



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Pipeline and Hazardous  
Materials Safety  
Administration**

1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20590

December 29, 2021

Mr. Ed Zinsmeyer  
Compliance Manager AME  
DynaEnergetics US Inc.  
2050 West Sam Houston Parkway South  
Suite 1750  
Houston, TX 77042

Reference No. 21-0095

Dear Mr. Zinsmeyer:

This letter is in response to your September 20, 2021, email requesting clarification of the Hazardous Materials Regulations (HMR; 49 CFR Parts 171-180) applicable to the classification of jet perforating guns (JPGs). Specifically, you state that your company has a JPG that was tested and approved by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) in accordance with § 173.56, but not classed using the Association of Energy Service Companies (AESC)/Institute of Makers of Explosives (IME) Standard, also known as the "Guide to Obtaining DOT Approval of Jet Perforating Guns using AESC/IME Perforating Gun Specifications," Ver. 02, dated September 1, 2017. You have included an Explosives Approval Letter, issued by PHMSA, which indicates the JPGs are classed as "UN0494, Jet perforating guns, charged, oil well, without detonator, 1.4D." You ask whether your JPGs may be transported without conforming to the requirements of Special Provision 114 in § 172.102.

The answer is yes. While Special Provision 114 provides conditions by which JPGs approved under UN0124, 1.1D may be reclassified to 1.4D under UN0454, it does not preclude the possibility of fully testing a JPG for approval as UN0454, 1.4D directly in accordance with § 173.56(b). The conditions of Special Provision 114 are applicable to JPGs PHMSA has approved as "UN0124, Jet perforating guns, charged, oil well, without detonator, 1.1D," and are not an additional requirement for those directly approved by PHMSA as "UN0494, Jet perforating guns, charged, oil well, without detonator, 1.4D."

I hope this information is helpful. Please contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Chief, Regulatory Review and Reinvention Branch  
Standards and Rulemaking Division

Larson

**From:** [Foster, Glenn \(PHMSA\)](#)  
**To:** [Dodd, Alice \(PHMSA\)](#); [Hillman, Kenetha CTR \(PHMSA\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Question on an approved perfgun and SP114  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 10:24:06 AM  
**Attachments:** [Trinity Gun Approval.pdf](#)  
[ETC Report 2019092-trinity\\_gun.pdf](#)

---

21-0095

Alice and Kenetha,

Please have the attached checked in as an Interp and assigned to the next Specialist in the rotation.

Thanks,  
Glenn

---

**From:** Fink, William (PHMSA) <William.Fink@dot.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 21, 2021 9:34 AM  
**To:** Foster, Glenn (PHMSA) <Glenn.Foster@dot.gov>  
**Cc:** Singh, Harpreet (PHMSA) <harpreet.singh@dot.gov>; Raszewski, Kimberly (PHMSA) <kimberly.raszewski@dot.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Question on an approved perfgun and SP114

Glenn,

A request for an interp.

Bill Fink

---

**From:** Ed Zinsmeyer <[Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com](mailto:Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 20, 2021 4:10 PM  
**To:** Fink, William (PHMSA) <[William.Fink@dot.gov](mailto:William.Fink@dot.gov)>  
**Subject:** Question on an approved perfgun and SP114

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Bill,

With the change in rules governing loaded perforating guns, I have a question regarding a gun we manufacture that we had live tested and approved as a 1.4D gun. We call it our Trinity gun. It passed the live tests because it contains no detonating cord, which is typically the most sensitive article in a perfgun.

Since this Trinity gun was tested and approved on its own and not approved under assumption using the AESC/IME Guidelines, I need an official interpretation by PHMSA stating this gun can be shipped on its own without adhering to SP114 and the 200 pounds NEC limit.

How do I go about getting that interpretation? I have attached the official lab report and our Approval for this gun. Hope you can help.

Thanks,

**Ed Zinsmeyer**

Compliance Manager AME

---

**DynaEnergetics US Inc.**

2050 West Sam Houston Parkway South, Suite 1750  
Houston, Texas 77042  
United States  
[www.dynaenergetics.com](http://www.dynaenergetics.com)

T +1 512.656.2943

F -

M +1.512.656.2943

[Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com](mailto:Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com)

*Introducing DS Gravity™ and DS LoneStar™*

[Click here to learn more](#)



This email is intended only for the use of the party to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this email or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

---

**From:** Carson, Alan (PHMSA) <[alan.carson@dot.gov](mailto:alan.carson@dot.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, September 20, 2021 3:01 PM

**To:** Ed Zinsmeyer <[Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com](mailto:Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com)>

**Subject:** [External] RE: question on another perfgun we sell

**This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL! STOP. THINK before you CLICK links  
or OPEN attachments.**

ED

I would suggest you request a letter of interpretation from standards at PHMSA HQ.

**Alan S. Carson**

Investigator, Southwest Region

US DOT/PHMSA

8701 S. Gessner Road, Suite 900, Houston, TX 77074

Office: 713-272-2820 ♦ Mobile: 915-238-8545

---

**From:** Ed Zinsmeyer <[Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com](mailto:Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, September 20, 2021 2:55 PM

**To:** Carson, Alan (PHMSA) <[alan.carson@dot.gov](mailto:alan.carson@dot.gov)>

**Subject:** question on another perfgun we sell

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Alan,

DynaEnergetics manufactures, sells, and ships a loaded perforating gun that contains no detonating cord. These are our Trinity perforating guns. (see attached Approval) We spent the money to have that gun configuration live tested to conform with the UN 6 tests, instead of using the AESC/IME Guidelines which would have classed these guns under “assumption”. Because these guns were approved NOT using the AESC/IME Guidelines, and shown to be 1.4D by actual laboratory testing, I interpret that I do NOT have to ship them under Special Provision 114. Can I get a clarification of that? The entire rule change that occurred last year specifically references those guns approved under the AESC/IME Guidelines... so I think I am correct that our Trinity guns fall outside that rule change.

I hope you can help me on that, as I want to avoid any future confusion.

Thank you,

**Ed Zinsmeyer**

Compliance Manager AME

---

**DynaEnergetics US Inc.**

2050 West Sam Houston Parkway South, Suite 1750

Houston, Texas 77042

United States

[www.dynaenergetics.com](http://www.dynaenergetics.com)

T +1 512.656.2943

F -

M +1.512.656.2943

[Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com](mailto:Ed.Zinsmeyer@dynaenergetics.com)

*Introducing DS Gravity™ and DS LoneStar™*

[Click here to learn more](#)



This email is intended only for the use of the party to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this email or its contents is strictly

prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.