



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

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE  
Washington DC 20590

## PIPELINE SAFETY

### 2011 State Damage Prevention Grant

for

### MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Please follow the directions listed below:

1. Review the entire document for completeness.
2. Review and have an authorized signatory sign page 2.
3. Fasten all pages with a paper or binder clip - no staples please as this package will be scanned upon it's arrival at PHMSA.
4. Mail the entire document, including this cover page to the following:

**ATTN: Maria Munoz  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration  
Office of Contracts and Procurement (PHA-30)  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Second Floor E22-305  
Washington, D.C. 20590**

#### **FedSTAR Information**

Submission Date: 9/7/2010 3:20:19 PM



**Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration**  
**1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE**  
**Washington DC 20590**

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

APPLICATION

2011 GRANT PROGRAM IN SUPPORT OF STATE DAMAGE PREVENTION

The MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION hereby applies to the Department of Transportation for Federal funds appropriated for the support of State Damage Prevention Programs established under 49 U.S.C. Section 60134 et seq.

The State agency plans to carry out the State Damage Prevention Program, during calendar year 2011, as described in Attachment 1, "Project Abstract/Statement of Objectives". To accomplish the program, the state agency proposes to expend funds as set forth in Attachment 4, "State Damage Prevention Estimated Budget".

---

Signature

---

Title

---

Date

## **Project Abstract/Statement of Objectives**

**Please provide a clear and concise description of the work this grant will fund for calendar year 2011**

Since 2007, Mississippi Public Service Commission, a founding member and stakeholder of the Mississippi Damage Prevention Committee (MDPC) has worked with Mississippi 811 and other stakeholders to develop a fair and effective enforcement program.

The 2011 MDPC agenda concentrates on elevating our already successful effort of consensus building with stakeholder groups and especially as it relates to fair and effective enforcement. The 2011 legislative goal is to propose an amendment to the law that includes enforcement. The MDPC has selected a steering committee from its stakeholders to develop the framework for the intended legislative proposal for effective enforcement.

This project will identify and develop the specific processes and procedures associated with the final proposal. Based on data analysis derived from surveys taken during the 2010 MDPC educational effort and ongoing dialogue at the committee level, this project allows for the development and presentation of materials necessary for building support from stakeholders prior to introducing the proposal at the Capitol. The presentations will be a combination of face to face, web, electronic and printed materials. The presentations will build on the benefits gained through enacted legislation since 2007 and will serve as the foundation for taking the next logical step for effective enforcement.

The objectives of this project are as follows:

Continue to promote the MDPC as Mississippi's vehicle for building consensus to achieve our goal of a stronger and more effective damage prevention program.

Develop and implement a plan to achieve consensus regarding support of a comprehensive enforcement plan.

Recognize those who oppose the effort and work with them face to face and one on one if necessary to gain support for the initiative prior to 2011 legislative session.

Get enforcement legislation passed in the 2011 legislative session.

Reduce the number of third party damages to underground utilities.

## State Damage Prevention Elements

### **ELEMENT 1 - EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS**

"Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of methods for establishing and maintaining effective communications between stakeholders from receipt of an excavation notification until successful completion of the excavation, as appropriate."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** No

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

The Mississippi Damage Prevention Committee (MDPC) was established in 2007 to develop a plan and strategy for making Mississippi's damage prevention program stronger and more effective.

Legislation was passed in 2008 requiring membership in Mississippi 811 (the one-call system) for all owners/operators of underground facilities. Following the implementation of that initiative, the MDPC recommended that in 2009 the state propose legislation to incorporate electronic positive response to improve the communications between stakeholders. This legislation went into effect January 1, 2010.

The MDPC continues to evaluate the effectiveness of the current law and best practices with regard to effective communications.

**ELEMENT 2 - COMPREHENSIVE STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT**

"A process for fostering and ensuring the support and partnership of stakeholders, including excavators, operators, locators, designers, and local government in all phases of the program."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) No**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Damage Prevention Coordination Council (DPCC) groups have been formed across the state and meet regularly. These groups have grown in number and relevancy in coordinating local projects and providing utility contacts between the stakeholders.

