

(iv) the same frequency groups may not be reassigned to a base station within 70 miles of another base station on the same channels;

(v) technical parameters for the use of these frequencies are the same as those in §§ 22.904, 22.905, 22.906, and 22.907, and the use of directionalized antennas is acceptable;

(3) for the Canadian Regions and within 68.4 miles of the Mexican border, the frequencies in paragraph (c) of this section are not available, however, a suitable allocation will be made on a case-by-case basis.

(c) The following frequencies are available on a co-primary basis for Basic Exchange Telecommunications Radio Service:

Subscriber location	Central Office
816.2375	861.2375
817.2375	862.2375
818.2375	863.2375
819.2375	864.2375
820.2375	865.2375
816.2125	861.2125
817.2125	862.2125
818.2125	863.2125
819.2125	864.2125
820.2125	865.2125
816.1875	861.1875
817.1875	862.1875
818.1875	863.1875
819.1875	864.1875
820.1875	865.1875
816.1625	861.1625
817.1625	862.1625
818.1625	863.1625
819.1625	864.1625
820.1625	865.1625
816.1375	861.1375
817.1375	862.1375
818.1375	863.1375
819.1375	864.1375
820.1375	865.1375
816.1125	861.1125
817.1125	862.1125
818.1125	863.1125
819.1125	864.1125
820.1125	865.1125
816.0875	861.0875
817.0875	862.0875
818.0875	863.0875
819.0875	864.0875
820.0875	865.0875
816.0625	861.0625
817.0625	862.0625
818.0625	863.0625
819.0625	864.0625
820.0625	865.0625
816.0375	861.0325
817.0375	862.0325
818.0375	863.0325
819.0375	864.0325
820.0375	865.0325
816.0125	861.0125
817.0125	862.0125
818.0125	863.0125
819.0125	864.0125
820.0125	865.0125

Federal Communications Commission,
William J. Tricarico,
Secretary.
[FR Doc. 87-2695 Filed 2-10-87; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Parts 192 and 195

[Docket No. PS-93; Notice 1]

Proposals for Pipeline Safety; Request for Comment

AGENCY: Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS), Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM).

SUMMARY: This notice, issued in advance of a proposed rule invites public comment on whether certain proposals for new or amended standards are needed for the safety of gas or hazardous liquid pipelines. Current requirements may be insufficient to provide an acceptable level of safety. The comments are to assist OPS in developing a final position on the proposals.

DATE: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments in triplicate before March 30, 1987. Late filed comments will be considered if practical.

ADDRESS: Send comments to the Dockets Unit, Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation, Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Identify the docket and notice numbers stated in the headings of this notice. All comments and docketed materials will be available for inspection and copying in Room 8426 between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. each business day.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: L. M. Furrow, (202) 366-2392, regarding the subject matter of this notice, or Sandra Cureton, (202) 366-5046, for copies of this notice or other material in the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 8, 1986, about 4:20 a.m., an 8-inch petroleum products pipeline operated by Williams Pipeline Company ruptured in Mounds View, Minnesota. Gasoline, spilling from an opening in the longitudinal seam of the electric resistance welded pipe, flowed along the town streets. In about 20 minutes, the vapors were ignited, and an explosion and fire killed a mother and her young daughter, who were escaping their smoke-filled home. One other person was severely burned, and many Mounds View homes suffered extensive damage as the fire followed the path of the

spreading gasoline. There was also serious environmental damage.

In the wake of this accident, the National Transportation Safety Board conducted hearings (the results of which are not yet available) and the OPS began enforcement action against Williams Pipeline. The Governor of Minnesota formed a Commission on Pipeline Safety, which on November 20, 1986, issued a report (hereafter "Minn. Rep.") which included its "Findings and Recommendations" on pipeline safety. (A copy of the report is in the docket). During the 99th Congress, Senator Durenberger introduced S2780 (132 Cong. Rec. S11956, August 15, 1986), proposing several amendments to the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 (HLPESA); while in the House of Representatives, Mr. Vento introduced H.R. 5401 (132 Cong. Rec. H6047, August 12, 1986) to make various other amendments to both the HLPESA and the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1986 (NGPSA). Then on September 16, 1986, in the House Mr. Sikorski voiced his concerns about pipeline safety in support of H.R. 4426, the House Energy and Commerce Committee's pipeline safety bill (132 Cong. Rec. H6937). Additionally, Mr. Sharp, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic fuels, reported the Committee's pipeline safety recommendations formulated earlier in the year in conjunction with H.R. 4426 (132 Cong. Rec. H6938).

