a walkthrough with the plants so  
18 they could actually see what the facility was all about.

19 In North Andover, actually, they went through a phase where  
20 they had me coming in every year. I did a training almost every  
21 year with North Andover. One of the reasons I did that, is when I  
22 first started as a -- in the supervisory role, emergency response  
23 was definitely afraid of that facility.

24 I basically asked the firefighters, what would you do if  
25 there was an alarm at the facility at Lawrence? And they said,



1 we'd head for Methuen. And that struck me as odd. And it  
2 bothered me because here emergency responders didn't have a clue  
3 as to what was in their community. And that role started a very  
4 good relationship between the gas company and emergency  
5 responders.

6 Q. Okay. So how far back did you say you started working with  
7 the fire chiefs on regular annual --

8 A. I want to say '89 --

9 Q. '89?

10 A. -- '90. I don't remember. I mean, it's all, it's all well  
11 documented.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. I had well documented in electronic version.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. And I worked with the community and government relations  
16 folks as far as they'd help me set the training. And then, and I  
17 would do that on a regular basis. And even when I was in New  
18 Hampshire and Maine, I'd perform that training for the emergency  
19 responders in New Hampshire as well.

20 Q. Okay. So do you still have those documents? Or --

21 A. I do not have those documents.

22 Q. They're just -- back at CMA?

23 A. Electronic documents at CMA.

24 Q. All right.

25 A. I can give you the names of the files.

1 Q. Oh, okay.

2 A. The Excel files.

3 Q. Go ahead.

4 A. It's firefighter training. It's an Excel document, and it  
5 was on the common drive in Lawrence as well as the H drive that I  
6 had in Lawrence.

7 Q. Okay. So primarily every year, you would go through training  
8 with fire departments specifically on that plant, [REDACTED]?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. No. Not the plant, just the plants, but pressure control and  
12 the emergency response in the community.

13 Q. Okay. So in there, so what kind of exercises for the  
14 community type stuff would you do?

15 A. Well, the training, I -- my -- what I understand the question  
16 to be, the training would be, you know, what is natural gas? How  
17 does it get to their community? And then what to do if there was  
18 a leak or -- and how to prevent overpressurization. You know,  
19 blocking relief valves, relief vents, and things of that nature.  
20 And they totally understood that.

21 Q. And those were relief, that's where they -- were they at the  
22 regulator stations?

23 A. No. They were at the -- the ones I focused on most recently  
24 were at, you know, customer facilities. But originally we had a  
25 relief valve at the gate station in Methuen. And that was a big

1 thing I keyed on. If they shut that relief valve off, there was a  
2 blocked valve under the relief valve. If they shut that relief  
3 valve off, they -- within minutes there'd be fires and explosions  
4 all around them. And very accurately to what actually happened in  
5 September of '18.

6 Q. If they turned the relief valve off?

7 A. If they turned the block valve off --

8 Q. Oh.

9 A. -- underneath the relief valve.

10 Q. Oh, okay.

11 A. And actually, I went into detail about overpressure  
12 protection. And federal, the federal and state regulations  
13 required overpressure protection.

14 Q. Right.

15 A. And I went into detail on overpressure protection with the  
16 emergency responders.

17 Q. Okay. So can you describe in detail what that -- like how  
18 you would do that with them?

19 A. I would do that -- if there was a relief valve blowing and,  
20 not to stick a broom handle in the relief valve because that would  
21 overpressure the individual --

22 Q. Customer?

23 A. -- facility. At the customer's facility. And if, you know,  
24 if it was blocked by ice, if the ice had actually blocked an  
25 overprotection protection device, not to smash it with a hammer or

1 an axe, and basically to use water to melt the ice off so that the  
2 relief could operate in the way it was designed.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. And talked about regulator stations. If they, you know,  
5 responded to a regulator station, not to operate any underground  
6 valves because they could operate the wrong valve and put high  
7 pressure into a low pressure or basically shut off thousands of  
8 customers with the turn of a valve.

9 Q. Oh, okay. So did you -- with overpressure protection, was  
10 the focus more on a single customer or did you also look at  
11 overpressure protection on the whole system?

12 A. The whole system.

13 Q. The whole system. Okay. So something like that would affect  
14 multiple --

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. -- customers? Okay. So that was, you were showing them how  
17 to -- if the relief valve was affected, you would show them what  
18 not to do or what to do?

19 A. When we had to, the facility, I really took into detail and  
20 actually had photographs of, so it was Oak Street, the Oak Street,  
21 the gate station which was in Methuen, and actually had pictures  
22 of the relief valve and the block valve underneath the relief  
23 valve, and explained to them, don't close a block valve under  
24 relief valve, because that could impact the entire network of  
25 underground piping, and explained why.

1           You know, I mean the, we had 750 pounds of pressure coming  
2 into that facility, with a 200 MAOP going out. If they closed the  
3 relief valve, they could put 500 to 600 pounds in the 200-pound  
4 system. Basically you'd have multiple failures in a very short  
5 period of time.

6 Q.   And when you say failures, you mean the pipes would break?

7 Or --

8 A.   Pipe failures, equipment failures, regulators would fail.

9 I'd go into detail about pilot lights. Pilot light on a range,  
10 which is normally 3/8 of an inch tall would become 17 or 18 inches  
11 tall, and then that would ignite cabinets and kitchens. And those  
12 are the details I offered to the emergency responders.

13 Q.   So how were, what were responders supposed to do in time,  
14 like, so they just weren't supposed to touch those things? But --

15 A.   Right. Notify --

16 Q.   Yeah.

17 A.   -- the gas company at that point.

18 Q.   Okay.

19 A.   Notify the gas company. Or they could, if it was individual  
20 customer, always gave them the authority to close the, close the  
21 service valve, the inlet valve --

22 Q.   Oh. On the meter?

23 A.   But not, on the meter, but not on an underground district  
24 regulator.

25 Q.   Okay. All right. Because, under what scenario would they

1 want to touch those valves? The block valve?

2 A. It just, I mean it's just human nature.

3 Q. Oh, okay.

4 A. And I would explain to you, you would, you know, for a relief  
5 valve, the relief valve that I spoke of at the Oak Street station,  
6 if they closed that block valve, there was a 6-inch relief valve  
7 there at the time. The noise, and the noise would be just  
8 deafening, and the easiest thing to stop the noise and stop the  
9 release of gas would be to close the valve.

10 Q. Oh, okay.

11 A. And you would have an immediate solution to the problem. The  
12 noise would go away and the release of gas goes away, but now that  
13 gas has to go somewhere. It goes in the, in the downstream  
14 piping, and that's where you'd have fires and explosions within  
15 minutes all around.

16 Q. I see. So you're instructing the fire department, in light  
17 of an overpressure event don't touch these valves, but go to the  
18 houses and valves that --

19 A. The service risers.

20 Q. The service risers, and --

21 A. And --

22 Q. -- shut the meters off?

23 A. At each, at each training session, if, I probably mention the  
24 shutting off the service risers at least 20 times. You want to  
25 shut a service riser off, please do that. That's the best thing

1 to do. But don't, you know, stick a plug or a broom handle into a  
2 relief valve of a blowing regulator because that would defeat the  
3 purpose of the design of that regulator.

4 Q. Okay. All right. Great. So, okay. So after you, so that's  
5 the regular training you provide them. Was there any other type  
6 of training besides that you would offer them?

7 A. Again, liquefied natural gas.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. We had liquefied natural gas deliveries on a regular basis at  
10 the facility. I'd always offer them, let them know when the  
11 transports are coming in so they could actually see the properties  
12 of liquefied natural gas.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. You would, I would put it in a glass beaker and they could  
15 actually see it boiling in the glass beaker.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. You know, we would put it in a plastic bottle to see that you  
18 could, you could control it in a, just a mere plastic bottle  
19 because it was so cold.

20 Q. Yeah.

21 A. And we also had propane deliveries on a regular basis. And  
22 I'd go over them, each time I'd go over the emergency features of  
23 each transport and what to do in the event there was an emergency  
24 with any, either of the transports.

25 Q. Okay. So have you ever experienced an overpressure event

1 while working there?

2 A. Yes. I'm trying to remember. There was one we had that was  
3 a minor one, but water got into a regulator vault in North Andover  
4 and caused a, not, well it wasn't a major incident, but I believe  
5 it was reported, I think it was reported it anyways. But as soon  
6 as we were able to get the catch basin cleared, the incident went  
7 away. But there were no damage, there was no damage, no problem.

8 There was another event in Methuen, Massachusetts on Street  
9 where there was actually an explosion in one apartment. I don't  
10 know what the final determination was, but where, there was  
11 multiple investigation, they couldn't find anything wrong with the  
12 equipment, don't really know, we weren't positive there was  
13 overpressure. But it appeared to be an overpressure event.

14 Q. And how did the fire department respond in those situations?

15 A. They responded, I mean, there was -- there wasn't any ensuing  
16 fires. But they responded, emergency response to that facility,  
17 or --

18 Q. Oh, okay. But they didn't touch any valves or anything?

19 They --

20 A. Again, I, whether they turned the service riser off --

21 Q. Yeah.

22 A. I don't know if they turned the service riser off. I was  
23 focused, my responsibility was the regulator vault, the regulator  
24 station itself.

25 Q. Okay. And what did you do in those two incidents?



1 A. Recorded. I mean, recorded pressures, checked pressures,  
2 recorded pressures, checked the equipment, tested the equipment.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. And actually, the Department of Public Utilities was  
5 involved. We actually pulled the equipment and locked it up so  
6 that they could witness the investigation of the equipment itself.

7 Q. Okay. And when you say equipment, you're talking about the  
8 regulators?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Okay. So you, did you have to shut off those stations then  
11 to do all that?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Yeah. So you, okay. So when that happened, you shut  
14 off the station and tested the equipment? Okay. And recorded  
15 pressures?

