

§ 571.125 Standard No. 125; warning devices (effective Jan. 2, 1974).

(d) The code number assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter.

10. § 517.126, Truck-camper loading, would be amended by adding new paragraph S5.1.1(f), to read:

§ 517.126 Standard No. 126; truck-camper loading.

(f) "Code number" followed by the manufacturer's code number assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter.

11. Section 571.205, Glazing materials, would be amended to institute a new code for glazing material manufacturers by changing S6.2 to read:

§ 571.205 Standard No. 205; glazing materials.

S6.2 Each prime glazing material manufacturer shall certify each piece of glazing material to which this standard applies that is designed as a component of any specific motor vehicle or camper, pursuant to section 114 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, by adding to the mark required by S6.1 in letters and numerals of the size specified in section 6 of ANS Z26, the symbol "DOT" and the code number assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter.

12. Section 571.208, Occupant crash protection, would be amended by adding new paragraph S9.3, to read:

§ 571.208 Standard No. 208; occupant crash protection (effective Jan. 1, 1972, with amendments effective Jan. 1, 1973).

S9.3 Each pressure vessel and explosive device shall be permanently and legibly marked or labeled with the manufacturer's code number assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter and the symbol DOT constituting a certification by the manufacturer that the device complies with all applicable motor vehicle safety standards.

13. Section 571.209, Seatbelt assemblies, would be amended by changing paragraph S4.1(k), to read:

§ 571.209 Standard No. 209; seatbelt assemblies.

(k) *Marking.*—Each seatbelt assembly shall be permanently and legibly marked or labeled with:

(i) Year of manufacture, model, and name of manufacturer or distributor, or manufacturer code number assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter.

(ii) The symbol DOT, or a statement that the seatbelt assembly complies with all applicable motor vehicle safety standards.

14. § 571.211, Wheel nuts, wheel disks, and hubcaps, would be amended by redesignating the contents of "S4 Requirements" as "S4.1, Winged Projections," and adding a new section "S4.2, Labeling," to read:

§ 571.211 Standard No. 211; wheel nuts, wheel disks, and hubcaps.

S4.2 *Labeling.*—Each wheel nut, wheel disk, and hubcap shall be permanently and legibly marked or labeled with the manufacturer's code number assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter and the symbol DOT, constituting a certification by the manufacturer that the device complies with all applicable motor vehicle safety standards.

15. § 571.213, Child seating systems, would be amended by revising paragraph S4.1(a), to read:

§ 571.213 Standard No. 213; child seating systems.

(a) The manufacturer's name, the code number, assigned pursuant to § 566.7 of this chapter, and certification by the manufacturer that the child seating system complies with all applicable motor vehicle safety standards. However . . .

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the proposal. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, room 5221, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the comment closing date indicated below will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered by the Administration. However, the rulemaking action may proceed at any time after that date, and comments received after the closing date and too late for consideration in regard to the action will be treated as suggestions for future rulemaking. The Administration will continue to file relevant material, as it becomes available in the docket after the closing date, and it is recommended that interested persons continue to examine the docket for new material.

*Comment closing date.*—September 7, 1973.

*Proposed effective date.*—September 1, 1974.

(Secs. 103, 119, Public Law 89-563, 80 Stat. 718, 15 U.S.C. 1392, 1407; delegation of authority at 38 FR 12147.)

Issued on June 1, 1973.

JAMES E. WILSON,  
Associate Administrator  
Traffic Safety Programs.

[FR Doc.73-11399 Filed 6-6-73; 8:45 am]

Office of Pipeline Safety  
[ 49 CFR Parts 192, 195 ]  
[Notice 73-1; Docket No. OPS-23]

# BENDING LIMITATIONS

## Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

The Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) is considering amending the pipeline safety regulations set forth in part 192 for gas pipelines and part 195 for liquid pipelines to provide more realistic pipe bending limitations and to make the standards in this regard for gas and liquid pipelines consistent insofar as practicable. The need for revised standards in connection with bending limitations has become evident with the development of the internal bending mandrel and recent industry use of reels on barges.