Except for the reporting provisions of H.R. 4426 that were included in Pub. L. No. 99-516 (approved October 22, 1986), none of the proposed legislation has been enacted. It is expected, however, that the issues will be debated again during further Congressional hearings this year. Already, Mr. Vento has introduced H.R. 262, the "Safe Pipeline Act of 1987," an expanded version of H.R. 5401 noted above.

OPS is considering each of the proposals to determine whether changes are needed in the Federal pipeline safety program now in effect under the HLPESA and NGPSA. The proposals cover a broad range of topics, including regulations, enforcement activities, research, and relations with State agencies. However, the ones of concern in this notice involve adoption of new or amended Federal safety standards for gas pipeline subject to 49 CFR Part 192 and hazardous liquid pipelines subject to 49 CFR Part 195. The purpose of this notice, therefore, is to seek comments from all knowledgeable sources about the need to carry out the standards-related proposals. OPS will use the information provided to assess the

problems the proposals imply and to identify and evaluate possible alternative solutions to these problems. OPS then will choose an appropriate course of action which may be to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking based on one or more of the proposals.

The proposals, with sources noted, are enumerated below. In a few cases related ones are grouped together. Also included under each number are the current Federal pipeline safety standards that bear on the proposal and a few relevant questions. The questions are intended to focus public discussion on issues OPS believes are important, but should not be viewed as limiting comments just to those issues. OPS is particularly interested in receiving comments that address the safety problem implied by each proposal, discuss the effectiveness of any current Federal, State, or voluntary standard that relates to the problem, describe ways now being applied or available to resolve the problem, and discuss the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of implementing the proposal or any alternative way to resolve the problem. In responding to this notice, commenters are requested to use subheadings to identify the proposal and question to which their specific remarks are addressed. Unless otherwise specified, commenters may assume that the proposals relate to gas transmission and distribution pipelines and to interstate and intrastate hazardous liquid pipelines.

1. Proposal

Require operators to provide local jurisdictions, fire departments, and public safety agencies with ½ mile of pipelines, maps, inventories, and descriptions of transported substances, updated as appropriate. In addition, provide local fire departments and public safety agencies a copy of each operator's operations, maintenance and emergency manual. (H.R. 262; Min. Rep., Rec. 1.4).

Applicable Federal Standards

The Federal standards do not specifically require that operators provide the recommended information to local jurisdictions or agencies. However, liaison with public officials is required by § 192.615(c) and § 195.402(c)(12) to plan responses in an emergency.

Questions

(a) Should the Federal government mandate that operators provide the information regardless of whether a local jurisdiction or agency has requested it?

(b) Could local jurisdictions or agencies that want the information obtain it under their own authority without Federal intervention?

(c) At present, do operators voluntarily provide the information upon request of local authorities?

(d) How will the proposed requirement benefit emergency preparedness?

2. Proposal

- Require operators to provide land owners within ½ mile of pipelines, written notice of each pipeline's existence, its location, and how to identify and respond to hazards. (H.R. 262)

- Establish standards for uniform public education programs. (Minn. Rep., Rec. 2.3)

Applicable Federal Standards

The Federal standards do not require that operators provide each land owner written notice of a pipeline's location and hazards. However, § 192.615(d) and § 195.440 require operators to conduct a continuing educational program through comprehensive media to enable customers and the public to recognize and report a pipeline emergency. These programs vary from operator to operator.

Questions

(a) Would the proposed written notice to land owners of a pipeline's location and emergency response information be a beneficial addition to the communication required by the current standard?

(b) What would be the cost of notifying all such landowners?

(c) What compliance difficulties are foreseen for gas distribution systems or other pipelines in residential and urban areas in giving the proposed written notice?

(d) Should public education programs be uniform or be allowed to vary according to local conditions?

(e) What additional standards should be established for uniform public education programs?

3. Proposal

- Require operators to post conspicuous signs at road crossings. (H.R. 262)

Applicable Federal Standards

Line markers are required at public road crossings by § 192.707 and § 195.410, but sign size is not regulated. Certain exceptions apply to urban areas.