16 A. Um-hum.

17 Q. Okay. And that, do you remember the timing of those  
18 incidents, when they --

19 A. I don't.

20 Q. Okay. That's all right. We'll ask if we haven't already.  
21 So, okay. And when you left, did anyone replace you for the --

22 A. You mean --

23 Q. -- as a liaison?

24 A. -- at measurement and regulation? This is one of the, one of  
25 the areas that was an issue, is that they split measurement and

1 regulation, which is, they call M&R. M&R is measurement and  
2 regulation, and the propane and LNG plants, they split those two  
3 departments. And where the division is so small, it was, in my  
4 opinion, it was not the best decision for the company or for the  
5 community.

6 Q. Okay. So tell me, so now, let's go into that department. So  
7 when you were in M&R, that was when you became operations  
8 supervisor?

9 A. I was in M&R as a union worker --

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. -- in '81, they started that in '81. And then in '88 I  
12 became the supervisor for --

13 Q. Okay. M&R?

14 A. -- plants and M&R.

15 Q. Okay. Compliance and M&R?

16 A. Plants.

17 Q. Plants and M&R.

18 A. Plants.

19 Q. I'm sorry. So how many people when you first started were  
20 there?

21 A. When I first started in '81, there were probably, I don't  
22 know, there were probably 8 or 10 people in the department.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. I could, I could sit here and name them off, but it would  
25 take me a few minutes. But I could, I could get a hard number.

1 But there quite a few people. And especially in the wintertime,  
2 and that's how I started. Because I'd work distribution in the  
3 summertime, and in the wintertime they needed more people to  
4 operate the plants, unload the, unload the trucks, the transports.  
5 So they'd bring two or three operators from distribution to work  
6 at the plants for shift work for 3 months or 4 months of the year.

7 Q. And did that staffing change over the years?

8 A. It did. It did. With the addition of natural gas supply to  
9 the region, when the Canadian pipeline got tied in, we got another  
10 source of natural gas from the north instead of getting everything  
11 from the Tennessee gas pipeline out of the south. The supplies  
12 were much more abundant, therefore the need for the peak shaving  
13 facilities became less and less. And that's when staffing started  
14 to decline. And then there was also the downsizing phase that  
15 took place with every utility probably 10 or 12 years ago. And I  
16 remember when that was. Everybody downsized, and you did more  
17 with less.

18 Q. Okay. And so when you left, how many were in the department?

19 A. The day I left?

20 Q. Yeah.

21 A. There was one person in the department.

22 Q. Okay. So you were saying it used to be one department and  
23 then they split it?

24 A. Um-hum.

25 Q. So what did they split exactly?

1 A. They split off the responsibilities for measurement and  
2 regulation. That went to, Jeffery Croke was the, he was the  
3 supervisor for measurement and regulation for entire  
4 Massachusetts. So they took those two technicians, and those two  
5 technicians reported to Jeffery Croke. And I was left with the  
6 plants, LPG and LNG plants, and it was still up in the air who was  
7 taking care of the large volume customers. And I maintained  
8 responsibility for the large volume customers.

9 Q. Okay. So Jeffery Croke dealt with the single customer and  
10 residential?

11 A. No. Jeffery Croke dealt with the measurement and regulation  
12 stations.

13 Q. Oh, stations. Sorry. Okay.

14 A. Pressure control.

15 Q. I see. And you maintained the large plants?

16 A. The LNG and propane plants.

17 Q. Plants, okay.

18 A. And then the large volume customers, the individual  
19 customers.

20 Q. Okay. Thank you.

21 A. I was actually still doing both when I left because it wasn't  
22 really clear as to what the responsibilities were. And I felt  
23 responsible for that, and so I wouldn't let anything happen. And  
24 that made it so I kept my hand in it.

25 Q. Okay. So when it was one department, you guys dealt with all

1 of it together?

2 A. Um-hum.

3 Q. The large plants, the regulator stations, and the  
4 distribution side to the customers? So it got split up, what  
5 then, when was that actually?

6 A. That took place over the last 2 years.

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. From '17 to '18.

9 Q. Okay. And so describe us, what the split, how that impacted  
10 operations.

11 A. Well, it takes, it takes technicians, it takes resources, it  
12 takes personnel away from the combined unit. And when you take  
13 personnel away, you can't get the work done.

14 Q. Okay. And which work are you, you mean just the work itself?  
15 Yeah.

16 A. The work in both, in both areas.

17 Q. Yeah.

18 A. The propane LNG plants, the large volume customers, and M&R  
19 work was going to get done because they took those, they took  
20 those two technicians to maintain the M&R.

21 Q. Okay. So would your responsibilities after the split deal  
22 with replacing cast iron with plastic?

23 A. No. I had no, I had no authority, or no involvement in  
24 decision making as to replacing cast iron pipe. That was not my  
25 responsibility at all.

1 Q. Was that after the split? Or --

2 A. No.

3 Q. Or ever?

4 A. Ever.

5 Q. Ever? Okay.

6 A. That was, that was between engineering, distribution, and  
7 construction.

8 Q. Okay. That was between engineering, distribution, and  
9 construction?

10 A. And they call it plant now. Distribution, when, again, I'm  
11 old school. My thought process with distribution was the  
12 distribution system, the underground piping. But the NiSource  
13 nomenclature was that's plant work.

14 Q. Oh.

15 A. To me, plant work was LNG and propane, so they got, that was  
16 confusing to the layman.

17 Q. Okay. But did you ever work on that kind of project?

18 A. Oh yes.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. Yes. As, and my involvement in the construction project, I'd  
21 be involved in, on the large project, engineers would ask for  
22 advice and critique on procedures and elements of the pipe that  
23 they were, the segments of pipe that they were replacing.

24 Q. Okay. So would you maintain historical documents on the  
25 actual pipe system?

1 A. No.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. Well, the only, the only historical documents that I did  
4 maintain was, we operated the entire system, the entire high  
5 pressure system, I want to say it was in '90, in the '90s, the  
6 early '90s. And we went from a 60-pound system to a 99-pound  
7 system. I did maintain paper documents --

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. -- as well as electronic documents for that upgrade.

10 Q. Okay. So why would they, if they didn't maintain the  
11 documents, like, why would they come to you about that?

12 A. Again, that was experience and somebody that's involved in  
13 pressure control for the entire system.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. They wanted to make sure that there was nothing they were,  
16 they were missing --

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. -- when they did that.

19 Q. I see.

20 A. And again, experience played a huge role because you could  
21 offer that experience and, you know, what to do and what not to do  
22 in, you know, cutting off a pipe or introducing gas, putting a new  
23 segment of pipe in service.

24 Q. Oh, okay. So before the split, you oversaw all of that,  
25 right?

1 A. I didn't oversee it. I did not oversee it. I had, I only  
2 offered advice or --

3 Q. Oh, okay.

4 A. -- you know, we'd have a meeting. And say, they're going to,  
5 they're going to replace a segment of pipe on Park Street --

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. -- and, you know, you know, what do we need to look for? Is  
8 there anything that you know, any nuances that you know of in that  
9 system and, you know, if it impacts the regulator stations, you  
10 know, is there anything in regulator station that we need to be  
11 concerned about?

12 Q. Okay. So I'm sorry. I didn't mean, like, what I meant by  
13 oversight, I meant when you, before the split happened and Jeffery  
14 Croke went this way and you went this way, you were in charge of  
15 that M&R department?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. So you were the most familiar with everything?

20 A. Exactly.

21 Q. Right. Okay. So that's why they would consult you?

22 A. Right.

23 Q. Okay. So before the split, did you also work, so they would  
24 consult you on these capital projects for replacing lines?

25 A. Not all of them, but on the major ones. Or the ones that



1 had, you know, that they weren't quite sure of, they would contact  
2 me.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. And the seasoned inspectors, the seasoned construction  
5 inspectors, they would notify me the day before, hey, we're going  
6 to, we're going to cut off a section of low pressure main in this  
7 area, you know, just so you're aware.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. And if, and if a light went on, I would say, you know, did  
10 you take a look at this? And so I was offered that opportunity to  
11 advise them if there, anything that came to mind.

12 Q. Okay. So if they were specifically asking about a, replacing  
13 a cast iron with plastic, and they said, we're going to do this  
14 section today, what kind of things would you tell them to look  
15 for? Or is it --

16 A. Well, and I wouldn't tell them to look, it depended on, you  
17 know, the segment of pipe that they, probably 99 percent of the  
18 time, 98 percent of the time, it's like, okay. Thank you for  
19 letting me know. And then I would notify gas control and my  
20 technicians to, you know, look for any pressure anomalies in that  
21 segment of pipe if there was a telemeter, a pressure recording  
22 device, a pressure transmitting device in that area.

23 Q. So would you direct them during the, whatever project that  
24 was being planned? Or --

25 A. No.

1 Q. -- you'd just tell them to look out? Okay.

2 A. Just, I just, you know, if we got a call, if gas control saw  
3 an anomaly, you know, my guys are prepared, okay, they need to  
4 respond because, you know, the construction crew is working in  
5 this area.

6 Q. Oh, okay. Great. And gas control being the Columbus --

7 A. Columbus, Ohio.

8 Q. -- Ohio?

9 A. Right.

10 Q. Okay. All right. Was there ever a situation where you had  
11 to review a project, documents, and like identify things in the --

12 A. That was more on the -- if we did it, we upgraded a section  
13 of pipe, they would -- the company was doing a good job of  
14 replacing cast iron with plastic, or bare steel with plastic. And  
15 in some instances, that would require to upgrade the pressure to  
16 go from a low pressure system to a 99-pound system, or a low  
17 pressured system to a 5-pound system. So those upgrades I was  
18 always involved in because I would be the one controlling that  
19 pressure increase.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. And I was the most experienced and familiar with the  
22 regulations and the requirements of the upgrade process.

23 Q. Increase, okay. And what would you, what would be your role  
24 in that? Would you just review the documents? Or would you be  
25 present during the project itself? Or --

1 A. Both.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. We would review the documents, and most recently I was very  
4 impressed with the way that we had to sign off on documents to  
5 make sure that we all knew what our responsibilities were and that  
6 we took care of the responsibilities that were set upon us.

7 Q. And did you work with contractors?

8 A. I did not. Well, I mean, I work with contractors, but the,  
9 those meetings and that stuff all took place with in-house people,  
10 the engineers and the, and the construction managers, and  
11 supervisors.

