

SECOND

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968



CALENDAR YEAR 1969

GTR0000572

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

I herewith transmit to you the second Annual Report on the administration of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

This report has been prepared in accordance with Section 14 of the Act, and covers the period of January 1, 1969, through December 31, 1969.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Richard Nixon", is centered on the page.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

April 1970.

INDEX

(In Accordance with Section 14 of the Act)

	Page
Introduction	1
Organizational Developments	2
Section 14(a)(1) Compilation of Accidents and Casualties Occurring During Year 1969	2
Section 14(a)(2) List of Federal Gas Pipeline Standards Established or In Effect	3
Section 14(a)(3) Waivers Granted Under Section 3(e) of the Act in 1969	3
Section 14(a)(4) Evaluation of Degree of Observance of Applicable Safety Standards	5
Section 14(a)(5) Summary of Outstanding Problems	5
Section 14(a)(6) Analysis and Evaluation of Research Activities as a Result of Government and Private Sponsorship	5
Section 14(a)(7) Pending or Completed Judicial Actions	6
Section 14(a)(8) Dissemination of Technical and Consumer- Oriented Information	6
Section 14(a)(9) Compilation of Section 5(a) Certifications with State Agencies	6
Section 14(a)(10) Compilation of Section 5(b) Agreements with State Agencies	6
Section 14(b) Recommendations for Additional Legislation	7
Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee Developments	7
Cooperation with Other Federal Agencies	7-8
Attachments	

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Section 14 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, this report covers the administration of the Act for calendar year 1969.

The Act provides for Federal safety standards for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of natural gas pipeline systems. The Act creates exclusive Federal authority over systems which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act, generally described as interstate systems. Each State has authority to adopt for intrastate systems additional or more stringent standards which are not incompatible with Federal standards.

The year 1969 was the first full year of operation for the Office of Pipeline Safety, which was established within the Department of Transportation on September 10, 1968, to administer the Act. Administratively, the Office of Pipeline Safety developed an organizational structure and completed its initial staffing. In the program area, the Office established a cooperative program with the States for enforcement of safety regulations, investigated major accidents, began the regulatory process for the issuance of minimum Federal safety standards, began a series of research projects, and established an industry-wide leak and test failure reporting system. These achievements are discussed in detail in the appropriate sections of the report.

The report is divided into sections, which to the degree possible, correspond directly to the requirements of Section 14 of the Act.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

The Department's Office of Pipeline Safety was organized to parallel the functional requirements of the Act. A technical division was established for the scientific, technical, and research activities. A state program division was established to administer Section 5 of the Act. An industry program division was established to educate system operators as to the existence of, and the requirement to comply with, safety standards. A regulations division was established to carry out the many regulatory functions required by the Act.

The initial staffing of 20 positions was completed by mid-year.

The Department also completed planning for a field office in Houston, Texas. Houston was selected as the initial field office because of the concentration of pipeline activity in that area.

The Department's two pipeline safety programs are now administered separately, the liquid pipeline program in the Federal Railroad Administration and the gas pipeline program in the Office of Pipeline Safety in the Office of the Secretary. On November 24, 1969, a task force began a study of the advisability of consolidating the natural gas and liquid pipeline safety functions in one office. The task force report and recommendation are expected early in 1970.

COMPILATION OF ACCIDENTS AND CASUALTIES

Attachments # 1A and # 1B are a compilation of accident and casualty statistics, which were furnished to the Department by the States for intra-state gas facilities and by the Federal Power Commission for interstate gas facilities. Attachment # 2 is the statement of probable cause of the only natural gas pipeline accident for which the National Transportation Safety Board held a public hearing and issued a finding of probable cause.

LIST OF FEDERAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS

The Interim Minimum Federal Safety Standards, adopted as required by the Act on November 7, 1968, were the only Federal safety standards in effect during 1969.

On November 14, 1969, the Department issued a Notice (Attachment # 3) outlining plans for establishing minimum Federal safety standards by August 12, 1970.

On December 31, 1969, the Department issued a regulation (Attachment # 4) requiring leak and accident reports as a source of information for the future administration of the program. On the same date, the Department also issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Attachment # 5) on a proposal that each gas pipeline operator be required to file an inspection and maintenance plan with the Department or a State agency.

WAIVERS GRANTED UNDER SECTION 3(e) OF THE ACT

On May 23, 1969, the San Diego Gas and Electric Company sought authority to deviate from the California Public Utilities Commission's General Order No. 94-A, concerning the 20-year inspection requirements applicable to its propane storage vessels located in the City of San Diego.

This deviation was sought to permit the use of ultrasonic testing equipment in place of the visual inspection required by the Order.

The waiver was granted by the Commission for the following reasons:

1. Elimination of hazards to inspectors involved in crawling inside the vessels.
2. The inspections could be made while the vessel remains in service.
3. Ultrasonic metal thickness gauges will measure with the utmost accuracy.

