

FR Q MAILERS BALTO MD

366.4 ADC Tray Preparation and Labeling

Mail left over after preparing all 3-digit and SCF trays must be placed in the appropriate Area Distribution Center (ADC) tray. Mail for each 3-digit destination within a tray must be physically separated by visible index tabs or separator cards. Only those authorized 3-digit ZIP Code prefixes in Exhibit 122.63m can be mailed under the provisions of 366. ADC trays must be labeled in accordance with the requirements in Exhibit 122.63o, in the following manner:

Line 1: Area Distribution Center, Code

Line 2: Class, Contents

Line 3: Mailer, Mailer Location

Sample:

DIS ORLANDO FL 327

FCM ZIP +4 PRESORT

FR Q MAILERS BALTO MD

366.5 Postage Payment

Mailings under this section at the time of acceptance must be accompanied by documentation supporting mailing statements which are required by 382.4. The types of documents required to support mailing statements for mailings presented under the provisions of 366 are listed in 365.4. Required documentation depends on whether postage is affixed to each piece in the mailing and whether the ZIP+4 rate pieces are physically separated from other pieces in the mailing.

366.6 Mailing Statements

The mailer must submit a mailing statement for each mailing. When pieces for a mailing list or mailing cycle as defined by the mailer are mailed over a period of more than one day, each day the mailer must indicate on each mailing statement submitted under this procedure the mailing cycle or mailing list to which the pieces belong, and the final mailing statement for the mailing list or mailing cycle must accurately account for the full list or cycle. Under this procedure, a mailing statement may not be submitted for more than one mailing cycle or one mailing list.

An appropriate amendment to 39 CFR 111.3 to reflect these changes will be published when the final rule is adopted.

Fred Eggleston,

Assistant General Counsel, Legislative Division.

[FR Doc. 86-1467 Filed 1-22-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Parts 171, 172, 173, 176, 177, 178, and 180

[Docket Nos. HM-183, 183A; Notice No. 85-4]

Requirements for Cargo Tanks; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation, Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking; Extension of Comment Period.

SUMMARY: On September 17, 1985, RSPA published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the *Federal Register* (50 FR 37766). The NPRM proposed to amend the Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR Parts 171-179) pertaining to the manufacture of cargo tanks and the operation, maintenance, repair and requalification of all specification cargo tanks. A document correcting typographical errors, omissions, minor discrepancies and clarifying certain requirements in the NPRM was published on December 5, 1985 (50 FR 49866).

Several petitioners—including the American Petroleum Institute, the Compressed Gas Association, Inc., the National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., the Truck Trailer Manufacturers Association and the Petroleum Marketers Association of America—have requested additional time to evaluate the proposals contained in the NPRM. RSPA agrees that some additional time should be allowed and is extending the closing date for comments on Notice No. 85-4.

DATE: By this notice, RSPA extends the comment period from February 11, 1986, to May 22, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hattie Mitchell (202) 426-2075, Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on January 16, 1986 under the authority delegated in 49 CFR Part 106, Appendix A.

Alan I. Roberts,

Director, Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation.

[FR Doc. 86-1384 Filed 1-22-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. PS-76; Notice 2]

Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline; Monitoring of External Corrosion Control

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) DOT.

ACTION: Withdrawal of Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM).

SUMMARY: This Notice withdraws a proposal to provide alternate methods of compliance with the requirements for monitoring cathodic protection systems where pipelines are located beneath paving or in areas of stray currents. Comments to the ANPRM indicated that, with few exceptions, the required monitoring of cathodic protection of pipelines located beneath paving or in stray current areas can be done effectively, although with difficulty.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Cory, (202) 426-2082, regarding the content of this notice, or the Dockets Branch, (202) 426-3148, regarding copies of this notice or other information in the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: RSPA has reviewed the requirements of § 192.465(a) which provide that each pipeline under cathodic protection must be tested at least once each calendar year, but with intervals not exceeding 15 months, to determine whether the cathodic protection meets the criteria of § 192-463. The main focus of the review was the technical feasibility of making the necessary electrical tests in areas where cathodically protected pipelines are located beneath continuous paving.

The review considered a 1976 petition from the American society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Gas Piping Standards Committee (Pet. 76-5) to permit the use of annual leakage surveys and corrosion and leak history studies to monitor the effectiveness of cathodic protection.

The ASME contended that where cathodically protected pipelines are beneath paving, the reference electrode often cannot be placed in intimate electrical contact with the soil, and readings taken with contact on the paving surface are often found to be invalid.

The review also considered that in 1978 the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee (TPSSC) had recommended the use of annual leakage surveys and corrosion and leak history studies to verify and monitor the effectiveness of cathodic protection where electrical methods are

impractical or ineffectual. Like ASME, the TPSSC intended that these methods be used in business and commercial areas where roadway and sidewalk paving exists between on each side of the street, and where stray current effects are predominant.

Neither the ASME petition nor the TPSSC recommendation was adopted because the objective of the monitoring required by § 192.465(a) is to find and correct faulty cathodic protection in time to prevent corrosion leaks. Use of the proposed alternatives would be fruitful only after cathodic protection has become so ineffective that leaks are occurring. In addition, the agency was not convinced that electrical testing was impractical or ineffective in the areas in which the alternative would apply.

