Inquiries concerning the land should be addressed to the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 2965, Portland, Oregon 97208.

Garrey E. Carruthers,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

February 25, 1982.

[FR Doc. 82-6119 Filed 3-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-M

43 CFR Public Land Order 6182

[NM 23614]

New Mexico; Withdrawal for Army National Guard Rifle Range

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Public land order.

SUMMARY: This order withdraws 52.70 acres of public land and reserves it for use as a rifle range and weekend training site for the New Mexico Army National Guard for a period for 20 years.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 8, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stella V. Gonzales, New Mexico State Office, 505-988-6211.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by Section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 90 Stat. 2751; 43 U.S.C. 1714, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights, the following described public land which is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby withdrawn from settlement, sale, location or entry, under the general land laws, including the mining laws, 30 U.S.C. Ch. 2 but not the mineral leasing laws, as a rifle range for the New Mexico Army National Guard.

New Mexico Principal Meridian

T. 12 N., R. 30 E.,
Sec. 32, lots 1 and 2.

The area described contains 52.70 acres in Quay County.

2. The withdrawal made by this order does not alter the applicability of those public land laws governing the use of the land under lease, license or permit, or governing the disposal of its mineral or vegetative resources other than under the mining laws.

3. This withdrawal shall remain in effect for a period of 20 years from the date of this order.

Garrey E. Carruthers,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

February 25, 1982.

[FR Doc. 82-6120 Filed 3-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-M

43 CFR Public Land Order 6183

[NM 36236]

Oklahoma; Withdrawal Fort Sill Military Reservation

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Public land order.

SUMMARY: This action withdraws 10.32 acres of public land and reserves it for troop maneuvers and filed artillery firing exercises at Fort Sill for a period of 20 years.

EFFECTIVE DATES: March 8, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stella V. Gonzales, New Mexico State Office 505-988-6211.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by Section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 90 Stat. 2751; 43 U.S.C. 1714, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights, the following described public lands are hereby withdrawn from settlement, sale, location, or entry, under the general land laws, including the mining laws, 30 U.S.C. Ch. 2, but not the mineral leasing laws, and reserved for the use of the Department of the Army for military purposes.

Indian Meridian, Oklahoma

T. 3 N., R. 13 W.,
Sec. 19 Block 15 Goldenpass Townsite located in SE¼SE¼;
Sec. 20, Blocks 34, 35 and 36 Goldenpass Townsite located in SW¼SW¼.

The area described contains 10.32 acres in Comanche County, Oklahoma.

2. The withdrawal made by this order does not alter the applicability of those public land laws governing the use of the lands under lease, license, or permit, or governing the disposal of their mineral or vegetative resources other than under the mining laws.

3. This withdrawal shall remain in effect for a period of 20 years from the date of this order.

Garrey E. Carruthers,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

February 25, 1982.

[FR Doc. 82-6121 Filed 3-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 192

[Amdt. 192-39; Docket OPSO-37]

Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline; Metal Alloy Fittings in Plastic Pipelines

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), RSPA, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule removes the requirement in § 192.455(f)(3) that a means be provided for identifying the location of each metal alloy fitting that is installed without coating and cathodic protection in plastic pipelines. The identification requirement is unnecessray for safety and hinders the use of corrosion resistant metal alloy fittings to mechanically join plastic pipe and components.

DATE: This final rule takes effect April 7, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: L. M. Furrow; 202-426-2392.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fittings made of corrosion resistant metal alloys are available for use to mechanically join lengths of plastic pipe and plastic components. These fittings have both safety and economic advantages. For one, mechanical joints may be made by personnel who do not have the added skills required for other methods of joining plastic pipe (see § 192.285). More important, however, a properly selected alloy (matching the alloy with the environment) can protect a buried fitting against electrochemical corrosion without the added expense of cathodic protection.

Before 1977, the use of corrosion resistant metal alloy fittings in plastic pipelines was hindered by MTB's corrosion control regulations (§§ 192.455 and 192.465) aimed at preventing or mitigating corrosion on buried or submerged metal pipelines, including metal fittings in plastic pipelines. Under corrosive conditions, ordinary metal fittings in plastic pipelines can corrode rapidly, causing gas leaks that could threaten public safety. To guard against this result, before 1977 § 192.455 required that all metal fittings be coated and cathodically protected, and then periodically inspected under § 192.465. The cost of materials and labor to comply with these corrosion control measures outweighed the safety and economic benefits from using corrosion resistant metal alloy fittings in plastic

pipelines. However, in 1977, MTB considered documented tests and experience (Notice 76–1, 41 FR 42221, Sept. 21, 1976) showing that under various corrosive environments, properly selected metal alloy fittings in plastic pipelines can provide sufficient protection against electrochemical corrosion. Thus, a new paragraph (f) was added to § 192.455 to conditionally except these fittings from the cathodic protection and inspection requirements (Amendment 192–28; 42 FR 35653, July 11, 1977).

Three conditions were established in § 192.455(f) to qualify metal alloy fittings for the exception from the coating and cathodic protection requirements: First, there must be evidence that in the area of application, corrosion will be controlled by alloyage. Second, the fitting must have a design that prevents leakage from localized corrosion pitting. Third, the pipeline operator must have some means to identify the location of each fitting that is installed.

