

SUMMARY: This notice invites written comments on the General Services Administration proposal to establish the General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations (GSAR) as Chapter 5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations System. The GSAR will implement and supplement the Federal Acquisition Regulations. The new GSAR will supercede the current General Services Administration Procurement Regulations. The following Parts of the proposed GSAR are available for review and comment:

Part 501—Federal Acquisition Regulations System

Part 502—Definitions of Words and Terms

Part 529—Taxes

Part 530—Cost Accounting Standards

Part 531—Contract Cost Principles and Procedures

Part 550—Extraordinary Contractual Actions

DATE: Comments are due not later than December 5, 1983.

ADDRESS: Request for copies of the proposals and comments should be addressed to the Office of GSA Acquisition Policy and Regulations, Office of Acquisition Policy, Room 4026, 18th & F Streets, NW., Washington, D.C. 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ida Ustad, Office of GSA Acquisition Policy and Regulations, Office of Acquisition Policy, (202) 523-4754.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Impact

The Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), by memorandum dated October 4, 1982, exempted agency procurement regulations from Executive Order 12291. The General Services Administration (GSA) certifies that these documents will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et. seq.). The rule does not contain information collection requirements which require approval by OMB under 44 U.S.C. 3501 et. seq. This rule provides uniformity with other Federal agencies and reduces the administrative impact on bidders as set forth in OFPP Policy Letter 83-2.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Chapter 5

General Services Administration Acquisition Regulations, Government procurement.

Dated: October 21, 1983.

William B. Ferguson,
Acting Assistant Administrator for Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. 83-29945 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-61-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. PS-78; Notice 1]

Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline; Design of Pipeline Components, General Requirements

AGENCY: Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to revise the general requirements for design of pipeline components to recognize that limiting stresses to "unit stresses equivalent to those allowed for comparable material in pipe in the same location and kind of service" is not an appropriate criterion, from a safety standpoint, for many pipeline components. In response to a petition from the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the Materials Transportation Bureau proposes to clarify the requirements.

DATE: Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on this proposal. All comments must be filed by January 3, 1983. Late filed comments will be considered so far as practicable. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all the material that is considered relevant to any statement of fact or argument made.

ADDRESS: Communications should be sent to the Dockets Branch, Room 8426, Materials Transportation Bureau, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, and identify the docket and notice numbers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Cory, (202) 426-2082.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

American Society of Mechanical Engineers' Petition

The Gas Piping Technology Committee of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), by letter of April 6, 1983, petitioned the MTB to revise § 192.143, General requirements,

Subpart D of Part 192. This section, limiting the stress in components to "unit stresses equivalent to those allowed for comparable material in pipe in the same location and kind of service" in the context of "Each component of a pipeline . . ." is both impractical and technically inappropriate for valves, flanges, and some other components, according to the petition. These components achieve primary pressure containment through bolting, gaskets, elastomer seals, and sealing compounds. The basis for design of the metallic parts is unit strain (i.e., elastic deformation) at critical locations under rated pressure.

The ASME stated that the objective in designing such components is to limit the strain at these critical locations so that the pressure seal will remain functional. These components have an irregular contour and the stress levels at rated pressure vary from very low to highly localized conditions that approach or may exceed the yield strength. Thus, the actual stress levels can only be determined by a finite element stress analysis.

The "unit stress" language entered § 192.143 through paragraph 831 of the 1969 Edition of the B31.8 Code for Pressure Piping, Gas Transmission, and Distribution Piping Systems. The Code Committee realized the error of the statement and revised paragraph 831 in 1969. This revision would have been in a 1970 Edition, but was not published due to the adoption of Part 192. However, this revision is contained in the 1975 Edition.

The petitioner further pointed out that it has been common practice in design of pipelines to limit operating pressure of valves, flanges, and similar components in accordance with their design rating, e.g., ASA 150 (WOG 275), ASA 300 (WOG 720 psi), ASA 400 (WOG 960 psi), ASA 600 (1440 psi), etc. This practice is based upon sound engineering standards (see standards listed in Part 192, Appendix A—Incorporated by Reference) that have proven to provide safety at least equal to the pipe design level for the same design pressure. This has been the intent of the present wording of § 192.143. In addition, the listed specifications have been required for such components since Part 192 was first issued.

In view of the above, MTB concurs with the ASME petition that clarification of § 192.143 is needed. Therefore, MTB proposes to amend § 192.143 to provide an option to designing pipeline components on the basis of unit stresses by permitting the design to be based on

the pressure being rated in accordance with the requirements of an appropriate specification listed in Appendix A of Part 192. In addition, components that were manufactured to an edition of a listed specification that has not been referenced in Part 192 would be permitted to be used by compliance with § 192.144. This standard permits the use of components made to an unlisted edition of a specification listed in Appendix A. Components not covered by a specification listed in Appendix A or § 192.144 would be considered for waiver upon appropriate application and justification by the pipeline operator.

