

**Drafting Information**

The principal persons involved in drafting this document are: Mr. Robert Markle, Project Manager, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, and Mr. William Register, Project Attorney, Office of the chief counsel.

(46 U.S.C. 375, 391a, 416, and 481; 49 U.S.C. 1655(b); and 49 CFR 1.46)

Dated: September 10, 1979.

W. D. Markle,

*Deputy Chief, Office of Merchant Marine Safety.*

[FR Doc. 79-28540 Filed 9-12-79; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION****[47 CFR Part 73]**

[BC Docket No. 79-149; RM-3343; and RM-3465]

**FM Broadcast Station in St. Simons Island and Waycross, Ga.; Order Extending Time for Filing Reply Comments**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Order.

**SUMMARY:** Action taken herein extends the time for filing reply comments in a proceeding involving FM channel assignments in St. Simons Island and Waycross, Georgia. The additional time is given so that parties can respond to a counterproposal which requests the assignment of the same channel to Waycross instead of to St. Simons Island.

**DATE:** Reply comments must be received on or before September 7, 1979.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mildred B. Nesterak, Broadcast Bureau, (202) 632-7792.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Order Extending Time for Filing Reply Comments**

Adopted: August 27, 1979.

Released: August 31, 1979.

In the matter of amendment of § 73.202(b), *Table of Assignments*, FM Broadcast Stations. (St. Simons Island and Waycross, Georgia), BC Docket No. 79-149, RM-3343, RM-3465.

1. On June 7, 1979, the Commission adopted a Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 44 FR 34979, concerning the proposed assignment of FM Channel

<sup>1</sup>This community has been added to the caption.

249A to St. Simons Island, Georgia. The date for filing reply comments is presently August 27, 1979.

2. On August 6, 1979, a counterproposal was filed by Jack R. Mays requesting the assignment of FM Channel 249A to Waycross, Georgia. This request conflicts with the earlier proposal to assign Channel 249A to St. Simons Island, Georgia, as set forth in the Notice. Since the Waycross counterproposal is entitled to be considered as a timely filed request in this proceeding, we have consolidated it herein on our own motion.

3. Public Notice of this counterproposal (RM-3465) was given on August 27, 1979. Pursuant to that action, the Commission, also on its own motion, is extending the time for filing reply comments in order to give all parties an opportunity to prepare a response to the counterproposal.

4. Accordingly, it is ordered, that the date for filing reply comments in BC Docket No. 79-149 is extended to and including September 7, 1979.

Federal Communications Commission.

Richard J. Shibben,

*Chief, Broadcast Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 79-28441 Filed 9-12-79; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

**[47 CFR Part 73]**

[BC Docket No. 79-155; RM-3261 and RM-3469]

**FM Broadcast Station in Mountain Home, Ark.; Order Extending Time for Filing Reply Comments**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Order.

**SUMMARY:** Action taken herein extends the time for filing reply comments to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making concerning a proposed FM channel assignment at Mountain Home, Arkansas. The additional time is needed to respond to a counterproposal that was submitted in comments.

**DATE:** Reply comments must be filed on or before September 28, 1979.

**ADDRESS:** Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark N. Lipp, Broadcast Bureau, (202) 632-7792.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Order Extending Time for Filing Reply Comments**

Adopted: August 31, 1979.

Released: September 5, 1979.

In the matter of amendment of § 73.202(b), *Table of Assignments*, FM Broadcast Stations. (Mountain Home, Arkansas), BC Docket No. 79-155, RM-3261, RM-3469.

1. On June 18, 1979, the Commission adopted a *Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, 44 FR 37518, concerning the above-entitled proceeding. The date for filing reply comments is presently September 10, 1979.

2. On August 20, 1979, a petition was filed by Mountain Valley Broadcasters, Inc. to assign FM Channel 282 to Mountain Home, Arkansas, instead of Channel 288A which was previously proposed. Since this petition was timely filed and the Commission has accepted it as a counterproposal (RM-3469, Report No. 1191), Tri-Rivers Broadcasting Company has requested additional time until September 28, 1979, to respond to this proposal.

3. Under these circumstances, we are granting an extension in order to provide sufficient time to respond to the counterproposal.

4. Accordingly, it is ordered, that the request for extension of time for filing reply comments is extended to and including September 28, 1979.

