

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 19, 1983 the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received a proposed revision to the New York State Implementation Plan (SIP). Additional supporting and clarifying material was submitted by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) on November 4, 1983. The State's SIP revision request provided for the renewal, in modified form, of a State-initiated fuel oil sulfur content relaxation ("special limitation") for certain fuel burning sources in New York's Southern Tier East, Central, and Champlain Valley (Northern) Air Quality Control Regions. A similar "special limitation" was approved by EPA on October 27, 1977 (42 FR 58607) and its extension until December 31, 1982 was approved by EPA on August 20, 1980 (45 FR 55482). On March 23, 1984 (49 FR 11101) EPA proposed to approve the State's current request which would have reinstated the expired special limitation until June 30, 1984.

A 30 day comment period on EPA's March 23, 1984 proposal ended on April 23, 1984. This provided a little more than two months for EPA to analyze and respond to any comments received and to publish a final rulemaking action in the Federal Register before the proposed SIP revision became moot. Since fuel oil users could not have procured and used the higher sulfur content fuel oil in the period between the time EPA would have completed its final rulemaking action and the special limitation's June 30, 1984 expiration date, EPA did not finalize the State's request and is now withdrawing its March 23, 1984 proposal.

No fuel oil users are affected by today's action. New York's SIP revision request is embodied in an Order of the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation which specifies that the higher sulfur content fuel oil cannot be burned until it is approved by EPA. Since the State-proposed plan revision, by its own terms, was not effective until EPA approval and expired on June 30, 1984, further EPA action at this time would serve no purpose.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations.

(Secs. 110 and 301 of the Clean Air Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 7410 and 7601))

Dated: September 28, 1984.

Christopher J. Daggett,
Regional Administrator, Environmental
Protection Agency.

[FR Doc. 84-29634 Filed 11-9-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Parts 406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 422, 424, 426, 431, 432, and 439

[FRL-2716-3]

Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology Effluent Limitation Guidelines; Availability of New Information and Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Availability of information and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On September 20, 1984, EPA issued a notice of data availability concerning the methodology for Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT) effluent limitation guidelines (49 FR 37045). The comment period for the notice was scheduled to close November 19, 1984. EPA is now announcing the availability of additional information and is extending the comment period for 45 days.

DATE: Comments on the notice of data availability, including the information announced today, must be submitted on or before January 3, 1985.

ADDRESS: Comments should be mailed or delivered to Debra Maness, Attn: Comments on BCT Notice of Availability, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (WH-586), 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Debra Maness at (202) 382-5385.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 20, 1984, EPA issued a notice of data availability pertaining to the methodology for Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (BCT) effluent limitation guidelines (49 FR 37045). The notice identified possible changes to the methodology and presented new data that the Agency is considering using in the final BCT methodology.

In that notice, the Agency described an analysis of POTW performance data (page 37051, section III.B). The analysis was used to estimate long-term effluent concentrations, which may be used in the benchmark calculations. The data set used in that analysis is a portion of a larger data base, called the O&M Cost Data Base, which is a data collection

effort on POTW operation and maintenance costs. The O&M Cost Data Base contains cost information for more than 900 municipal wastewater treatment facilities. It also contains performance data, such as influent and effluent pollutant concentrations, for more than 500 facilities.

The Agency is considering using the performance data from the entire O&M Cost Data Base in its analysis of long-term effluent concentrations. The use of the entire data base, instead of a portion of it, could affect the calculation of the benchmarks. Therefore, the entire data base is now included in the record, and the comment period is extended for an additional 45 days.

The O&M Cost Data Base is available on computer tape. If you wish to obtain a copy of the tape, please call Debra Maness at (202) 382-5385. The price for a copy of the tape is \$75.

The Agency recognizes that this rulemaking is large and complex. Therefore, the public is invited to meet with the Agency's staff during this comment period on issues relating to this rulemaking. Summaries of these meetings will be included in the record of this rulemaking.

