

C. Any changes to the information furnished under paragraph B. of this clause shall be furnished to the Contracting Officer in writing at least 30 days before the effective date of the change. It is the Contractor's responsibility to furnish these changes promptly to avoid payments to erroneous addresses or bank accounts.

D. The document furnishing the information required in paragraphs B. and C. must be dated and contain the signature, title, and telephone number of the Contractor official authorized to provide it, as well as the Contractor's name and contract number.

(End of Clause)

1952.242-70 Authorized Representative of the Contracting Officer:

As prescribed in 1942.202-70 insert the following clause in solicitations and contracts:

Authorized Representative of the Contracting Officer (Feb. 85)

The Contracting Officer will appoint by letter an Authorized Representative of the Contracting Officer (AR/CO) who will be given the responsibility of ensuring that the work conforms to the requirements of the contract and such other responsibilities as are specifically identified in the letter of authorization, unless specifically delegated such authority, in writing, by the Contracting Officer. The AR/CO *shall not* have the authority to make changes in the scope or terms and conditions of the contract; *only* the Contracting Officer has such authority. **THE RESULTANT CONTRACTOR IS HEREBY FOREWARNED THAT IT MAY BE HELD FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY CHANGES NOT AUTHORIZED IN ADVANCE, IN WRITING, BY THE CONTRACTING OFFICER, AND MAY BE DENIED COMPENSATION FOR ANY ADDITIONAL WORK PERFORMED WHICH IS NOT SO AUTHORIZED.**

(End of Clause)

PART 1953—FORMS

Subpart 1953.3—Illustrations of Forms

Sec.
1953.300 Scope of subpart.
1953.370 USIA forms.

Authority: 40 U.S.C. 486(c)

Subpart 1953.3—Illustrations of Forms

1953.300 Scope of subpart.

This subpart contains illustrations of some forms referenced in this IAAR.

1953.370 USIA forms.

This section contains illustrations of USIA forms references in this IAAR.

Note.—IAAR forms are not published in the Federal Register or in the Code of Federal Regulations. Forms may be obtained by writing: Office of Contracts, United States Information Agency, Washington, DC 20547. For the convenience of the user, a list containing section numbers, form numbers and form titles appears below:

Sec.
1953.370-21 USIA Form IA-21, Abstract of Quotations.
1953.370-44 USIA Form IA-44, Requisition-Purchase—Order-Invoice for Professional Services.

Dated: March 27, 1985.

Philip R. Rogers,

Director, Office of Contracts.

[FR Doc. 85-7932 Filed 4-2-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 192

[Amendment No. 192-49; Docket PS-81]

Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline; Ovality of Field Bends in Steel Pipe

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), Research and Special Programs Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment removes the ovality limitation requirement of 2½ percent of the nominal diameter for a field bend made in steel pipe during construction of transmission lines and mains. This limitation was operational in origin (i.e., to permit the passage of internal "pigging" devices) and has been found to be redundant because of other performance requirements that each bend have a smooth contour, be free of mechanical damage, and must not impair the serviceability of the pipe. Experience has also shown that the rule was unnecessary for safety.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 3, 1985.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

William A. Gloe, (202) 426-2082, regarding the content of this amendment, or the Dockets Branch, (202) 426-3148, regarding copies of the amendment or other information in the docket file for this proceeding.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 192.313, Bends and elbows, is contained in the minimum Federal safety standards for gas pipelines to provide for the structural integrity of field pipe bends and for elbows in steel transmission lines and mains. Requirements of the section were largely derived from the 1968 edition of the industry standard, ANSI B31.8, and were later modified by a rulemaking action and issuance of Amendments 192-26 and 195-10 (14 FR 26018; June 24, 1976). Amendment 192-26 revised § 192.313

while Amendment 195-10 concurrently revised § 195.212 of 49 CFR Part 195, the minimum Federal safety standards for hazardous liquid pipelines. As resulted from that rulemaking, § 192.313(a) reads as follows:

§ 192.313 Bends and elbows.

(a) Each field bend in steel pipe, other than a wrinkle bend made in accordance with § 192.315, must comply with the following:

- (1) A bend must not impair the serviceability of the pipe.
- (2) For pipe more than 4 inches in nominal diameter, the difference between the maximum and minimum diameter at a bend must not be more than 2½ percent of the nominal diameter.
- (3) Each bend must have a smooth contour and be free from buckling, cracks, or any other mechanical damage.
- (4) On pipe containing a longitudinal weld, the longitudinal weld must be as near as practicable to the neutral axis of the bend unless:

- (i) The bend is made with an internal bending material; or
- (ii) The pipe is 12 inches or less in outside diameter or has a diameter to wall thickness ratio less than 70.

In the 1976 rulemaking it was stated that MTB intends to propose deletion of the ovality restriction in § 192.313. MTB averred, however, in the preamble of the final rule that the deletion could not be made in that proceeding because it had not been proposed in the advance notice or the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM). Comments were occasioned on the ovality restriction for the reason that MTB had proposed amending § 195.212 to include the restriction in the hazardous liquid pipeline safety regulations, then existing in Part 192 as § 192.313(a)(4). The following excerpt from the preamble (41 FR 26017) describes evaluation of the comments and the decision to exclude the restriction from Part 195:

Ovality—For pipe more than 4 inches in nominal diameter, § 192.313(a)(4) provides a numerical restriction on ovality due to bending. The liquid pipeline bending regulations do not contain a similar requirement. Because the ovality restriction limits wall thinning and excessive strain due to bending, MTB proposed that § 195.212 be amended to include the ovality limitation now existing in § 192.313(a)(4). This proposal resulted in a considerable amount of negative comment. Commenters pointed out that the proposed ovality requirement is twice as restrictive as the current industry practice and more stringent than the ovality limitation in pipe manufacturing specifications. In the latter case, if the proposal were adopted, pipe from a manufacturer could exceed the ovality restriction before being bent. Another commenter pointed out that liquid pipeline carriers have not filed with the Department any reports of failures caused by bends with excessive ovality.

