COMMISSIONERS

JASON SHAW , Chairman
FITZ JOHNSON , Vice-Chairman
TIM G. ECHOLS
LAUREN "BUBBA" McDONALD
TRICIA PRIDEMORE

REECE McALISTER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MICHELLE THEBERT
FACILITIES PROTECTION UNIT DIRECTOR

FILED
APR 2 2 2026
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
GPSC

Georgia Public Service Commission

(404) 463-6526
(800) 282-5813

244 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334-5701

FAX: (404) 463-6532
psc.ga.gov

DOCKET# 37023
DOCUMENT# 226320

Docket No. 37023

City of Ashburn Gas Department
P. O. Box 766
Ashburn, GA 31714

REF: Follow Up Inspection # JJ25-038

☐ Certified Mail ☐ Regular Mail ☒ Email

Attention: Mr. Daryl Hall

On June 9, 2025, a representative of the Georgia Public Service Commission Pipeline Safety/Facilities Protection Office conducted an on-site inspection of your gas system and found that previously identified probable violation(s) of the Pipeline Safety Regulations have either been cleared or are continuing, as identified below.

- ☒ Previously existing probable violation(s) has/have been cleared.
- ☒ Previously existing probable violation(s) still exist.
- ☐ Additional Enforcement
  - ☐ Notice of Proposed Violation
  - ☐ Notice of Proposed Violation with Proposed Civil Penalty
  - ☐ Warning Letter
  - ☐ Letter of Concern
  - ☐ Observed Issue
- ☐ Consent Agreement Pending

The enclosed inspection report numbered JJ25-038 is provided for your information and file.

Please review and respond to this report in accordance with the attached Instructions for Responding to Enforcement Actions, Enforcement Letters, and Notifications Issued by the Georgia Public Service Commission. Please refer to Docket No. 37023 in your response.

Please let me know if there are any questions concerning this report at (404) 985-4271 or mthebert@psc.ga.gov. Thank you for your continuing contribution toward increased pipeline safety.

Sincerely,

Michelle Thebert
Michelle L. Thebert
Director, Office of Pipeline Safety/Facilities Protection

COMMISSIONERS

JASON SHAW , Chairman
LAUREN "BUBBA" McDONALD , Vice-Chairman
PETER HUBBARD
DR. ALICIA M. JOHNSON
TRICIA PRIDEMORE

REECE McALISTER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MICHELLE THEBERT
FACILITIES PROTECTION UNIT DIRECTOR

Georgia Public Service Commission

(404) 463-6526
(800) 282-5813

244 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334-5701

FAX: (404) 463-6532
psc.ga.gov

REPORT OF NATURAL GAS SAFETY

INSPECTION NO: JJ25-038

OPERATOR: City of Ashburn Gas Department

INVESTIGATOR: Joe Jones

INSPECTION DATE: June 9, 2025 REPORT MAILED DATE: April 16, 2026

Any questions concerning this report may be directed to the above address or by telephoning (404) 463-6526.

1. PURPOSE OF INSPECTION

To conduct a follow-up inspection of the Operators previously existing probable violations.

2. CONTINUING VIOLATIONS

Violation	Description	Inspection#	Date
192.616(e)	The program must include activities to advise affected municipalities, school districts,...	DL24-031	8/28/2024

3. CLEARED VIOLATIONS

Cleared on 6/9/2025

Violation	Description	Inspection#	Date
192.615(c)	Each operator shall establish and maintain liaison with appropriate fire, police, and other...	DL24-031	8/28/2024
192.616(c)	The operator must follow the general program recommendations, including baseline and supplemental...	DL24-031	8/28/2024

4. NEW VIOLATIONS

Violation	Description	Inspection#	Date
Consent Agreement Pending	Operator is negotiating Consent Agreement with the FPU Director	JJ25-038	6/9/2025

5. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS

SEE ATTACHED INSPECTION REPORT

CITY OF ASHBURN / FOLLOW UP INSPECTION
INSPECTION NUMBER JJ25-038 / DOCKET NUMBER 37023

On June 9, 2025, Staff contacted the City of Ashburn to perform a follow-up inspection of the Operator's previously existing probable violations. This inspection was conducted in conjunction with the Comprehensive inspection. (Inspection # JJ25-039). The Exit meeting was held on June 18, 2025.