5. This action is taken pursuant to authority found in Sections 4(i), 5(d)(1), and 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and § 0.281 of the Commission's rules.

Federal Communications Commission.

Richard J. Shibben,

*Chief, Broadcast Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 79-28442 Filed 9-12-79; 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-58, Notice 1]

**Transportation of Gas or Liquid by Pipeline; Temperature Limits on Cold Expanded Steel Pipe**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This notice proposes to amend the pipeline design regulations in Part 192 and Part 195 by increasing to 900° F the temperature limit to which cold expanded steel pipe may be heated (other than by welding) without a 25 percent reduction in design pressure as normally calculated under § 192.105 for gas pipelines and § 192.106 for liquid

pipelines. The existing temperature limit is 600° F and temperatures above 800° F for up to 1 hour are needed for removal of material defects called "hard spots" by heat tempering. Research shows that temperatures up to 900° F can be applied for up to 1 hour without adversely affecting safety.

**DATE:** Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on this proposal before December 1, 1979. Late filed comments will be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESS:** Comments should be sent in triplicate to: Docket Branch, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul J. Cory, 202-426-2392.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Currently § 192.105(b), governing the design of gas pipelines, and § 195.106(a), governing the design of hazardous liquid pipelines, require a 25 percent reduction in the allowable pipe design pressure for cold worked<sup>1</sup> steel pipe that is heated, other than by welding, to 600° F or more. This 25 percent in design pressure is intended to compensate for any reduction in material strength or other adverse effects on the material that could result from high temperatures. As explained below, MTB believes that these pipe steels can be subjected to temperatures as high as 900° F for limited periods of time without reduction of the material properties to a level that would be detrimental to the safe operation of the pipeline.

The ASME Gas Piping Standards Committee has petitioned (Pet. 76-26) the MTB to amend § 192.105(b) to raise the current 600° F temperature limit to 825° F in order to permit the removal of "hard spots" in steel pipe by heat tempering. While the petition did not seek an amendment to § 195.106(b), because of the similarity of the two rules, MTB has adopted the ASME petition as a basis for proposing to amend both requirements. The petition is available for review and copying in the docket for this proceeding.

Hard spots occur during the manufacturing of steel pipe. If steel plate which has been heated to a temperature in excess of 1,550° F for rolling to the thickness of pipe is suddenly cooled (quenched), for any reason, it becomes extremely hard and brittle.

<sup>1</sup>Note: Hereafter the term "cold expanded" is used instead of "cold worked", both for consistency with the language of the API line pipe specifications referenced in Part 192 and to avoid possible confusion with cold finished seamless pipe. Provisions of both the present and the proposed regulations do not apply to cold finished seamless pipe with regard to subsequent heating.

Occasionally, during the manufacturing of pipe, water may be sprayed or unintentionally spilled on the hot steel in a localized area, causing a hard spot to be formed on the surface of the steel. Unless that hard spot is subsequently reheated to a high temperature for a sufficient amount of time to allow the metal to soften (called tempering), the hard spot will appear on the surface of the finished pipe.

If pipe containing a hard spot with a measure of hardness greater than 360 Brinell Hardness Number (BHN) is buried in soil that is slightly caustic (chemically basic) and is subjected to a moderate to high stress (internal pressure would supply this) in the presence of hydrogen (which could result from corrosion protection), the pipeline may fail due to hydrogen-stress cracking. Removal of any one of these three conditions from the environment of the hard spot or elimination of the hard spot will prevent pipe failure from hydrogen-stress cracking.

A report entitled "The Effect of Tempering on the Mechanical Properties of Cold-Expanded Line-Pipe Steel," by Groenveld et. al., dated December 21, 1970, done by Battelle Memorial Institute under the sponsorship of the American Gas Association, is cited by ASME Committee as justification for the petition. The Battelle report concludes that the present 600° F limitation in § 192.105(b) could be increased to permit heating up to 825° F, provided the increase in temperature is limited to a total time of 1 hour. The report is available for review and copying in the public docket.

