

Mr. James S. Stites
Chief, Gas Department
Utilities Division
The Public Service Commission
P.O. Drawer 11649
111 Doctors Circle
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Dear Mr. Stites:

The enclosed interpretation is in response to your letter of September 10, 1981, regarding compliance with 49 CFR 192.727(d) when a service line stop valve is closed by someone other than the operator.

Sincerely,

Melvin A. Judah
Acting Associate Director for
Pipeline Safety Regulation
Materials Transportation Bureau

Enclosure

No. 81-5
Date: Oct. 7, 1981

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION
MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION BUREAU

PIPELINE
SAFETY REGULATORY INTERPRETATION

Note: A pipeline safety regulatory interpretation applies a particular rule to a particular set of facts and circumstances, and, as such, may be relied upon only by those persons to whom the interpretation is specifically addressed.

SECTION: 192.727(d)

SUBJECT: Inactivated service line

FACTS: The stop valve at a customer meter is closed by the customer or by someone other than the operator. The operator is not told of the closing or requested to discontinue service, but discovers at a later date that the valve is closed.

QUESTION: After discovering the closed valve, does the operator have to meet the requirements of §192.727(d) regarding a discontinued service?

INTERPRETATION: Section 192.727(d) prescribes precautionary steps an operator must take "whenever service to a customer is discontinued." This regulation was established by Amendment 192-8 (37 FR 20695, October 3, 1972) to prevent accidents caused by the unauthorized reactivation of service lines that are not currently being used to provided gas service. As the regulation indicates, the potential for such accidents arises when the delivery of gas to a customer is discontinued. The potential is the same whether discontinuance results from an action by the

operator or by someone else. Thus, under the facts stated above, the operator would have to comply with §192.727(d) if the closed stop valve represented a discontinuance of service, even though the valve was closed without the operator's knowledge. Whether the closed valve amounted to a discontinuance of service, and not just a prank or temporary closure for some purpose other than termination of service to the

customer, would depend on facts that should have been ascertained by the operator after discovering the closed valve.

Melvin A. Judah
Acting Associate Director for
Pipeline Safety Regulation

September 10, 1981

Mr. Melvin A. Judah
Acting Associate Director for
Pipeline Safety Regulation
Materials Transportation Bureau
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Judah:

This is a request for your interpretation of paragraph 192.727(d) as it applies to the following situation.

The stop valve on the Company's piping at a customer measurement meter installation is closed by a customer or by someone other than the Company personnel and the Company is not notified to discontinue service to the customer. Sometime subsequent to the closing of the stop valve the Company's personnel notice that the stop valve has been closed. With regard to compliance with Paragraph 192.727(d), after the Company becomes aware of the valve closing is it required to take steps to comply with Paragraph 192.727(d) (1) (2) or (3)?

If you need additional information concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Your very truly,

James S. Stites, Chief
Gas Department
Utilities Division