During this inspection the Operator was represented by:
Adam Lavender – Utilities Superintendent
Mike Hudson – MGAG/SRCS (Consultant)
Wade Sharpe – MGAG/SRCS (Consultant)

Commission Staff were represented by:
Joe Jones – Lead Inspector
Chuck Whitaker – Pipeline Safety Inspector

At the time of this inspection, the City of Ashburn natural gas system was under three (3) previously existing probable violations. Staff reviewed this probable violation with the Operator and determined that:

PROBABLE VIOLATIONS CLEARED

1. In regard to the notice of probable violation of 49CFR §192.615(c) which was cited in Inspection Number DL24-031; in that inspection Staff stated:

   "STAFFS COMMENTS: PHMSA PAP inspection form question #11 & 20 states - Do records indicate liaisons established and maintained with appropriate fire, police, other public officials, and 911 emergency call centers in accordance with procedures?

   During this inspection, the Operator provided documentation showing they e-mailed information to the emergency officials and public official groups in CY's 2019 - 2022. They attached PAP material/messaging to the e-mail. The City of Ashburn Gas Department had no records to demonstrate that there had been a 2023 mail out for a meeting, nor had they included the public officials with the City of Sycamore in any of their mailouts. Also, at the time of this inspection, the City of Ashburn were not a member of GPERI.

   PROBABLE VIOLATION: The City of Ashburn Gas System failed to provide records that demonstrated that they have established and maintained liaison with appropriate emergency and public officials as required by §192.615(c)."

   OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number (Ref: Inspection Number DL24-031), dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated that: "The City of Ashburn (Ashburn) provides the following status to the Probable Violation of 192.615(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28, 2024. Ashburn will establish Liaison with the City of Sycamore by December 31, 2025."

   FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had established Liaison with the City of Sycamore.

   Staff determined that this probable violation could be cleared at this time.

2. In regard to the notice of probable violation of 49CFR §192.616(c) which was cited in Inspection Number DL24-031; in that inspection Staff stated:

"Based on the deficiencies identified in the PHMSA Public Awareness Program Effectiveness Inspection form, the City of Ashburn has failed to conduct a Public Awareness Program as required by 49CFR §192.616."

Staff proposed a civil penalty of $5,000 for this violation.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCIES

a) PHMSA PAP inspection form question #10:
Did the delivery of materials and messages meet or exceed the baseline delivery frequencies specified in API RP 1162, Table 2-1 through Table 2.3?

STAFFS COMMENTS: During this inspection, Staff asked for various documentation that would illustrate the delivery of public awareness material/messages to all stakeholder audience members. In CY's 2019 - 2022, the Operator e-mailed emergency officials and public officials' information regarding awareness of natural gas. The Operator was not able to provide documentation showing any sort of delivery in CY2023 for any group. There was also no documentation to indicate that they had ever included the public officials with the City of Sycamore in any of their mailouts.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: Ashburn Gas System failed to ensure delivery of public awareness material/messages met or exceed the baseline frequencies specified in API RP 1162 for Emergency and Public Officials.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had established Liaison with the City of Sycamore and all emergency and public officials.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

b) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question #15 - Has an audit or review of the operator's program implementation been performed annually since the program was developed?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not provide documentation which demonstrated that they had conducted an annual review of their PAP for CY2023.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct an annual review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Section 8.3.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed annual reviews of their PAP plan.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

c) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 18: Evaluating Program Effectiveness
Do records indicate program effectiveness evaluation(s) have been performed and cover all program requirements and all systems covered by the program?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not demonstrate they had conducted their 4-year evaluation that was due in CY2022. The last 4-year evaluation was done in CY2018.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct a 4-year review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Section 8.4.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed 4-year evaluations with all stakeholder audience.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

d) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 19: Measure Program Outreach
In evaluating effectiveness, was actual program outreach for each stakeholder audience tracked?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not demonstrate they had conducted their 4-year evaluation that was due in CY2022. The last 4-year evaluation was done in CY2018.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct a 4-year review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Section 8.4.1.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed 4-year evaluations with all stakeholder audience.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

e) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 20. Measure Understandability of Message Content
In evaluating program effectiveness, was the percentage of each stakeholder audience that understood and retained the key information from the messages determined?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not demonstrate they had conducted their 4-year evaluation that was due in CY2022. The last 4-year evaluation was done in CY2018.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct a 4-year review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Section 8.4.2.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed 4-year evaluations with all stakeholder audience.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

f) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 21. Measure Desired Stakeholder Behavior
In evaluating program effectiveness, was evaluation made of whether appropriate preventive, response, and mitigative behaviors were understood and likely to be exhibited?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not demonstrate they had conducted their 4-year evaluation that was due in CY2022. The last 4-year evaluation was done in CY2018.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct a 4-year review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Section 8.4.3.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed 4-year evaluations with all stakeholder audience.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

g) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 22. Measure Bottom-Line Results
Were bottom-line results of the program measured by tracking third-party incidents and consequences including: (1) near misses, (2) excavation damages resulting in pipeline failures, (3) excavation damages that do not result in pipeline failures?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not demonstrate they had conducted their 4-year evaluation that was due in CY2022. The last 4-year evaluation was done in CY2018.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct a 4-year review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Section 8.4.4.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed 4-year evaluations with all stakeholder audience.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

h) PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 23. Program Changes
Were needed changes and/or modifications to the program identified and documented based on the results and findings of the program effectiveness evaluations?

STAFFS COMMENTS: The City of Ashburn could not demonstrate they had conducted their 4-year evaluation that was due in CY2022. The last 4-year evaluation was done in CY2018.

OBSERVED DEFICIENCY: The City of Ashburn failed to conduct a 4-year review of their PAP as required by §192.616(c) and API RP 1162 Sections 2.7 and 8.5.

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated: "The City of Ashburn requests an Informal Conference to discuss the Probable Violation of 192.616(c) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28,2024."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had performed 4-year evaluations with all stakeholder audience.

Staff determined that this deficiency has been addressed.

Staff determined that the Operator has addressed the deficiencies associated with this probable violation, and that the violation could be cleared at this time; however, the Operator will still need to address the outstanding proposed civil penalty with the Director.

PROBABLE VIOLATION CONTINUING

In regard to the notice of probable violation of 49CFR §192.616(e) which was cited in Inspection Number DL24-031; in that inspection Staff stated:

"PHMSA PAP inspection form Question 5
Do records identify the individual stakeholders in the four affected stakeholder audience groups: Affected Public, Emergency Officials, Local Public Officials, and Excavators, as well as affected municipalities, school districts, businesses, and residents to which it sends public awareness materials and messages?

STAFFS COMMENTS: During this inspection, the Operator provided documentation showing they e-mailed information to the emergency officials and public official groups in CY's 2019 - 2022. They attached PAP material/messaging to the e-mail. The City of Ashburn Gas Department had no records to demonstrate that there had been a 2023 mail out for a meeting, nor had they included the public officials with the City of Sycamore in any of their mailouts. Also, at the time of this inspection, the City of Ashburn were not a member of GPERI.

PROBABLE VIOLATION: The City of Ashburn Gas System failed to provide records that demonstrated that they have established and maintained liaison with appropriate emergency and public officials as required by §192.615(c)."

OPERATOR RESPONSE: In their response letter to Inspection Number DL24-031, dated May 21, 2025, the City of Ashburn stated:

"The City of Ashburn (Ashburn) questions the accuracy of the Probable Violation 192.616(e) cited in Inspection Report DL24-031 conducted on August 28, 2024. In that Inspection, PSC Staff (Staff) quoted Question 5 from the PHMSA Public Awareness (PAP) inspection form – "do records identify the individual stakeholders in the four stakeholder audience groups" and cited the Probable Violation as "The City of Ashburn Gas System failed to provide records that demonstrated that they have established and maintained liaison with appropriate emergency and public officials as required by 192.615(c)". Ashburn reads question 5 on the PHMSA PAP Inspection form as "Audience Identification" (see attached) for PAP messaging as required under 192.616 with no relation to establishing and maintaining liaison as required under 192.615. Inspection Report DL24-032 already cites failure to establish and maintain liaison under NOPV 1 and failure to deliver messaging under NOVP 2. Ashburn respectfully requests clarification on this Probable Violation, or the clearing of it."

