

<i>North Carolina</i>	
Hickory	New Bern
Kinston	
<i>Oklahoma</i>	
Ardmore	Lawton
Enid	
<i>Oregon</i>	
Pendleton	
<i>Puerto Rico</i>	
Mayaguez	
<i>South Carolina</i>	
Greenville	Spartanburg
Myrtle Beach	
<i>Tennessee</i>	
Knoxville (Downtown)	
<i>Texas</i>	
<i>Utah</i>	
Ogden	Utah
<i>Washington</i>	
Olympia	
Tacoma (Industrial)	
Walla Walla	
<i>West Virginia</i>	
Laredo	Brownsville
Plainview	Harlingen
Wheeling	Lewisburg
<i>Wisconsin</i>	
Appleton	

[FR Doc. 77-25426 Filed 8-31-77; 8:45 am]

Office of Pipeline Safety Operations
[Notice No. 77-5; Docket No. OPSO-47]

GAS PIPELINE SAFETY
Grant-in-Aid Program

This notice is issued to inform the public of the criteria and procedures established by the Materials Transportation Bureau (MTB) for determining a State's eligibility to participate in the grant-in-aid program under Section 5(f) of the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1674(f)) (the Act). Although monies are not presently available to fund the Section 5(f) grant program, the following detailed information is provided so that States may have a factual basis for expressing, to MTB, their desire to participate in such a program. Knowing the extent of State interest will then allow MTB to accurately estimate the level of funding necessary to fully implement the Section 5(f) grant program.

Section 5(f) was enacted by Pub. L. 94-477 on October 11, 1976 (Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, Amendments of 1976), and provides:

(f) (1) During the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, the Secretary shall, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary taking into account the needs of the respective States, pay to each State agency out of funds appropriated or otherwise made available one hundred percent of the cost (not to exceed \$60,000 for each State agency) of not more than three full-time natural gas pipeline safety inspectors in addition to, and not in lieu of, the number of natural gas pipeline safety inspectors maintained by such State agency in calendar year 1977.

(2) Not later than September 30, 1977, any State may apply to receive funds under paragraph (1) for the calendar year 1978.

(3) Each State agency which receives funds under paragraph (1) shall continue to maintain during calendar years 1979 and 1980 not less than the number of full-time natural gas pipeline safety inspectors which were maintained by such State agency in calendar year 1978.

(4) Any State in which the State agency fails to meet its obligations under paragraph (3) shall reimburse the Secretary for a sum equal to 50 percent of the funds received by such State under this subsection in proportion to which such State agency has failed to meet its obligations.

In order to take " * * * into account the needs of the respective States" it became necessary for MTB to determine the level of inspection effort that would be reasonably required by each State agency to maintain a satisfactory gas pipeline safety program. MTB recognized that this determination was of major significance in deciding a State's eligibility to receive Section 5(f) funding. The appropriateness of several criteria including miles of pipelines, age of pipelines, number of services, corrosive nature of States' soil, geographic area of the State, number, size, and quality of gas operators, number of gas incidents and fatalities were considered for making this determination. After carefully reviewing the propriety of each criterion and the availability of data, MTB decided that the level of inspection effort for each State would be based on the following three criteria: (1) Number of metered gas services, (2) miles of distribution main (for States acting as DOT's interstate agent,

includes miles of transmission), and (3) number of distribution operators. Moreover, statistical data relating to these three criteria would be obtained from the MTB data bank developed from the 1975 Distribution and Transmission annual reports.

In order to arrive at a correlation between the chosen criteria and an adequate inspection effort that would be applicable to all States, MTB considered it a sound approach to base the correlation on program data of selected State agencies that are thought to have "good gas pipeline safety programs." In response to this approach, State agencies with such programs were identified by the MTB Regional Chiefs, their opinion being based on various factors including MTB internal State monitoring records.