Questions

(a) Are pipeline markers at road crossings an important factor in

preventing damage from roadway excavation activities or providing quicker response time to emergency situations?

(b) If roadway signs are important, should conspicuous signs be required in all neighborhoods and urban areas without regard for the problems of land use, installation, or esthetic considerations?

(c) What should be the standard for conspicuousness?

(d) Would "conspicuous" signs at road crossings interfere with other safety signs such as stop signs or railroad crossing signs?

4. Proposal

- Convert required shutoff valves on existing pipelines to work automatically and require new pipelines to be equipped with automatic shutoff valves. (H.R. 262)

- On new lines, install remote-control shutoff valves every 20 miles in rural areas; every 4 miles in urban areas. Periodically test these valves. (Minn. Rep., Rec. 5.3)

Applicable Federal Standards

Shutoff valves are required by § 192.179, § 192.181, and § 192.260 at certain locations, but they need not operate automatically or be remotely controllable.

Questions

(a) For new pipelines, are automatic or remote-control shutoff valves included in the design, and, if so, where are they installed?

(b) Are automatic or remote-control shutoff valves effective in mitigating the consequences of a pipeline accident?

(c) Do automatic or remote-control shutoff valves present any optional difficulties?

(d) What would be the conversion costs for existing pipelines; the installation costs for new lines; the operating costs for both?

5. Proposal

- Require operators to determine and submit (to OPS) an inventory, including specifications, of the types of pipeline in their systems. (H.R. 262)

Applicable Federal Standards

Operators of hazardous liquid pipelines are required by § 195.404(a)(4) to keep a record of the type of pipe in their systems as well as the pipe grade, diameter and wall thickness, but they do not have to submit this information to OPS. Gas operators are not required to record or submit this information.

Questions

(a) What information should be submitted under the category of "type" of pipeline?

(b) What are the benefits of requiring operators to submit this information to OPS?

(c) Would the benefits outweigh the costs of collecting and submitting it, and of maintaining it?

6. Proposal

- Require integrity testing at least every 2 years, with frequency and type of test determined case-by-case in light of certain pipeline and environmental factors. (H.R. 262)
- Require tests every 3 years to detect release potential. (S2780)
- Require increased use of "smart pigs" to detect flaws, based on population density and certain pipeline and environmental factors. (Subcommittee, Fossil and Synthetic Fuels; Mr. Sikorski)

Applicable Federal Standards

An initial pressure test is required for new pipelines during construction, but the standards do not require subsequent periodic tests to demonstrate the continued physical integrity of pipelines. Since the initial pressure test requirement does not apply to existing pipelines (unless they are replaced or relocated), there may be existing pipelines in operation that have not been tested. However, § 195.302 requires that existing pipelines transporting highly volatile liquids (HVL) which were not initially pressure tested to 1.25 times their maximum operating pressure must be tested to that level or have their operating pressure reduced commensurately. Also, periodic testing for corrosion is required by § 192.465(e) and § 195.416.

Questions

(a) Should the 1.25 safety margin mandated for existing HVL pipelines be required for existing pipelines carrying other petroleum products or natural gas?

(b) Should periodic integrity testing be mandated for all product, HVL, or gas pipelines in populated areas?

(c) Are there any adverse safety consequences associated with periodic pressure testing?

(d) What would be the costs and benefits of industry wide testing or testing on a selective basis?

(e) Under what conditions should OPS require the use of "smart pigs"?

7. Proposal

Prohibit new pipelines within 150 feet of any permanently inhabited facility.

(H.R. 262) (Assume this proposal does not apply to gas distribution systems).

Applicable Federal Standards

The location of new gas pipelines is not restricted, but new rights-of-way for hazardous liquid pipelines must avoid inhabited areas as far as practicable (§ 195.210).

Questions

(a) How would the proposed 300-foot zone affect the occurrence or results of accidents?

(b) What compliance or operational difficulties are foreseen?

(c) Should exemptions be permitted for new pipelines on existing, or enlargements of existing, rights-of-way; for replacements or relocations of existing pipelines?

(d) Is land use for pipelines an appropriate Federal function, or are State and local governments better suited to plan such use?

(e) How would land use be controlled within the proposed zone after the pipeline is constructed?