4. Eliminating the cutting of the vessel thereby economizing on the extensive repair welding.

A copy of the decision was transmitted to the Department pursuant to the requirement of Section 3(e) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Department did not object to the waiver.

The Order granting the waiver was dated July 22, 1969.

The Pacific Gas and Electric Company on February 3, 1969, filed a petition with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, seeking authority to deviate from the requirements of the General Order No. 94-A, covering 10-year inspection requirements applicable to its underground holders located in Fresno, San Rafael and Yuban City.

This deviation was sought to permit the use of ultrasonic testing equipment in place of the visual inspections required by the General Order.

The waiver was granted by the Commission for the following reasons:

1. Elimination of hazards to inspectors involved in crawling inside the vessels.
2. The inspections could be made while the vessel remains in service.
3. Ultrasonic metal thickness gauges will measure with the utmost accuracy.
4. Eliminating the cutting of the vessel thereby economizing on the extensive repair welding.

A copy of the decision was transmitted to the Department pursuant to the requirement of Section 3(e) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Department did not object to the waiver.

The Order granting the waiver was dated May 4, 1969.

EVALUATION OF DEGREE OF OBSERVANCE OF
APPLICABLE SAFETY STANDARDS

There were no enforcement actions by the Department and none were reported by the States. Due to the lack of a field surveillance force, the Department does not have the kind of information which will permit a valid statement as to the degree of compliance with the regulations. We hope to be able to make this evaluation for 1970 and subsequent years.

SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING PROBLEMS

The problems outstanding in the administration of the Act at the close of the reporting period are:

1. A number of State agencies will not be able to obtain statutory authority for injunctive and monetary sanctions, substantially the same as provided in Sections 9 and 10 of the Act, within two years after the date of its enactment on August 12, 1968. Many States were not able to take legislative action in 1969, because of the short time interval. Since the legislatures of about half of the States will not be in general session again until 1971, these State agencies will not be able to submit a certificate under Section 5(a) of the Act on January 1, 1971. This problem can be overcome by amending the Act to allow the States an additional year to comply with the requirement.

2. The grant-in-aid program authorized in Section 5(c) of the Act is established on a calendar year basis whereas the Federal budget is on a fiscal year basis. This presents administrative problems which could be corrected by having the grant-in-aid program established on a fiscal year basis.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Due to the newness of the pipeline safety program and limited personnel resources, no coordinated analysis and evaluation of research activities were undertaken in 1969.

PENDING OR COMPLETED JUDICIAL ACTIONS

There were no judicial actions pending at the beginning of the year and none were begun during the year.

DISSEMINATION OF TECHNICAL AND CONSUMER- ORIENTED INFORMATION

The Department's activities have not yet been of a kind to develop technical or consumer information which is of interest sufficient for general distribution.

CERTIFICATES AND AGREEMENTS UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE ACT

Attachment # 6 shows the action the States have taken to assume responsibility under Section 5 of the Act. Twenty-one States submitted Section 5(a) certifications covering all intrastate systems in those States. Twenty-six States submitted Section 5(a) certifications covering the intrastate systems under State agency jurisdiction and ten of these also entered into agreements to assume enforcement responsibility to the extent permissible under State law for certain intrastate systems not directly subject to State agency regulation. One State entered only into a Section 5(b) agreement. The intrastate systems not covered by either State certifications or agreements (primarily municipally owned facilities) continue to be a direct responsibility of the Department. Four States did not take any action under Section 5.

None of the certifications were rejected and none of the agreements were terminated.

Attachment # 7 shows the States which agreed to serve as agents of the Department, exercising safety enforcement over the interstate transmission lines. These enforcement agreements will continue until the Department has a field force capable of undertaking enforcement of the regulations covering interstate systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 should be amended as follows:

1. The exception in Section 5(a) that permits certification for two years without regard to injunctive and monetary sanctions should be extended for one additional year.
2. The grant-in-aid program should be established on a fiscal year basis instead of a calendar year basis as now provided in Section 5(c)(1).

TECHNICAL PIPELINE SAFETY STANDARDS COMMITTEE DEVELOPMENTS

The Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee met six times during its first full year of operation. At the request of the Office of Pipeline Safety, the Committee has provided technical advice on a wide range of activities.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Department's Office of Pipeline Safety worked closely with several other Federal agencies during the year. This insured that those areas requiring coordination on pipeline safety matters were made known to interested or affected agencies and that their inputs were included in the decision making processes. The National Transportation Safety Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Interior, the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget were consulted on various matters during the year.

National Transportation Safety Board

The Department's Office of Pipeline Safety participated with the National Transportation Safety Board in the investigation of a June 3, 1969, natural gas pipeline explosion and fire in Gary, Indiana. The Office of Pipeline Safety provided the Board with all the information it developed in connection with its own investigation of the accident and assisted the Board by providing technical expertise on various phases of their public hearing on the accident. Communications interchange between the Office of Pipeline Safety and the Safety Board were established.

