





State Presentation - Connecticut

October 10, 2018 Karl Baker 2018 Pipeline Safety Seminar Meredith, NH



Personnel

- Program Manager Karl Baker 25 years
- Engineer 3 Bruce Benson 21 years
- Engineer 3 Daniel Nivison 20 years
- Engineer 2 John DePaolo 8 years
- Engineer 2 Kevin Dowling 5 years
- Engineer 1 Daniel Tomasino 5 years
- Engineer Intern Sean Morris 6 months



Cast Iron & Unprotected Steel

Start of Year	Cast Iron Main	Unprotected Bare or Coated Steel Main	Leak Prone Steel Services	
	Miles	Miles	Quantity	
2013	1426	221	71016	
2014	1381	218	67621	
2015	1349	205	65146	
2016	1298	196	62077	
2017	1251	188	57631	
Mains – 18% leak prone Services – 13% leak prone				



Accelerated Infrastructure Replacement

• 20-year or less time frame

• DIMP trackers



Enforcement Issues

Recent Top Enforcement Issues

- 1. 192.11 propane facility issues NFPA 58 violations
- 192.605(a)/13(c) not following procedures or bad/no procedures
- 3. 192.JOINING 283, 285, 287



Civil Penalties

Year	Number Assessed	Dollars Assessed	Number Collected	Dollars Collected
2013	10	\$292,000	11	\$309,479
2014	3	\$31,500	2	\$19,021
2015	16	\$447,250	16	\$462,250
2016	38	\$294,375	26	\$180,025
2017	45	\$370,200	53	\$492,600



- \$60,000 - lack of PPE and lack of inspection





- \$50,000 - connected air compressor to live main







- \$7,000, \$14,000, \$14,000, \$30,000 and \$50,000 – propane field installation violations





- \$50,000 - pipe joining AOCs







- \$75,000 – not qualified to join nor to perform PT







— \$50,000 - clearance





- \$25,000 - corrosion technician not OQ'ed







\$50,000 – not qualified to join with inspector watching







 \$10,000 – failure to day-light crossings while using trenchless technology





– \$75,000 – failure to install split sleeves at sheer points





MDPE Tees on HDPE Mains

Problem started in 2004



- Company found problem in 2011
- Operator lied (more than once) to PURA during 2017 O&M Audit
- Senior Director of Gas Operations and O&M
 Manager terminated
- Excavated 616 tees
- Replaced 124 tees



MDPE Tees on HDPE Mains

- 113 counts of 49 CFR 192.603(b) in that the
 Operator failed to keep accurate MAOP records
- 113 counts of 49 CFR 192.619(a)(1) and 192.621(a)(1) in that the operating pressure exceeded the MDPE tee design pressure
- 113 counts of 49 CFR 192.703(b) for failing to replace, repair or remove from service each segment of pipeline that becomes unsafe



MDPE Tees on HDPE Mains

- 120 counts of 49 CFR 192.739(a)(3) in that the overpressure control set-points at gate/DR stations were not set properly
- 113 counts of 49 CFR 192.805(b) in that a deficient OQ program did not ensure that individuals were qualified to recognize and react to AOCs, specifically the installation of fittings not rated for the operating pressures



MDPE Tees on HDPE Mains

- 113 counts of 49 CFR 192.805(h) in that the OQ program did not provide adequate training
- 113 counts of Conn. Agencies Regs. §16-11-42(a) in that the Operator failed to use every effort to properly protect the public from danger and exercise due care to reduce the hazards to which employees, customers and others were subjected



MDPE Tees on HDPE Mains

- Total cost to shareholders >\$4.7 million
 - Civil Penalty of \$1.5 million
 - Up to \$600,000 can be used for GIS
 - Up to \$150,000 can be used for pilot program
 - Not allowed to retain any recovered money
 - If any recovery, must be returned to ratepayers
 - Not allowed to recover any costs ≈\$3 million
 - Includes, but not limited to: outside counsel, outside investigation, remediation, GIS or pilot program
 - PURA directed Management Audit ≈\$200,000



One-Call

Year	Total Locate Requests	Total Damages per 1,000 Locates	Total Gas Damages per 1,000 Locates	Total Gas Damages due to Utility Error per 1,000 Locates	Total Fines Collected
2012	173,000	3.03	1.6	0.6	\$156,000
2013	182,177	3.11	1.6	0.4	\$117,000
2014	189,366	2.86	1.5	0.4	\$110,350
2015	201,945	2.89	1.4	0.4	\$134,100
2016	206,131	2.60	1.4	0.4	\$135,300
2017	215,630	2.17	1.5	0.5	\$299,500



Propane

- Jurisdictional propane operators 24
- Jurisdictional systems ≈350

We have inspected every <u>known</u> operator
 Please let us know if someone is out there that we do not know about

• We are not going to be your code compliance department!



Propane

- 12/4/2017 PHMSA interpretation sent to AmeriGas, clearly states that under 49 CFR 192.625(f), LP operators must conduct periodic sampling of combustible gases using an instrument capable of determining the percentage of gas in air at which the odor becomes readily detectable
- However, neither the interpretation nor 192.625 states where the sampling is performed



Propane

 1/12/18 - CT PURA asks if the sampling can take place at the bulk plants

 9/24/18 – PHMSA interpretation sent to CT PURA says NO. Sampling must be performed in the pipeline system to ensure the entire pipeline system has the required odorant levels



Incidents

NONE!



Coming up...

Legislative Proposal



Questions?

Karl Baker Public Utilities Supervisor of Technical Analysis karl.baker@ct.gov 860-827-2661