12 Q. Okay. So then when you were executing that project, would  
13 you also have meetings with the contractors who were doing that?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. I'd be in the field.

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. When we did the upgrades, I would actually be on sight and,  
19 you know, working with the project coordinator to make sure that  
20 everything followed the procedure that was written beforehand.

21 Q. Okay. So were you familiar with the project that was going  
22 on at the time of the incident?

23 A. I was not.

24 Q. Okay. So you weren't involved in, ever? Because I know you  
25 retired 3 months, 2 months before? Or May?

1 A. I officially retired in July.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. They walked me out the door in May.

4 Q. Okay. So we're -- because this project apparently was part  
5 of a bigger project, capital --

6 A. And I'm going to be honest with you. I still don't know what  
7 the, what the project was.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. I still don't know what the project was.

10 Q. So you weren't directly ever involved --

11 A. No.

12 Q. -- with that project?

13 A. Uh-uh.

14 Q. Okay. Just checking. So what do you, what can you tell us  
15 about locating and identifying sensing lines on a --

16 A. In most instances, I, and the records, the records from the  
17 '70s and '80s were not as accurate as everybody would like them.  
18 And locating control lines was a difficult task, and not everyone  
19 understood the importance of the sensing line, control line, or  
20 sensing line, or static line, whatever the, whatever type of  
21 regulator was there.

22 And, but, you know, when there was work there, I would, I  
23 would always send one of my crews. I would send, and to make sure  
24 that they were able to locate as best they could the control lines  
25 for these stations.

1 Q. At what point would you send them, like is it right prior to  
2 the construction? Or --

3 A. Prior to the construction, and then if, whenever they  
4 requested it. If they weren't sure --

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. -- if they were, they, and particularly if they were digging  
7 close to a regulator station --

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. -- I would have somebody go and --

10 Q. Locate them?

11 A. -- locate the, well wouldn't locate them. We would help  
12 locate them.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. And if the construction was in the close proximity, and I  
15 would, I would check with engineering, and system planning, and in  
16 a lot of instances we would basically shut the regulator station  
17 off so that if there was, you know, something went awry, that  
18 regulator station, it wouldn't, it wouldn't go out of control.

19 Q. Okay. So in terms of, when you're replacing a, have you ever  
20 replaced a, cast iron with --

21 A. I have. And, you know, when I was in distribution --

22 Q. Yeah.

23 A. -- I did replace, I've actually physically replaced cast iron  
24 pipe with plastic pipe.

25 Q. Okay.

1 A. So I know how to do it. I've been involved in physically  
2 doing it myself.

3 Q. Okay. So if you were, so can you describe a time where you  
4 had to do that and identify the sensing line?

5 A. No. We never, I never was involved in that --

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. -- aspect of it, no.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. If we were replacing a regulator station, then that was a  
10 different story because you're replacing the entire station and we  
11 were installing a new station. So you physically saw where the  
12 control lines or the sensing lines were going and --

13 Q. I see.

14 A. -- things of that nature.

15 Q. So when, so you're saying the only times you would know to  
16 kind of look for the sensing lines was when there was digging near  
17 the regulator station or there was construction in close  
18 proximity --

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. -- proximity to the regulator station?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Okay. Were there any other, that was, are those the only two  
23 times? Or --

24 A. If they, and again, if there were unusual circumstances. If,  
25 you know, I mean sometimes there was a couple of stations where

1 the control lines were not would expect them to be. And that's  
2 what I can only surmise happened in this location, is they shut  
3 off a main, cut off a main that the control lines were tied to,  
4 and it wasn't in a close proximity to the regulator station as  
5 they would expect it to be.

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. But I don't know that to be fact. But again, that's from  
8 what I saw, and sleepless nights I had. I can only surmise that  
9 that's, you know, what -- that's the only thing that could have  
10 happened.

11 Q. So can you describe how the sensing lines are attached to  
12 that main? So they're at the regulator station, those sensing  
13 lines?

14 A. The control lines or sensing lines, there's a -- there's a  
15 reason for the different titles of each one. But the sensing line  
16 would go from the regulator, the actual valve, from there into the  
17 -- it would attach to the downstream piping so that the regulator  
18 knew what the pressure was in the downstream piping, and it could  
19 open and close with regard to the pressure in that downstream  
20 piping.

21 Q. Okay. And that, so those sensing lines, were they attached  
22 to the main line that was attached to the downstream piping?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. Yes. They, and they were hard           . One of the

1 requirements that I had was that, well, we would always use a  
2 steel control line and attach that to a steel, a steel pipe so  
3 that it couldn't be damaged easily. It had to, it had to have  
4 some force to damage it.

5 Q. So if you're working on downstream piping, how would that,  
6 how would that impact that sensing lines?

7 A. In the event you cut off a section of pipe where those  
8 sensing lines are, if the sensing line sees that the pressure is  
9 dropping in that piece of pipe, then the regulator is designed to  
10 open up.

11 And if, and the regulator's going to continue to open until  
12 that sensing line pressure satisfies the set point of that  
13 regulator.

14 Q. So, but is there any, is there any construction work piping  
15 that would just, what I'm trying to understand is where you don't  
16 have to worry about the sensing lines?

17 A. Yeah. I mean, if you're not, if you're not working in close  
18 proximity to a regulator station, no. You can --

19 Q. Oh, okay.

20 A. You can cut off 1,000 feet of pipe --

21 Q. Oh.

22 A. -- and not be concerned about a sensing line.

23 Q. Oh. So at what point do you have to start working about the  
24 sensing lines?

25 A. When you're in, I mean, when you're in close proximity, you



1 know, within, I don't know, 100 yard radius of a regulator  
2 station.

3 Q. Oh, okay. And is that described anywhere?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. No.

7 Q. That's just from experience?

8 A. There's a requirement --

9 Q. Oh.

10 A. -- that, NiSource had a requirement that if the, if a  
11 construction was taking place within, I don't know, 50 feet of a  
12 regulator station, you had a technician on site or you notified  
13 M&R, and they would decide whether to have a technician on site.

14 Q. Okay. So it's only when in close proximity that you had to  
15 have a technician on site?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And that technician would have a pressure gauge with them?  
18 Like --

19 A. Right.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. Yeah. They'd have a pressure gauge. Now, of course there  
22 pressure recording devices in most of the stations. So they could  
23 actually see the pressure in most of the stations that were there.

24 Q. And if the pressure increased, who would he be communicating  
25 with? Or would he --

1 A. The, well, if the downstream pressure would increase, he  
2 would have the authority to shut the station off or get control of  
3 the station.

4 Q. And then would he, what would be the steps after that if he  
5 shut the station off?

6 A. I mean, notify the supervisor, notify gas control, and notify  
7 engineering --

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. -- as well as the management for the, for the division.

10 Q. Have you, in your experience, dealt with that, where the,  
11 that they had to shut off the regulator station? Or was that the  
12 Methuen and Andover?

13 A. Yeah. That, well, yeah. The one in Methuen, we shut that  
14 station off when they anticipated, they thought it was an  
15 overpressure --

16 Q. Event?

17 A. -- issue. And I'm trying to think. Now, never did I have  
18 to, oh I should have, never say never, you know? But I don't  
19 recall any event where I had to shut off a regulator station  
20 because of a damage.

21 Q. Okay. From construction or --

22 A. From construction.

23 Q. Okay. And so was that requirement for a technician to be  
24 present, was that in place before you left?

25 A. It was. It was. Did we comply with it all of the time? No.

1 Because we didn't have the resources.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. I couldn't send a crew, we'd, well I'd send them out in the  
4 morning, pass by, see what they're doing, see if they need you  
5 there. If they need you there, you stay there, but if they don't  
6 need you there, we have compliance work we've got to execute.

7 Q. Okay. So NiSource always had this requirement to have  
8 somebody there?

9 A. Not always. They just recently in the past, I want to say 4  
10 or 5 years, they instituted that policy.

11 Q. To have that person there?

12 A. To have someone from M&R on site.

13 Q. Oh, okay.

14 A. Because they had that situation happen in other states. And  
15 I don't recall which ones they were, but --

16 Q. Okay. So that was more recent requirement?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. And you, but you said that wasn't always necessarily  
19 implemented because of resources?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. Okay. And it was always someone from M&R?

22 A. Um-hum.

23 Q. Okay. All right. I'm trying to think. Okay. So were there  
24 any procedures that you saw change over the years that also  
25 impacted construction projects similar to this that you thought

1 were not safe?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Okay.

4 A. No. not that I can, not that I can recall, no.

5 Q. Okay. So what were your concerns about what was going on  
6 towards your retirement?

7 A. We didn't, again, the requirement was for us to have a crew  
8 at these sites. We didn't have the resources, and therefore I  
9 couldn't provide that service.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. And one of my other concerns were that the inspectors that,  
12 the company inspectors that were working with these contractor  
13 crews, you know, everybody had the operator qualifications, but  
14 operator qualifications doesn't provide you with the experience of  
15 what to do in an anomaly, for an anomaly.

16 Q. Okay. So you're saying not enough resources and also not  
17 enough qualifications?

18 A. And, not so much qualification, but inexperienced.

19 Q. Oh, experience.

20 A. Inexperienced inspectors and construction crews.

21 Q. Okay. And are you saying that because of what you witnessed  
22 on site?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. So what kind of things would they miss?

25 A. You know, nothing real, that was dangerous. It's just that

1 they would miss the things that, I mean, putting pressure gauges  
2 in certain areas. They would, you know, wouldn't bother putting a  
3 pressure gauge in that area, and that's not something, you learn  
4 from experience that if there's a requirement for a pressure  
5 gauge, you put the pressure gauge in.