On page 2 of the Battelle report, it stated that "steels having actual yield strengths below 150,000 pounds per square (psi) (ultimate tensile strengths below about 170,000 psi or hardness below about 350 BHN) do not fail at applied stresses of the magnitude encountered in normal operations when pipelines in soils are cathodically protected." Battelle then states that the objective in tempering of hard spots is to reduce "hardness below 350 BHN" and further states, " \* \* \* To achieve a hardness of about 350 BHN after tempering, the hard spots should be tempered at about 800° F. \* \* \* " On page 10 of the report, the following phrase appears: "Since 800° F is the minimum tempering temperature, from the standpoint of softening hard spots, that should be used \* \* \* "

While MTB believes that the Battelle report adequately establishes the need to attain a temperature of 800° F minimum if hard spots are going to be removed by heat tempering, various metals handbooks (e.g., "Steel and Its

Heat Treatment," Vol. I-5th Ed., by D. K. Bullens, page 53) indicate that the temperature required to reduce hard spots in most pipeline quality steels to less than 350 BHN would be higher than, or only at the top end of the 600° - 825° F range. MTB therefore questions the practicality of the 825° F temperature limit suggested by ASME since control of the temperature of the pipe to a minimum of 800° F (needed for tempering) with no more than an allowable 25° F variation would be very difficult if not impossible with the heating equipment that is currently available.

In examining the effects of increased temperatures above 800° F on pipe steels, MTB reviewed the data presented in the Battelle study. This data shows that:

A. Heating of X-52 cold expanded pipe at 900° F for 1 hour at temperature results in an average reduction in yield strength of 2 percent, which is considered to be within the test error. (One test resulted in a reduction of 4.7 percent, the others being materially unaffected.)

b. Short-time heating of X-52 pipe material at 850° F to 900° F (up to 30 minutes) results in a slight average increase in yield strength.

c. Heating of X-60 and X-65 cold expanded pipe at 900° F for 1 hour at temperature results in an average increase in yield strength.

d. Heating X-52, X-60, and X-65 pipe materials in the range of 800° to 900° F for 1 hour has shown no significant degradation of properties, including fracture toughness.

Thus, on a short-time basis (1 hour or less), the Battelle report shows that the current 600° F limitation is too restrictive with respect to heating of cold expanded line pipe inasmuch as temperatures as high as 900° F do not significantly affect the yield strength of the steel. The Battelle data further indicates that a 1 hour heating time is both adequate to permit the tempering of hard spots, and restrictive enough to prevent actual reduction of properties in the surrounding metal. (Since this rulemaking is concerned only with heating for a time sufficient to permit the removal of hard spots, MTB has not examined the effects of heating above 600° F for longer than 1 hour.) Based on the Battelle tests, MTB believes that a 900° F temperature limit is safe and more practical than the 825° F recommendation. Thus, MTB proposes to limit to one hour the time that cold expanded steel pipe may be exposed to temperatures in excess of 600° F (to a maximum of 900° F) without requiring a 25 percent reduction in design pressure.

Although Parts 192 and 195 do not address toughness of pipeline steels, it is noted that the Battelle report found no adverse effect on toughness due to heating in the range of 800°-900° F.

Since the ASME petition was received new pipeline steels have been introduced and referenced and specifications have been adopted in Part 192 (Amdt. 192-22, 41 FR 13591, March 31, 1976) that permit the use of steels with an SMYS of 70,000 psi. Data on tempering of steels with this higher SMYS has not been available to MTB. Since no problems are anticipated, MTB has included the X-70 steels in this rulemaking. However, it is requested that commenters provide any data available on the tempering of X-70 pipeline steels to assist MTB in further evaluating whether X-70 steels should be included with the other X-grade steels in this rulemaking or specifically excluded from the proposed relaxation of the present temperature limitation in §§ 192.105(b) and 195.106(a).

The existing §§ 192.105(b) and 195.106(a) cite welding as an exception to the heating limitation, but omit mention of possible stress relieving as a part of welding. Because § 192.239(g) specifies minimum stress-relieving temperatures of 1,100° F and 1,200° F for various steels, this notice proposes to include stress relieving as an exception to the existing temperature limitation.

With the time and temperature limitation proposed §§ 192.105(b) and 195.106(c), MTB believes that a specified procedure is necessary for removal of hard spots from steel pipe to assure that the proposed constraints are met. For this reason, MTB is proposing to add a new paragraph (c) to §§ 192.713 and 195.422 requiring that if hard spots are removed by thermal methods, they must be removed in accordance with established written procedures consistent with the temperature limitations of § 192.105(b) or § 195.106(a), as appropriate.