This advance notice of proposed rulemaking is being issued pursuant to the OPS's policy for instituting rulemaking proceedings in an appropriate situation prior to formulating a specific rule proposal. An advance notice is issued when it is found that the resources of the OPS and reasonable outside inquiry do not yield a sufficient basis to identify and select a tentative course or alternate courses of action, or where it would be helpful to invite public participation in the identification and selection of a course or alternate courses of action. The subject matter of this notice involves a situation contemplated by that policy.

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rules by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket or notice number and be submitted in duplicate to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590. All communications received on or before August 6, 1973, will be considered by the Director before taking further action in the matter. All comments will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, for examination by interested persons. If it is determined to be in the public interest to proceed further, after consideration of the available data and comments received in response to this notice, a notice of proposed rulemaking will be issued. Such notice may propose to amend the part 192 requirements or the part 195 requirements, or both, as appropriate.

The reel barge technique has been developed by industry for laying pipelines offshore. Essentially, the pipeline is fabricated onshore and spooled onto a reel on a barge. The barge is then towed to location and the pipeline is unspooled along the right-of-way. During the spooling of pipe 12 inches or more in diameter, bends in excess of that allowed by part 192 occur. However, during the laying operation, the pipe is unreel and straightened so that there is little or no bend in the installed position. From the technical evidence presently available, there is no indication or reduction in the structural integrity of the pipe due to the repeated bending without

an internal mandrel that occurs during the reeling process.

The bending deflection limitation of the gas safety regulations was adopted from the ANSI B 31.8 Code where it was placed prior to the development of the internal bending mandrel. Except in bending operations involving reeling as described above, the mandrel supports the inside wall of the pipe during bending thereby reducing the possibility of wrinkles, buckling, or collapsing. There is evidence now that, by using the mandrel, bends larger than those allowed under current regulations may safely be made.

In order to determine whether industry advances, such as the barge reel and internal bending mandrel and increased technical knowledge, justify a rule change, the OPS requires information in three general areas. The first of these areas relates to the present deflection limitation and the factors on which it is based; the second area concerns the non-destructive testing of girth welds subject to bending; the third involves the identification and measurement of mechanical damage resulting from bends.

So that the required information may be elicited in the form most useful to the OPS, commentators are asked to respond to the various questions propounded below and to include supporting data wherever possible. These questions are numbered consecutively for ease of reference and each is intended to denote a broad subject within one of the three major areas of inquiry. In addition, since information concerning industry techniques and the fundamental technology of bends is limited, the OPS encourages the submission of any other comments which may be of assistance in formulating new standards even though such comments may not be in direct response to any of the questions.

Section 192.313(a)(3) presently permits a maximum deflection of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  degrees in a length of pipe equal to the diameter on pipe having a diameter of 12 inches or more. Part 195 contains no comparable bending limitation. Information concerning deflection limitation is required in the following areas:

1. Establishment or revision of the maximum deflection limit.

(a) Why should or should not a maximum deflection limit be established?

(b) What criteria should be considered in establishing a maximum deflection limit?

(c) If a maximum limit is established, what should its numerical value be in degrees per length of pipe equal to the diameter and what are the reasons for that value?

2. Strain and wall thinning as criteria for setting a bending limit.

(a) Should the amount of strain that occurs during bending be used to set a bending limit, and, if so, what is the criterion?

(b) Should the amount of wall thinning that occurs during bending be used

as a bending limit and, if so, what is the criterion?

3. Relation of diameter to wall thickness (D/t) ratio to a maximum limit on bending.

(a) Is there technical merit to setting a D/t ratio above which (i.e. for thin wall piping) a maximum limit on bending would be established and at or below which (i.e. for thick wall piping) there would be no bending limit specified?