Based on all the comments to Notice 75-7, MTB now believes that a numerical restriction on ovality is not necessary to provide for the safety of a steel pipeline subjected to field bending. Rather, MTB believes that the performance standards involving smoothness, mechanical damage, and serviceability are sufficient to protect against material damage due to bending. In effect, these standards also limit ovality because excessive ovality would impair the serviceability of a pipeline or cause mechanical damage. It further appears that the ovality restriction now existing in 192.313(a)(4) is derived from a provision of the 1968 addition [sic] of the ANSI B31.8 Code which was based on an operating consideration, e.g., passage of internal cleaning and inspection equipment, rather than a strength of materials consideration. Consequently, the proposed ovality amendment to § 195.212 is not adopted.

Although a numerical restriction on the ovality of field bends was shown to be unnecessary, further action was not taken due to the apparent absence of problems in meeting the requirement. Thus, the subject remained inactive until receipt of a January 25, 1984, petition from the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) for deletion of § 192.313(a)(2) (as the requirement has since been designated). The petition stated:

INGAA is not aware of ovality being a problem in construction, operation or safety; in fact, to the best of our knowledge ovality has not been connected with the cause of a single pipeline failure. Furthermore, with the retention of the requirements in Section 192.313(a)(1) and (a)(3), and we are not suggesting their elimination, it is our opinion the specific ovality limits contained in (a)(2) are unnecessary and do not contribute toward improving public safety.

NPRM and Discussion of Comments

A notice was published in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 1984 (49 FR 43728), proposing to delete the ovality restriction from Part 192, in agreement with conclusions of the previous rulemaking and the INGAA January 1984 petition. Favorable letter comments were received from all of the 12 respondents, consisting of oil and gas pipeline operators, a pipeline contractor, industry associations, and the Iowa State Commerce Commission.

In its comment, the Iowa Commission expressed concern that the ability of a bend to permit passage of internal cleaning or inspection equipment is relevant to pipeline safety and should not be ignored. MTB agrees. In fact, this issue was considered before in

Amendments 192-26 and 195-10 regarding bending of pipe for gas and hazardous liquid pipelines. In deciding not to adopt a proposed ovality restriction for liquid pipelines while at the same time adopting a proposed performance standard regarding pipe serviceability, MTB stated:

The requirement of the existing § 192.313(a)(1) that a bend may not impair the serviceability of the pipe was proposed to be added to § 195.212 as necessary to provide for continued safe bends. There were no adverse comments to this proposal. The requirement is particularly meaningful in the absence of an ovality restriction. If, for instance, a pipeline is so out-of-round that it prevents the passage of cleaning scrapers and other equipment necessary for safe operation of the pipeline, the pipeline's serviceability would be impaired. (41 FR 26017)

MTB believes the existing performance requirement that "[a] bend must not impair the serviceability of the pipe" (§ 192.313(a)(1)) is sufficient to assure that bends do not interfere with operations by preventing the passage of internal cleaning or inspection devices. A more stringent regulation such as the current ovality restriction is not needed for this purpose because internal cleaning or inspection activities normally are closely monitored by operator personnel. Therefore, MTB concludes that there is no need for a specific restriction on the ovality of field pipe bends in Part 192 to provide for structural safety and the safety consideration raised by the Iowa Commission is covered by the existing performance standard regarding serviceability. This conclusion is supported by an informative background comment from the Columbia Gas System Research Department that the 2½ percent ovality requirement initially was self-imposed by the industry for operating and economic reasons, and not for safety.

Advisory Committee Review

Section 4(b) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1673(b)), requires that each proposed amendment to a safety standard established under that statute be submitted to a 15-member advisory committee for its consideration. The committee, composed of persons knowledgeable about transportation of gas by pipeline, considered the proposed amendment to § 192.313 at a meeting in Washington, D.C., on October 30, 1984.

The Committee found the proposed amendment, as set forth in the NPRM, to be technically feasible, reasonable, and practicable.

Classification

This final rule is not "major" under Executive Order 12291 because it will have a positive effect on the economy of less than \$100 million a year, will result in cost savings to consumers, industry, and governmental agencies, and no adverse effects are anticipated. Also, it is not "significant" under Department of Transportation Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). Further, MTB has determined that this final rule does not require a full Regulatory Evaluation under those procedures. While the rule would provide definite cost savings for operators in some cases, the difference between the existing and revised requirements and the frequency at which savings would occur should result only in a minor cost savings impact on the gas pipeline industry as a whole.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) requires a review of certain rules proposed after January 1, 1981, for their effects on small businesses, organizations, and governmental bodies. I certify that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, because few, if any, gas pipeline operators who would be classed as small entities engage in the field bending of large steel pipe, and therefore such operators would not be affected by this rulemaking.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline safety, Pipe bends and elbows.

PART 192—[AMENDED]

In view of the foregoing, MTB amends 49 CFR 192.313(a) by removing paragraph (a)(2) and redesignating paragraphs (a)(3) and (a)(4) as (a)(2) and (a)(3), respectively.

(49 U.S.C. 1672 and 1604; 49 CFR 1.53, and Appendix A of Part 1)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 29, 1985.

L. D. Santman,

Director, Materials Transportation Bureau.
[FR Doc. 85-7931 Filed 4-2-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M