In the September 20th FR notice, EPA indicated that following receipt of public comments it would either move directly to publication of a final BCT methodology or repropose the BCT methodology and/or BCT effluent limitations (page 37046). The Agency now intends to move directly to publication of a final methodology without reproposal of any portion of the rulemaking.

Dated: November 6, 1984.

Henry L. Longest II,
Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of
Water (WH-556).

[FR Doc. 84-29633 Filed 11-9-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 195

[Docket No. PS-82; Notice 1]

Transportation of Hazardous Liquids by Pipeline: Recordkeeping and Accident Reporting

AGENCY: Materials Transportation
Bureau, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to (1) reduce the overall recordkeeping

requirements and to simplify and modify the accident reporting requirements now in effect for operators of interstate pipelines that transport petroleum, petroleum products, or anhydrous ammonia, and (2) make these requirements applicable to operators of intrastate pipelines that transport those commodities. This action will reduce the paperwork burden on interstate pipeline operators without reducing pipeline safety, and will provide more meaningful, comprehensive data to assess compliance and analyze pipeline accidents.

DATE: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on this notice before January 14, 1985. Late filed comments will be considered insofar as practicable.

ADDRESS: Comments should be sent to the Dockets Branch, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. All comments and docket materials may be reviewed in the Dockets Branch, Room 8426, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. each working day.

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

Background

On January 15, 1981, the American Petroleum Institute (API) petitioned the MTB (Petition No. P-14) to change the recordkeeping requirements of §§ 195.310 and 195.404 of 49 CFR Part 195. Section 195.310 requires operators to keep certain information on pressure recording gauge charts. API argued that the amount of information to be kept on the recording charts often makes the chart cluttered and illegible. API recommended that the required information be kept on separate documents instead of the charts to provide more legible records.

In regard to § 195.404, API recommended reducing to 1 year the respective retention periods for daily operating records (§ 195.404(b)), for repair records on facilities other than pipe (§ 195.404(c)(1)), and for records of inspections and tests prescribed by Subpart F (§ 195.404(c)(2)). The current rule requires that daily operating records be kept for 3 years and that all repair, inspection, and test records be kept for the useful life of the facility. API suggested that a 1-year retention period is adequate time to make records available to analyze any problems concerning daily operations, the

periodic tests or inspections required by Subpart F, or repairs to facilities other than pipe.

The accident reporting requirements under Subpart B of Part 195 and the recordkeeping requirements of §§ 195.266, 195.310, and 195.404 currently apply only to interstate pipelines that are used in the transportation of petroleum, petroleum products, or anhydrous ammonia. The MTB published a notice on March 26, 1984, (49 FR 11226, Docket No. PS-80), proposing to extend the applicability of 49 CFR Part 195 to intrastate pipelines that transport those commodities and affect interstate or foreign commerce. That proposal specifically excepted recordkeeping and accident reporting requirements because of the planned rulemaking to review the accident reporting and recordkeeping requirements of Part 195 to determine if they create an unnecessary burden. This notice, which is the result of that review, now proposes identical recordkeeping and accident reporting requirements for interstate pipelines that are now subject to Part 195 and for those intrastate pipelines that would become subject to Part 195 when the rules proposed in Docket PS-80 are adopted as final. These modified requirements would take effect for interstate pipelines 30 days after being adopted as final. For intrastate pipelines, however, they would not take effect until final rules adopted in Docket PS-80 become effective. Longer lead times, as suggested by commenters, may be adopted if justified in MTB's opinion.

In an effort to reduce unnecessary paperwork, the MTB has considered not only the changes in recordkeeping recommended by API but also all of the remaining recordkeeping requirements as well as the accident reporting requirements of Part 195. The MTB believes the resulting proposed changes are consistent with the goal of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et. seq.) to minimize the federal paperwork burden.