FOLLOWUP INSPECTION: During this inspection (JJ25-038), the Operator provided Staff with documentation where they had established Liaison with the City of Sycamore and sent all required information to stakeholder audiences in 2024 – 2025 they provided proof of their membership with GPERI.

Because the Operator requested an informal conference to question the accuracy of this violation Staff determined that this probable violation could not be cleared at this time.

Please review and respond to this report in accordance with the attached Instructions for Responding to Enforcement Letters Issued by the Georgia Public Service Commission.

OPERATOR RESPONSE FORM

Operator Name: City of Ashburn

Informal Conference Requested: Yes ☐ No ☐

Docket Number: 37023

Responses required within **30 days of electronic mail.** Provide the following information for this report:

Response to Inspection Number:_____

Type of Enforcement Action(s) cited in report:			Informal Conference Requested	
☐ Notice of Probable Violation (NOPV)	☐ New	☐Continuing	☐ Yes	☐ No
☐ Notice of Amendment (NOA)	☐ New	☐Continuing	☐ Yes	☐ No
☐ Warning Letter	☐ New	☐Continuing	☐ Yes	☐ No
☐ Letter of Concern	☐ New	☐Continuing	☐ Yes	☐ No
☐ Observed Issue	☐ New	☐Continuing	☐ Yes	☐ No
☐ Proposed Civil Penalty	$ _____ PCP $ Amount (Total for report)			

Indicate below (A-E) based on the type of Enforcement Actions in this report: (Check all that apply)
Complete a separate copy of Page 2, Operator Response to Enforcement Action, for each cited item.

A. Response for **Notice of Probable Violation** (with and without proposed civil penalty):
   1. ☐ Written statement indicating that corrective measures have achieved Compliance or
   2. ☐ Written plan of action outlining the corrective measures that will be taken to achieve compliance and when compliance is anticipated.

B. Response for **NOA**:
   1. ☐ Contested: Attach written explanation, information, or other material in answer to the allegations in the Notice of Amendment stating your reasons for objecting to the NOA, in whole or in part; or
   2. ☐ Not Contested: Explanation, information, or other material believed to warrant modification of the NOA in whole or in part; or
   3. ☐ Written request for clarification. (Attached)

C. Response for **Continuing** and/or **Existing** violations:
   Current status, updates, expected completion dates, proposed modifications, etc., of the continuing and/or existing violations, even if this information was previously provided. Referencing a previously filed response letter, as status, updates, etc. alone is not sufficient for this response. Failure to provide this information may result in formal interrogatories from the Director through data requests.

D. Response for ☐ **Letter of Concern** / ☐ **Warning Letter**
   I acknowledge receipt of the Letter of Concern/Warning Letter:_____
   SIGNATURE / TITLE

   Additional Comments: (Optional)_____
   _____
   _____

E. Response for **Observed Issue** and **No Violation**: (Optional Response)
   Staff requests that the Operator acknowledge receipt of the Observed Issue/No Violation in writing, or by submitting an email to the FPU Director

Operator Response to Enforcement Action

Enforcement Action for:_____ ☐ New Violation ☐ Continuing Violation
Enter Code / Commission Rule (Complete a separate attachment for each enforcement action)

Enforcement Action(s) cited in report:	Conference Requested:	
☐ Notice of Probable Violation (NOPV)	☐ Yes ☐ No	$_____ Proposed Penalty for this violation
☐ Notice of Amendment (NOA)	☐ Yes ☐ No	
☐ Warning Letter	☐ Yes ☐ No	
☐ Letter of Concern	☐ Yes ☐ No	
☐ Observed Issue	☐ Yes ☐ No	
☐ Proposed Civil Penalty	☐ Yes ☐ No	

