









IDENTIFICATION AND ILLUMINATION OF INTERNAL DISPLAYS				
COLUMN 1	Col. 2	COLUMN 3	Col. 4	Col. 5
DISPLAY	TELLTALE COLOR	IDENTIFYING WORDS OR ABBREVIATION	IDENTIFYING SYMBOL	ILLUMINATED
TURN SIGNAL TELL-TALE	GREEN	—		—
HAZARD WARNING TELL-TALE	GREEN	—		—
SEAT BELT TELL-TALE	RED	—		—
FUEL LEVEL TELL-TALE GAUGE	YELLOW	FUEL FUEL		YES
OIL PRESSURE TELL-TALE GAUGE	RED	OIL OIL		YES
COOLANT TEMPERATURE TELL-TALE GAUGE	RED	TEMP TEMP		YES
ELECTRICAL CHARGE TELL-TALE GAUGE	RED	AMP AMP		YES
SPEEDOMETER	—	MPH <sup>3</sup>	NONE	YES
ODOMETER	—	— 4	NONE	—
AUTOMATIC GEAR POSITION	—	P, R, N, D	NONE	YES
HIGH BEAM TELL TALE	BLUE	—		—
BRAKE AIR PRESSURE TELL TALE	RED	BRAKE AIR	NONE	—
MALEFUNCTION <sup>5</sup> IN ANTI-LOCK OR BRAKE SYSTEM	YELLOW	ANTI-LOCK BRAKE	NONE	—

<sup>1</sup> The pair of arrows is a single symbol. When the indicators for left and right turn operate independently, however, the two arrows will be considered separate symbols and may be spaced accordingly.

<sup>2</sup> Not required when arrows of turn signal tell-tales that otherwise operate independently flash simultaneously as hazard warning tell-tale.

<sup>3</sup> "Km/h" is optional addition.

<sup>4</sup> If the odometer indicates kilometers, then "KILOMETERS" or "Km" shall appear; otherwise, no identification is required.

<sup>5</sup> When the tell-tale indicates anti-lock malfunction only, the color shall be yellow. When a single tell-tale is used to indicate antilock and other brake malfunctions, the color shall be red.

<sup>6</sup> Framed areas may be filled.

[FR Doc. 76-30593 Filed 10-15-76; 8:45 am]

#### Office of Pipeline Safety Operations

[49 CFR Parts 192, 195]

[Notice 76-2; Docket No. OPSO-38]

#### TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL AND OTHER GAS AND HAZARDOUS LIQUIDS BY PIPELINE

##### Longitudinal Seams in Pipe Bends

The Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB) is considering amending § 192.313(a)(4) of the Federal gas pipeline safety standards and § 195.212(b)(3) of the Federal liquid pipeline safety standards to except bends made with an internal bending mandrel from the requirement that for field bends of steel pipe containing a longitudinal weld, the weld must be as near as practicable to the neutral axis of the bend.

This notice is based, in part, on a petition dated October 18, 1975, by the Alyeska Pipeline Service Company (Alyeska) (Pet. 76-11W) requesting that the pipe bending requirement of 49 CFR 195.212(e) (now § 195.212(b)(3)) be repealed and, in the interim, that Alyeska be granted a waiver from compliance with the requirement with respect to the Trans-Alaska crude oil pipeline. In its petition, Alyeska alleged that placing the longitudinal seam near the neutral axis during bending is unnecessary for the quality or integrity of a pipeline.

In response to Alyeska's request, MTB sought additional information from Alyeska to show why the bending requirement is not necessary as alleged. In addition, in connection with a separate rulemaking proceeding on pipe bending,

MTB asked interested persons to submit technical information on whether it is unnecessary from a safety standpoint for a longitudinal weld to be located near the neutral axis during bending (Docket No. OPS-23, Notice 75-7, 40 FR 60076, Dec. 31, 1975).