Recordkeeping

Section 195.266. Section 195.266(f) requires, in part, that when a new pipeline is constructed or an existing pipeline is relocated, replaced, or otherwise changed, a record of the location of "weighted pipe" and "other item connected to the pipe" be maintained for the life of the facility. However, MTB believes that these records are not needed to assure compliance with any related regulation in Part 195, to facilitate inspections or tests, or for other safety reasons. Consequently, MTB proposes to delete

the requirement to maintain a record of the location of weighted pipe and items connected to pipe as superfluous.

Section 195.310(a). The current rule requires that records of hydrostatic test be made and that the test record be kept as long as the facility tested is in use. The purpose of the initial and any subsequent hydrostatic tests under Part 195 is to confirm pipeline integrity and provide a basis for the pipeline's maximum operating pressure. Because the latest hydrostatic test serves this purpose better than earlier tests, MTB believes that records of any earlier hydrostatic tests are unnecessary. For these reasons, the MTB proposes to amend this section to permit operators to discard all but the latest hydrostatic test records.

Section 195.310(b) sets forth the minimum requirements for the hydrostatic test records to be retained. Several changes are proposed for this section as follows:

The requirement to keep certain information physically on the recording chart would be amended to permit operators to keep the information on other documents for the reasons suggested by API. The currently required "dead weight tester data" would be included within a new term, "test instrument calibration data." This change would take into account the fact that modern instrumentation which does not involve dead weight testers is now in use. The reasons for any test failure would no longer be separately required, but would be included in the proposed § 195.310(b)(8).

Section 195.404. Under § 195.404(a)(1), requiring operators to maintain records identifying their "major facilities" is too indefinite and may not result in identification of facilities that MTB considers major. As set forth below, MTB is proposing to substitute a list of specific facilities for "major facilities."

Such specificity should assist operators and enforcement personnel in determining compliance with other operation and maintenance rules in Subpart F of Part 195 that directly pertain to the listed facilities. Line pipe would not be listed since its location and identification is now required by § 195.404(a)(4). Paragraphs (a)(2)-(a)(4) would not be changed by this proposal.

The 3-year retention period in § 195.404(b) for daily operating records would be retained in contrast to the 1 year period as API recommended. The MTB believes that three years' collection of daily records are necessary to demonstrate and confirm potential operational problems.

Further, instead of daily records of any "unusual operations of a facility" as required by the current § 195.404(b), the proposed amendment would require a record of "any emergency or abnormal operation to which the procedures under § 195.402 apply." The MTB believes the term "unusual operations" is indefinite and could be construed to cover a wide spectrum of events unrelated to safety. Substitution of the terms "emergency" and "abnormal operation", on the other hand, would comport with the use of these terms in § 195.402(d) and (e) and would aid enforcement personnel in investigating the operator's use of the procedures to respond to abnormal operations and emergencies.

Unlike the current rule, the proposed § 195.404(c) distinguishes between records of repairs made to pipe and records of repairs made to parts of the pipeline system other than pipe. Records of repairs made to pipe under the proposed § 195.404(c)(1) would be retained for the useful life of the pipe as is required by the current rule. Records of repairs to parts of the pipeline system other than pipe would be retained for at least 1 year instead of the currently required useful life of the part. MTB agrees with API that any problems in repair should surface within one year so that it is unnecessary to retain repair records for more than a year.

In contrast to the 1-year retention period recommended by the API petition, the retention period for inspections and tests prescribed by Subpart F would be reduced by the proposed § 195.404(c)(3) from the current useful life of the facility to at least 5 years. A 5-year retention period is necessary to assure compliance with the 5-year inspection and test intervals prescribed by §§ 195.412(b), 195.416(d), and 195.428(b).

Accident Reporting

The form (DOT Form 7000-1) which interstate operators now must use to report accidents under Subpart B of Part 195 would be revised to delete unnecessary information items and to gather more meaningful data. Comments on information items that should be added or deleted together with appropriate rationale, clearer wording for proposed information items or instructions, and better organization of the form are specifically requested. Specific proposed revisions to the accident reporting regulations are discussed below.