6 And it, those were most of the ones. I mean, I can't, I  
7 can't recall them all. But it just, you know, you'd see something  
8 or you would hear something, and then, you know, the ones I'm  
9 speaking of, the ones that I've witnessed, but I would hear things  
10 that, you know, and I don't dwell on it, but it kind of bugs you,  
11 you know --

12 Q. Yeah.

13 A. -- that that stuff is happening out there. But you don't  
14 know, but somebody's telling you that it is.

15 Q. So did you ever experience any downstream in houses, fires  
16 due to construction projects?

17 A. Not so much overpressure, but underpressure. Underpressure  
18 was, is, you know, not as dangerous, but yet it impacts the  
19 customers greatly. They had one in Methuen where they were doing  
20 some work and they basically lost the pressure in the pipe, and  
21 they had to shut the entire district down in order to repressurize  
22 that.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. And I still never heard what the, what the cause was. But  
25 I'm confident that somebody didn't put a gauge where it needed to

1 be, and didn't have the authority, or didn't execute the authority  
2 to stop the project when the pressure anomaly happened.

3 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay. I'll turn it over to Anne.

4 MS. GARCIA: Okay. Thank you. This is Anne Garcia --

5 MR. MADERIOS: Bart Maderios.

6 MS. GARCIA: Okay. Thank you. I have a couple of questions  
7 for, just kind of jumping back to fill in some questions in my  
8 mind from the discussion that you were having with Rachael, and  
9 then perhaps a few additional ones. And then we'll pass it on to  
10 the folks who are listening on the phone --

11 MR. MADERIOS: Sure.

12 MS. GARCIA: -- to ask you questions also. Okay?

13 BY MS. GARCIA:

14 Q. So, first, just for the specifics, what was your title on  
15 your position when you left the company?

16 A. I was, I was the supervisor of systems operations. That was  
17 my official title when I left the company.

18 Q. Okay. For what department, or area, or --

19 A. For the, for the, I mean, for the Lawrence Division. And  
20 again, it was, it was unclear whether it was my, in my estimation,  
21 or my opinion, the day I left, I did not have responsibility for  
22 measurement and regulation. I had responsibility for the propane  
23 and LNG plants.

24 Q. Okay. And who did you report to? Who was your boss?

25 A. The operations center manager, who was Dana Argo. His name

1 was Dana Argo, D-a-n-a, A-r-g-o.

2 Q. And what was his title again?

3 A. The operations center manager.

4 Q. Okay. And was he located in --

5 A. Lawrence. He was --

6 Q. -- Lawrence?

7 A. His office was in Lawrence.

8 Q. Okay. Thank you. Before the split, what was your title,  
9 your job title? Was it the same?

10 A. This, yeah. The, my job title was the same since NiSource  
11 took over, and so my title never changed.

12 Q. Okay. And what year did NiSource take over?

13 A. I don't recall the year. It was prior to, I don't know. It  
14 was probably in the early 90s, mid 90s.

15 Q. Okay. You mentioned back in 1981 when you started, there  
16 were about 8 to 10 people in the department. What jobs were they  
17 doing, those people?

18 A. They were doing pressure control, they were operating the LNG  
19 and propane plants at the time. Again, but this was before we had  
20 the additional pipeline supply from the north. We had around the  
21 clock shift coverage for each plant, for the LNG plant and for the  
22 propane plant, which required a plant operator and a plant  
23 unloader for each of those plants.

24 We had four people, at least four people on a shift, and lots  
25 of times you had five as a mechanic for responding to repairs of

1 either one of the plants.

2 Q. Okay. And when you left, was there still around the clock  
3 shift coverage?

4 A. Upon request. When needed. In the event that a gas supply,  
5 they couldn't secure enough gas supply, we would operate the plant  
6 and provide, we vaporize [REDACTED] natural gas or [REDACTED] propane to  
7 supplement the natural pipeline gas.

8 Q. Okay. Thank you. And what is your education level?

9 A. High school. I graduated from high school in 1974,  
10 Bridgewater-Raynham Regional High School. No college education.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. Lots of school of the hard knocks.

13 Q. Yeah, and you worked your way up. I just have a list of  
14 questions now we'll go through, not in any particular order, okay?  
15 Rachael has asked you about, you know, a system wide failure  
16 versus a failure that's just one house or something, and you'd  
17 mentioned the work that you've done with emergency response and  
18 the firemen. Did you have a plan in place in the event of a  
19 system wide failure?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Did the company have a plan in place?

22 A. Yes. The company did have a plan. We have a critical valve.  
23 We also main, the, maintain the critical valve, what we call  
24 valves. And that's a federal requirement and a state requirement  
25 so that the in the event that there was an issue, we could upgrade



1 critical valves to --

2 Q. What are critical valves?

3 A. Critical valves, you could isolate a segment of pipe, of  
4 piping, and of late, they actually put customer numbers on these,  
5 on these segments. So if you closed off three valves, you would,  
6 you would shut off 3,000 customers. So if you shut off these four  
7 valves, then you'd shut off 500 customers. And there was a plan  
8 in place that was executed very well to make sure that we maintain  
9 those valves.

10 Q. Okay. And do you know if there was a risk assessment done by  
11 the company of a major system wide failure?

12 A. Risk assessment was done on a regular basis as far as, and  
13 not as far as failures, but they would, they would put, we did a  
14 risk assessment, an annual risk assessment on regulator stations.  
15 They did risk assessment of pipe, you know, pipe that was of  
16 concern that, you know, they look at leak history and things of  
17 that nature. Those risk assessments took place every year. But  
18 as far as system failure, no. I, no, not that I'm aware of. I  
19 mean, I would meet with insurance company, and they would look at  
20 those type of risks, do a risk assessment, but nothing that I  
21 could detail.

22 Q. Okay. Do you know who in the company did the annual risk  
23 assessments?

24 A. Engineering. It was headed up by Dave Mueller. Dave Mueller  
25 was the director of engineering, or the manager of director,

1 manager of engineering when I left. He was, I mean he had people  
2 in each location that would make sure that they met with me for  
3 M&R or for regulator stations, and with various people for piping  
4 and whatnot.

5 Q. Okay. Thank you. Do you know in terms of the work orders  
6 for something like this, you know, changing out a large area of  
7 cast iron for plastic pipes, who has the big plan of all of the  
8 work packets that have to be done over many months and years? Who  
9 holds onto that big plan and is responsible?

10 A. That was, engineering had that. Again, through the risk  
11 assessment program, and engineering, and the regulatory people  
12 would actually look and decide what segments of pipe were going to  
13 get replaced and things of that nature.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. One thing I was very impressed with was the amount of pipe  
16 that got replaced in the last 8 years was absolutely incredible.  
17 Working for Bay State Gas in the 70s and 80s, that money wasn't  
18 available to replace that type of pipe, but NiSource really had an  
19 aggressive effort to replace suspect pipe, and I was pleased with  
20 the, with the progress.

21 Q. Is it, who is it that decides what order the different work  
22 packets get done in?

23 A. I don't know.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. That would be through a construction, between construction

1 and engineering. Construction and engineering would decide that.

2 Q. Okay. Thank you. Do you know if there have been any changes  
3 that have occurred in that whole engineering work order process  
4 while you were there?

5 A. Oh yes. We went to, we transitioned to Work Management  
6 System.

7 Q. When was that?

8 A. That was, I want to say in 2012. And, you know, at first it  
9 was a nightmare. But the more, the more I got use it, the more we  
10 got to use it, we became more familiar with it, and it certainly  
11 was effective.

12 Q. Okay. Is that a computer program? What is that, Work  
13 Management --

14 A. That's a, that's a computer based program that was in place  
15 when I left in May.

16 Q. Okay. And which departments use that?

17 A. All departments use that. All departments used Work  
18 Management System for any of the work that they did. And the Work  
19 Management System basically was focused around compliance to make  
20 sure that we maintained compliance with the regulations that we  
21 needed to comply with. And it was a, it was a paper trail  
22 basically, a record, an official record of our compliance work.

23 Q. Okay. So these, so I guess that that would be, you mentioned  
24 Dave Mueller would be the one who had the big vision?

25 A. That's correct. He was, and, well I, it may, it may have

1 been above him as far as, you know, how much money was available.  
2 But as far as the local for Massachusetts I believe, my opinion  
3 would be Dave Mueller would be controlling or recommending which  
4 projects got done and which projects, you know, the priority of  
5 the projects that get done.

6 Q. Right. And then when you have a particular work packet, do  
7 you call them work packets? The, a piece of work that was being  
8 done by --

9 A. I dealt with work orders, so I didn't have those.

10 Q. Work orders.

11 A. But they, I know they had work job folders.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. Maybe, some of them called it work packets, some of them  
14 called it job folders.

15 Q. Who was, who would you specifically interact with when they  
16 were about to do a piece of work?

17 A. Construction, the construction manager or supervisor, or  
18 project leader, or whatever, and then also engineering and --

19 Q. Okay. So construction, that would be like the contractors  
20 who were --

21 A. No. The construction --

22 Q. -- that --

23 A. The company had a construction department --

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. -- that the contractors work for the construction department.

1 And engineering and construction work closely together to make  
2 sure that, you know, they were traffic cops, that, you know, that  
3 they got enough resources for this project and they could, they  
4 could shift resources around to accommodate the construction needs  
5 for the different projects.

6 Q. Okay. So the engineering person would develop the work  
7 packet, and then construction would --

8 A. Execute it.

9 Q. -- execute it?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. Okay. Thank you. This is very helpful. I appreciate it.  
12 You mentioned the overpressure procedure.

13 A. Overpressure protection is, I believe is what I --

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. -- referred to. I don't think there's a, I don't know if  
16 there's a procedure for overpressure.

17 Q. Okay. Thank you.

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. And you mentioned that in the past, you would have had a  
20 person there to, who would notice if there was a pressure, an  
21 anomaly in the pressure?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. And again, that was if I, if I deemed it necessary. You  
25 know, with my experience, if I deemed that they were doing a

1 project in an area that required a technician, I'd send a  
2 technician. If it was a bigger project that I was more concerned  
3 about, I would respond myself with a technician.

4 Q. Okay. Could you just repeat, I know you already talked about  
5 this a bit, but just walk me through what the specific  
6 overpressure protection procedure would be for your person who was  
7 there.

8 A. Again, the first thing that we always did, I always  
9 instructed my technicians, and I always did in the fields, was you  
10 install pressure gauges upstream of the pressure device, and you  
11 install pressure gauges in between the pressure control devices,  
12 and the overpressure protection, and you had a pressure gauge  
13 downstream.