Federal Power Commission

The Department and the Federal Power Commission cooperated in developing leak and accident reporting requirements so that a single report serves the purposes of both agencies minimizing the burden on the public. The Federal Power Commission furnishes one of the governmental members of the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee.

Department of Interior

The Department has participated with the Department of Interior in interagency task force activities relating to the development of the Trans Alaskan Pipeline System.

Department of Defense

The Department has assisted the Department of Defense by providing limited technical advice on a special study to determine the feasibility of continuing operation of the Haines-Fairbanks, Alaska, pipeline.

Bureau of the Budget

The Department worked with the Bureau of the Budget in developing the individual leak and test failure reporting forms for transmission and distribution systems.

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Colorado	7/3/69	Colo. Springs	N	2	N	Equipment struck gas line
California	2/10/69	San Pablo	1	N	N/R	Leak at soldered connection
"	2/18/69	Fremont	2	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
"	2/23/69	Van Nuys	1	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
"	3/1/69	Tahoe City	N	N	N/R	Excessive snow and ice on service riser
"	3/13/69	Crestline	N	N	\$ 4,500.	Ice on regulator vent
"	3/13/69	Running Springs	N	N	N/R	Nipple at gas meter broken
"	3/17/69	Compton	1	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
"	3/19/69	Thousand Oaks	1	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
"	3/20/69	Los Angeles	1	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
"	3/31/69	Venice	N	N	N/R	Service line broken by car
"	4/15/69	Ventura	N	N	N/R	Earth movement
"	4/21/69	Sylman	N	N	N/R	Skip loader

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
California	4/22/69	Los Angeles	5	N	N/R	Escaping gas from meter-solder melted
"	4/25/69	Huntington Beach	N	N	N	Contraction crew
"	7/4/69	Los Angeles	1	N	N	Gas leak in curb meter vault
"	7/4/69	Whittier	1	N	N	Gas leak in curb meter vault
"	7/24/69	Modesto	1	1	N/R	Construction equip-ment
"	7/25/69	Santa Ana	2	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
"	8/6/69	Oakland	N	N	\$ 20,000.	Earth movement
"	8/6/69	Chico	N	N	\$ 25,000.	Grading equipment
"	9/1/69	Los Angeles	1	N	N/R	Gas leak at meter set
"	11/10/69	Whittier	N	2	N/R	Leaks in distribu-tion
"	12/13/69	San Mateo	1	N	N/R	Corrosion leak
Iowa	1/6/69	Clinton	2	N	Home demolished	Cracked valve

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Connecticut	6/12/69	Weston	1	N	N/R	Torch ignited leaking gas
"	8/4/69	New London	1	N	N/R	Leaking Regulator
Delaware	5/16/69	Camden	N	N	N/R	Unknown
Florida	1/24/69	Daytona Beach	1	N	N/R	Backhoe
Georgia	2/6/69	Milledgeville	1	N	N/R	Leaking Main
Illinois	1/28/69	N/R	1	N	N/R	Unknown
"	1/29/69	N/R	4	N	N/R	Ground Frost
"	2/15/69	N/R	1	N	N/R	Corrosion
"	2/26/69	N/R	2	1	N/R	Electrolysis
"	3/7/69	N/R	2	N	N/R	Pipe damaged by backhoe
Indiana	1/14/69	Walton	N	N	Extensive damage to home	Cracked valve in distribution system
"	4/30/69	New Albany	1	1	N/R	Gas leak
"	5/25/69	Edinburg	N	1	Garage burned	Unknown
"	6/6/69	Gary	9	N	\$ 350,000.	Over pressurization of line

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Iowa	1/27/69	Sioux City	N	N	\$ 5,000. to 7,000	Break in 4" pressure main
"	2/4/69	Red Oak	1	N	\$38,201.92	Crack in 90 degree elbow in street main
"	2/5/69	Oakland	N	N	\$ 1,000.	Fracture in service pipe
"	3/11/69	Guthrie Center	N	N	N/R	Probably dresser couple separated
"	8/15/69	Cedar Rapids	N	N	\$78,400.	Broken sleeve
"	11/6/69	Burlington	N	N	N/R	Broken regulator
Kansas	2/4/69	Washington	1	N	Extensive	Leak in service line
"	3/7/69	Emporia	N	N	Extensive	Service line pulled out of coupling
Kentucky	11/24/69	Louisville	2	N	\$12,500.	Grader on heavy vehicle crossing the service line
Mass.	12/17/69	Dedham	N	N	House damaged	Contractor's equipment
"	2/24/69	Belmont	N	N	Extensive	Cracked Weld

