

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION)
BY THE UNION LIGHT, HEAT AND)
POWER COMPANY FOR PERMISSION TO) CASE NO. 94-039
DEVIATE FROM RULE 807 KAR 5:022,)
ODORIZATION OF GAS, SECTION 13,)
PARAGRAPH 17)

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that The Union Light, Heat and Power Company ("ULH&P") shall file the original and seven copies of the following information with the Commission, with a copy to all parties of record within 15 days of the date of this Order. Each copy of the data requested should be appropriately numbered. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided in the event a public hearing is held.

1. When were the operations of the monitoring systems for the Alexandria and Cold Spring odorization stations started?

2. Provide odorant testing records at points related to the Alexandria and Cold Spring stations for the last 12 months. Include the date, location, gas concentration in gas/air mixture, and the odorant injection rate (pounds per million cubic feet).

3. Identify the type of odorant used at the Alexandria Station, the Cold Spring Station, and in the propane injected during periods of peak shaving.

4. Provide the amounts of propane injected into ULH&P's system and the air/propane ratio for each injection made between January 1992 and the present.

5. Provide the odorant testing records downstream of propane injection points during injection and the next testing date after the injection and compare the results to the testing records prior to propane injection.

6. Quantify any cost savings which result from testing for odor on a bimonthly instead of weekly basis.

7. Provide any studies showing that, at a fixed odorant/gas injection ratio, the same concentration of gas is detected at all the farthest points from the Alexandria and Cold Spring stations.

8. Provide evidence that bimonthly odorant testing provides the same safety and integrity measurement from gas leaks as the weekly testing.

9. What is the basis for choosing bimonthly odor detection testing?

10. What is the cost of the odorant?

11. What are the cost savings if ULH&P keeps the odorant detection level close to one percent by volume of gas to a gas/air ratio and the tests are carried out weekly?

12. Will ULH&P consider improving its Control Center and odorization stations by adding the following:

a. Monitoring the odorant level or capacity in the storage tanks from the Control Center?

b. Installing a standby odorant pump that can be operated from the Control Center in case of failure of the main pump?

c. Lighting and monitoring the stations by a television camera?

d. Installing a sight level gauge on the odorant tank?

e. Improving the flare systems in the odorization stations to assure their integrity and safe operation?

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 24th day of March, 1994.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director