Under § 195.54 the 15-day period for reporting accidents is needlessly short and would be increased to 30 days to provide more time for gathering data. Also, under § 195.54, as well as the

revised form, provisions would be added for filing accident reports for intrastate pipelines. Intrastate operators would be permitted to file reports with State agencies that have submitted certifications under section 205 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 provided the State agency requires such report and agrees to forward a copy of the report to MTB within 10 days.

Section 195.56 would be deleted from the regulations and revised instructions would be included on the accident report form. Adding the instructions to the form should make the form easier to complete. Removing the instructions from Part 195 will allow the instructions to be modified more easily as MTB and the industry gain experience with use of the new form. At the outset, however, comments on the revised instructions are solicited.

Section 195.58 would be amended to permit filing changes or additions to an accident report with a State agency in the same manner as an original report under the proposed § 195.54. The filing period for changes or additions would be changed from "immediately" to "within 30 days" to be consistent with the filing period for the original report.

Significant changes proposed for Form DOT 7000-1 are as follows:

In Part A an entry would be added to indicate whether the pipeline is interstate or intrastate. This information is needed to determine whether there is a difference in the cause or frequency of accidents between interstate and intrastate pipelines.

In Part B operators would have to indicate whether the accident occurred onshore or offshore, and whether Federal lands were involved. The onshore/offshore information would be used in future analyses devoted to the special conditions of offshore pipelines. The Federal lands information is needed for MTB to comply with the reporting requirements of section 28(w) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 185(w)).

Part C would combine item 4 of Part B, item 3 of Part G, and item 4 of Part H of the current form with information concerning the part of the system involved as well as the specific item involved would be included in Part C to simplify the organization of the form.

Part E of the current form requires differentiation between employees and non-employees when reporting deaths and injuries. The new form would require only the total deaths and total injuries because the totals are the important factors when considering the effect or cost of an accident.

Part F would be changed to require operators to report all estimated property damage. The cost of the commodity lost and cost of clean-up would be specifically included in order to get a more complete estimate of the total property damage. Unlike the current form, damage would not be divided between operator and other property damage, because it is the total property damage that is significant. Also, the items damaged need not be listed.

Part G of the proposed form would change the way a spilled commodity is classified and reported. The spilled commodity is to be classified as petroleum, petroleum product, or anhydrous ammonia, and if the commodity is a petroleum product, as a highly volatile liquid. These changes would facilitate entry of these data into the MTB computer data bank and should make errors in classification less frequent.

Part H of the proposed form would reduce the number of data entries currently required from 17 to 11. Entries for condition when installed, pipe configuration, amount of cover, and test medium used would be deleted because these items are not usually associated with the cause of an accident. The entry for "coating" would be deleted as this information is provided in Part I of the form. One new item, "specified minimum yield strength", would be substituted for the current entry for "pipe grade" to more clearly indicate pipe strength. The entry for "Design Pressure" would be changed to "Maximum Operating Pressure" as a better indication of the pressure limit to which the pipe has been qualified. As stated above, the "year of installation" would be moved to Part C.

Part I of the proposed form would eliminate two entries for type of corrosion tests and their timing. Electrical tests for corrosion on cathodically unprotected bare pipe are required by § 195.416(d) at least every 5 years, and the deleted entries are not needed in view of this rule. A new entry would indicate whether the corrosion was galvanic or some other type. This entry should cast light on the types and prevalence of bacterial corrosion, and whether bacterial corrosion presents a significant safety problem.

Part J of the current form would be changed substantially to provide more complete information about all accidents caused by outside force instead of just accidents resulting from equipment rupturing the pipeline. The type of outside force damage that caused the accident would be entered,

along with whether a "one-call" or other damage prevention program was in effect and, if so, whether the excavator called or the pipeline location was temporarily marked for the excavator. Entries for the distance to the closest permanent line marker, information on the marker, and the length of time between patrols have been deleted as not being needed in view of the current standards in Part 195 governing these topics. The new entries concerning "one-call" or other damage prevention programs are designed to determine whether the operator participates in such programs and the timeliness of calls and marking under these programs.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rulemaking contains information collection requirements in the following sections: Subpart B of Part 195 and §§ 195.266, 195.310 and 195.404. These requirements will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Persons desiring to comment on these information collection requirements should submit their comments to: Office of Regulatory Policy, Office of Management and Budget, 726 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C. 20503, Attention: Desk Officer, MTB. Persons submitting comments to OMB are also requested to submit a copy of their comments to MTB as indicated above under *ADDRESS*.