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Mass.	4/8/69	Springfield	N	N	Oil truck, 67 Ford and 66 Lincoln	Broken drip riser
"	10/3/69	Haverhill	N	N	Extensive	Under investigation
"	12/2/69	Danvers	2	11	N/R	Compression type coupling separated
Nebraska	2/22/69	Red Cloud	N	N	N/R	Broken gas main
Nevada	N/R	Carson City	N/R	N/R	N/R	Under investigation
"	N/R	Las Vegas	N/R	N/R	N/R	"
N. Hampshire	3/22/69	Hampton	1	N	N/R	Break in 2" main
Michigan	1/10/69	Adrian	N	N	Severe damage to kitchen	Leak in service line
"	1/15/69	Saginaw	N	N	\$ 5,000. to 7,000.	Regulator froze open
"	2/27/69	Mt. Morris	1	N	\$15,000.	Backhoe broke service line
"	4/3/69	Lakeview	1	N	N/R	Lighted match in catch basin
"	5/14/69	New Baltimore	2	N	\$20,000.	Lateral line pulled apart by front end loader

N--None N/R---Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Michigan	6/18/69	Flint	2	N	N	Line pulled loose by backhoe
"	6/20/69	Comstock	N	N	\$ 25,000. to 30,000.	Lighting struck meter
"	6/25/69	Ovid	2	N	N/R	Settling of over-burden
"	7/16/69	Perry	N	N	\$ 30,000.	Backhoe broke service line
"	10/3/69	Livonia	N	N	\$205,000.	Line pulled loose by grader
"	11/2/69	Melvindale	1	N	No estimate	Leaking ell in service line
Minnesota	8/8/69	E. Grand Forks	N/R	N/R	Damage to small bldg.	Contractor's machine hit pipe that was marked
Missouri	3/11/69	St. Louis	N	1	\$ 1,284.12	Truck mounted auger struck main
"	3/13/69	Sedalia	N	N/R	N/R	N/R
"	5/25/69	Mexico	N	N	\$ 8,400.	Backhoe damaged main
"	10/17/69	Kansas City	N	N	N/R	Vibration of vehicular traffic

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
New York	1/3/69	New York City	5	N	N/R	Gas leaking into unused tunnel
"	2/9/69	Lindenhurst	N	N	Damaged bldgs. over \$1,000.	Apparently electricity igniting leak of 3/4" line
"	4/23/69	New York City	N	1	N/R	Pipe cap blew off while under test
"	8/18/69	" "	1	N	N/R	Pipe cap blew off while under test
"	9/8/69	Huntington	22	N	May exceed \$ 40,000.	Corrosion
"	10/8/69	Belmont	1	N	N/R	Lack of support for line
"	10/16/69	Great Neck	1	N	N/R	Under review
"	11/6/69	Westtown	1	N	N/R	Contractor's backhoe
"	12/11/69	New York City	4	N	N/R	Broken main by contractor
Ohio	1/11/69	Sandusky	N/R	N/R	\$ 40,000.	Unknown
"	3/26/69	Ashtabula	N/R	N/R	\$ 33,700.	Road Contractor
"	9/8/69	Hamilton	3	N/R	\$ 18,000.	Settling of earth fill

N--None N/R--Not Reported

Page-7

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Ohio	10/15/69	Piketon	N/R	N/R	\$ 2,000.	Road Contractor
Pennsylvania	1/16/69	Bethlehem	3	N	\$ 25,000. to 35,000.	Corrosion
"	3/3/69	Waynesboro	N	N	Church damaged	Leaking gas into church from broken main
"	5/27/69	Roseto	N	N	House severely damaged	Back filling pushed plank against line
"	9/8/69	Scranton	1	N	Bldg. destroyed	External Corrosion
"	9/21/69	Oliphant	1	N	House destroyed	Bulldozer broke service main
Rhode Island	7/28/69	Granston	4	N	Over \$1,000.	Backhoe pulled line apart by contrac- tor
"	12/30/69	Newport	N	N	Over \$1,000.	Backhoe pulled pipe out of coupling
Tennessee	1/14/69	Cleveland	2	N	\$ 15,000.	Cold weather caused weld contraction
Texas	11/5/69	Kerrville	N	N	\$ 4,000.	Service line leaked
"	12/1/69	Fort Worth	3	N	N/R	Leak on 16" line
Washington	6/12/69	Wenatchee	N/R	N/R	N/R	Contractor's equip- ment

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Washington	1/3/69	Tacoma	4	N	N/R	Frozen earth
"	1/14/69	Seattle	1	N	N/R	Escaping gas ignited
"	1/7/69	Kent	1	N	N/R	Contractor's Equip- ment
"	5/16/69	Spokane	1	N	\$ 1,000.	"
"	12/1/69	Seattle	2	N	N	Gas ignited from Torch
Virginia	12/5/69	Portsmouth	1	N/R	N/R	Line buckled by backhoe
Wisconsin	2/25/69	Menomonee Falls	1	N	N/R	Failure of by-pass valve
Wyoming	10/23/69	Cody	N/R	N/R	\$ 4,400.	Probably a backhoe broke line
Dist. of Columbia	3/22/69	Washington, D.C.	N	N	N/R	Corrosion
Total-----			124	21	\$ 1,040,886.04*	
Total accidents-----			83			*This is the estimate for 27 fail- ures for which monetary esti- mates of property damage were reported. In 4 instances where a range of estimated property damage was reported, the average of the range was used.
SEE FOOTNOTES-----			Page-10			

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

FOOTNOTES: This information is based on reports obtained from State agencies through March 6, 1970.

