American Petroleum Institute

26_RP11XX_LCMPR_1Ed_Revision

FM-3003

Standards Resource & Research Request (SR^3) Form

Pipeline Standards / Committee on Pipeline Standards

Revision: 0.0
Date: 11/04/2026

Document Information

Standard Designation:	**RP 1160**										
Title:	**Managing System Integrity for Hazardous Liquids Pipelines**										
Edition:	**1**										
Budget Year:	2027										
Committee/Subcommittee/Group: (check all that apply if a joint project)	**SMS VG**		**Public Awareness & Engagement VG**		**Cybernetics VG**		**Operator Qualifications VG**				
	Pipeline Integrity VG	X	**Emergency Response VG**		**Construction & Operations VG**		**Underground Storage VG**				
	Gathering Lines VG		**Environment, Health & Safety VG**		**COPS**		**Cybersecurity VG**				
Priority Matrix Ranking: (to be completed by API Staff)		**Priority 1 (Rank 10-15)**		**Priority 2 (Rank 7-9)**		X	**Priority 3 (Rank ≤6)**				
API Climate Action Framework (To be completed by API Staff Should be filled out before policy committee approval)		**#1 Accelerate Technology & Innovation**		**#2 Mitigate Emissions from Operations**		**#4 Advance Cleaner Fuels**			**#5 Support GHG/Climate Reporting**		
UN Sustainable Development Goal (to be completed by API Staff)		**#7 Access to Energy**		**#8 Economic Growth**	x	**#9 Resilient Infrastructure**			**Other**		
API Energy Excellence Program (to be completed by API Staff)		**Yes**	x	**No**							
Proposed Action:		**New Standard**			X	**Revise Current Standard**					
		Withdraw Current Standard				**Research Only**					
Proposed Funding Type:		**Budget Request**				**Special Solicitation**					
Total Funding Request (Parts A & B)**:**	**$**	**0**									
Name of Submitter(s):	Nicholas Montebello										
Date:	09 November 2026										

Part A – Resource Plan

I. Background and Information:

1. **Explain the business need for the proposed action.** Indicate potential cost savings to industry where possible.

API RP 1160 is being considered for Incorporation by Reference (IBR) in pipeline safety regulations at 49 CFR §195 for hazardous liquid pipelines under the repair criteria Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM). In the NPRM, PHMSA has proposed to IBR Section 9.2.3 of RP 1160 as the basis for anomaly response in non-HCAs, which is a new regulatory requirement. Recent revisions to RP 1176, continuing work on revisions to RP 1183, industry research results, and liquid industry comments submitted to PHMSA in response to the NPRM are in conflict with Section 9.2.3 and updates to the RP are needed in the near-term pending final PHMSA rulemaking on anomaly response criteria. If RP 1160 were IBR, the

financial impact to the industry will be significant, on the order of hundreds of millions of dollars based on industry cost-benefit analysis related to the impact of the rulemaking.

The work will be focused on updates to Section 9.2.3. and will be developed by pipeline operating company integrity management SMEs. The revisions will be largely based on work completed by industry IM SMEs through preparing comments to PHMSA's proposed rulemaking.

2. What is the scope of the standard?

RP 1160 is applicable to pipeline systems used to transport hazardous liquids as defined in U.S. Title 49 CFR Part 195.2. The use of RP 1160is not limited to pipelines regulated under 49 CFR 195 and the principles embodied in integrity management are applicable to all pipeline systems. The RP is specifically designed to provide the operator with a description of industry-proven practices in pipeline integrity management. The RP is largely targeted to onshore pipelines along the right-of-way, but the process and approach can be applied to pipeline facilities, including pipeline stations, terminals, and delivery facilities associated with pipeline systems. Certain sections of this RP provide guidance specific to pipeline stations, terminals, and delivery facilities.

3. Is this standard on the work program of another standards development organization (SDO)?

Yes		No	X

If yes, specify SDO and standard designation/project title/contact

If yes, is the work being coordinated with the appropriate group? Are there special circumstances that would justify independent API initiation of the proposed action?

4. Are a volunteer chair and group of experts available to perform the proposed action?

Please include names and company affiliation and indicate chair, if available.

Matthew Thompson, Enbridge
Yvan Hubert, Enbridge
Kristen Shnipke, Marathon
Matt Young, ExxonMobil
Munendra Tomare, TC Energy
Yohann Miglis, Kinder Morgan
Justin Harkrader, Shell
Stephen Thomas, Colonial Pipeline
Fernando Curiel, bp

5. Is there a need to commit resources to supplement the development of the draft? Would a paid content specialist accelerate progress on the development/revision? Is there a readily available content specialist?

No.

6. **Are there special format requirements for final document, i.e. knowledge of ISO template required), significant graphics, photos or equations) required that would need extraordinary resources?**

Yes		No	x

If Yes, please provide details:

7. **Please provide any other information that is pertinent to the proposed action.**

8. **What are the implications of not initiating the proposed action?** Include potential safety, reliability, environmental and financial impacts that may arise.

If RP 1160 is IBR in its current form, the cost impact for responding to anomalies in non-HCAs would be significant. The criteria should not be more stringent than those established for HCAs.

9. **Is there research proposed to accomplish the proposed action?**

Yes		No	x
If yes, complete Part B of this form.			

II. Project Timing

Proposed start date:	11/9/2026	**Proposed date draft will be ready for letter ballot:**	Q4 2027
TG/WG: (estimated number of volunteers needed)	50	**Content Management:** ($ amount "if needed" or volunteer)	

PART B – Research Plan

I. Background and Information

1. **Proposed Research Title:**

2. **Proposed Project Scope:**

3. **Research Amount:**

$	

4. **What is the business need for the proposed research?**

5. **Is the proposed research edition-specific for a single standard or will it result in technology enhancement for multiple standards?**

Yes		No	
If multiple standards, please cite the standards effected:			

6. **Research Timing:**

	Research is necessary prior to scheduled revision.		Research can be done concurrent with revision.

7. **How does the research support the proposed action identified in Part A?**

8. **Is a joint industry project (JIP) a possibility?**

Yes		No	
If Yes, with whom?			

9. **Are there opportunities for leveraged research with other organizations?**

Yes		No	
What organizations?			

10. **What are the implications of not performing the proposed research?**

II. Dates and Funding:

Estimated Completion Date	Prior Research Funding Requested		Anticipated Future Research Funding Needs					
	$		Year 2: $		Year 3: $		Year 4: $	

PART C – Proposal Feedback/Approval Information

For API Use ONLY

COPS comments to Proposer/WG:	
Date approved by COPS:	
Date entered into API Publications DB:	