

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

Karl A. Kensinger,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 89-15101 Filed 6-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 89-285, RM-6582]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Gould, AR**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition by Arkansas Radio Company, seeking the allotment of FM Channel 273A to Gould, Arkansas, as that community's first local broadcast service. Coordinates used for proposed Channel 273A at Gould, Arkansas, are 33-59-00 and 91-33-26.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before August 11, 1989, and reply comments on or before August 28, 1989.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, as follows: Arkansas Radio Company, Attn.: J. Boyd Ingram, P.O. Box 73, Batesville, MS 38606.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Joyner, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 634-6530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 89-285, adopted June 1, 1989, and released June 21, 1989. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, (202) 857-3800, 2100 M Street NW Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in

Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contact.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, See 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

Karl A. Kensington,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 89-15102 Filed 6-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 89-284, RM-6492]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Greenwood, AR**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document requests comments on a petition filed on behalf of Red, White and Blue Communications, Inc., licensee of Station KAJJ(FM), Channel 292A, Greenwood, Arkansas, seeking the substitution of Channel 292C2 for Channel 292A and modification of its license accordingly. Reference coordinates used for Channel 292C2 at Greenwood are 35-12-25 and 93-58-25.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before August 10, 1989, and reply comments on or before August 25, 1989.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner's counsel, as follows: Aaron P. Shainis and Lee J. Peltzman, Esqs., Baraff, Koerner, Olender & Hochberg, P.C., Suite 203, 2033 M Street NW., Washington, DC 20036.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Joyner, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 634-6530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making, MM Docket No. 89-284, adopted May 31, 1989, and released June 20, 1989. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street NW Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, (202) 857-3800,

2100 M Street NW Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contact.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

Karl A. Kensinger,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 89-15103 Filed 6-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Research and Special Programs Administration****49 CFR Part 192**

[Docket No. PS-107; Notice 1]

RIN 2137-AB50

Determining the Extent of Corrosion on Gas Pipelines**AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: Gas pipeline operators who must now inspect for corrosion on buried metallic pipe that is exposed, would be required to investigate further to determine the full extent of any corrosion that is found. At least one major gas pipeline accident might have been prevented had such further investigation been required. Such investigation is required for hazardous liquid pipelines, and this proposal should result in a comparable level of safety.

DATE: Comments must be received by September 25, 1989. Late filed comments will be considered so far as is practicable.

ADDRESS: Send comments in duplicate to the Dockets Unit, Room 8417 Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS), 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 heading of this notice. All comments and docketed material 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:

Bernard L. Liebler, (202) 366-2392, regarding the subject matter of this proposed rule or the Dockets Unit, (202) 366-4148, regarding copies of this final rule or other material in the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 21, 1986, in Lancaster, Kentucky, a natural gas pipeline operated by a major interstate transmission company failed. The leaking gas was immediately ignited. The resulting fire injured 6 persons in varying degrees, destroyed several buildings and automobiles, and burned about 15 acres of pasture and woodland.

The 30-inch pipeline failed about 30 feet from the end of a casing where it crosses under State Highway 52. At the time of the failure, the pipeline was operating at 987 psig. The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) investigated the accident and concluded that the pipeline had failed at a region of external corrosion where the wall thickness had been reduced beyond its ability to contain the operating pressure of the pipeline.

As part of a rehabilitation program, the operator, in 1985, began to perform in-line inspections of its pipelines, and the in-line inspection of the line that would fail in 1986 had been completed. However, after an in-line inspection device is run and the data initially reviewed, it is standard procedure to excavate at least one location to verify the line location and calibrate the in-line inspection log. The location where the pipeline crossed Highway 52 was chosen as a verification location, excavated, and visually inspected on September 12, 1985.

Although the visual examination showed corrosion potentially requiring remedial action, the inspectors did not look for corrosion adjacent to and below the portion of pipe that had been exposed. Since the exposure was for verification of the line log and the operator did not judge the observed corrosion to be serious enough to require immediate replacement of the pipe, the excavated pipeline segment was backfilled until such time as further examination could be scheduled. The location of the failure was only about one foot from the location of the last

corrosion pit measured when the pipe was uncovered.

Because of the extreme proximity of the rupture to the pipeline segment that had been excavated to verify the in-line inspection predictions, the NTSB, in its report on the Beaumont and Lancaster incidents (NTSB/PAR-87-01), made the following recommendation to the OPS:

Amend 49 CFR 192.459 External corrosion control, examination of buried pipelines when exposed, to require pipeline operators to fully expose and fully examine pipelines exposed for any reason. The exposure and examination should continue until corroded or other damaged areas are no longer encountered. (P-87-3)

Current Requirements

The corrosion control requirements for gas operators provide in § 192.459 that, "Whenever an operator has knowledge that any portion of a buried pipeline is exposed, the exposed portion must be examined for evidence of external corrosion if the pipe is bare, or if the coating is deteriorated."