The first condition was adopted to ensure that fittings are made from alloys that have been proven effective against corrosion in the soils in which the fittings are to be used. The second condition recognizes that even under the best circumstances some corrosion pitting can occur, and in the absence of coating and cathodic protection, the fitting's design is the final safeguard against leakage. Because of the relatively small amount of field experience with alloy fittings in plastic pipelines that had occurred by 1977, and the consequent uncertainty in predicting long range corrosion protection, the third condition was established to ensure that operators keep track of any fittings installed so that remedial action could readily be taken if needed in the future.

Looking toward possible relaxation of the conditions under § 192.455(f), MTB has sought to obtain more information about the long-term corrosive effects on alloy fittings in plastic pipelines. For example, in the preamble to the final rule document establishing the conditional exception, MTB requested that operators report the conditions of alloy fittings that are uncovered, paying special attention to leakage and corrosion performance. To date, all the information received about the susceptibility of alloy fittings to corrosion has pointed toward deleting the § 192.455(f)(3) condition as costly and unnecessary for safety.

While the bulk of the information has come from observations by MTB or State field enforcement personnel, or reports made to them, one major gas distribution company, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), has prepared an extensive written finding of its experience with alloy fittings in California soils. The PG&E report dated May, 1980, (a copy of which is in the public docket) shows that out of 362 samples from the approximately 942,000 Type 316 stainless steel alloy fittings manufactured by AMP, Inc., and installed between 1969 and 1979 in a broad range of soil conditions (soil resistivity from 330 to 100,000 ohm.cm; pH from 4.4 to 9) none exhibited any corrosive effects. This report substantiates preliminary findings made by PG&E in a 1976 study of 200 fittings which formed a basis for the notice of proposed rulemaking that preceded Amendment 192–28.

In addition to requesting reports from operators, MTB also sought advice on the need for § 192.455(f)(3) from the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, a statutory advisory committee made up of 15 knowledgeable persons from both the public and private sectors who are qualified to evaluate pipeline safety regulations. In its report of a meeting held January 17, 1978, the Committee, by unanimous vote, recommended that § 192.455(f)(3) be deleted on grounds that the rule serves no useful purpose and it adds to cost without a commensurate safety benefit.

In a petition (P–17) dated September 21, 1981, AMP Incorporated, a manufacturer of stainless steel fittings for plastic pipelines, argues for removal of the paragraph (f)(3) limitation. AMP states that its fittings made from AISI Series 300 stainless steels "provide a sufficient, long-term safeguard against corrosion, and obviate the need to subject them to additional location recordkeeping requirements." As a basis for its argument, AMP points to its sale since 1967 of over 15,000,000 metal alloy fittings to more than 160 operators throughout the United States, without having received any reports of corrosion failures.

AMP furthers its argument by detailing (in an appendix to the petition) the administrative costs of complying with paragraph (f)(3) by the use of computerized data banks to provide for immediate identification of each fitting installed under § 192.455(f). Although the rule does not require that operators have such means of identification (a mere card index system might suffice, using ordinary business records kept for customer services), according to the petition, operators who choose to comply in this way may spend as much as $22,500 in start-up costs, with on-going industry-wide costs in excess of $500,000 annually.

In addition to the financial costs of complying with paragraph (f)(3), MTB feels the biggest drawback of this provision is the inhibiting effect it has on the use of corrosion resistant alloy fittings to mechanically join plastic pipe components. As previously mentioned, joining plastic pipelines with corrosion resistant alloy fittings has safety and economic advantages over other joining techniques. The main purposes of issuing Amendment 192–28 was to allow operators and the public to fully realize these advantages. Since it appears that most operators are reluctant to utilize alloy fittings and also comply with the identification requirement of § 192.455(f)(3), then paragraph (f)(3) essentially frustrates the main purpose of Amendment 192–28 and should be removed unless it is needed for safety. As to the safety need for paragraph (f)(3), the evidence points to the contrary.

In summary, since Amendment 192–28 was issued, there has been an accumulation of favorable information about the effects of corrosion on alloy fittings that reduces the prior uncertainties about their long-term behavior in corrosive environments. In addition, § 192.455(f)(2) provides a redundant safeguard against the potential harmful effects of corrosion, should any occur. In view of these factors and the added costs and inhibiting effects of providing a means for later identification of the location of each fitting that is installed, MTB is by this document repealing § 192.455(f)(3).

Because this document grants relief from a regulatory burden for which there is no apparent need, a notice and comment period would be unnecessary, and in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553, the repeal of § 192.455(f)(3) is final. Also, since this final rulemaking action will have a postive effect on the economy of less than $100 million a year, will result in a cost savings to consumers, industry, and government agencies, and no adverse effects are anticipated, the action is not "major" under E.O. 12291 or "significant" under DOT procedures.