14 So you could see three different pressures and so you knew  
15 exactly what was taking place in that system. If the pressure  
16 changed, whether the pressure went down in the downstream system  
17 or the pressure went up in the upstream system, you knew what you  
18 had to do to gain control and prevent an overpressure or an  
19 underpressure situation.

20 Q. So, and these would be temporary --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- things that they would put in and take with them?

23 A. Right.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. They would put them in actually what they call Pete's plugs.

1 It's like a basketball. If you ever inflated a basketball, you  
2 put a pin the basketball and you can inflate it. We'd actually  
3 put these pins in the bottom of a pressure gauge, and you can  
4 install it into a fitting that was, that was installed on the gas  
5 piping that would allow you to stick the gauge in, tell you what  
6 the pressure was, and then remove the gauge when you were done  
7 without interrupting service for that particular location.

8 Q. Okay. And would this normally require the person to be there  
9 for the entire duration of the work? Like for a whole day, or  
10 for --

11 A. Depending on the, on the work that they were doing. If it  
12 was just a, if they were just installing stoppers or cutting off a  
13 segment of pipe, once that segment of pipe was depressurized, then  
14 I'd send the crew on the way.

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. You know, if they were going to do multiple stops or multiple  
17 cuts, then we'd have the crew there the entire day.

18 Q. Okay. What kind of timeframe are we talking about from where  
19 they might observe an anomaly to taking an action to correct it,  
20 versus having it get out of control?

21 A. They, they'll know within 5 to 10 minutes they'll know if  
22 there's an anomaly that they need to, they need to take action to.

23 Q. Okay. So it wouldn't be an immediate thing that --

24 A. Well, it could be. It, again, it depends on the size of the  
25 pipe, it depends on --

1 Q. So on the main line?

2 A. -- the pressures in the, in the pipe that they're working on.  
3 you know, low pressure, it's going to take, it may take 20 minutes  
4 to see an anomaly.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. You know, high pressure, a 99-pound system, it may take 2 or  
7 3 minutes. In a 200-pound system, it may take 30 seconds, you  
8 know? So there's no set timeframe. Is, you watch the gauges, and  
9 the gauges will tell you what you need to do.

10 Q. Okay. So what I'm hearing you say is that someone with the  
11 regulator there, someone with the experience and knowledge, when  
12 an anomaly starts, they would have time to do something to  
13 mitigate it.

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. Well, again, I say that, and that mitigating may be stopping  
17 the construction crew from doing the work that they're doing. You  
18 know, if, in overpressure situation, the only thing they can do is  
19 basically shut off the station that they feel is the cause of the  
20 anomaly.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 A. If the pressure reduces, they would have the authority to  
23 instruct the construction crew to stop the procedure and reopen  
24 the segment of pipe that they're dealing so that they wouldn't  
25 have an underpressure situation.



1 Q. Okay. Thank you. With construction work going on, if there  
2 was a need to move the sensing lines, when you were there, would  
3 part of the procedure be to have you have input, take a look at  
4 the plan? Or --

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. And at the time when you left, was that still the  
7 procedure?

8 A Yes. If they were working on control lines, I would be  
9 involved in decision making as to where they got attached and how  
10 they got attached.

11 Q. And when they got moved?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. And do you use control lines and sensing lines  
14 interchangeably? Or could they be different?

15 A. Depend on the equipment. Depends on the equipment. If you  
16 have certain regulators that require control lines, which is a  
17 downstream control line, excuse me, that has a bleed, a downstream  
18 bleed from the regulator pilot where the pilot actually bleeds a  
19 small amount of natural gas into the sensing line, or into the  
20 control line, so that's a control line.

21 A sensing line or a static line is sensing static pressure,  
22 which is, there's no flow in that piece of pipe. It's basically  
23 static pressure in that piece of pipe, and that's the difference  
24 between the two.

25 Q. Thank you. Okay. When the work packet or work order require

1 that sensing lines be moved, well who is it that determines that  
2 the sensing lines need to be moved, and who is the person who  
3 would contact you?

4 A. Engineering would determine what, that they need to be moved.  
5 And they would contact me to say, okay, we need, we're going to  
6 relocate these control lines. And we'd go forth, and they would  
7 send a plan, and --

8 Q. What level person in engineering?

9 A. Again, I don't know the title, but the head engineer in  
10 Lawrence would be the final decision. But I would get, I would  
11 get contacted by one of the junior engineers. And one of the  
12 junior engineers contacted me frequently to ask me questions of  
13 things like that, and, you know, do I need to be concerned about  
14 this or not?

15 Q. Okay. So that would be basically the lowest level engineer -  
16 -

17 A. Right.

18 Q. -- in the --

19 A. And then it would go right to the next level, and even  
20 further go to the state level, and I'd have an interaction with  
21 the state level engineer if need be.

22 Q. And would the junior engineer then talk to the construction  
23 person?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And would delegate the work order to them?

1 A. Yes, correct.

2 Q. Okay. After consulting with you?

3 A. Um-hum.

4 Q. Okay. And so that construction person then would hand the  
5 work off to the contractor?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. So the contractor worked for the construction person, not for  
8 the engineer?

9 A. That's right.

10 Q. Okay. Thank you.

11 A. Again, that's my observation, and then that's what I feel was  
12 in place at the time.

13 Q. That's very helpful. And I'm just curious, you mentioned  
14 that you officially retired in July, but you were walked off in  
15 May. What's the difference in the timeframe? What happened?

16 A. It's very difficult to talk about. You know? Because I was  
17 crying for resources, they had a plan to fire me. They put in a  
18 plan to fire me. And once I announced that I was going to retire  
19 and take my vacation, they decided, we don't need you here for the  
20 extra time. We want you out in the next 20 minutes after 42  
21 years.

22 So it's very difficult. It's very hard for me to talk about.  
23 Because I gave that company 42 years of my life and not to get  
24 recognized for spending 42 years, and doing such good work in the  
25 42 years, I'm still a little bit bitter. And that's because I

1 wouldn't, I wouldn't give in and say, you know, yeah, we don't  
2 need resources. Because I would never be a yes man. I continued  
3 to tell them, we need help, we need people to prevent this type of  
4 thing from happening.

5 Q. Who did you talk to? Who did you tell that you needed help?

6 A. Obviously my immediate supervisor [REDACTED] Argo, and Frank Davis.  
7 He was the general manager.

8 Q. What was his name again?

9 A. Frank Davis.

10 Q. And what was their reaction the first time that you went and  
11 said you need more resources? And how long ago was that?

12 A. That was probably a year and a half ago. They told me to put  
13 a plan together. I'm, can't remember the name of the plan, but I  
14 built a, built a plan, and explained exactly why we needed the  
15 help. And it was the form of, it was a PowerPoint presentation  
16 along with a Word document presentation that I physically went to  
17 Westborough and presented it to Frank Davis. And they thought it  
18 was awesome.

19 And then, you know, that's as far as they went. Never got  
20 the resources, so I continued to complain about it. The union  
21 came to me and, constantly, so I would go to my boss, and then his  
22 boss. And nothing got done. And finally they got, they got sick  
23 of hearing from me, so they developed a plan to fire me.

24 Q. You wouldn't still have copies of that, would you?

25 A. I don't have copies, no. I don't, again, I don't know, I

1 mean that was, I was escorted out of my office, and after 42 years  
2 I had to put all that, all that stuff in the back of my truck and  
3 take it home. I dumped it basically in the middle of my garage  
4 floor, so I haven't gone through it all yet.

5 But I may have some of it. I don't know. But I know it's  
6 all, the electronic versions are all there, and I'd be more than  
7 happy to, if those electronics, files were made available, I'd be  
8 more than happy to point out to anybody where those files were and  
9 the names of those files.


10 Q. Okay.

11 A. And actually, they, the existing union people that are they,  
12 I think the guy that took my place in the plant, the plants, the  
13 LNG and propane plant, Steve McGinnity, I'm sure he is fully  
14 aware of those documents. He may have copies of those documents.  
15 The union may have copies of those documents because the union was  
16 involved my cry for resources.

17 Q. How do you spell Steve's last name?

18 A. M-c-G-i-n-n-i-t-y.

19 Q. Okay. And you say he took your place in the union?

20 A. Well, I'm hearing it, I don't  if it, for a fact, but I'm, I  
21 was told by a vendor actually, that Steve McGinnity took my role  
22 as a supervisor for the LNG plant and the propane plant.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. I don't know that to be a fact.

25 Q. Okay. Who in the union would know?

1 A. Joe Curran. Joe Curran was the --

2 Q. How do you spell his last name?

3 A. Joseph Curran, C-u-r-r-a-n. He was the shop steward,  
4 assistant business agent.

5 Q. Okay. That's --

6 A. Had I not been walked out in May, I wouldn't have, you know,  
7 had they not put this plan to fire me, I was, I'm only 62 years  
8 old. I had planned on working there for another 3 years. Had I  
9 worked for another 3 months, all of these people would not have  
10 been displaced and their lives would not have been disrupted and  
11 ruined the way they were.

12 Q. So I'm curious, Bart, then. You think that Steve McGinnity,  
13 who you believe took your place as a supervisor, that he did  
14 things differently than you did them?

15 A. Well, understand now. Let me, let me point out that Steve  
16 McGinnity had the responsibility for the propane plant and the LNG  
17 plant. The M&R responsibility, the measurement and regulation and  
18 pressure control was taken over by Jeffery Croke.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. So that was, the split took place, and so I don't know how  
21 involved Steve McGinnity was involved in pressure control. I  
22 don't believe he was involved at all, but he was the most  
23 qualified technician that was there when I left.

24 Q. Okay. So you think that if you had stayed there that you  
25 would have done something different in the procedure that

1 happened?

2 A. Again, if, again, I, like I said, I don't know the details,  
3 but from what I saw, it could only lead me to one location, and at  
4 that location the control lines were not where the, where they  
5 would traditionally be, and they were on a different segment of  
6 pipe. And I believe they cut that piece of pipe off. And had I  
7 been there, I would have known that, no, don't cut that piece of  
8 pipe off until you relocate the control lines.