Data was subsequently retrieved from MTB's data bank concerning the number of services, miles of pipeline, number of operators subject to State jurisdiction, and the person-years currently expended on inspection by the above selected States. MTB then related, by graphical representation, each of the three chosen criteria to the level of inspection effort currently being expended. From the graphical representations, "approximate regression curves" were established which approximated the correlation between each of the three criteria and inspection effort. These curves were used in conjunction with MTB's judgment to develop the following mathematical formulas for determining the satisfactory level of inspection effort in person-years under each criterion:

Number of Services

1. Less than 900,000 services in State inspection;

$$\text{Inspection effort} = .5 + \frac{\text{Number of Services in State.}}{200,000 \text{ services}}$$

2. More than 900,000 services in State inspection;

$$\text{Inspection effort} = .5 + \frac{\text{Number of Services in State, 900,000 services}}{1,000,000 \text{ services}}$$

Miles of Pipeline

1. Less than 20,000 miles in State inspection;

$$\text{Inspection effort} = .5 + \frac{\text{Miles in State.}}{4,000 \text{ miles}}$$

2. More than 20,000 miles in State inspection;

$$\text{Inspection effort} = .5 + \frac{\text{Miles in State—20,000 miles}}{15,000 \text{ miles}}$$

Number of Operators

$$\text{Inspection effort} = .5 + \frac{\text{Number of Operators in State.}}{15 \text{ operators}}$$

¹ In person-years.

The resulting inspection effort under each criterion was then averaged giving equal weight to each criterion. MTB considered that this average represented the person-years of inspection effort that a State must devote to gas pipeline safety to maintain a good program. The average for each State calculated as described above is available from MTB upon request. Because of the unavailability of data concerning master meter operators, person-year requirements as calculated by MTB do not reflect a State's inspection requirements over master meter operators. Therefore, those States having jurisdiction over master

meters and/or petroleum gas operators and desiring to participate in the 5(f) funding program should inform MTB of the need to adjust the calculations regarding person-year requirements.

Section 5(f) provides that 100 percent funding will be available only for inspectors that are in addition to and not in lieu of the number of natural gas pipeline safety inspectors maintained by a State agency in calendar year 1977. To determine the "1977 Level of Inspection Effort," MTB used the most current data available. This information was obtained from Attachment 6 of the 1977 5(a) certifications and 5(b) agreements and re-

lates to inspection effort being expended by States on January 1, 1977. This information is also available from MTB upon request.

However, the true "1977 Level of Inspection Effort" should reflect any increases or decreases of person-years of inspection effort made in a State program between January 1, 1977, and the time their letter of intent to participate in the 5(f) funding program was submitted to MTB. Therefore, when applicable, a State must adjust the January 1, 1977, figures to reflect such increases or decreases. Since the person-years a State devotes to pipeline safety is not constant and change from day to day, the adjustment must be accomplished by calculating the average increase or decrease of person-years the State devoted to pipeline safety from January 1, 1977, to the time their letter of intent was submitted to MTB.

For a State to be eligible to receive section 5(f) funding, a deficiency of inspection effort, determined by subtracting the 1977 level of inspection effort (adjusted if necessary) from the level of inspection effort required to maintain a good gas pipeline safety program (as calculated by MTB), must exist.

Although inspection effort deficiencies often contain fractional person-years, MTB believes that eligibility for 5(f) funding should be expressed in terms of whole person-years. This would avoid the problem of a State having to decide whether to hire a full-time gas pipeline safety inspector to cover a fractional person-year deficiency, knowing that if the full-time inspector is hired only that portion of his inspection effort equal to the fractional deficiency will be eligible for 5(f) reimbursement. Expressing 5(f) eligibility in terms of whole person-years also eases the burden of States and the MTB in administering the 5(f) program. Therefore, MTB has decided that in arriving at the maximum person-years that can qualify for 100 percent Federal reimbursement under section 5(f), all fractional person-year deficiencies will be rounded as follows: Deficiencies of .25 or greater rounded up to the nearest whole number, to a maximum of 3 person-years; deficiencies of .24 or less rounded down to the nearest whole person-year (including zero person-years).