PART 192—TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL AND OTHER GAS BY PIPELINE: MINIMUM FEDERAL SAFETY STANDARDS

In consideration of the foregoing, § 192.455(f) of Part 192 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations is revised to read as follows:

§ 192.455 External corrosion control: Buried or submerged pipelines installed after July 31, 1971.

* * * * *

(f) This section does not apply to electrically isolated, metal alloy fittings in plastic pipelines, if—

(1) For the size fitting to be used, an operator can show by tests, investigation, or experience in the area of application that adequate corrosion control is provided by alloyage; and

(2) The fitting is designed to prevent leakage caused by localized corrosion pitting.

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

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 2, 1982.

L. D. Santman,

Director, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc. 82-6045 Filed 3-5-82; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

49 CFR Part 1111

[Ex Parte Nos. 282 (Sub-3) and 282 (Sub-8)]

Railroad Consolidation Procedures, Time Revisions

AGENCY: Interstate Commerce Commission.

ACTION: Final rules.

SUMMARY: The Commission has revised the informational requirements for applications by rail carriers under 49 U.S.C. 11343–11346. These regulations will result in better use of Commission and carrier resources by reducing required information, and avoiding lengthy and costly proceedings when unwarranted by their impact. Additionally, the submission of information that is unnecessary or available elsewhere will no longer be required. The Commission has also adopted rules incorporating the time limits of 49 U.S.C. 11345 as amended by section 228 of the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 (Staggers Act), Pub. L. 96–448. Other changes necessitated by the Staggers Act have also been made.

EFFECTIVE DATES: These procedures will be effective on April 7, 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ernest B. Abbott, (202) 275–3002.

ADDRESS: Copies: The text of the full decision is available from: Office of the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, Room 2227, Washington, D.C. 20423; or by calling toll-free (800) 424–5403.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: These rules incorporate changes based on the Staggers Act and on comments to previous versions of the rules, published at 44 FR 66626, November 20, 1979, and 45 FR 62991, September 23, 1980. The text of these rules appears in the Appendix to this notice. The Commission's decision explaining the changes in the rules can be obtained from the Commission's office of the Secretary.

Subpart A to Part 1111 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations is revised in accordance with the appendix of this decision. (49 U.S.C. 11343–11347 and 5 U.S.C. 552 and 553).

Dated: February 19, 1982.

By the Commission, Chairman Taylor, Vice-Chairman Gilliam, Commissioners Gresham and Clapp. Commissioner Clapp dissented in part with a separate expression.

Agatha L. Mergenovich,

Secretary.

COMMISSIONER CLAPP, dissenting in part:

While I support the continuing efforts to improve consolidation procedures and to lessen filing burdens where possible, I am concerned about the use of "market or impact analysis" in lieu of more specific filing requirements. An applicant should have the flexibility to provide only useful information but I believe that the Commission should offer more complete guidelines so that all interested persons will know what needs to be filed in an application. I am not necessarily advocating traffic studies although the AAR has pointed out traffic studies may still be necessary for analysis of impact on essential services. Whatever data is required generally, the waiver process is always available for relief when certain information is not needed or not pertinent.

Under the new regulations, the Commission may still be able to obtain the information needed to decide an application, but it will be by way of less certain, more circuitous route. Thus, the burden on all parties may ultimately be greater.

Part 1111 of Title 49 is amended as follows:

1. The heading for Part 1111 is revised.

2. Subpart A is revised to read as follows:

Appendix

Subpart A of Part 1111 of Title 49 is revised to read as follows:

PART 1111—RAILROAD ACQUISITION, CONTROL, MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, TRACKAGE RIGHTS AND LEASE PROCEDURES

Subpart A—General Acquisition Procedures

Sec.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 11343–11347 and 5 U.S.C. 552 and 553.

Subpart A—General Acquisition Procedures

§ 1111.0 Scope and purpose.

These regulations set out the information to be filed and the procedures to be followed in control, merger, acquisition, lease, trackage rights, and any other consolidation transaction involving more than one railroad that is initiated under 49 U.S.C. 11343. Section 1111.2 separates these transactions into four types: *Major, significant, minor,* and *exempt.* The informational requirements for these types of transactions differ. Before an application is filed, the designation of type of transaction may be clarified or certain of the information required may be waived upon petition to the Commission. This procedure is explained in § 1111.4. The required contents of an application are set out in §§ 1111.6 (general information supporting the transaction), 1111.7 (competitive and market information), 1111.8 (operational information) and 1111.9 (financial data). *Major* and *significant* applications must contain all of the information required in §§ 1111.6 through 1111.9. The informational requirements for a *minor* application are more limited and are set out in §§ 1111.6 and 1111.8. Procedures (including time limits, filing requirements, participation requirements, and other matters) are contained in § 1111.4. Index I lists all exhibits and indicates the type of application for which the exhibit is required. Index II is a table of contents of this Subpart. All applicants must comply with the Commission's general procedural rules, in Part 1100, unless otherwise specified. These regulations may be cited as the Railroad Consolidation Procedures.

§ 1111.1 General policy statement for merger or control of at least two Class I railroads.

(a) *General.* The Interstate Commerce Commission encourages private industry initiative that leads to the rationalization of the nation's rail facilities and reduction of its excess