The (Mississippi Damage Prevention Committee (MDPC) was established as one of our top priorities to continue to reach out to all stakeholders. There has been phenomenal growth in the number of members, stakeholder groups, and accomplishments. The legislative success enjoyed by Mississippi has been in large part due to the influence and cooperation of the MDPC in gaining support from organizations that in the past have opposed initiatives such as required membership in the one-call system.

Already stakeholders such as County Supervisors, Municipal League, Rural Water Association, Public Service Commission, Contract Locating, State Fire Marshal's office, and the One-Call system have joined together with interested utilities and pipeline companies to continue to reach out to other stakeholders to ensure ongoing support and partnership based on mutual trust and respect.

In 2009 and 2010, we have held regional meetings across the state in an effort to gain support for the MDPC and its stated goals. New stakeholder groups have been added and a greater awareness for the need to keep Mississippi a safer place to live and work has been achieved. Some of the new stakeholder groups added to the MDPC as the result of our efforts are: AGC/ABC, M-DOT, the Insurance industry and the Railroad industry.

We are also pleased to have in regular attendance of these meetings many elected officials including state legislators.

**ELEMENT 3 - OPERATOR INTERNAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

"A process for reviewing the adequacy of a pipeline operator's internal performance measures regarding persons performing locating services and quality assurance programs."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) No**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

As with every critical area to pipeline safety, locating a service safely and accurately is most important. The MDPC has a high level representative from the largest locator group operating in our state. He is able to keep us informed of issues and challenges that arise in the field. Our pipeline safety inspectors look at the training afforded persons who perform locating services for our operators. We also check regularly to make sure our operators keep an up-to-date list of potential excavators near or over their pipelines. In order to manage this task of monitoring performance of these locators, one must consider both the in-house and contract locating personnel. All operators should establish minimum training requirements for contract locators and have an acceptable feedback mechanism to measure their performance. Our inspectors advise operators to monitor performance issues, good and bad, and have retraining and regular in-service training conducted as necessary. The Mississippi Public Service Commission has also used the 2010 One Call Grant to provide locator training to municipal gas and water operators, master meter gas operators, hazardous liquid operators and electric power association locators.

**ELEMENT 4 - EFFECTIVE EMPLOYEE TRAINING**

"Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of effective employee training programs to ensure that operators, the one call center, the enforcing agency, and the excavators have partnered to design and implement training for the employees of operators, excavators, and locators."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** No

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

In 2008, the MDPC, Public Service Commission and Mississippi 811 created the first annual Damage Prevention Summit for Mississippi (a regional CGA event). It was well attended and the sessions were designed to promote damage prevention through partnership. Training hours were secured by the appropriate state agencies for elected officials, water operators, gas operators and engineers. The comments from attendees convince us that this event will become a signature event for Mississippi and an important means for bringing stakeholders together. The second annual Summit was even more successful in attendance and relevance. The third annual event is scheduled for November 2010 at Vicksburg and promises to be even more successful. The theme continues to be working together to keep Mississippi a safer place to live and work. The event continues to attract new stakeholders.

In 2010, the MDPC received a grant to develop an interactive web-based training module. This project will be recognized as the guideline for digging safely in Mississippi and through the power of partnership.

The project is on schedule and will be implemented by the end of 2010. We continue to work with accrediting agencies throughout the state to offer CEUs for members of their respective associations who complete the training module.

We are convinced the training module will be seen as a tremendous success, however, the MDPC recognizes the real benefit has been the opportunity to work with different stakeholders to achieve a common ground for the training module.

**ELEMENT 5 - PUBLIC EDUCATION**

"A process for fostering and ensuring active participation by all stakeholders in public education for damage prevention activities."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) No**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

In 2008, the MDPC created a committee to develop, recommend, and prioritize methods and materials to be used for public education. The first project developed was the production of a video designed to be presented at civic clubs, schools and other public meetings across the state. The video has been mass produced and has been a great benefit in gaining support for our efforts.