Table I below shows, for each State, the number of person-years qualifying for 5(f) funds based on the person-year deficiencies arrived at by MTB using the calculations described above.

Table I

Schedule of States Qualifying
for Section 5(f) Funding *

State	Person-years Qualifying for 5(f) funds
Alabama	0
Alaska	1
Arizona	2
Arkansas	0
California	3
Colorado	1
Connecticut	1
Delaware	1
Florida PSC	0
Florida Fire Marshal	3
Georgia	0
Hawaii	1
Idaho	1
Illinois	2
Indiana	3
Iowa	3
Kansas	3
Kentucky	0
Louisiana	1
Maine	0
Maryland	2
Massachusetts	3
Michigan	2
Minnesota	0
Mississippi	0
Missouri	1
Montana	1
Nebraska	1
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	1
New Mexico	1
New York	0
North Carolina	0
North Dakota	1
Ohio	2
Oklahoma	2
Oregon	0
Pennsylvania	1
Rhode Island	0
South Carolina	0
South Dakota	1
Tennessee	0
Texas	3
Utah	1
Vermont	1
Virginia	1
Washington	1
West Virginia	0
Wisconsin	3
Wyoming	0
District of Columbia	1
Puerto Rico	0
TOTAL	57

* The above figures are only valid if adjustments to reflect a State's jurisdiction over master meter operators and/or petroleum gas operators or changes to the January 1, 1977, level of inspection effort are unnecessary.

MTB also made the following determinations relevant to section 5(f):

1. *Cost of an Inspector.* Costs qualifying for 5(f) funds include, in addition to the gas inspector's salary, all expenses which are directly related to his inspection activity (such as training, travel, etc.). However, 100 percent reimbursement for these expenses under section

5(f) may not exceed \$60,000 for each State agency or \$25,000 for any one inspector. Expenses in excess of these amounts may be eligible for up to 50 percent reimbursement under section 5(c) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

2. *Eligibility for Section 5(f) Funding Program.* State agencies that qualify

for section 5(f) funding (see Table I) and that desire to participate in the section 5(f) funding program must indicate their intent to participate in writing by September 30, 1977 to:

Director, Materials Transportation Bureau,
Department of Transportation, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590

Any eligible State agency that intends to participate in the section 5(f) funding program must also participate in the 1978 gas pipeline safety grant-in-aid program authorized by section 5(c) of the Act, and must submit the required MTB forms for participation in the section 5(c) funding program by September 30, 1977.

3. *Recordkeeping requirements.* Each State participating in the section 5(f) funding program will be responsible for insuring that the Procedural Guide for the Gas Pipeline Safety Grant Program (copies will be made available upon request to the above address is followed and that program funds have been accounted for under its provisions. Section 225.10(b) of the Guide requiring daily time records showing the status of each gas pipeline safety employee for the total day must be stringently followed in order to qualify for 100 percent reimbursement of section 5(f) funds.

4. *Request for Reimbursement Under Section 5(f).* State agencies will be reimbursed for expenses under section 5(f) in accordance with section 190 of the Procedural Guide for the gas pipeline safety program. Reimbursement under section 5(f) will be achieved by submitting a supplemental form which will be included in the 1978 yearend request for reimbursement form. No reimbursement for 5(f) funds will be made at midyear. This form, which will be mailed in January of 1979, will require the person-years qualified for reimbursement under section 5(f) to be calculated in the following manner:

Line (A) total technical person-years expended in 1978.

Line (B) total technical person-years expended in 1977.¹

Line (C) total additional person-years expended in 1978 (line A less line B).

Line (D) maximum person-years eligible for section funds per Table I of this notice.

Line (E) person-years qualifying for section 5(f) funds (line C or line D whichever is less).

