

BEFORE THE
STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of
Corning Natural Gas Corporation

Case 08-G-1137

February 2009

Prepared Exhibits of Gas Safety
Panel:

Kevin Speicher
Utility Supervisor (Safety),
Office of Electric, Gas, & Water

Christopher R. Stolicky
Utility Engineer 3 (Safety)
Office of Electric, Gas, & Water

Brett Mahan
Utility Engineer 2 (Safety)
Office of Electric, Gas, & Water

State of New York
Department of Public Service
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223-1350

**CASE 08-G-1137
CORNING GAS - RATES**

**STATE OF NEW YORK
STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

INTERROGATORY / DOCUMENT REQUEST

Request No.: DPS-136
Requested By: Gas Safety Panel
Date of Request: January 6, 2009
Witness: Matt Cook
Subject: SCADA Procedures

- A. Does Corning Natural Gas currently have procedures in its Operations and Maintenance Plan and/or Emergency Plan that detail how the operator uses SCADA and responds to pipeline characteristics monitored by its SCADA system?
- B. If so, please provide all procedures that detail how the SCADA system is used and operated (include required procedures to respond to alarms, current alarm set points, etc.)
- C. If the company currently has procedures that address SCADA, will these procedures be altered with the proposed SCADA system upgrades? If so, how?

Response:

- A. The Company currently does not have procedures in its Operations and Maintenance Plan and/or Emergency Plan that detail how the operator uses SCADA and responds to pipeline characteristics monitored by its SCADA system. The Company, however, plans to produce a written procedure by the end of the third quarter of 2009.
- B. As mentioned above, the Company does not have a written procedure in place. The SCADA system is monitored during business hours by Company employees. After hours the system is monitored by the SCADA computer that is programmed to alarm one of several designated employees by phone. Those employees have the ability to connect to the SCADA computer via the internet to monitor the system and review alarms.
- C. As mentioned above, the Company does not have a written procedure in place. As noted in the response to Part H of Interrogatory DPS-125 and Part B of Interrogatory DPS-135, these upgrades consist of the replacement of three existing RTUs in three stations. It is anticipated that no additional control points will be added; therefore, a change in procedure would not be required.

Name of Respondent: Matt J. Cook
Position of Respondent: Vice President – Operations
Date: January 8, 2009

**CASE 08-G-1137
CORNING GAS - RATES**

**STATE OF NEW YORK
STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

INTERROGATORY / DOCUMENT REQUEST

Request No.: DPS-75
Requested By: Gas Safety Panel
Date of Request: November 14, 2008
Witness: Matt Cook
Subject: Forecasted Leak Reduction


Please explain how your testimony was filed in September 2008 but your Exhibit CNG-12 (Page 1 of 1) forecasts zero leaks found for September, October, November, and December 2008.

Response:

The graph contained in Exhibit CNG-12 depicts the Type 1, 2 and 2A leaks found by month for 2008 through the month of September. When the data for the graph were compiled, zeros were placed in the months of September through December since obviously these months had not yet been completed. The intent was not to present a forecast of leaks for the remainder of the year. This graph has been revised and is attached hereto as Attachment DPS-75.

Name of Respondent: Matt J. Cook
Position of Respondent: Vice President - Operations
Date: December 3, 2008

NOTICE: This report is required by 49 CFR Part 191. Failure to report may result in a civil penalty not to exceed \$100,000 for each violation per Form Approved for each day the violation continues up to a maximum of \$1,000,000 as provided in 49 USC 60122. OMB No. 2137-0522



U.S. Department of Transportation
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials
Safety Administration

ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2007

GAS DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

INITIAL REPORT

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

PART A - OPERATOR INFORMATION

1. NAME OF OPERATOR
CORNING NATURAL GAS CORP

2. LOCATION OF OFFICE WHERE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE OBTAINED
330 WEST WILLIAM STREET
Number and Street
CORNING STEUBEN
City and County
NY 14830
State and Zip Code

DOT USE ONLY 20070879 -- 7760

3. OPERATOR'S 5 DIGIT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
 / / 2800 / /

4. HEADQUARTERS NAME & ADDRESS, IF DIFFERENT

Number and Street

City and County

State and Zip Code

5. STATE IN WHICH SYSTEM OPERATES: NY / (provide a separate report for each state in which system operates)

PART B - SYSTEM DESCRIPTION Report miles of main and number of services in system at end of year.

1. GENERAL

	STEEL				PLASTIC	CAST/ WROUGHT IRON	DUCTIL E IRON	COPPER	OTHER	OTHER	TOTAL
	UNPROTECTED		CATHODICALLY PROTECTED								
	BARE	COATED	BARE	COATED							
MILES OF MAIN	65	36	29	109	86	0	0	0	0	0	325
NO. OF SERVICES	1886	3384	0	365	9459	0	0	0	0	0	15014

2. MILES OF MAINS IN SYSTEM AT END OF YEAR

MATERIAL	UNKNOWN	2" OR LESS	OVER 2" THRU 4"	OVER 4" THRU 8"	OVER 8" THRU 12"	OVER 12"	TOTAL
STEEL	0	46	84	82	32	6	250
DUCTILE IRON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COPPER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAST/WROUGHT IRON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PLASTIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1. PVC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. PE	0	40	21	8	6	0	75
3. ABS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYSTEM TOTALS	0	86	105	90	38	6	325