Mississippi 811 has produced a quarterly damage prevention magazine that is mailed to all users and members of the one-call system. The mailing list includes mayors, county supervisors, and members of the state legislature. The magazine promotes legislative efforts as well as a stronger and more effective damage prevention accomplished through the power of partnership. The MDPC uses the magazine to keep our message in front of all stakeholders in Mississippi. The publication is made available to all subscribers free of charge.

The MDPC has a website, [www.msdamageprevention.com](http://www.msdamageprevention.com) that will be utilized to reach all stakeholders as programs are implemented. Additionally, email campaigns are being used to keep stakeholders informed about impending changes and opportunities to meet with other stakeholders in their areas.

**ELEMENT 6 - DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

"A process for resolving disputes that defines the State authority's role as a partner and facilitator to resolve issues."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) No**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Discussions are taking place by assigned committees as how best to approach this element. In the interest of fairness and in the spirit of cooperation, the MDPC is leaning toward the development of a balanced committee of stakeholders to review violations of the damage prevention law or the assignment of penalties for such violations.

The MDPC believes significant progress has been made in getting support for both elements 6 and 7 and is working to craft and introduce legislation that incorporates these elements in the upcoming legislative session.

**ELEMENT 7 - ENFORCEMENT**

"Enforcement of State damage prevention laws and regulations for all aspects of the damage prevention process, including public education, and the use of civil penalties for violations assessable by the appropriate State authority."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) Yes**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

In 2007, the MDPC established a timeline to achieve fair and effective enforcement within four years. Based on the progress and momentum achieved in gaining support for the earlier efforts, the MDPC is committed to proposing legislation for fair and effective enforcement in the upcoming legislative session.

Legislation has been proposed and adopted in each of the legislative sessions since the inception of the MDPC. Each proposal was crafted with the idea that framing the issue so as to gain support outside the Capitol before taking it to the legislators was critical. We believe that we have been successful in our attempts to strengthen our law because of our continuing commitment to the benefits of educational process and consensus building. We are further convinced that vehicles such as the Mississippi 811 magazine, the Summit, and other efforts have allowed us to keep a consistent message in front of all stakeholders. The 2010 and 2011 Mississippi Damage Prevention Summit will focus on the issue of enforcement and ask the questions? If not us?who? If not now?when?

**Describe how the proposed project will enhance or continue implementation of this element: (Required only if proposal addresses this element)**

This project builds on the successes from the past few years. While there are stakeholder groups who recognize the value of enforcement, the specific details have not been developed. Obviously this is crucial in order to gain support for the program. This project and the theme of being prepared to propose a fair and effective enforcement amendment to the law at the 2011 legislative session will be the primary focus of the MDPC. The grant funds will allow us to accelerate our energies and focus on our resources to maximize our effectiveness.

The project will involve using the analyzed data collected over the past three years to develop the materials necessary to be successful. The momentum gained by continuing to provide a consistent message is critical. We recognize that when we start to discuss the specific details there will be natural oppositions to certain elements. In these instances, face to face meetings will be essential.

Having the right information is critical, but also having the right personnel involved in the face to face meetings is even more so. One of the things we've learned over the past few years is that while correct information is vital, timely inspiration for doing the right thing often softens the opposition. This project will allow the MDPC to focus on successful completion of this year's goal, instead of having to wonder whether or not the committee will have the resources to accomplish the goal.

**Estimated budget for this element: (Required only if proposal addresses this element)**

a. Personnel:	\$0.00
b. Fringe Benefits:	\$0.00
c. Travel:	\$0.00
d. Equipment:	\$0.00
e. Supplies:	\$0.00
f. Contractual:	\$100,000.00
g. Construction:	\$0.00
h. Other:	\$0.00
<b>i. Total Direct Charges (sum of a through h):</b>	<b>\$100,000.00</b>
j. Indirect Charges:	\$0.00
<b>k. TOTAL (sum of i and j):</b>	<b>\$100,000.00</b>

**Budget Narrative for this element: (Required only if proposal addresses this element)**

It is our intention to contract this project out to ACTS Now, Inc. ACTS was instrumental in helping establish the MDPC, publishes the Mississippi 811 magazine, produced the MDPC video to educate the general public, is developing the training module, and is very familiar with Mississippi's damage prevention law and the culture of our state.