8. Proposal

Specify "chemical fertilizer products" as a "Hazardous liquid." (H.R. 262)

Applicable Federal Standards

The Part 195 standards define "Hazardous liquid" to include "anhydrous ammonia," which is the predominate chemical fertilizer products. (§ 195.2)

Question

(a) Besides anhydrous ammonia, what products transported by pipeline would be covered by the suggested definitional change?

(b) Are any of these products transported in pipelines that are already subject to Part 195 because the pipeline also carries a regulated commodity such as anhydrous ammonia?

(c) Do any unregulated pipelines carrying these products pose a sufficient threat to public safety to warrant imposition of Part 195 safety standards?

9. Proposal

Include carbon dioxide (CO₂) pipelines in the regulation of hazardous liquid pipelines. (Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels)

Applicable Federal Standards

The Part 195 standards do not apply to CO₂ pipeline.

Question

(a) Do CO₂ pipelines pose a sufficient threat to life or property to warrant imposition of Federal safety regulations?

(b) If Federal standards are imposed, should there be exceptions for gathering or transmission lines in rural areas?

10. Proposal

Require existing hazardous liquid pipelines to be coated or cathodically protected to prevent corrosion. (S2780)

Applicable Federal Standards

The standards require that new and effectively coated existing pipelines be cathodically protected in areas of active corrosion. Periodic tests are required to discover areas of active corrosion. (§§ 195.242 and 195.414)

Questions

(a) What would be the added costs of requiring full cathodic protection on existing pipelines that are ineffectively coated or bare?

(b) Would this investment pay for itself in terms of preventing corrosion caused accidents?

(c) What alternatives to the present or proposed requirement are there to preventing corrosion-caused leaks on existing pipelines?

(d) Should more frequent tests be required to discover areas of active corrosion?

11. Proposal

Require new hazardous liquid pipelines and existing ones in populated areas to have double-wall construction with continuous leak detection systems. (S2780; Minn. Rep. Rec. 5.5)

Applicable Federal Standards

None

Questions

(a) What has been the operating experience, if any, with this technology?

(b) What would be the costs of implementation?

(c) After implementation, what would be the expected impact on safety in terms of accidents prevented or consequences lessened?

12. Proposal

- Require operators to improve ability to rapidly locate and isolate leaks, through remote-controlled valves, (spaced according to population) remotely monitored gauges and meters at pump stations, and more specific emergency procedures. (Minn. Rep. Rec. 4.4)

- Establish release (leak) detection standards and hazardous liquid pipelines. (S2780)

Applicable Federal Standards

Under § 195.412, hazardous liquid pipeline rights-of-way must be inspected

for signs of leaks every 2 weeks. Gas pipelines must be checked for leaks at various intervals under §§ 192.705, 192.706, 192.721, and 192.723. Emergency procedures are required by § 192.615 and § 195.402.

Questions

(a) What technology is commercially available that would enable prompt leak detection so that corrective action could be taken in populated areas before deaths, injuries or substantial property damages would be likely to occur?

(b) What are the costs of implementation?

(c) What changes might be made to the emergency procedures to improve operators' response to emergencies?

13. Proposal

Require siting standards for hazardous liquid pipelines similar to those in effect for gas pipelines. (Mr. Sikorski)

Applicable Federal Standards

There are no standards in Part 191 or Part 195 for "siting" pipelines but many of the standards for gas and hazardous liquid pipelines increase in stringency as pipelines enter more populated areas. The gas standards increase in stringency according to a set of "class location" criteria based on population density near the pipeline. In contrast, the stringency of the hazardous liquid standards varies by the use of such terms as "residential" or "industrial" areas.

Questions

(a) How would the class location criteria in Part 192 improve the safety of hazardous liquid pipelines if applied to the regulations in Part 195?

(b) Should any of the Part 192 standards based on class location for which there is no comparable Part 195 requirement be added to Part 195, and why?

14. Proposal

Require for hazardous liquid pipelines an increased safety margin between test and operating pressure depending on population or environmental factors. (Minn. Rep., Rec. 4.1)

Applicable Federal Standards

Section 195.406 requires at least a 20 percent margin between test and operating pressure for all new pipelines.

The margin for new gas pipelines is either 10, 20, or 33 percent depending on population (§ 192.619).

Questions

(a) What would be the rationale for development and selection of an increased safety margin for hazardous liquid pipelines?