9 Q. So you say they were in a different place than where they  
10 traditionally would have been. Where would they have been?

11 A. Within close proximity of the regulator station.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. And if what I think has happened, they were actually on  
14 another street.

15 Q. Why would they, do you know why they would be in a different  
16 position than --

17 A. Yes. I do know specifically why that particular intersection  
18 was a mess, it was a nightmare. And in order for us to get  
19 accurate pressure control, we had to put the control lines on a  
20 different piece of pipe.

21 Q. Okay. So you mentioned that NiSource has a regulation, this  
22 is my last question.

23 A. No, it's fine.

24 Q. That within 50 yards, you need a person on site to check the  
25 pressure, and you said that you thought, well 100 yard radius of a

1 regulator station would be needed in order to address the sensing  
2 lines. It's my understanding that these particular sensing lines  
3 were even farther than that.

4 A. And again, and then that's highly unusual.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. It's highly irregular. And the, with experience, you know  
7 that, and so you can share that experience with other departments.

8 Q. Do you know regulation that is that NiSource has?

9 A. It's not a regulation. It's a, it's a gas standard. I don't  
10 know what gas standard it is, but they're, they had some, I mean  
11 the gas standards I became very fond of and very familiar with,  
12 and very -- I appreciated them, as do -- I did the same with the  
13 federal regulations and the state regulations. I know why they're  
14 in place, and they're in place to prevent things like this from  
15 happening.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. But this is an event that's, I mean, there are so many  
18 unusual events that took place. I mean, the regulations that are  
19 in place are there to prevent this type of thing from happening,  
20 and this was just out of the box. Way out of the box, out of the  
21 ordinary, and just, the only thing that could've prevented it was  
22 experience.

23 MS. GARCIA: Thank you.

24 BY MS. GUNARATNAM:

25 Q. Can I just follow up on that gas standards you just state --



1 A. Um-hum.

2 Q. Gas standards, NiSource gas standards? Or --

3 A. Yes. Columbia Gas, there were then NiSource gas standards.

4 Q. Were there any industry standards you would refer to? Or  
5 were they all company?

6 A. No. There are no industry standards --

7 Q. There are none?

8 A. -- other than operator qualifications. I mean, I was on the  
9 operator qualification team that actually developed operator  
10 qualifications for measurement, and regulation, and propane  
11 plants.

12 Q. Okay. Just one or two follow-up. When you, so you left in  
13 July. Had you stayed on and you were, would you have been  
14 involved in the September, like if there was construction going  
15 on, would you --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. You would have been there?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You would have been involved?

22 A. Right.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. I would have been able to identify prior to the execution of  
25 the project that this was a different set of circumstances, and,

1 you know, this station needs to be addressed before construction  
2 takes place on that piece of, piece of pipe.

3 Q. Okay. Because that, one thing I'm confused about is because  
4 you told me the split happened 2 years ago and you were focused on  
5 LNG plants and --

6 A. No. No I didn't say that. The split happened the day I left  
7 or the, 2 months before I left. They wanted it to happen --

8 Q. Oh, the split of the two, M&R?

9 A. Yeah. Oh yeah, no. M&R did not split until probably a month  
10 before I left. M&R and the plants did not --

11 Q. Oh.

12 A. -- officially split until maybe a month or less before I  
13 left.

14 Q. So in June? Or, you, oh, you left in May?

15 A. Right.

16 Q. So it would have been in April?

17 A. Um-hum.

18 Q. That's when it split?

19 A. Yeah.

20 Q. Okay. So sorry to ask you again then, because you were, you  
21 were saying your jobs were to focus on the LPG and LNG plants?

22 A. The day I left, my job was focused on the LPG and LNG plants.

23 Q. Oh, the day you left.

24 A. Two weeks before, I had everything.

25 Q. Okay. That was in 2018?

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. Okay. All right.

3 A. And have financial records that can back that up. You can  
4 look into the financials and see when they took the technicians,  
5 because there are different department codes for the technicians.

6 Q. Okay. Thank you for clarifying.

7 A. Sorry for the confusion.

8 MR. EVANS: This is Roger.

9 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah.

10 MR. EVANS: Can I -- I'm going into an appointment, a doctor  
11 appointment. Can I ask just a few questions?

12 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah, go ahead. Roger Evens is the IC for  
13 this case.

14 MR. MADERIOS: Okay.

15 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah.

16 MS. GARCIA: Investigator in charge.

17 MS. GUNARATNAM: Sorry.

18 MR. MADERIOS: Okay.

19 MS. GUNARATNAM: Investigator in charge, yeah. Go ahead,  
20 Roger.

21 BY MR. EVANS:

22 Q. Okay. Well, thanks for agreeing to speak with us today.

23 It's been great hearing what you have to say.

24 Just a few questions. When it comes to sensing lines, the --  
25 would you ever involve in a constructability review where you knew

1 they were going to do a change to a main and that the sensing line  
2 location had to be determined, and, you know, someone would go out  
3 and walk down, perhaps? Is that typical?

4 A. Yes. I would be, I would have been involved in that.

5 Q. Okay. So when you did have a main that was going to be cut  
6 into, like in this case, they were doing cast iron replacement and  
7 putting plastic in place of cast iron, I think they took out a big  
8 chunk of the pipe, and they had a valve on one end of it and all  
9 that.

10 And that work order that was used to do that work, the work  
11 order was nicely done as was a step by step process. However, in  
12 that work order, there was no mention at all of sensing lines.

13 Would that be something that would be looked at prior to  
14 that, the step by step process being done? Or should, would we be  
15 able to find the document that says, you know, we've looked for  
16 the sensing lines, and here they are, and this is where they are,  
17 so let's attach this to the work, the project.

18 A. And that --

19 Q. Can you kind of go into that a little bit?

20 A. Sure. And that's why I said this is totally out of the box.  
21 It's out of the ordinary. It's highly unusual for a regulator  
22 station control lines to be this far away from the station.  
23 That's just not a normal business practice. It's an usual  
24 business practice, but it made sense at the time that that was  
25 done.

1           And that's why, you know, the recommendation of having a  
2 professional engineer, a professional engineer could very well  
3 have missed this very thing. There's no, nothing that tells me  
4 that a professional engineer would have picked this up.

5 Q.    Okay. But as far as the process itself, when you have a work  
6 package that involves sensing lines, is there always a, some, a  
7 sideline document that says these sensing lines have been located  
8 and they're from this regulator and to this piping? Is that a  
9 standard document that one would have when the work gets planned?

10 A.   No. And it depends on, you know, again, this situation, the  
11 control lines probably were not even thought about. They didn't  
12 need to locate them because they were on another street. But when  
13 they do have a location, we do have locate technicians that go out  
14 and locate pipe.

15           They actually document what they located, and those documents  
16 will provide documentation that they located control lines or  
17 sensing lines for a regulator station.

18 Q.    Okay. So if, do they, do they put that on some type of a  
19 form that they've located them and this locate is required for  
20 this project ID? Is that something that if we requested we could  
21 get that document?

22 A.    I'm hoping. I'm not, I assume that that takes place on the  
23 work order. WMS, Work Management System work order is a separate  
24 job order for locates, the locate person would complete that. I  
25 don't know how much detail they put in those work orders, but I

1 would assume that those would be on that work order.

2 Q. I see. And can your, in the last 5 or 6 years, did you do  
3 any upgrades or relocation of sensing lines?

4 A. No. Not in the last 5 years, but, not that I can recall.

5 Q. Okay. So what about in the last 10 years?

6 A. No, in the last 10 years, yes.

7 Q. Okay. The, whenever they're going to plan a project and  
8 they're going to tie into a main, and they have a, we have a  
9 document that we found that's called a constructability review.  
10 When that review was conducted, was the M&R department included as  
11 a pertinent reviewer of that document?

12 A. Not to my knowledge.

13 Q. So you don't typically see constructability review documents  
14 in you, in the M&R department?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. Oh, okay. Interesting. By the way, Richard Wallace says  
17 hello.

18 A. Oh, tell him I say hello. How's his heath?

19 Q. Yeah, I'll tell him that. He's, he knows I'm speaking with  
20 you today and he said just tell him hello. I think that's all I  
21 had. I'm, I do want to mention something, that, you know, and  
22 this is a pertinent detail to the case, so I don't think it's  
23 going to hurt anything if you know, because I want to, I want to  
24 see what your reaction is. The sensing lines for the project that  
25 was going on were located about 2,330 feet away from where the

1 line was cut.

2 A. 2330 feet?

3 Q. Can you talk to that?

4 A. No way. No way. No way. Absolutely no way.

5 Q. So can you, can you explain how that could have happened?

6 A. It didn't happen. There is no, there is no way you can have  
7 a control line that long. Sorry, it can't happen.

8 Q. No. I meant, I meant the control lines themselves were  
9 attached to a header right out in front of the regulator station.

10 A. Okay. I guess I'm confused. You just --

11 Q. But the lines --

12 MS. GUNARATNAM: The work itself was, you're saying the work  
13 itself was 2,300 feet away?

14 MR. MADERIOS: Oh.

15 MR. EVANS: Yes.

16 MR. MADERIOS: Now that I can understand. Absolutely. That  
17 I can understand, sure.

18 MS. GUNARATNAM: So how would it --

19 MR. EVANS: Okay. Well, that was the case, that was the case  
20 in this particular accident.

21 MR. MADERIOS: Yep.

22 BY MR. EVANS:

23 Q. The control lines were 2,330 feet from the regulator itself.

24 A. No.

25 Q. Somehow they all, they tied that in adjacent to the street

1 there, into the headers, but the actual line that was cut, the  
2 location where the line was cut was 2,330 feet north.

3 A. Okay. So the control lines were not, you just said it again.  
4 The control lines were 2,300 feet long. That's not the case.  
5 They were attached to a main that was --

6 Q. No.

7 A. -- 2,300 feet long. I can understand that.

8 Q. That's right. Yeah. I'm sorry.

9 A. But they cut, they had to, they had to cut that main in two  
10 spots?

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. They cut that main in two spots. I can, and yes, that  
13 happened.