The grant request of \$100,000 is supported by attachment of proposal from ACTS.

The Mississippi Public Service Commission is not requesting any reimbursement for expenses incurred by staff or travel.

**ELEMENT 8 - TECHNOLOGY**

"A process for fostering and promoting the use, by all appropriate stakeholders, of improving technologies that may enhance communications, underground pipeline locating capability, and gathering and analyzing information about the accuracy and effectiveness of locating programs."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) No**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Over the past seven years, Mississippi 811 utilized GPS technology to map the entire state. The 811 facility database is in a spatial environment which allows for more accurate ticket transmission. The 811 staff has ongoing training for the conversion and utilization of the integrated mapping system.

Mississippi 811 has implemented the use of DIRT to gather and analyze information regarding damages that occur throughout our state. This information will be available to the MDPC so that the Committee can best determine the next logical steps for reducing damages.

**ELEMENT 9 - DAMAGE PREVENTION PROGRAM REVIEW**

"A process for review and analysis of the effectiveness of each program element, including a means for implementing improvements identified by such program reviews."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required) No**

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

The MDPC has spent the bulk of our energy and resources in creating meaningful relationships that have culminated in legislation promoting a safer place to live and work in Mississippi.

We recognize the value of review and have assigned the task of determining the best process for review and analysis to a committee within the MDPC. We continue to look at other programs that have successfully implemented element 9 for guidance.

## **Legislative/Regulatory Actions**

**Provide a description of any legislature or regulatory actions (including legislative/regulatory studies) taken by the State within the past five (5) years pertaining to damage prevention program improvement, even if those actions were not completely successful.**

In 2007, the Mississippi Public Service Commission and Mississippi 811 (the one-call system), agreed to host a meeting for interested parties to explore the possibility of bringing stakeholders together to discuss keeping Mississippi a safer place to live and work.

At that meeting the decision was made to form the Mississippi Damage Prevention Committee (MDPC). The MDPC would begin the process of identifying the logical steps (including legislative initiatives) to achieve the goal of a stronger and more effective damage prevention program. Retired Senator Billy Thames was hired to be the lobbyist for the MDPC. Senator Thames continues to work with the Committee today.

Legislation enacted since that first meeting is as follows:

Passed in the 2008 session - requires all owners/operators of underground facilities in Mississippi to be a member of the one-call system.

Passed in the 2009 session: All underground utility lines installed after 01-01-10 must be locatable. The state law was changed to reflect wording of federal guidelines, "requiring the excavator to immediately call 911 in the event of a damage permitting escape of any hazardous material that may endanger life or cause serious bodily harm or damage to property." Positive response defined and established in Mississippi.

Passed in the 2010 session: Any owner/operator of an underground facility who chooses not to be a member of Mississippi 811 waives its right to damages to their facilities. (municipalities exempted from this provision) There are only five (5) municipalities not a member of Mississippi 811 and during the process of this piece of legislation, Jackson, the largest municipality and the State Capitol agreed to become a member of Mississippi 811 at the urging of Representative Tyrone Ellis, who is now a strong advocate of call before you dig and is one of the major sponsors of all one call legislation.

Passed in the 2010 session: Members with underground facility that can't be located (Plastic pipe) can now contact the excavator and will be given up to two extra working days to expose his facility in the interest of damage prevention. This was a request of the rural water industry and the state's contractors did not oppose it.

To be proposed in 2011: Enforcement for violation of the existing law

**State Damage Prevention Estimated Budget - Calendar Year 2011**

**DIRECT COSTS**

Personnel .....	
Fringe Benefits .....	
Travel .....	
Equipment .....	
Supplies .....	
Contractual .....	\$100,000.00
Construction .....	
Other .....	
<b>Total Direct .....</b>	<b>\$100,000.00</b>

**INDIRECT COSTS**

Indirect Charges .....