Although the regulation places an obligation on the operator to examine the exposed portion of pipe for corrosion, when corrosion is found, there is no obligation to extend that examination beyond the area already exposed.

In contrast, a corrosion control rule for hazardous liquid pipelines (49 CFR 195.416(e)) requires the operator to examine any exposed pipe for corrosion, and then requires that "If the operator finds that there is active corrosion, that the surface of the pipe is generally pitted, or that corrosion has caused a leak, it shall investigate further to determine the extent of the corrosion."

Discussion

The purpose of §§ 192.459 and 195.416(e) is to ensure that the operator uses every reasonable opportunity to visually inspect its buried pipelines for external corrosion. Otherwise, when pipelines are buried it is usually necessary to rely on indirect electrical measurements like pipe-to-soil potentials to determine the existence of external corrosion or the effectiveness of cathodic protection systems.

OPS believes that to achieve maximum benefit from visual observation of the condition of a pipeline, the examination should be as complete as possible. This is why any time corrosion is discovered on a hazardous liquid pipeline, the operator has to determine the full extent of any active corrosion. To do so, the excavation might have to be enlarged or extended, or both, for further observation, or buried pipe at or near

the excavation could be examined by indirect methods.

The approach recommended by NTSB is to always require further excavation until corrosion is no longer encountered. Unfortunately, if this approach were strictly followed, an operator could never be certain that the full extent of corrosion proximate to that observed in the original excavation had been determined. Corrosion pits are not all adjacent. Thus, there may be areas of uncorroded metal between any two small regions of corrosion. If an operator stopped excavating at the point where corrosion was no longer encountered, nearby corrosion might go undetected. OPS believes it is better for operators to use their own expert judgment on where excavation should stop when determining the extent of corrosion by this means. The flexible approach of § 195.416(e) permits this. It also permits the use of indirect methods when further excavation is unwise or impractical. In addition, surface corrosion of no consequence may be present, and may be widespread, particularly in old distribution lines, its pressure could cause the operator to continue excavating indefinitely.

Proposal

OPS believes that gas pipeline operators should be required to determine the extent of corrosion damage when a pipeline segment is inspected visually after being uncovered by excavation. However, because of the need for flexibility, as discussed above, OPS is proposing to adopt the same approach in Part 192 as is taken in Part 195. Section 192.459 would be amended to require the operator to investigate the extent of the corrosion, leaving the method and the amount of investigation to operator discretion. This performance-based approach would allow the operator to utilize any method of investigation appropriate under the circumstances.

In addition, this proposal is consistent with OPS's policy of making Parts 192 and 195 parallel wherever practicable. The remaining distinctions between § 192.459 and § 195.416(e) are to be incorporated as part of a separate project comparing all of the Part 192 and Part 195 corrosion control requirements.

Impact

Since the proposed rule would only extend the scope of specified operator activities under limited circumstances and would permit the operator to select the method to be used for investigating the extent of corrosion, the fiscal impact of the proposal should be small.

Therefore, this proposal is considered to be nonmajor under Executive Order 12291 and is not considered significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). Since the proposed rule should require minimal compliance expense, it does not warrant preparation of a Draft Evaluation. Also, based on the facts available concerning the impact of this proposal, I certify under Section 605 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act that it would not if adopted as final, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This action has been analyzed under the criteria of E.O. 12612 and found not to warrant preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline safety, corrosion, pipe.

In consideration of the foregoing, OPS proposes to amend 49 CFR Part 192 as follows:

PART 192—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 192 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 App. U.S.C. 1672 and 1804; 49 CFR 1.53.

2. Section 192.459 would be revised to read as follows:

§ 192.459 External corrosion control: Examination of buried pipeline when exposed.

Whenever an operator has knowledge

that any portion of a buried pipeline is exposed, the exposed portion must be examined for evidence of external corrosion if the pipe is bare, or if the coating is deteriorated. If external corrosion requiring remedial action is found, the operator shall investigate further to determine the extent of the corrosion and shall take remedial action to the extent required by § 192.483 and the applicable paragraphs of §§ 192.485, 192.487 or 192.489.

Issued in Washington, DC on June 21, 1989.

Richard L. Beam,

Director, Office of Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 89-15121 Filed 6-26-89; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M