Cost Impact

This rulemaking is not "major" under Executive order 12291 because it will have a positive effect on the economy of less than \$100 million a year, and no adverse effects are anticipated. Also, it is not "significant" under Department of Transportation Policies and Procedures (DOT Order 2100.5).

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 because there will be no direct or indirect costs of compliance or other adverse effects and overall effects will be minimal.

List of Subject in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline safety, Design of pipeline components.

PART 192—[AMENDED]

In consideration of the foregoing, MTB proposes that § 192.143 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations be revised as follows:

§ 192.143 General requirements.

Each component of a pipeline must be able to withstand operating pressures and other anticipated loadings with unit stresses equivalent to those allowed for comparable material in pipe in the same location and kind of service or must be pressure rated in accordance with the requirements of the applicable specification listed in Appendix A or meet the requirements of § 192.144.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1672; 49 U.S.C. 1804; 49 CFR 1.53; Appendix A to Part 1, and Appendix A to Part 106.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 31, 1983.

Richard L. Beam,

Associate Director for Pipeline Safety
Regulation, Materials Transportation Bureau.

[FR Doc. 83-29884 Filed 11-3-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Status Review for the Amber Darter (*Percina antesella*), Trispot Darter (*Etheostoma trisella*), and Reticulate Logperch (*Percina* sp.)

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of review.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is reviewing the status of the amber darter (*Percina antesella*), trispot darter (*Etheostoma trisella*), and reticulate logperch (*Percina* sp.) to determine if these species and their habitat should be provided protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. These fishes are currently known from the Conasauga River (Murray and Whitfield Counties, Georgia; Bradley and Polk Counties, Tennessee). The amber darter is also known from one site on the Etowah River (Cherokee County, Georgia). The distribution of these fishes could be reduced if water development projects now being considered for the upper Conasauga River are implemented without adequately considering the requirements of these species. Due to the limited distribution of the three fishes, any factors which degrade water quality in this short river reach, i.e., land use changes, chemical spills, increases in agricultural and urban runoff, could threaten the survival of these species. Based on information gathered through this review process plus the results of a status survey being conducted under a Service contract and other presently available data, the Service will determine if the three fishes should be proposed for inclusion on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. Comments and information are sought from the public.

DATES: Comments from all interested parties must be received by February 2, 1984.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons, organizations, agencies, and governments are requested to submit comments to Mr. Warren Parker, Field Supervisor, Endangered Species Field

Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 100 Otis Street, Room 224, Asheville, North Carolina 28801 (704/259-0321).

Comments and material relating to this notice are available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Richard G. Biggins (704/259-0321) (see above address).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The amber darter (*Percina antesella*), trispot darter (*Etheostoma trisella*), and reticulate logperch (*Percina* sp.) are known from tributaries of the Coosa River drainage in Georgia and Tennessee. Specifically, the trispot darter and reticulate logperch appear to be restricted to approximately 20 miles of the Conasauga River in Murray and Whitfield Counties, Georgia and Bradley and Polk Counties, Tennessee. The amber darter exists in this same short stretch of the Conasauga River and at one locality in the Etowah River, Cherokee County, Georgia, where a single specimen of the species was found in 1980 (Etnier, et al., 1981). The amber darter was once known to exist near the mouth of Shoal Creek, a tributary of the Etowah River, Cherokee County, Georgia, but this population was apparently lost in the 1950's when the Allatoona Reservoir was flooded. The trispot darter once existed in Cowans Creek, a tributary of Spring Creek which flows into the Coosa River in Cherokee County, Alabama (Bailey and Richards, 1963), and the Coosa River proper in Etowah County, Alabama (Ramsey, 1976). However, these are now flooded by backwaters of Weiss Dam and Neely Henry Dam respectively.

The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency and the Tennessee Heritage Program of the Tennessee Department of Conservation list all three darters as Threatened. In a publication edited by both agencies, *Tennessee Rare Wildlife Volume I: The Vertebrates*, they stated, relative to amber darter habitat, that "the combination of gently flowing runs and silt-free substrate is rare in these times of widespread siltation due to poor watershed management or impoundments. The Conasauga River in Tennessee remains clear in all but the heaviest of floods indicating its uniqueness and importance in preservation of the amber darter . . ." Ramsey (1973), in a report on extinct and rare freshwater fishes in Georgia, classified the amber and trispot darters