Neither Section 5(a) certifications for calendar year 1970 nor 1969 accident reports have been received from Hawaii, Louisiana, New Jersey, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Puerto Rico.

No reportable accidents accompanied the calendar year 1970, Section 5(a) certifications submitted by Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Vermont and West Virginia.

See Addenda on Page-11

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTRASTATE
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STATE AGENCIES

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
New Jersey	4/11/69	Wayne	N	N	House damaged	Corrosion
"	6/14/69	Newark	1	N	N/R	Regulator mal-function
Reported---March 9, 1970						

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Alabama	4/6/69	St. Clair Co.	N	N	N/R	Unknown
Arkansas	4/4/69	Union County	N	N	\$ 7,320.00	Bulldozer damaged
"	4/23/69	Quachita Co.	N	N	N/R	Line "
"	6/17/69	Saline County	N	N	\$ 1,750.00	" "
"	9/28/69	Grant County	N	N	\$ 1,689.00	" "
"	9/12/69	Columbia Co.	N	N	Bulldozer destroyed	" "
"	10/21/69	Union County	N	N	N/R	Brush rake damaged line
Arizona	9/10/69	Flagstaff Co.	N	N	N/R	Unknown
"	9/11/69	Greenlee Co.	N	N	N/R	Break from washout
"	9/24/69	Seligman Co.	1	2	N/R	Line damaged by excavating equipment
Colorado	4/10/69	Yuma County	N	N	N/R	Ditching machine hit line
Florida	5/7/69	Tampa County	N	1	N/R	Contractor's rotor-tiller
"	8/17/69	Broward County	N/R	N/R	N/R	Unknown
Georgia	7/11/69	Jones County	N	N	N/R	Road grader

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Illinois	2/24/69	Will County	N	N	N/R	Crack in girth weld
"	8/17/69	Bureau County	N	N	N/R	Ditching machine
"	8/30/69	Bureau County	3	N	N/R	Line separated at coupling
"	10/3/69	Fayette County	N	N	N/R	Lid separation from vessel
Iowa	1/3/69	Roland County	N	N	N/R	Hydrater froze
Iowa	12/2/69	Hardin County	N	N	N/R	Crack in reducer
Kansas	3/18/69	Harvey County	N	N	N/R	Line failed and gas ignited
Kansas	8/13/69	Anderson County	N	N	N/R	Line hit by farm equipment
Kentucky	3/20/69	Johnson County	N/R	N/R	N/R	Line moved by earth movement
"	6/11/69	Powell County	N	N	N/R	Pipe ruptured
"	10/15/69	Nicholas Co.	N	N	N/R	Regulator failed in shut position
"	10/24/69	Lewis County	N	N	N/R	Corrosion
"	11/3/69	Round County	N	N	N/R	Corrosion

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Kentucky	11/6/69	Mason County	N	N	N/R	Joint failed
Louisiana	2/7/69	Plaquemines Parish	N	N	N/R	Instrument line broke
"	2/23/69	Cameron Parish	N	N	N/R	Leak developed in line - unknown
"	3/12/69	St. Mary Parish	N	N	N/R	Weld failed
"	4/15/69	Sabine Parish	N	N	N/R	Line rupture - unknown
"	6/4/69	Bossier Parish	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer
"	6/10/69	St. Landry "	N	N	N/R	Leak in tap
"	12/11/69	Terrebonne	N	N	N/R	Pipe rupture
Maryland	8/8/69	Baltimore Co.	N	N	\$ 2,500.00	Earth moving equipment hit line
Michigan	1/10/69	Bessemer County	N	N	N/R	Line failed-unknown
"	12/12/69	Osceola County	N	N	N/R	Failure at plant
Mississippi	1/4/69	Hinds County	N	N	N/R	Leak in coupling
"	3/15/69	Sunflower Co.	N	N	N/R	Subsoiler hit line
"	4/3/69	Walthall County	N	N	N/R	Crack in pipe caused leak