Cost Impact

This notice does not propose a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291, and it does not propose a "significant rule" as defined by the Department of Transportation Policies and Procedures (DOT Order 2100.5). With respect to interstate pipelines, the proposed rule would reduce the number of records to be kept, reduce the overall retention time for records, and simplify accident reporting. However, the reduced paperwork burden and lowered costs to interstate pipeline operators and the government are not considered substantial enough to warrant further evaluation of the economic impact. With respect to intrastate pipelines the Draft Regulatory Evaluation prepared for Docket PS-80 covers the existing recordkeeping and reporting requirements of Part 195. That evaluation shows that net benefits would result if Part 195 is extended in its present form to intrastate operators. The changes to the paperwork requirements of Part 195 proposed by this notice would increase those benefits by reducing the paperwork burden projected by the evaluation.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires a review of certain rules proposed after January 1, 1981, for their effects on small businesses, organizations, and governmental bodies. I certify that the proposed rules will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Few, if any, small entities operate interstate pipelines. Also, the Draft Evaluation in Docket PS-80 shows that small entities that operate intrastate pipelines will not be affected by the proposed rule.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 195

Anhydrous ammonia, Hazardous liquids, Petroleum products, Pipeline safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

PART 195—[AMENDED]

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, the MTB proposes to amend 49 CFR Part 195 and the Liquid Pipeline Accident Report Form as follows. Also, MTB proposes to apply Subpart B of Part 195 and §§ 195.266, 195.310, and 195.404 to intrastate pipelines to which other regulations in Part 195 have been proposed to apply in Docket PS-80 (49 FR 11226), with the amendments to Subpart B and §§ 195.266, 195.310, and 195.404, and the accident report form as proposed below.

1. Section 195.54 would be revised to read as follows:

§ 195.54 Accident reporting.

Each operator that experiences an accident that is required to be reported under this subpart shall, as soon as practicable but not later than 30 days after discovery of the accident, prepare and file an accident report, on DOT Form 7000-1 or a facsimile, with the Information Systems Manager, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590. The operator shall file two copies of each report and shall retain one copy at its principal place of business. However, reports for intrastate pipelines subject to the jurisdiction of a State agency pursuant to certification under section 205 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, may be submitted in duplicate to the State agency if the regulations of that agency require submission of these reports and provide for further transmittal of one copy, within 10 days of receipt to the Information Systems Manager, Materials Transportation Bureau.

§ 195.56 [Removed]

2. Section 195.56 would be removed.

3. Section 195.58 would be revised to read as follows:

§ 195.58 Changes in or additions to accident report.

Whenever an operator receives any changes in the information reported or additions to the original report on DOT Form 7000-1 it shall file a supplemental report within 30 days with the Information Systems Manager, Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590. However, reports for intrastate pipelines subject to the jurisdiction of a State agency pursuant to certification under section 205 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 may be submitted in duplicate to the State agency if the regulations of that agency require submission of these reports and provide for further transmittal of one copy within 10 days of receipt to the Information Systems Manager.

4. Section 195.266(f) would be revised as follows:

§ 195.266 Construction records.

(f) The location of each valve and corrosion test station.

5. Section 195.310 would be revised to read as follows:

§ 195.310 Records.

(a) A record must be made of each hydrostatic test and the record of the latest test must be retained as long as the facility tested is in use.