As part of the review, the agency studies the feasibility of applying electrical testing techniques necessary to comply with § 192.465(a) in paved areas. This study, done by the Harco Corporation under Contract DTRS-5680-C-00004, was completed in January 1982. It investigated electrical measurements made on cathodically protected steel pipelines located in commercial areas where roadway and sidewalk paving exist between buildings on each side of the street and other underground metallic structures are buried, and in areas where stray current effects are predominant.

Harco's testing of cathodic protection on pipelines under paving verified the ASME contention that pipe-to-soil voltage readings were often not obtainable using surface contact, and when readings were obtained, they were often of little or no value in determining the level of cathodic protection being provided. However, Harco found that reliable readings could be obtained at cracks in the pavement, at adjacent spots of exposed soil, or by boring holes through the pavement to permit contact with the soil.

The review concluded that electrical tests made on a solid paved surface over a pipeline cannot be relied upon to comply with § 192.465(a), but that where contact with the soil is provided the electrical tests can be conducted satisfactorily. Also, the review determined that stray current problems could be circumvented by planning the time of tests.

On March 10, 1983, RSPA published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) [Docket No. PS-76; Notice 1; 48 FR 10092] primarily to learn the costs of compliance with § 192.465(a) but also to examine alternative ways to monitor cathodic protection in paved areas. Response to this ANPRM supports the position that

electrical tests under § 191.465(a) may be difficult in paved areas where access to the soil is not readily available. However, many comments indicated that with few exceptions the tests can be made satisfactorily. Comments to the ANPRM also indicated that there was no alternative to conducting electrical tests under § 192.465(a) other than using leak surveys or leak history which provides an indication only after complete failure of the cathodic protection system RSPA does not consider that the existence of paving over a pipeline makes the requirements of § 192.465(a) inappropriate. The purpose of monitoring cathodic protection is to prevent leaks. Thus the use of leak surveys is not a viable alternative to electrical tests on pipe where cathodic protection is required.

In the ANPRM one of the questions asked the costs of conducting the electrical tests required by § 192.465(a) under various conditions. Annual costs for the required tests under normal conditions involving little or no paving were reported between \$9.00 and \$600.00 per mile, with the average of the 37 comments received being \$127.92 per mile. Costs in paved areas where drilling is used varied between \$21.00 and \$1,220.00 per mile with the average of 17 comments being \$373.29 per mile. Costs in stray current areas requiring special measures varied between \$150.00 and \$16,600.00 per mile. The \$16,600.00 figure was more than 3 times the next lower figure at \$5,414.00 per mile and was considered as abnormally high. The average of the remaining 15 comments concerning costs of conducting the tests required under § 192.465(a) in areas of stray currents was \$1,440.56 per mile. RSPA does not consider the average costs indicated above to be unreasonable in comparison to the potential harm that can result from corrosion leaks in the highly populated areas where paving or stray currents exist. However, it may be possible to reduce this cost impact somewhat by changing the frequency of testing. RSPA is examining this issue in a separate review project.

In the process of reconsidering the monitoring under § 192.465(a), other questions were raised concerning the practicality of electrical surveys to detect corrosion on cathodically unprotected pipe (§ 192.465(e)) and the definition of active corrosion. These related issues are also being addressed by RSPA in a separate review project.

At a meeting of the TPSSC, December 10, 1985, a proposal to withdraw the ANPRM was informally discussed. No objection was made to the proposed withdrawal.

In view of the discussion above, RSPA hereby withdraws from further consideration the proposal stated in the ANPRM concerning the use of leak surveys as a general alternative to electrical tests of cathodic protection systems. In cases where technical problems preclude making the required tests or costs can be shown to exceed benefits operators may consider seeking a waiver of the requirement.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on January 16, 1986.

Robert L. Paullin,
Director, Office of Pipeline Safety.
[FR Doc. 86-1383 Filed 1-22-86; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 20

Migratory Game Bird Hunting; Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the Use of Lead Shot for Hunting Migratory Birds in the United States, and Proposed Rule for 1986-87 Nontoxic Shot Zones for Migratory Game Bird Hunting

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of extension of comment periods.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) gave notice in the December 19, 1985, *Federal Register* (at 50 FR 51752) of the availability of a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the use of lead shot for migratory bird hunting. This Draft Supplement of a 1976 Final Environmental Statement on the use of steel shot for hunting waterfowl in the United States incorporates data from that document and summarizes information gathered since 1976 on lead poisoning of endangered and nonendangered migratory birds due to lead shot ingestion.

When eaten by waterfowl and other migratory birds, spent lead shotshell pellets may have a toxic effect. To alleviate this problem, the FWS published a proposed rule in the January 6, 1986, *Federal Register* (at 51 FR 409) describing areas in which lead shot would be prohibited for waterfowl and coot hunting in the 1986-87 hunting season.

This notice advises the public that comment periods for the *Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the Use of Lead Shot for*