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Mississippi	6/6/69	Yalobusha Co.	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer
"	6/19/69	Clay County	N	N	N/R	Station struck by lighting
"	7/9/69	Warren County	N	N	N/R	Road grader
Minnesota	4/24/69	Long Prairie	N	N	N/R	Meter locked
Nebraska	3/14/69	Boone County	N	N	N/R	Line damaged extricating snow equipment
"	8/29/69	Otoe County	N	1	N/R	Relief valve being installed
"	10/27/69	Valley County	N	N	N/R	Surface contraction
"	10/28/69	Valley County	N	N	N/R	Line damaged by scoop
"	12/3/69	Boone	N	N	N/R	Line hit by grader blade
"	12/30/69	Cheyenne Co.	N	N	N/R	Rupture of Discharge line
New Mexico	11/30/69	McKinley Co.	N	N	N/R	Line failed
Ohio	1/11/69	Erie County	N	N	N/R	Not reported
Ohio	8/5/69	Muskingum Co.	N	N	N/R	Line failed - corrosion

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Ohio	8/5/69	Perry County	N	N	N/R	Line failed - unknown
"	9/8/69	Knox County	N	N	N/R	Line hydrostatically tested
"	10/1/69	Miami County	2	N	N/R	Fire in station
Oklahoma	5/22/69	Stephens Co.	N	N	N/R	Line ruptured by plow
"	6/7/69	Stephens Co.	1	N	N/R	Road grader hit line
"	6/10/69	Stephens Co.	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer
"	6/11/69	Garvin County	N	N	N/R	Dirt mover cut line
"	7/1/69	Blaine County	N	N	N/R	Earth moving equipment hit line
"	7/21/69	Blaine County	N	N	N/R	Farm plow hit line
"	8/28/69	Jefferson Co.	N	N	N/R	Joint split
"	9/8/69	Latimer County	N	N	N/R	Escaping gas from break in hydrator
"	10/2/69	Haskell County	2	N	N/R	Line blew out
"	11/1/69	Stephen County	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer

N--None
N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Oklahoma	11/23/69	Texas	N	N	N/R	Station caught fire
"	12/20/69	Washita	N	N	N/R	Line hit by plow
Oregon	12/25/69	Umatilla County	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer
"	12/7/69	Washington Co.	2	N	cabinet shop destroyed	Heaving of frozen ground
Pennsylvania	1/6/69	Allegheny Co.	N	N	N/R	Unknown
"	1/31/69	Fayette County	N	N	N/R	unknown
"	4/15/69	Gettsburg	N	N	N/R	Farm equipment
"	4/28/69	Fayette County	N	N	N/R	Unknown
Texas	1/8/69	Cass County	N	N	\$ 1,132.	Split occurred
"	1/19/69	Kenedy County	N	N	\$ 3,000.	30' section failed
"	3/18/69	Harrison Co.	N	N	\$ 2,200.	Break occurred gas ignited-unknown
"	4/6/69	Sherman County	N	N	N/R	Earth moving machine
"	5/8/69	Amarillo County	7	1	\$ 1,000,000.	Unknown
"	5/15/69	Nacogdoches Co.	N	N	1,500.	Joints pulled out of coupling

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
(Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Texas	7/7/69	San Patricio	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer
"	8/5/69	Cooke County	N	N	\$ 1,000.	Grader struck line
"	10/4/69	Wise County	N	N	\$ 50,000.	Backhoe ruptured line
"	11/8/69	Wilbarger Co.	1	N/R	\$ 40,300.	Heavy equipment bogged on line
"	12/2/69	Maverick Co.	N	N	\$ 1,000.	Complete report coming
"	12/6/69	Moore County	N	N	N/R	Underground header failed
"	12/16/69	Hansford County	N	N	N/R	Pipe hit by bulldozer
W. Virginia	6/13/69	Putnam County	N	N	N/R	Earth moving equipment
W. Virginia	9/22/69	Wetzel County	6	N	Loss of crane and bulldozer	Earth moving equipment ruptured line
Wisconsin	4/28/69	Black River Falls	N	N	N/R	Bulldozer severed line

N--None N/R--Not Reported

OFFICE OF PIPELINE SAFETY
 ANNUAL FAILURE REPORT - INTERSTATE
 (Information obtained from Federal Power Commission)

State	Date	Location	Injuries	Fatalities	Property Damage	Cause
Wisconsin	11/19/69	Fond du Lac	3	1	N/R	Line damaged by by plow
		Total-----	28	6	\$ 1,113,391.00*	
		Total accidents reported-----	92		*This amount is the total for 13 failures for which monetary estimates of property damage were reported.	

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD DETERMINATION OF PROBABLE
CAUSE OF PIPELINE ACCIDENT IN LOW PRESSURE NATURAL GAS DISTRIBUTION
SYSTEM -- GARY, INDIANA, JUNE 3, 1969

The Board finds that the probable cause of this accident was a combination of personnel error and system inadequacy. Involved were the inadvertent opening of a separation valve by a gas company employee allowing gas at 20 p.s.i.g. to flow into a 1/4 p.s.i.g. system and a system which could not control adequately such an increase in pressure owing to the lack of overpressure protection devices. Thereafter, the increase in pressure caused the failure of a regulator diaphragm which allowed an 80-fold overpressure in the low-pressure system to become continuous for 30 to 45 minutes.