3. NUMBER OF SERVICES IN SYSTEM AT END OF YEAR AVERAGE SERVICE LENGTH 58 FEET

MATERIAL	UNKNOWN	1" OR LESS	OVER 1" THRU 2"	OVER 2" THRU 4"	OVER 4" THRU 8"	OVER 8"	TOTAL
STEEL	1262	2647	2017	346	137	0	6409
DUCTILE IRON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COPPER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAST/WROUGHT IRON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PLASTIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1. PVC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. PE	902	3733	3425	391	234	0	8685
3. ABS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYSTEM TOTALS	2164	6380	5442	737	371	0	15094

4. MILES OF MAIN AND NUMBER OF SERVICES BY DECADE OF INSTALLATION										
	UN-KNOWN	PRE-1940	1940-1949	1950-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	1980-1989	1990-1999	2000-2009	TOTAL
MILES OF MAIN	0	59.6	8.5	110.1	73	17.5	34	7	15.3	323
NUMBER OF SERVICES	3357	7565	2567	855	465	91	66	42	86	15091

PART C - TOTAL LEAKS ELIMINATED/REPAIRED DURING YEAR			PART D - TOTAL NUMBER OF LEAKS ON FEDERAL LAND REPAIRED OR SCHEDULED FOR REPAIR	
CAUSE OF LEAK	Mains	Services	0	
	CORROSION	257		
NATURAL FORCES	0	0		
EXCAVATION	0	0		
OTHER OUTSIDE FORCE DAMAGE	6	7		
MATERIAL OR WELDS	0	0		
EQUIPMENT	0	0		
OPERATIONS	0	0		
OTHER	0	0		
NUMBER OF KNOWN SYSTEM LEAKS AT END OF YEAR SCHEDULED FOR REPAIR <u>208</u>			PART E - PERCENT OF UNACCOUNTED FOR GAS Unaccounted for gas as a percent of total input for the 12 months ending June 30 of the reporting year. [(Purchased gas + produced gas) minus (customer use + company use + appropriate adjustments)] divided by (purchased gas + produced gas) equals percent unaccounted for. Input for year ending 6/30 <u>2.4</u> %.	

PART F - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	

PART G - PREPARER AND AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE	
<u>AL HORNING</u> (type or print) Preparer's Name and Title	<u>6079363755</u> Area Code and Telephone Number
<u>AHORNING@CORNINGGAS.COM</u> Preparer's email address	<u>6079622844</u> Area Code and Facsimile Number
<u>SAFETY AND TRAINING SUPERVISOR</u> Name and Title of Person Signing	<u>6079363755</u> Area Code and Telephone Number
_____ Authorized Signature	

**CASE 08-G-1137
CORNING GAS - RATES**

**STATE OF NEW YORK
STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

INTERROGATORY / DOCUMENT REQUEST

Request No.: DPS-131
Requested By: Gas Safety Panel
Date of Request: December 23, 2008
Witness: Matt Cook
Subject: Cathodic Protection Program

- A. Referring to IR DPS-76, please provide the response to Question D. that was asked on November 14, 2008, for which the Company has yet to answer.
- B. Beginning in Case 02-G-0003 Corning has been required to evaluate and protect where economically feasible 8 miles of unprotected coated steel pipe each year since 2003. Evaluating 8 miles of pipe each year through 2008 means Corning evaluated 48 miles of pipe. According to the inventory of unprotected coated steel pipe inventory reported in Case 02-G-0003, Corning has 38 miles at the end of 2002. According to the USDOT Form PHMSA F 71000.1-1, Corning finished 2007 with 36 miles of unprotected coated steel pipe.
- i. Please explain why the company has evaluated more of this pipe than it has in inventory.
 - ii. Please explain why the quantity of pipe protected was not removed from this category and moved into the category of Coated Protected Steel, if it was actually protected.
 - iii. Please explain why the quantity of pipe evaluated was not removed from this category and moved into the category of Unprotected Bare Steel, if it was actually evaluated.

Response:

- A. Please see the response to part B.i., below.
- B. i. While the Company believes that it has complied in good faith with the survey and protection requirements referenced in the question, it appears that inadequate recordkeeping in the past has produced potential anomalies between actual and recorded mileages. To address this situation, the Company is in the process of inventorying its mains, which will result in corrections to the lengths of main

- 2 -

reported on USDOT Form PHMSA F 7100.1-1. The intent is to have the entire mains inventory completed prior to the submittal of the 2008 F 7100.1-1.

The Company has completed the inventory of coated unprotected mains and, as of the beginning of 2006, the amount remaining (reported on the DOT form) should have been 44.8 miles. Since 2006, the Company has evaluated 24.6 miles and has found 17.7 miles of that pipe to be not economically feasible to protect. Accordingly, at year-end 2008, the Company had 37.9 miles of coated unprotected main in inventory. Beginning January 2009, the Company will have 20.2 miles of coated unprotected main and 3,304 services remaining to be evaluated.

- ii. Due to record maintenance issues noted in the response to part B.i., above, the inventory reported in USDOT Form F7100.1-1 requires correction. For year-end 2008, Corning will add 6.9 miles of newly protected pipe, the difference between 24.6 miles and 17.7 miles, to the Coated Protected category on the DOT Form.
- iii. The question asks why the evaluated quantity of pipe was not moved to Unprotected Bare Steel, if actually evaluated. The pipe that is the subject of this interrogatory is Coated Unprotected; hence, the focus has been on pipe that is coated. Accordingly, throughout this study, one would not expect to find, nor has the Company found, any pipe that is uncoated. The Company's premise is that any pipe remaining in this category on the USDOT Form F7100.1-1 will be Coated Unprotected that is not economically feasible to protect and, therefore, would not be moved to Unprotected Bare Steel.

Name of Respondent: Matt J. Cook
Position of Respondent: Vice President - Operations
Date: January 5, 2009