

**TIM GRIFFIN**  
2ND DISTRICT, ARKANSAS  
ASSISTANT MAJORITY WHIP

**COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
Washington, DC 20515-0402

1501 NORTH UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
SUITE 150  
LITTLE ROCK, AR 72207  
PHONE: (501) 324-5941  
FAX: (501) 324-6029

1105 DEER STREET  
SUITE 12  
CONWAY, AR 72032  
PHONE: (501) 358-3481  
FAX: (501) 358-3494

1232 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515  
PHONE: (202) 225-2506  
FAX: (202) 225-5903

September 16, 2013

Gary Pruessing  
President  
ExxonMobil Pipeline Company  
800 Bell St  
Houston, TX 77002-7427

Dear Mr. Pruessing:

I write to express my continuing concern regarding the operation of the ExxonMobil Pegasus Pipeline and events that led up to the spill in Mayflower, Arkansas, on March 29, 2013.

As you are aware, ExxonMobil held a briefing on August 26, 2013, with state and local officials and me to discuss the results of the 2006 Hydrostatic Test as well as the 2010 and 2013 In-line Inspections. At this briefing, several questions were raised regarding the safety of the pipeline and precautionary measures taken to ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive areas, such as the Lake Maumelle Watershed. I request that you provide my office answers to the following questions:

1. What is the process through which ExxonMobil determines what specific locations along the Pegasus Pipeline route and other pipeline routes are high consequence and / or environmentally sensitive areas?
2. What safety measures have been implemented along the Pegasus Pipeline route and other pipeline routes that either supplement or exceed existing safety measures required by federal law and regulations?
3. It is my understanding that hydrostatic tests can be designed to 1) test the integrity of the pipeline, or 2) establish a maximum operating pressure (MOP). An integrity hydrostatic test usually targets crack threats by pressurizing the pipe to a certain percentage of its overall strength. Integrity hydrostatic tests occur at higher pressures than MOP tests. According to your briefing, the 2006 Hydrostatic test on the Pegasus Pipeline was an MOP test and the water pressure utilized was not high enough to be considered an integrity hydrostatic test for cracks. Why did ExxonMobil not utilize an integrity hydrostatic test in 2006?
4. According to the Corrective Action Order issued by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) on April 2, 2013, ExxonMobil is required to issue a "Remedial Work Plan" to include the results of the failure analyses, performance of additional field testing, inspections, and evaluations, and the performance of repairs along the affected pipeline. The work plan is required to be issued within 90 days after completing the metallurgical testing and analysis, which was completed on July 19, 2013. Is ExxonMobil on target for issuing the work plan within the allotted time?

Gary Pruessing  
September 16, 2013  
Page 2 of 2

At the August 26, 2013 briefing, I expressed the need for ExxonMobil to go above and beyond federal requirements to address safety concerns in environmentally sensitive areas along the Pipeline's route. As ExxonMobil and PHMSA continue their investigation into the Pegasus Pipeline spill in Mayflower, it is essential that the lingering questions over the safety of the Pipeline for future use are addressed.

I appreciate your consideration of these important questions as we work towards ensuring the safety of this Pipeline and the safety of the drinking water for more than 400,000 Arkansans.

Please send your answers to my questions to Peter Comstock in my Washington, D.C. office at [Peter.Comstock@mail.house.gov](mailto:Peter.Comstock@mail.house.gov). Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Tim", with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Tim Griffin  
Member of Congress