Significant contributing causal factors were:

1. The inaccessibility of the shutoff valve for the regulator which failed.
2. The lack of a systematic review of the hazards in the conversion operation which could have revealed the hazardous condition in which one human error could produce catastrophe, coupled with the lack of a written plan for the conversion.
3. The absence in Code B31.8 of any specification of safeguards to be employed at separation (isolation) valves during pressure conversions.
4. The lack of complete leakage surveys, before and during the pressure increase in the eastern area, which would have probably disclosed the leaking condition of the pipe and avoided the major leaks which occurred on June 3, 1969.



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

**DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION**

Office of Pipeline Safety

[49 CFR Part 192]

[Notice 69-3, Docket No. OPS-3]

GAS PIPELINES

Minimum Federal Safety Standards

The Department of Transportation is developing proposals for the comprehensive minimum Federal safety standards for the transportation of gas and pipeline facilities, as required by section 3(b) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. This notice is the first step in the rule making process that will result in the establishment of these standards to replace the interim Federal safety standards now in effect.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act required the Secretary of Transportation to establish the interim Federal standards within 3 months by adopting the State standards in effect on August 12, 1968. The interim standards were issued as Part 190 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations on November 7, 1968.

At that time, the Department asked for comment on the advisability of adopting the safety code most widely used by the industry (United States of America Standards Institute Standard Code for Pressure Piping—Gas Transmission and Distribution Systems—USAS B31.8, 1968 edition, referred to hereinafter as the B31.8 Code) as the minimum Federal standards. In addition to the comments received, the Office of Pipeline Safety has sought and considered information and suggestions from several other sources. These included changes under consideration by the USASI B31.8 Code Committee, recommendations of a committee from the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, and a comparative review of State standards. After considering the information received and consulting with the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, the Department has decided that the present State standards are the best source for the minimum Federal standards. Since all States that have adopted their own

standards have based them on the B31.8 Code, the proposed Federal standards will also be very similar in substance to that document although many changes in form, style, and language will be made. Since the B31.8 Code is readily available and well understood in the gas pipeline industry, this similarity will permit extensive use of the Code as a reference document in discussing these proposals. However, in adopting their standards, many States have added requirements to strengthen and improve the B31.8 Code. The Department has evaluated these additional requirements and many are being incorporated in the proposed Federal standards for the same reasons.

Due to the length and complexity of the State standards and the Code upon which they are based, the task of converting them into a Federal regulation will require a substantial amount of time to accomplish properly. In the meantime, in order to expedite the rule making process so as to meet the August 12, 1970, date specified in the statute and still provide adequate time for analysis and preparation of comments, the proposed standards will be issued in more than one notice of proposed rule making. This first notice proposes the added requirements that are presently contained in one or more State standards and which exceed the requirements of the B31.8 Code. Since these particular requirements are not universally applicable to the industry, evaluation of their significance will require additional time for most interested persons. These proposals are described in detail but are not set forth in specific regulatory language. This notice will enable interested persons to begin developing their comments on the proposed Federal standards. Subsequently, a series of supplementary notices of proposed rule making containing the specific regulatory language will be issued for evaluation and comment by interested persons. Each one of these supplementary notices will cover a particular area such as welding, maintenance, testing, etc., and each will allow from 60 to 90 days from date of issue for further preparation and actual submission of written comments.

The Department recognizes that there are some areas, such as uprating, corrosion control, and pipeline marking, wherein the existing State standards could be substantially improved. However, changes of this type might unduly complicate the proposals and thereby delay the establishment of the first minimum Federal standards. In addition, the problems and possible solutions in these areas of needed improvement are not sufficiently well defined to permit the making of specific regulatory proposals in this rule making proceeding. The additional study that is required to accomplish this would also result in some delay. Therefore, these proposals will consist of only the existing State standards with those substantive changes as appear necessary. In the meantime, the Department will study and resolve these problems and will initiate separate rule making proceedings to include these needed improvements subsequent to establish-

ment of the minimum Federal standards.

One significant change from existing State standards that is considered necessary is new definitions for class locations. The present definitions for Class 3 and Class 4 areas are too vague to be used as Federal standards. This subject, together with the related subject of the population density index, is presently under study and when the specific regulations are proposed in a subsequent notice, new definitions of class locations will be included.

Effective date of proposed regulations. No effective date is proposed for the various requirements contained in this notice of proposed rule making. Industry would need a reasonable period of time, probably no less than 120 days, to comply with most of the proposed requirements. Some requirements, particularly those relating to design and construction, may require longer lead time. It is probable that the proposed requirements will be made applicable on a phased basis. For example, the operation and maintenance subpart could apply within 120 days while the construction subpart could be delayed for 180 days after adoption. Comments should suggest practical effective dates for the various requirements, indicating the problems that would arise from early compliance and the time required to solve those problems.