OPERATORS RESPONSE: _____

Response Provided by: _____ Date:_____
Name / Title

Internal use only:

Lead Inspector: _____ Date Response Reviewed:_____

Actions Acceptable: ☐ Yes ☐No Re-inspection Needed:☐ Yes ☐ No Clear Violation:☐ Yes ☐ No

Supervisor Review by:_____ Date Reviewed:_____

Additional Enforcement Recommended: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Director Review

Approved: ☐ Yes ☐No Schedule Special Follow-up Inspection: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Cleared Violation: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:_____

Filings:
For all written responses or any other official correspondence, the Operator shall file the response at the following address:

Ms. Sallie Tanner, Executive Secretary
Georgia Public Service Commission
244 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

The Operator must file **five (5)** copies of any response and/or official correspondence, as well as a CD with an electronic version of the response in Microsoft Word and/or a PDF, if applicable.

Informal Conference:
Any Operator who chooses to request an informal conference shall request such a conference through emailing the Director (michellet@psc.state.ga.us), calling the Director (404-463-2765), or selecting the "Request Conference" choice.

Civil Penalty Payments:
Certified check for the full amount of the recommended civil penalty or consent agreement amount made payable to the Georgia Public Service Commission. The Operator's name, applicable Docket No., and Inspection Report No. must be included on the certified check. Mail payment to:

Ms. Michelle Thebert, Director, Facilities Protection Unit
Georgia Public Service Commission
244 Washington Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Hearing Requests:
The Operator has the right to request a hearing before the full Commission to contest the alleged probable violations, recommended civil penalties, and all other proposed actions of enforcement. A request for a hearing must be submitted in writing and in accordance with Commission Rule 515-2-1-.04. The Operator must include a statement of the issues that you intend to raise at the hearing. The issues may relate to the allegations, new information, proposed compliance order, proposed civil penalty, or any other recommendation for enforcement action. Please refer to Commission Rule 515-9-3-.11 and O.C.G.A. § 46-2-91 for assessment considerations upon which civil penalties are based. An operator's failure to specify an issue may result in a waiver of the right to raise that issue at hearing. The request must also indicate whether or not the Operator will be represented by counsel at the hearing.

Open Records and Trade Secret Filings:
The Operator is advised that any material provided to the Commission, and all materials prepared by the Commission, including the Notice of Probable Violations and any Orders issued in this case, may be considered public information and subject to disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act (O.C.G.A. § 50-18-70 et seq.). If you believe that any portion of your response material is security sensitive, privileged, confidential or may cause your company competitive disadvantages and would qualify for protection under the Commission's "Trade Secret Rule" (Commission Rule 515-3-1-.11), you must, along with the complete original document clearly marked "TRADE SECRET" on each page, provide a second copy of the document with the portions you believe qualify for trade secret treatment redacted, and an explanation of why you believe the redacted information qualifies for such trade secret treatment. Should the Commission receive a request for disclosure of any "TRADE SECRET" material, you will be notified, if after review, the materials and your provided justification are deemed not to meet any exemptions provided in the Georgia Open Records Act. You may appeal the Commission's decision to release material at that time. Your appeal will stay the release of those materials until a final decision is made.

BEFORE THE GEORGIA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STATE OF GEORGIA

IN THE MATTER OF:	)	
	)	
City of Ashburn Gas Department	)	**DOCKET NO. 37023**
	)	
	)	
	)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the within and foregoing document on the following persons via email and/or United States Mail as follows:

*Sallie Tanner, Executive Secretary
Georgia Public Service Commission
244 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334

*Daryl Hall, City Manager
City of Ashburn Gas Department
P.O. Box 766
Ashburn, GA 31714
dhall@cityofashburn.net

*Michelle Thebert, Facilities Protection Unit Director
Georgia Public Service Commission
244 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334

Respectfully Submitted this 23rd day of April 2026:

Cathy Nesbitt

Cathy Nesbitt, Administrative Assistant
Georgia Public Service Commission
Facilities Protection Unit
244 Washington Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334