(b) The record required by paragraph (a) of this section must include:

- (1) The pressure recording charts;
- (2) Test instrument calibration data;
- (3) The name of the operator, the name of the person responsible for making the test, and the name of the test company used, if any;
- (4) The date and time of the test;
- (5) The minimum test pressure;
- (6) The test medium;
- (7) A description of the facility tested and the test apparatus;
- (8) An explanation of any pressure discontinuities, including test failures, that appear on the pressure recording charts; and
- (9) Where elevation differences in the section under test exceed 100 feet, a profile of the pipeline that shows the elevation and test sites over the entire length of the test section.

6. In § 195.404, paragraphs (a)(1), (b), and (c) would be revised to read as follows:

§ 195.404 Maps and records.

(a) * * *

(1) Location and identification of the following pipeline facilities:

- (i) Breakout tanks;
- (ii) Pump stations;
- (iii) Scraper and sphere facilities;
- (iv) Pipeline valves;
- (v) Cathodically protected facilities;
- (vi) Facilities to which § 195.402(c)(9) applies;
- (vii) Rights-of-way; and
- (viii) Safety devices to which § 195.428 applies.

(b) Each operator shall maintain for at least 3 years daily operating records that indicate—

- (1) The discharge pressures at each pump station; and
 - (2) Any emergency or abnormal operation to which the procedures under § 195.402 apply.
- (c) Each operator shall maintain the following records for the periods specified:

- (1) The date, location, and description of each repair made to pipe shall be maintained for the useful life of the pipe.
- (2) The date, location, and description of each repair made to parts of the pipeline system other than pipe shall be maintained for at least 1 year.
- (3) A record of each inspection and test required by this subpart shall be maintained for at least 5 years.

7 The accident reporting form (Form DOT 7000-1) would be revised as follows:

Note.—Form DOT 7000-1 will not be shown in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Department of Transportation

Liquid Pipeline Accident Report

Instructions: Submit in duplicate. If the space provided for any question is not adequate, attach an additional sheet. Definition of a reportable accident is stated in Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, Part 195, Subpart B. File both copies of this report within 30 days after discovery of the accident with the Information Systems Manager (DMT-63), Materials Transportation Bureau, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. However, reports for intrastate pipelines subject to the jurisdiction of a State agency pursuant to certification under section 205 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipelines Safety Act of 1979 may be submitted in duplicate to the State agency if the regulations of that agency require submission of these reports and provide for further transmittal of one copy within 10 days of receipt to the Information Systems Manager.

Please write or call the Information Systems Manager (202-472-1024)

concerning questions about this report or these instructions, or to obtain copies of Form DOT 7000-1.

Each operator shall prepare each report of an accident on Form DOT 7000-1 or a facsimile as follows:

(1) *General.* Each applicable item must be marked or filled in as fully and as accurately as information accessible to the operator at the time of filing the report will permit.

(2) *Part A.* Enter the complete corporate name of the operator. Enter the address of the operator's principal place of business, including zip code.

(3) *Part B, Item 1.* Enter the date the accident occurred or was discovered. If the accident was not discovered on the date it occurred, state this under Part K. Indicate whether the accident occurred on Federal lands. For purposes of this report "Federal lands" means all lands owned by the United States except lands in the National Park System, lands held in trust for an Indian or Indian tribe, and lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Item 2. Enter the time the accident occurred according to a 24 hour clock (e.g., 1945). If the time of occurrence is not known, enter the time the accident was discovered and state this fact under Part K.

(4) *Part E.* Give the number of deaths and injuries known at the time of filing this report even if they were previously reported telephonically to the Department of Transportation. If none, state none.

(5) *Part F.* Indicate the total property damage including the value of the commodity not recovered, damage to other parties, and cost of clean up. The value of the damage is present day costs. If none, state none.

(6) *Part G, Item 1.* State the commonly used name of the commodity spilled such as #2 fuel oil, regular gasoline, propane, etc.