MTB obtained the following information from submissions by Alyeska, comments to Notice 75-7, and other sources: First, a recommended safety practice that longitudinal seams be near the neutral axis was included in the industry code for liquid pipelines, American National Standards Institute (ANSI) B31.4 Code, initially in the 1966 edition and in the industry code for gas pipelines, ANSI B31.8 Code, initially in the 1955 edition. This recommended practice served as a basis for §§ 195.212(b)(3) and 192.313(a)(4). The practice was developed prior to general usage of the internal bending mandrel and was intended to prevent damage to pipe at the weld seam by the die or stiffback during bending. The practice was not recommended, however, in the 1975 edition of the B31.4 Code primarily because use of the internal bending mandrel to provide support for pipe during bending minimizes the possibility of damage to a weld seam. The fact that protruding welds on spiral welded pipe had been regularly placed against the die or stiffback during bending without consequent damage to the pipe also led to the 1975 deletion. Although the practice continued to be recommended for gas pipelines in the 1975 edition of the B31.8 Code, the ANSI is now considering deleting the recommended practice in the next edition of the Code.

Secondly, thousands of bend sections were installed before the advent of the recommended practice or requirement that the longitudinal seam be near the neutral axis, and MTB is not aware of any gas or liquid pipeline accident caused by failure of a weld seam in a bend section.

Thirdly, the likelihood that stresses during bending will not adversely affect the integrity of a longitudinal seam weld is enhanced by the recent improvements in seam welding technology, quality control, and materials chemistry.

Fourthly, modern bending machines and internal bending mandrels commonly used by industry provide control and protection of the pipe, especially large diameter high strength thin wall pipe where damage would be more likely to occur, which were unavailable as recently as 10 years ago.

Finally, burst test data obtained on the Portland-Montreal pipeline system in 1965 for 24-inch X-52 steel pipe shows that with seams on both the inside and outside of the bend, ruptures occurred in the body of the pipe without damage to the weld seams.

After considering all available information, MTB granted Alyeska's request for waiver on August 3, 1976 (41 FR 34103, August 12, 1976).

MTB believes that under modern pipe manufacturing and bending techniques, there is little, if any, risk of gas or liquid

pipe damage from placing a longitudinal seam in a position other than near the neutral axis during bending. This conclusion is further supported by test data, the current recommended industry bending practice for liquid pipelines, and the apparent absence of accidents due to failure of a weld seam in a bend section. Moreover, if damage does occur at a longitudinal seam during bending, the bend would be rejected under other performance standards for pipe bends in §§ 192.313 and 195.212.

MTB does not believe, however, that the existing requirement for placing a weld seam near the neutral axis during bending should be repealed as suggested by Alyeska. Rather, because of the apparent significance of the internal bending mandrel in minimizing the likelihood of damage to a weld seam during bending, MTB is proposing to amend the requirement to provide an exception for bends made with the mandrel.

In consideration of the foregoing, MTB proposes to amend Parts 192 and 195 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

1. By amending § 192.313(a)(4) to read as follows:

§ 192.313 Bends and elbows.

(a) \* \* \*

(4) On pipe containing a longitudinal weld, the longitudinal weld must be as near as practicable to the neutral axis of the bend unless the bend is made with an internal bending mandrel.

2. By amending § 195.212(b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 195.212 Bending of pipe.

(b) \* \* \*

(3) On pipe containing a longitudinal weld, the longitudinal weld must be as near as practicable to the neutral axis of the bend unless the bend is made with an internal bending mandrel.

Interested persons are invited to participate in this rulemaking action by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket and notice numbers and be submitted in triplicate to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety Operations, Department of Transportation, 2100 Second Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. All communications received by November 8, 1976, will be considered before final action is taken on the notice. Late filed comments will be considered so far as practicable. All comments will be available for examination by interested persons at the Office of Pipeline Safety Operations before and after the closing date for comments. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

#### INFLATION IMPACT

Based on applicable inflationary impact criteria, MTB considers this rulemaking proposal "minor" and not requiring the preparation of an Inflation Impact Statement.

(Sec. 3, Pub. L. 90-481, 82 Stat. 721, (49 U.S.C. 1672); sec. 6, Pub. L. 89-670, 80 Stat. 937, (49 U.S.C. 1655; 18 U.S.C. 831-835); with respect to offshore gathering lines, the proposed amendment to Part 192 also issued under Sec. 108, Pub. L. 93-633, 88 Stat. 2157, 49 U.S.C. 1804; and 40 FR 43901, 49 CFR 1.53)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on October 18, 1976.