The MTB is studying the problems of hard spots in steel pipe to determine the need for a possible requirement for detection and removal of such hard spots under operating conditions that are hazardous or likely to become hazardous. Currently, we have insufficient information to make such a determination.

The MTB has determined that this document does not require a full draft evaluation, since the proposal has a minimal impact upon the industry. The proposal is a relaxation of present temperature limitations to permit hard spots to be removed from cold expanded steel pipe by heat tempering when the operator wishes to do so.

In consideration of the foregoing, MTB proposes that Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 192 and 195 be amended as follows:

1. By revising § 192.105(b) to read as follows:

§ 192.105 Design formula for steel pipe.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) If steel pipe that has been subjected to cold expansion to meet the SMYS is subsequently heated, other than by welding or stress relieving as a part of welding, the design pressure is limited to 75 percent of the pressure determined under paragraph (a) of this section if:

(1) The temperature of the pipe exceeds 482° C (900° F) at any time; or  
(2) The temperature of the pipe is held above 316° C (600° F) for more than 1 hour.

2. By amending the description of the term "F" in § 195.106(a) as follows:

§ 195.106 Internal design pressure.

(a) \* \* \*

F=A design factor of 0.72, except that a design factor of 0.60 is used for pipe, including risers, on a platform located offshore or on a platform in inland navigable waters, and 0.54 is used for pipe that has been subjected to cold expansion to meet the specified minimum yield strength and has been subsequently heated, other than by welding or stress relieving as a part of welding, to a temperature higher than 482° C (900° F) for any period of time or over 316° C (600° F) for more than 1 hour.

\* \* \* \* \*

3. By adding a new paragraph (c) to § 192.713 to read as follows:

§ 192.713 Transmission Lines; permanent field repair of imperfections and damages.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) If hard spots are removed by thermal methods, they must be removed in accordance with written procedures which ensure that the temperature and time limitations of § 192.105(b) are met.

4. By adding a new paragraph (c) to § 195.422 to read as follows:

§ 195.422 Pipeline repairs.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) If hard spots are removed by thermal methods, they must be removed in accordance with written procedures which ensure that the time and temperature limitations of § 195.106(a) are met.

(49 U.S.C. 1672; 49 U.S.C. 1804; 18 U.S.C. 831-835; 49 CFR 1.53, Appendix A of Part 1, and Appendix A of Part 106.)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on September 7, 1979.

Cesar De Leon,

Associate Director for Pipeline Safety Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc. 79-23482 Filed 9-12-79; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-82-M

[49 CFR Part 195]

[Docket PS-53, Notice 3]

Transportation of Liquids by Pipelines; Valve Spacing on Pipelines Carrying Highly Volatile Liquids

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau, DOT.

ACTION: Amended Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is intended to resolve conflicting information received as the result of Notice 1, Docket No. PS-53, that proposed to require the installation of remotely controlled valves at 7.5 mile intervals on pipelines transporting highly volatile liquids (HVL). This notice proposes alternative courses of regulatory action that would require remotely controlled valves on HVL pipelines at pump stations and terminals or at intervals spaced in accordance with a class location concept similar to that in 49 CFR, Part 192 for gas transmission pipelines.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by October 30, 1979. Late filed comments will be considered as far as practicable. As discussed hereafter, a public hearing will be held October 11, 1979 at 9 a.m.

**ADDRESS:** Comments must be sent in triplicate to the Docket Branch, Materials Transportation Bureau, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590.

The public hearing will be held in Room 2230 at Nassif Building, 400 7th Street, SW., Wash., D.C.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Frank Robinson, 202-426-2392.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Need for This Amended Notice**

To ensure that carriers can rapidly isolate a failed section of pipeline carrying a highly volatile liquid (HVL) and thereby reduce the amount of commodity spilled and the ensuing accident effects, the MTB published a notice (43 FR 39402, September 5, 1979) proposing the installation of automatic or remotely controlled valves at 7.5 mile intervals or less on new pipelines transporting HVL in inhabited areas. The notice also provided for equipping existing valves located more than 3.75 miles from another valve on existing