14 Q. Okay. So no issues in understanding how that happened?

15 A. Yep. I fully understand that. That, it may not be the  
16 location that I thought.

17 Q. Okay. My next question for you is, had we had a technician,  
18 and had they known that that regulator was located wherever it was  
19 located for this project work they were doing, and with the fact  
20 that they, you know, they had an overpressurization fairly  
21 quickly, do you have an opinion as to whether or not the person, a  
22 person local to that with meters, with gauges, and radio could  
23 have done something to prevent this? Because the person I would  
24 think would have a bit of time before the pressure came up on it.

25 A. Absolutely. Yes. My answer is yes.



1 MR. EVANS: Okay. Thank you so much. That's all I have and  
2 now I have to go to the doctor appointment. So I really  
3 appreciate it. And thank you again for agreeing to talk to us.

4 MR. MADERIOS: All right. Tell Richard --

5 MR. EVANS: It's very interesting.

6 MR. MADERIOS: I've got great respect for Richard, and we  
7 have a mutual respect for each other. So I miss working with him.

8 MR. EVANS: Okay. Well, okay well I'll see you guys and  
9 we'll talk to you on Monday.

10 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay. By, Roger.

11 MS. GARCIA: Thanks, Roger.

12 MS. GUNARATNAM: Steve? Steve, do you have any questions?  
13 Steve is --

14 DR. JENNER: Yeah, I have a few. Thank you. This is Steve  
15 Jenner with the NTSB. Thank you for your insights so far. We do  
16 appreciate that.

17 BY DR. JENNER:

18 Q. I just would like to get some clarification for some areas  
19 that we're discussing. It sounded like most of the time that a  
20 technician would have been at the regulator is when work was being  
21 performed within 50 feet of the regulator. Is that correct?

22 A. If the resources were available.

23 Q. Right. Now it's, now what you just heard from Roger, this  
24 work was being done, you know, in the area of a half mile away.  
25 Is there any reason per, you know, company policy that there would

1 have been someone at the regulator with the work that was being  
2 done so far away?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Okay. I was a little unclear about, we had mentioned the  
5 timeframe 4 to 5 years, the last 4 to 5 years. Just to be clear,  
6 in the last 4 to 5 years, was that practice being done of having a  
7 technician when work is done within 50 feet? Was that still being  
8 practiced?

9 A. When resources were available, yes.

10 Q. Right. Okay. And along those lines, you'd mentioned when  
11 you first started there, about 8 to 10 people available in the M&R  
12 department. Was that a sufficient number at the time?

13 A. Yes. And again, you know, let me clarify that. There were  
14 two key pressure control people, but the other people were capable  
15 of making safe a pressure control anomaly if that makes sense.

16 Q. It does. What do you think was the minimum number of  
17 personnel that you would have felt comfortable with in the  
18 department? The number went down from between 8 and 10, started  
19 to decrease. What number do you think you could still operate and  
20 felt that it was sufficient?

21 A. And my argument was that we needed six people if the M&R and  
22 the plants stayed together. And if they didn't, we needed at  
23 least four people for just the plants.

24 Q. And at the end, when you left, there was just one person?

25 A. That's correct.

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. And there was another person --

3 Q. So what we were --

4 A. There was another person that --

5 Q. Oh, go ahead.

6 A. -- bid into the department, but as soon as he found out I was  
7 retiring, he withdrew his bid and went back to the job he was  
8 doing.

9 Q. Okay. Now the M&R is on occasion involved in reviewing  
10 project plans, is that correct?

11 A. On occasion, not common practice. Depending on the magnitude  
12 and the location of the project.

13 Q. Can you, can you elaborate on that a little? The, what are  
14 your, what are your criteria for the magnitude and the location?  
15 What, I want to understand that.

16 A. And again, you know, I have no problem clarifying that. If  
17 they're working in a reasonable proximity to a regulator station,  
18 or the plants, then they would, they would consult me and ask me  
19 my opinion. Or if they, if I thought that we needed to be  
20 involved.

21 But a small segment of pipe, if they're replacing 2,300 feet  
22 of pipe and it was between point A and point B, and nothing  
23 unusual, I wouldn't even know about it necessarily.

24 Q. Okay. So on occasion, am I to interpret that it was sort of,  
25 it was pretty rare that a project would end up on your desk?

1 A. Yes. And no so much on my desk, but the engineers, they,  
2 whether it be the field engineer or the, or the junior engineer  
3 would often, you know, come and consult me. And, because I was,  
4 had no problems sharing the experience that I had and giving them  
5 guidance on how to make some of their decisions.

6 And so they ask me about these projects. And if it flipped a  
7 light on, I'd say yeah, we need to take a look at that one, or no,  
8 that one's going to be fine.

9 Q. Okay. So in the occasions that you were asked to, or agreed  
10 to review the project, can you walk me through that? What does  
11 that involve? How detailed of a review are you, are you giving?

12 A. We'd sit and we'd look at a map, and discuss the work of what  
13 was going to take place, and where were they, where they were  
14 going to cut, and how they were going to tie over the different  
15 mains.

16 And if they had a written procedure, I would review the  
17 written procedure to make sure that they had pressure gauges in  
18 the right places so that they wouldn't be dealing with an  
19 underpressure or an overpressure situation.

20 Q. Okay. How long would that take for you to go through this  
21 review as you just described?

22 A. Thirty minutes, 45 minutes.

23 Q. Okay. And if you were to just give a rough estimate, we've,  
24 you're, you've used this term on occasion. In a given week, would  
25 you see one or more of given --

1 A. Maybe --

2 Q. If you can quantify in numbers.

3 A. -- one a month.

4 Q. One a month? Okay.

5 A. One a month.

6 Q. So it didn't take up a ton of your time?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Okay. Hypothetically speaking from what we've made public  
9 about the, about the incident and from questions here, that the  
10 work was being done about 2,300 feet away, and nowhere in the work  
11 packet was sensing lines discussed.

12 If this packet came across you, across your desk, and you sat  
13 down and reviewed it with a junior engineer, what are the odds of  
14 you, or someone in your position picking up that sensing lines  
15 weren't discussed?

16 A. I mean, I would have identified it. Probably 95 percent sure  
17 I would have identified it.

18 Q. And what, why are you so confident?

19 A. Because you know where the control lines are for your  
20 stations. I knew where the control lines were for all 60 stations.  
21 I knew what mains they were tied to, and if they were cutting off  
22 that segment of main, I'd make sure that either there was a  
23 duplicate main there, and they were cutting off the non-affected  
24 pressure control main, or that we'd relocate, we'd actually dig a  
25 test hole and make sure that the main wasn't attached to the main

1 they were cutting off.

2 Q. Okay. So what I'm hearing is by part of this procedure  
3 involving cutting off the main line, that sort of lights a  
4 lightbulb for you?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. That process of cutting off the main is significant?

7 A. Yes it, yes it is.

8 Q. And it makes you, an experienced person, think if they're  
9 cutting off mains, this has consequences, and it makes you think  
10 of sensing lines. Is that fair?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Now, you bring 42 years of experience into this. If someone  
13 had, was after review, and you had 5 years' experience, would that  
14 be clear to them, what you're telling me now?

15 A. I'm just thinking, you know, it, 5 years possibly. It  
16 depends on how much time they spent in the field at the station.  
17 I mean, you know, my experience was I was the nuts and bolts guy  
18 from '81 to '88.

19 So I actually tore this, tore this equipment down, and made  
20 repairs, and did the required inspections for 7 years. And then I  
21 oversaw that, those inspections take place by people that I worked  
22 with for the next 30 years. So I was intimately involved. I knew  
23 these stations very well.

24 Q. Okay. So experience is a big factor here from what you're  
25 telling me in terms of detecting that something is not being

1 discussed in this packet that should be discussed?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. I'm sorry, looking through notes.

4 A. But this, I mean, what you're describing to me now, it, a cut  
5 a had to take place in close proximity to a regulator station for  
6 it to overpressure the entire system. So --

7 Q. I'm sorry, I missed that, sir. If you could just repeat  
8 that.

9 A. The cuts, the cuts that they made in that segment of main,  
10 they had to make two cuts on that main. One of the cuts, or one  
11 of the --

12 Q. Yeah.

13 A. -- stops in that main had to be in fairly close proximity to  
14 that regulation station.

15 Q. I mean, close proximity, what are you, what are you talking  
16 about in terms of --

17 A. Within 100 yards. Within 100 yards.

18 Q. Okay.

19 MS. GUNARATNAM: But we understand this work to be being done  
20 2,300 feet away.

21 MR. MADERIOS: No.

22 MS. GUNARATNAM: So it couldn't have?

23 MR. MADERIOS: Couldn't have.

24 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay.

25 MR. MADERIOS: Couldn't have. And that's my fear of, just, I

1 don't know. I don't, people just don't know what, I don't know.  
2 I can't, I can't, for construction not to take place in close  
3 proximity, and yet you lose the controls, the control line for a  
4 regulator, and yet the regulator opens up and feeds the entire  
5 district, it just doesn't make sense. And no professional  
6 engineer is going to pick it up. Sorry. It's not going to  
7 happen.

8 MS. GARCIA: A question, this is Anne. Is it possible, if  
9 this work was going on about 2,300 feet away from the regulator  
10 station, is it possible that another piece of work was being done  
11 right close to the regulator station?

12 MR. MADERIOS: That's the only way they could, the only it  
13 could take place. The only way it could take place.

14 MS. GARCIA: So a completely separate work crew --

15 MR. MADERIOS: Well, it doesn't have to be a separate work  
16 crew. They could, and that's what I'm saying. If they're taking  
17 on a segment of pipe, they're, the, they're taking a piece where  
18 the outlet of the regulator is attached to the rest of the system.  
19 And the piece they're taking out of service has the control lines  
20 attached to them. So that has to, that's the only way that that  
21 can happen for that amount of gas to get dumped into that system.

22 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay. And it has to be within close  
23 proximity?