(b) If the answer to (a) is yes, what is the proper numerical value of D/t and the reasons for that value?

(c) If the answer to (a) is yes, what should be the maximum limit on bending for the thin wall piping?

4. Please document any recent research or testing conducted relative to the bending of pipe. It is requested that the documentation include the scope of the research or test, when and by whom conducted, and the results.

Section 192.313(b) requires that each circumferential weld of steel pipe that is subjected to stress during bending must be nondestructively tested. This requirement does not specify whether the test is to be performed before or after bending. Part 195 does not contain a comparable requirement. Information concerning the nondestructive testing requirement is sought based on the following questions:

5. Is it a sound technical approach to require girth welds located in bend sections to be nondestructively tested—

(a) After the bend is completed when formed in a field bending machine?

(b) Before bending when the pipe is to be bent by the reeling process as on a reel barge? In this connection, is the strain induced by the reeling sufficient to require nondestructive testing after the reeling?

6. Should the decision whether to non-destructively test before or after bending be based on a strain limit? What other criteria could be employed in reaching that decision?

7. Should a standard other than "subjected to stress during bending," as currently included in § 192.313(b), be used to determine when a weld in a bend section must be nondestructively tested?

Section 192.313(d) requires, in part, that bends in gas pipelines must be free of mechanical damage. Section 195.212(b) states a similar requirement for liquid pipelines. With regard to mechanical damage, the following questions pertain:

8. For purposes of these rules, how should mechanical damage be defined and what are the criteria for determining what constitutes mechanical damage?

9. After pipe has been bent, what mechanical tests should be performed on pipe bends to determine if damage has been caused during the bending process?

10. Prior to actually engaging in a pipeline construction project—

(a) What criteria should be established to insure that there will be no

damage to the pipe to be used in that particular project considering the maximum bend that will be required?

(b) Should test bends be formed on representative samples of pipe in order to determine the maximum bend which will be allowed for the pipe to be used in that particular construction project?

(c) If test bends are formed on representative samples, should coupons be removed from the test bend sections to check the mechanical properties of the pipe at the maximum bends to be used?

This advance notice of proposed rulemaking is issued under the authority of section 3 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (49 U.S.C. 1672), sections 831-835 of title 18, United States Code, section 6(e)(4) of the Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1655(e)(4)), § 1.58(d) of the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR 1.58(d)), and the redelegation of authority to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, set forth in appendix A to part 1 of the regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR pt. 1).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on May 31, 1973.

JOSEPH C. CALDWELL,  
Director,  
Office of Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc.73-11358 Filed 6-6-73; 8:45 am]

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[47 CFR Part 73]

[Docket No. 19727]

### FM BROADCAST STATIONS IN NEW BERN AND MOREHEAD CITY-BEAUFORT, N.C.

Order Extending Time for Filing Comments and Reply Comments

In the matter of amendment of § 73.202(b), *Table of assignments*, FM Broadcast Stations. (New Bern and Morehead City-Beaufort, N.C.) docket No. 19727, RM-1981.

1. On April 25, 1973, the Commission adopted a notice of proposed rulemaking in the above-captioned proceeding. Publication was given in the FEDERAL REGISTER on May 3, 1973, 38 FR 10968. Comment and reply comment dates are presently designated as June 6 and June 15, 1973, respectively.

2. On May 30, 1973, V.W.B. Inc., licensee of Station WSFL(FM), Bridgeport, N.C., filed a request for an extension of time for 14 days to file comments. V.W.B., Inc., states that its counsel and engineering consultant, during the past 30 or more days, have been unable to prepare meaningful and helpful comments in the instant proceeding because of other activities before the Commission on behalf of the principals of V.W.B., Inc., concerning a standard broadcast station in New Bern, N.C., of which they, in partnership are the licensee.

3. It appears that the requested extension is warranted: Accordingly, it is or-