---

**TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS**

**\$100,000.00**

---

**State Damage Prevention Application Attachments**

2011 Gov letter.doc  
2011 Roger Cox contract.doc





## **Proposal for PSC training project**

August 30, 2010

Mark McCarver  
Director of Pipeline Safety  
Mississippi Public Service Commission  
501 West Street  
Jackson, MS 39215

Dear Mark:

Thank you for again considering ACTS as you move closer to your goal of fair and effective enforcement. Listed below is a summary of the project as I understand it and a proposal for implementation. I further understand that the project depends on the availability of grant funds. And that if funded, project will be for the year 2011. I trust we've proven to you in the past that ACTS will have no problem in meeting your time schedule.

The proposed project is to identify and develop the specific processes and procedures that define effective enforcement in Mississippi. This process will require we identify and categorize the different ideas, philosophies, and concerns. Then the process is to work with the same groups to identify what they share in common (example would be to keep their communities and families safe) and from those discussions we'll create a comparative analysis for the MDPC. We'll then work with them until they create the consensus document relative to effective enforcement from which all educational materials and presentations will be built.

I understand you want ACTS to produce the materials and presentations for this project subject to your approval. The presentations will be a combination of face to face, web, electronic and printed materials. ACTS will work closely with the MDPC throughout 2011 to help you and the committee achieves your intended goal of keeping Mississippi a safer place to live and work.

Out-of-pocket expenses, such as long-distance telephone calls, photocopies, computer printouts, fax charges, messengers, and local and out-of-town travel incurred in connection with the project are included in the proposal.

Sincerely,

Roger Cox



<b>A. Facilitation of meetings/Consulting for 2011</b>	<b>\$55,000</b>
a. Work with MDPC through 2011	
b. Meetings on behalf of MDPC	
c. Facilitate the discussion of differences/commonalities	
d. Create comparative analysis based on meetings	
e. Development of specific program based on consensus document	
<b>B. Development of materials and presentations</b>	
<b>a. Preproduction</b>	<b>\$ 7,500</b>
i. Create and develop content	
ii. Create theme for all materials/presentations	
<b>b. Production</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>
i. Produce content	
ii. Graphics	
iii. Layout of materials/presentations	
<b>c. Postproduction</b>	<b>\$17,500</b>
i. Print materials	
ii. Duplication	
iii. Marketing and promotion	
<b>Total cost of project</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>

We have not received a response from the governor as of Sept 7, 2010, but expect to at any time.

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

Version 02

* 1. Type of Submission: <input type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application	* 2. Type of Application: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision	* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): <input type="text"/> * Other (Specify) <input type="text"/>
--	--	---

* 3. Date Received: <input type="text" value="09/07/2010"/>	4. Applicant Identifier: <input type="text"/>
--	--

5a. Federal Entity Identifier: <input type="text"/>	* 5b. Federal Award Identifier: <input type="text"/>
--	---

**State Use Only:**

6. Date Received by State: <input type="text"/>	7. State Application Identifier: <input type="text"/>
---	---

**8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:**

\* a. Legal Name:

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN): <input type="text" value="64-6000806"/>	* c. Organizational DUNS: <input type="text" value="878639368"/>
--	---

**d. Address:**

* Street1:	<input type="text" value="P. O. Box 1174"/>
Street2:	<input type="text"/>
* City:	<input type="text" value="Jackson"/>
County:	<input type="text"/>
* State:	<input type="text" value="MS: Mississippi"/>
Province:	<input type="text"/>
* Country:	<input type="text" value="USA: UNITED STATES"/>
* Zip / Postal Code:	<input type="text" value="39215-1174"/>

**e. Organizational Unit:**

Department Name: <input type="text"/>	Division Name: <input type="text"/>
--	--

**f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:**

Prefix: <input type="text" value="Mrs."/>	* First Name: <input type="text" value="Ilicia"/>
Middle Name: <input type="text"/>	
* Last Name: <input type="text" value="Boaler"/>	
Suffix: <input type="text"/>	