Item 2. Give the classification of the commodity spilled and if it is a petroleum product, indicate whether it is a highly volatile liquid (HVL) or non-HVL. For a definition of "highly volatile liquid", see § 195.2. If the commodity spilled is not anhydrous ammonia, petroleum, or a petroleum product, it is not necessary to file this report.

(7) *Part K.* Give an account of the accident sufficiently complete and detailed to convey an understanding of the cause of the accident. Continue on an extra sheet of paper if more space is needed.

A. Operator Information:

- 1. Name of operator
- 2. Principal business address
- 3. Is pipeline interstate? ☐ Yes ☐ No

B. Time and Location of Accident:

- 1. Date (Month, Day, Year)
- 2. Hour (24 hour clock)
- 3. If onshore, give State (including Puerto Rico and Washington, DC), and county or city.
- 4. If offshore, give offshore coordinates.
- 5. Did accident occur on Federal lands? Yes ☐ No ☐ (See instructions for definition of Federal lands)
- 6. Specific location (If location is near offshore platforms, buildings, or other landmarks, such as highways, waterways, or railroads, attach a sketch or drawing showing relationship of accident location to these landmarks)
- C. Origin of Release of Liquid or Vapor (check all applicable items):
 - 1. Part of system involved ☐ Line Pipe ☐ Tank farm ☐ Pump station ☐ Other (Specify) _____
 - 2. Item involved ☐ Pipe ☐ Valve ☐ Scraper trap ☐ Pump ☐ Welded fitting ☐ Girth weld ☐ Breakout tank ☐ Bolted fitting ☐ Longitudinal weld ☐ Other (Specify) _____
 - 3. Year item installed _____
- D. Cause of Accident:
 - ☐ Corrosion ☐ Failed weld ☐ Incorrect operation by operator personnel ☐ Failed pipe ☐ Outside force damage ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- E. Death or Injury:
 - 1. Number of persons killed
 - 2. Number of persons injured
- F. Estimated Total Property Damage

G. Commodity Spilled:

- 1. Name of commodity spilled
- 2. Classification of commodity spilled
 - ☐ Petroleum
 - ☐ Petroleum product
 - ☐ HVL (For definition of HVL see § 195.2)
 - ☐ Non-HVL
 - ☐ Anhydrous ammonia
- 3. Estimated amount of commodity spilled — Barrels ☐
- 4. Was there an explosion? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 5. Was there a fire? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Instructions: Answer sections H, I or J only if it applies to the particular accident being reported.

H. Occurred in Line Pipe:

- 1. Nominal diameter (inches)
- 2. Wall thickness (inches)
- 3. SMYS (inches)
- 4. Type of joint
- 5. Pipe was
 - ☐ Welded
 - ☐ Coupled
 - ☐ Below ground
 - ☐ Threaded
 - ☐ Above ground
- 6. Maximum operating pressure, (psig)
- 7. Pressure at time and location of accident (psig)
- 8. Had there been a pressure test on system? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 9. Duration of test (hrs)
- 10. Maximum test pressure (psig)
- 11. Date of latest test

I. Caused by Corrosion:

1. Location of corrosion
☐ Internal ☐ External
2. Facility coated?
☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Facility under cathodic protection?
☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Type of corrosion
☐ Galvanic ☐ Other (Specify) _____

- ☐ Frostheave
☐ Earthquake
☐ Ship anchor
☐ Landslide
☐ Fishing operations

Other _____

2. Was a damage prevention program in effect?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If yes, was the program

☐ "one-call" ☐ Other _____

4. Did excavator call?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Was pipeline location temporarily marked for the excavator?

☐ Yes ☐ No**K. Account of accident.**

(Space for account of accident)

Name and title of operator official filing this report _____

Telephone number (including area code) _____

Date _____

DOT Form 7000-1

(49 U.S.C. 2010(b); 49 CFR 1.53, Appendix A to Part 1 and Appendix A to Part 106)

Issued in Washington, D.C. on November 7, 1984.

Richard L. Beam,

Associate Director for Pipeline Safety
Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc. 84-27724 Filed 11-9-84; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-60-M