CESAR DELEON,  
Acting Director, Office of  
Pipeline Safety Operations.

[FR Doc. 76-31032 Filed 10-20-76; 8:45 am]

### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[14 CFR Parts 207, 208, 212, 214]

[ERD-311, Docket No. 29444]

#### CHARTERING ORGANIZATIONS

Announcements of Pro Rata Charters to Include Taxes and Services in Statement of Total Cost

OCTOBER 18, 1976.

Notice is hereby given that the Civil Aeronautics Board is proposing to amend Parts 207, 208, 212, and 214 of the Economic Regulations to require that the announcements or statements of chartering organizations with respect to pro rata charters include all taxes and services in the stated "total cost of the entire trip" and precisely identify the nature of such taxes and services. The purpose of the proposal is described in the Explanatory Statement and the proposed amendments are set forth in the Proposed Rules.

The rules are proposed under authority of sections 204(a), 403(b) and 411 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 72 Stat. 743, 758 (as amended) and 769; 49 U.S.C. 1324, 1373 and 1381.

Interested persons may participate in the proposed rulemaking through submission of twenty (20) copies of written data, views, or arguments pertaining thereto, addressed to: Docket 29444, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C. 20428. All relevant material received on or before November 22, 1976, and reply comments received on or before December 7, 1976, will be considered by the Board before taking final action on the proposed rule.

Copies of such communications will be available for examination by interested persons in the Docket Section of the Board, Room 711, Universal Building, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. upon request thereof.

Those persons planning to file comments and/or responsive comments who wish to be served with the comments filed by others, and are willing to undertake service of their own comments on others, shall file with the Docket Section at the above address by November 1, 1976, a request to be placed on the service list in Docket 29444. The service list will be prepared by the Docket Section and sent to the persons named thereon. The persons on the service list are to serve each other with their comments and/or responsive comments at the time of filing, and are to include appropriate proof of service (Rule 8(e), 14 CFR 302.8(e)) with each filing.

Individual members of the general public who wish to express their interest as consumers by participating informally in this proceeding, may do so through submission of comments in letter form to the Docket Section at the above indicated address, without the necessity of filing additional copies thereof.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

JAMES R. DERSTINE,  
Acting Secretary.

#### EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The practice of stating taxes and services as an "add-on" component in tour charter advertisements was considered by the Board at the time it adopted the requirement that inclusive tour charter advertisements be limited to "the total tour price without a breakdown into component parts." The single component limitation was designed to eliminate advertising which might misinform or deceive the public as to the real total cost of the advertised inclusive tour. In view of our concern with this possibility, we rejected a request for an exception permitting the separate statement of "taxes." The requirement of single component advertising was later carried over to regulations with respect to other types of charter tour packages.<sup>1</sup>

More recently, the question of component advertising of tour packages arose with respect to Group Inclusive Tours (GIT's) and here, too—in order to ensure full and correct information to prospective participants and reduce any unfair advantage enjoyed by sellers of GIT's—we required that advertisements clearly disclose the total tour price.<sup>2</sup> Here, too, we declined to make an exception in response to a request that separate statement of certain taxes be permitted.<sup>3</sup>

Petitioner Donald L. Pevsner now requests institution of a rulemaking with respect to advertising of "affinity charter/package tours." He proposes amendment of affinity charter rules to prohibit advertisements from including a separate statement of "taxes and services or similar classifications," expressed as a percentage "add-on," and would require incorporation of this component in the total price. No answer to the petition has been filed.

The petition alleges that affinity charter tour package advertisements showing a specific price plus a percentage "add-on" constitute a deceptive practice, misleading to affinity group members. It appears that some advertisements show tour costs as a flat sum, plus a stated percentage for completely unexplained payments, while others describe the additional percentage as for unspecified "tax and service." In some cases, petitioner alleges, the tax and service may in fact be nonexistent. Petitioner's basic contention is that there is no reason why the advertising of tours based

<sup>1</sup> Part 378, § 378.12.

<sup>2</sup> SPR-32, October 14, 1969, pp. 11-12.

<sup>3</sup> §§378a.27; 378a.105(c). See SPR-85, 87, note 48.

<sup>4</sup> Part 399, § 399.84.

<sup>5</sup> PS-62, January 29, 1975, p. 4.