24 MR. MADERIOS: Exactly.

25 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah. Okay.



1 MS. GARCIA: Because the sensing lines wouldn't be any longer  
2 than that?

3 MR. MADERIOS: That's correct.

4 MS. GARCIA: Okay. What's the maximum length for a sensing  
5 line?

6 MR. MADERIOS: There's no, there's no requirement for the  
7 maximum length, but I mean, I don't think there's a regulator  
8 sensing line that's over 100 feet long. One hundred feet would be  
9 crazy long.

10 DR. JENNER: Okay. That's all of the questions that I have.  
11 So thank you very much.

12 MR. MADERIOS: You're welcome.

13 MS. GUNARATNAM: I just had one last with, regarding  
14 emergency response.

15 BY MS. GUNARATNAM:

16 Q. Is this a procedure you've seen? It's by NiSource, called  
17 Response to Overpressure?

18 A. That's a gas standard. That's --

19 Q. That's a gas standard.

20 A. -- what I was referring to. It's --

21 Q. Okay.

22 A. This is a gas standard.

23 Q. Right. Okay. It's the one --

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. That's the one you're familiar with?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And what would have applied -- I think it's -- could you,  
3 yeah -- in this situation with the systemwide, it would have been  
4 from section 3? Or --

5 A. Three is if a meter has a service regulator.

6 DR. JENNER: This is Steve Jenner. Can I ask one more  
7 question, please?

8 MR. MADERIOS: You sure can.

9 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah. Hold one second. He's just looking  
10 over a document for me.

11 DR. JENNER: Okay.

12 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah. I'll let -- he's just confirming  
13 something and then I'll turn it over.

14 MR. MADERIOS: So it starts with number 5 --

15 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay.

16 MR. MADERIOS: -- would be where the regulator station is  
17 involved.

18 MS. GUNARATNAM: Oh okay. All right. Thanks. And, but  
19 would this also apply? Is that everything for 5 beyond?

20 MR. MADERIOS: Yep.

21 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay.

22 MR. MADERIOS: Yeah. Yes. Those --

23 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay. All right. Okay.

24 MR. MADERIOS: Those would apply.

25 MS. GUNARATNAM: Thanks. All right. Thank you. Okay,

1 Steve. Go ahead.

2 BY DR. JENNER:

3 Q. Okay. What we understand is that a project, a big project  
4 will go through different levels of review. That'd include like a  
5 peer review, and a constructability, and on some occasions M&R,  
6 and the engineer supervisor, and then it moves on. We saw, from  
7 our discussion, that M&R would have been one possibility that  
8 would have picked up that sensing lines were overlooked. Do you  
9 think there were, there's, that the other levels of review had an  
10 opportunity, a realistic opportunity to pick up that sensing lines  
11 weren't addressed in the packet?

12 A. It's possible. I mean, again, a seasoned engineer that was  
13 familiar with the infrastructure may have, may have identified it.  
14 But not a lot of people, M&R would certainly have known. If they  
15 contacted anybody from, well, any experienced person from M&R,  
16 they would have known. You know, they, the supervisor that was in  
17 charge of M&R, Jeff Croke, when I left, he would not have been  
18 able to identify. I don't, again, my, it's my opinion he would  
19 not have been able to identify that that segment of pipe was going  
20 to be an issue.

21 Q. Why is that?

22 A. Because if he's not familiar --

23 Q. Oh.

24 A. -- with, if he's not, if he is not familiar with the  
25 hydraulics of the system, the flows of the natural gas pipeline

1 infrastructure, then you're not going to pick it up.

2 Q. So this is really relying very heavily on people's, you know,  
3 valuable experience to pick it up. And it doesn't sound like it's  
4 a matter of like, a checklist items, are sensing lines involved,  
5 yes or no? It's something a little more abstract --

6 A. You're correct.

7 Q. -- relying on who's --

8 A. You're correct. The only thing that regulations may be able  
9 to set forth so that they actually identify any pressure control  
10 stations within, you know, a certain area of a construction site.

11 I think this has been an eye opener for all utilities across  
12 the country because this happened in Massachusetts. It could have  
13 happened in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, you know, anywhere in the  
14 United States. And I think this is, has opened people's eyes that  
15 okay, we need to take a little bit better look at the really  
16 critical segments of distribution system.

17 DR. JENNER: Understood. Thank you. That's all, Rachael.

18 MS. GUNARATNAM: All right. Thanks, Steve. Okay. Anymore  
19 follow, okay.

20 MS. GARCIA: No.

21 MS. GUNARATNAM: All right. This has been really good.  
22 Thank you so much for taking the time and coming to meet with us.  
23 We really appreciate it.

24 MR. MADERIOS: Okay. Again, I hope, I want to make sure this  
25 doesn't happen again. And anything we can do to make sure it

1 doesn't happen again because I'm still not right. I won't be  
2 right because it impacted way too many people, and I'm still just  
3 devastated by this whole situation.

4 And I have been one in, emergency response will tell you that  
5 regulations, whether they're federal regulations or state  
6 regulations, they're extremely important. And they are only  
7 enacted because someone got hurt or someone lost a life, and the  
8 government's trying to make sure that that doesn't happen a second  
9 time. And that's why I appreciate what you guys do and why you're  
10 here. And that's why I'm here. Because I want to help prevent  
11 that from happening again.

12 MS. GUNARATNAM: Yeah.

13 DR. JENNER: If I may insert myself here. We, after we end  
14 our interviews and piggybacking on that, if you have any thoughts  
15 about what could make the system safer, then we'd welcome them at  
16 this time.

17 MR. MADERIOS: The, again, the only thing that I just can't  
18 grasp is the noise of the station that opened up had to get  
19 somebody's attention. Because that station had to scream for an  
20 extended period of time. I mean, the noise level had to be  
21 extremely high in order for that to take place. And why that  
22 didn't get picked up, I just, I can't fathom.

23 DR. JENNER: Right.

24 MS. GARCIA: This is Anne. Just to make sure I understand.  
25 The noise would be at the regulator station?

1 MR. MADERIOS: Yes.

2 MS. GARCIA: Okay.

3 MR. MADERIOS: And most of the regulator stations in the  
4 Lawrence territory are underground, and they have a metal cover,  
5 whether it be aluminum or steel. And that would just magnify the  
6 sound. And I don't, I don't understand.

7 MS. GUNARATNAM: So you're saying the noise would have  
8 alerted someone, who then would have shut it off?

9 MR. MADERIOS: Um-hum.

10 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay.

11 MR. MADERIOS: And I don't think, in my opinion, I don't  
12 believe the existing supervisor took the notification from gas  
13 control serious enough to act according.

14 MS. GARCIA: What position was that?

15 MR. MADERIOS: The, I don't know what his official position  
16 was, but he was, I don't know, supervisor of M&R, or I don't know  
17 what his title was.

18 BY MS. GUNARATNAM:

19 Q. But he was someone in the field who would have been  
20 contacted by --

21 A. Yeah. He was, he was --


22 Q. -- control?

23 A. Gas control would have contacted him, and or they would have  
24 contacted me I'm sure. I'm sure my old cell phone number and old  
25 pager number were going crazy that day.

1 Q. Yeah.

2 A. You know, between the fire departments and gas control.


3 Q. Well, so this was in our public document on recommendations  
4 where SCADA did contact them at like 4:05. They had two alarms,  
5 4:04 and 4:05. The first 911 call was at 4:11. So that's a very  
6 short timeframe to try to do anything. So what do you think,  
7 what's your thoughts on that?

8 A. Again, that, I'm not surprised that it only took, in all my  
9 training, I taught, I taught emergency responders within   
10 minutes you're going to see fires and explosions all around you.  
11 That's exactly what happened.

12 Q. So you're saying between that time period, they could have  
13 maybe --

14 A. No. Not, in that 4 to 5 minutes, no.

15 Q. No?

16 A. But I think once gas control made the first call, if you  
17 start rolling a crew, and again, the time of day was unfortunate  
18 because I'm sure the technicians had gone home and they had to   
19 them back in. But for that widespread impact, that station had to  
20 be on for longer than 45 minutes.

21 Q. Really? Okay.

22 MS. GARCIA: Longer than 45 minutes?

23 MR. MADERIOS: Yeah.

24 BY MS. GUNARATNAM:

25 Q. Even though the high-high alarm came in just 10 minutes --

1 A. And when --

2 Q. -- 6 minutes before?

3 A. Yeah. But the, again, in a high-high alarm, you know,  
4 somebody interpreted that, well that was an equipment failure, so  
5 we're not going to respond. Then you get multiple high-high  
6 alarms, that's when, oh, that's an oh shit moment. So --

7 Q. So you think --

8 A. -- it's like we better, we better be smart. But --

9 Q. would they have gotten another alarm before that, before the  
10 high-high?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Oh, okay.

13 A. No. But they would have got many more after the high-high.

14 Q. I'm sure. Because I'm just thinking in the 6 minutes that  
15 they, before the first 911 call, what could they have done?  
16 Because it seemed like it was just, bam.

17 A. They could have stopped the construction procedure.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. They could have stopped blowing down the main.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. They were blowing down the main when that took place. If  
22 they had stopped blowing down the main and kept that pressure in  
23 the pipe, then the regulator would have seen it, and get adequate  
24 pressure, and now the regulator can close.

25 Q. Okay. And they could have done that within a few minutes?



1 A. Yeah.

2 MS. GARCIA: Yeah?

3 MR. MADERIOS: Yeah.

4 MS. GARCIA: Okay. All right.

5 MS. GUNARATNAM: Okay.

6 MS. GARCIA: Good.

7 MS. GUNARATNAM: Thank you very much. So we'll end the  
8 interview.

9 Off the record.

10 (Whereupon, the interview was concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:           MERRIMACK VALLEY RESIDENTIAL GAS  
                                  FIRES AND EXPLOSIONS  
                                  SEPTEMBER 13, 2018  
                                  Interview of Dana Argo

ACCIDENT NUMBER:           PLD18MR003

PLACE:                        Lawrence, Massachusetts

DATE:                         February 28, 2018

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.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Christy Wilson  
Transcriber