Title:

Organizational Affiliation:

* Telephone Number: <input type="text" value="601-961-5485"/>	Fax Number: <input type="text"/>
---	----------------------------------

\* Email:

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

Version 02

**9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

A: State Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

\* Other (specify):

**\* 10. Name of Federal Agency:**

Pipeline & Hazardous Material Safety Administration

**11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:**

20.720

CFDA Title:

State Damage Prevention Program Grants

**\* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

DTPH56-11-SN-0001

\* Title:

State Damage Prevention Grants

**13. Competition Identification Number:**

Title:

**14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):**

**\* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:**

MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION State Damage Prevention

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

Version 02

**16. Congressional Districts Of:**

\* a. Applicant

\* b. Program/Project

Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

**17. Proposed Project:**

\* a. Start Date:

\* b. End Date:

**18. Estimated Funding (\$):**

* a. Federal	<input type="text" value="100,000.00"/>
* b. Applicant	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* c. State	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* d. Local	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* e. Other	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* f. Program Income	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
* g. TOTAL	<input type="text" value="100,000.00"/>

**\* 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?**

- a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on
- b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
- c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

**\* 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation.)**

- Yes  No

**21. \*By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications\*\* and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances\*\* and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)**

\*\* I AGREE

\*\* The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

**Authorized Representative:**

Prefix:  \* First Name:

Middle Name:

\* Last Name:

Suffix:

\* Title:

\* Telephone Number:  Fax Number:

\* Email:

\* Signature of Authorized Representative:  \* Date Signed:

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

Version 02

**\* Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.

**BUDGET INFORMATION - Non-Construction Programs**

OMB Approval No. 4040-0006  
Expiration Date 07/30/2010

**SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY**

Grant Program Function or Activity (a)	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	Total (g)
1. State Damage Prevention Program		\$	\$	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 100,000.00
2.						
3.						
4.						
5. <b>Totals</b>		\$	\$	\$ 100,000.00	\$	\$ 100,000.00

**SECTION B - BUDGET CATEGORIES**

6. Object Class Categories	GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY				Total (5)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
	SDP				
a. Personnel	\$ 0.00	\$	\$	\$	\$
b. Fringe Benefits	0.00				
c. Travel	0.00				
d. Equipment	0.00				
e. Supplies	0.00				
f. Contractual	100,000.00				100,000.00
g. Construction	0.00				
h. Other	0.00				
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h)	100,000.00				\$ 100,000.00
j. Indirect Charges	0.00				\$
k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)	\$ 100,000.00	\$	\$	\$	\$ 100,000.00
7. Program Income	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Standard Form 424A (Rev. 7- 97)  
Prescribed by OMB (Circular A -102) Page 1A

**SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES**

(a) Grant Program	(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e)TOTALS
8. <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
9. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
10. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
11. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)</b>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>

**SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS**

	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
13. Federal	\$ <input type="text"/>				
14. Non-Federal	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)</b>	\$ <input type="text"/>				

**SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT**

(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (YEARS)			
	(b)First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth
16. <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
17. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
18. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
19. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<b>20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16 - 19)</b>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>

**SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION**

21. Direct Charges: <input type="text"/>	22. Indirect Charges: <input type="text"/>
23. Remarks: <input type="text"/>	

---

## CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

### Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

### Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

<b>* APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION</b> <input style="width: 90%;" type="text" value="MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION"/>	
<b>* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE</b>	
Prefix: <input style="width: 50px;" type="text" value="Mr."/>	* First Name: <input style="width: 150px;" type="text" value="Brian"/> Middle Name: <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
* Last Name: <input style="width: 200px;" type="text" value="Ray"/>	Suffix: <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
* Title: <input style="width: 250px;" type="text" value="Executive Secretary"/>	
* SIGNATURE: <input style="width: 250px;" type="text" value="Mark McCarver"/>	* DATE: <input style="width: 100px;" type="text" value="09/07/2010"/>