(b) What would be the result in terms of accidents prevented if the current safety margin were increased?

(c) What would be the incremental cost of increasing the margin?

15. Proposal

Require submission of 4-year comprehensive reports on the condition of pipelines (corrosion, leaks, etc.). Use them as basis for remedial action, i.e., pigs, pressure tests, replacement. (Minn. Rep., Rec. 4.2)

Applicable Federal Standards

Operators are required by § 192.491 and § 195.404 to record the results of each required corrosion control test or inspection. Serious leaks must be reported as required by 49 CFR Parts 191 and 195. Repairs on gas transmission lines must be recorded under § 192.709 and on hazardous pipelines under § 195.404. Also, pursuant to Pub. L. No. 99-156 (approved October 22, 1986), operators will be required to report adverse safety related conditions within 5 days of discovery.

Questions

(a) What additional information about a pipeline's condition, besides what is now or will be required to be recorded or reported, would be useful in determining the need for integrity testing?

(b) What would be the paperwork burdens/cost of filing the proposed information with OPS?

16. Proposal

Since seam failure in electric resistance welded pipe have caused a number of accidents, a study should be conducted to learn which ERW pipe is susceptible to seam degradation. (Minn. Rep., Rec. 4.5)

Applicable Federal Standards

None

Questions

(a) Because accident data show the rate of ERW failures is diminishing, would the expected benefits of any generally applied remedy be expected to exceed costs?

(b) Should particular ERW pipelines that have experienced ERW-related ruptures be replaced or tested frequently in densely populated areas?

(c) What remedy, if any, should be applied to deter continued ERW-degradation discovered on pipelines in any area?

17. Proposal

Require operators to create or participate in "one call" systems. (H.R. 262)

Applicable Federal Standards

Operators of gas pipelines in populated areas are now required by § 192.614 to conduct or participate in "one call" or other damage prevention programs. There is no such requirement for hazardous liquid pipeline operators, although OPS is studying the costs and benefits of such a requirement.

Questions

(a) Should "one call" systems be required to the exclusion of alternative programs?

(b) Should participation be required in areas of low population, such as Class 1 and 2 locations for gas pipelines or rural areas for hazardous liquid pipelines, where the cost of participation may exceed the potential benefits?

18. Proposal

- Provide for Increased Federal oversight in design and construction of new pipelines. (H.R. 262)

- Study the need for certification of pipeline design and construction personnel (Minn. Rep., Rec. 5.6)

Applicable Federal Standards

Parts 192 and 195 contain extensive design standards which OPS and State agencies enforce through site visits. However, there are no Federal standards governing the qualifications of *design* personnel, and only those *construction* personnel who weld steel pipe or join plastic pipe are subject to qualification standards (§§ 192.227, § 192.285 and § 195.222). Also, the Federal standards do not require operators to notify OPS of pending construction or to submit design plans for approval prior to construction, although upon request by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission OPS reviews the design of interstate transmission facilities.

Questions

(a) What safety problems are there in the design and construction of pipelines

that current Federal standards do not cover adequately?

(b) If these problems involve the abilities of persons who design or construct pipelines, could they be resolved by amending or enlarging the scope of the current qualification requirements, or is a Federal certification program needed to control the problem?

(c) Do State or local jurisdictions commonly require review or certification of pipeline design plans by a licensed professional engineer before granting construction permits?

Issued in Washington, DC on February 6, 1987.

Richard L. Beam,

Director, Office of Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 87-2878 Filed 2-10-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 216

[Docket No. 50219-6214]

North Pacific Fur Seal—Pribilof Island Population; Designation as Depleted

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), NOAA, Commerce.

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The NMFS is extending the comment period on the proposed rule to designate the Pribilof Island population of North Pacific fur seals as depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. The proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on December 30,

1986, (51 FR 47155). The extension from a 39-day comment period (ending February 6, 1987) to a 67-day comment period (March 6, 1987) is being granted to accommodate the special needs of rural Alaskans.

DATES: Comments on the proposed rule must be submitted on or before March 6, 1987.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Nancy Foster, Director, Office of Protected Species and Habitat Conservation, F/M4, NMFS, Washington, DC 20235.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Georgia Cranmore, 202-673-5351.

Dated: February 5, 1987.

James E. Douglas, Jr.

Acting Deputy Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 87-2830 Filed 2-10-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-M