¹NOTE.—Must reflect the increases or decreases in person-years expended made in the State's gas pipeline safety program from January 1, 1977, and the time the letter of intent to participate in the 5(f) funding program was submitted to MTB.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The criteria and procedures established by this notice are effective on August 29, 1977. However, comments on this notice will be considered by MTB and may be a basis for amending this notice.

PRINCIPAL AUTHORS

The principal authors of this notice are James M. Cayelli, State Programs Officer, and Robert L. Beauregard, Attorney, Office of the General Counsel.

Address: Send comments to:

Director, Office of Pipeline Safety Operations,
Department of Transportation, Trans Point Building, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.

(49 U.S.C. 1674(f), 49 CFR 1.53(a))

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

[FR Doc.77-25057 Filed 8-31-77;8:45 am]

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notice of Public Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. I), notice is hereby given of a meeting of a special planning group of the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee to be held September 21, 1977, at the Denver Marina Hotel, 303 W. Colfax Street, Denver, Colorado.

The planning group will meet for one day from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. to plan future meeting schedules and agendas for the full Committee's work over the next year.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. Meeting room will be posted on the hotel meeting board. With the approval of the Chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Any member of the public may present a written statement to the Committee at any time.

This meeting is subject to the approval of the Secretary of Transportation.

Additional information may be obtained from the NHTSA Executive Secretary, Room 5215, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, telephone 202-426-2872.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on August 26, 1977.

WM. H. MARSH,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc.77-25375 Filed 8-31-77;8:45 am]

TRUCK AND BUS SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEES

Cancellation of Public Meeting

On August 18, 1977 notice of a public meeting of the Truck and Bus Safety Subcommittees was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. This meeting was scheduled to take place on September 7 at the DOT Headquarters Building in Washington, D.C. The items on the agenda for the meeting will be taken up at the Truck and Bus Safety Subcommittees meeting on September 20.

Additional information may be obtained from the NHTSA Executive Secretary, Room 5215, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, telephone 202-426-2872.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on: August 29, 1977.

WM. H. MARSH,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc.77-25468 Filed 8-31-77;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms

[Notice No. 77-12]

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EXPLOSIVES TAGGING

Closed Meeting

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463), notice is hereby given that a closed meeting of the Advisory Committee on Explosives Tagging will be held on September 29, 1977, at the Federal Building, 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C., Room 5041 beginning at 9:00 a.m. (e.d.t.).

The Advisory Committee will discuss detailed proprietary scientific and technical data concerning various candidate explosive tagging systems that can be used in the detection and identification of explosives. The information which will be presented and discussed during the meeting will constitute trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential within the ambit of Title 5, United States Code, Section 552b(c)(4). Accordingly, the meeting of the Advisory Committee will, under authority of Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463), not be open to the public.

All communications regarding this Advisory Committee meeting should be addressed to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Washington, D.C. 20226, Attention: Mr. Robert F. Dexter, Committees Manager, Technical Services Division, Explosives Technology Branch, Room 8233.

Dated: August 22, 1977.

REX D. DAVIS,
*Director, Bureau of Alcohol,
Tobacco and Firearms.*

[FR Doc.77-25415 Filed 8-31-77;8:45 am]

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

WATER RESOURCES POLICY REVIEW

Change of Schedule

The Chairman of the Water Resources Council, Secretary of the Interior Cecil B. Andrus announced on August 26th a change in the schedule of the national water resources policy review. He set November 20, 1977 as the date for the closing of the record for public comments on the option papers published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on August 19, 1977, Vol. 42, No. 161, page 41943. Previously, the time for completion of the review has been extended by 90 days, so that the President's decision in regard to policy changes would be made in February 1978.

GUY R. MARTIN,
*Alternate to the Chairman,
Water Resources Council,
Chairman, Water Resources
Policy Committee.*

AUGUST 29, 1977.

[FR Doc.77-25535 Filed 8-31-77;8:45 am]