Cost/benefit determination. In evaluating these proposals, commenters should bear in mind that every safety regulation has a cost factor, either a direct purchase and operation cost or an indirect cost resulting from operating at less than maximum efficiency. Every safety regulation (if it is justified) also has a benefit factor, the increase in safety to the public and a less noticeable but definable benefit to the pipeline operator in reducing his casualty losses and damage claims to some extent. Although the cost of complying with a regulation (cost to the operator less benefit to the operator) is initially borne by the pipeline operator, this cost is ultimately paid by the public in the higher cost of the delivered product. Thus, from the point of view of the regulatory agency, the cost/benefit determination is whether the safety benefit to the public justifies the monetary cost of compliance to the public. For this reason, the proposals described herein should be evaluated as to cost and benefits. When comments on the specific regulations are submitted, these factors should be discussed fully. The information resulting from these cost/benefit determinations will be most helpful in making decisions with respect to particular proposals.

Proposed minimum Federal standards. The following are the significant provisions of the State gas pipeline safety standards that are not presently contained in the B31.8 Code—1968 but which are hereby proposed for inclusion in the minimum Federal standards. Existing requirements that are referred to are those set forth in the B31.8 Code which was the basis for all State standards. Included with each proposal are questions which should be considered and discussed

when comments are submitted. The responses to these questions, together with the cost/benefit information requested above, will be significant factors in determining the content of the minimum Federal standards.

Welding. Pipeline systems that are to operate at 20 percent or more of specified minimum yield strength (SMYS) would require visual inspection in addition to nondestructive testing. There would be a requirement for 100 percent nondestructive testing of these lines in (1) Class 3 and 4 locations, (2) within railroad or public highway rights-of-way, including tunnels, (3) at tie-ins, (4) at overhead road crossings, and (5) whenever welds are repaired. The testing percentage for Class 1 and 2 locations would remain the same. When conducting nondestructive testing on these lines, each welder's work would be sampled to at least the same percentage as the overall nondestructive testing requirement for the area. All welds tested would be tested over their entire circumference. There would no longer be an option of testing an equivalent length of welds over a part of the circumference.

Records would have to be retained for the life of the facility showing the number of welds made, the number nondestructively tested, the number of rejects, and the disposition of the rejects. In addition, detailed records of testing, including exposed X-ray film, be retained for 3 years after construction.

In discussing these proposals, commenters should provide the following information. Describe the problems in determining that each welder's work is sampled to the percentage required. Should the percentage be based on completed welds or on length of welds? Would it be sufficient to assure that each welder is checked each day and eliminate the fixed percentages? Does a requirement to test the entire circumference present any different problems on larger pipe than on smaller and if so, at what point do these differences become significant? How difficult would 100 percent testing be in Class 3 and 4 locations? What percentage of welds are nondestructively tested today in these locations? As nearly as possible, provide additional cost figures for 90 percent and 95 percent testing in these locations. Specify any problems associated with testing all tie-in welds. What is the present practice as to retention of nondestructive testing records?

Initial test requirements. Strength-proof testing requirements for pipelines and mains that are to operate at 30 percent or more of SMYS would be modified as follows: (1) Minimum test pressure in Class 3 or 4 locations would be 150 percent of maximum operating pressure; (2) test pressure would have to be held for at least 24 consecutive hours after stabilization; (3) exceptions that permit air testing of these pipelines and mains in Class 3 or 4 locations would be eliminated; (4) the test medium would have to be disposed of in a manner that is not detrimental to the environment. Pipelines or mains to be operated at less

than 1 p.s.i. would have to be tested to at least 10 p.s.i. and those operated at more than 1 p.s.i. would be required to be tested to at least 100 p.s.i. Pipelines and mains with a coating capable of sealing a leak would be tested to at least 125 p.s.i.

With respect to these proposals, discuss the difficulties that might result from eliminating air testing in Class 3 and 4 locations. Would test equipment now in use be able to meet these requirements? Is 125 p.s.i.g. test pressure sufficient to determine whether the coating is sealing a leak?

Bends, elbows, and miters. On pipelines and mains operated at a hoop stress of 30 percent or more of the specified minimum yield strength, bends would not be made within 1½ pipe diameters of a circumferential weld. In addition, miter bends that produce an angle of 3° or more would not be permitted on these pipelines and mains.

Can bends be made closer than 1½ pipe diameters to the circumferential weld without having a detrimental effect on the weld? If so, are there any special methods or techniques that should be used?

Cover requirements. The cover requirements for buried distribution mains would be increased to a minimum of 30 inches. However, whenever a local law or regulation (either a State or subdivision thereof) required distribution mains to be placed in a common trench with other utilities, the local requirements would govern the depth of cover. Buried transmission pipelines would have to be installed with a minimum cover as set forth in the following table:

Location	Cover in inches	
	Normal excavation	Excavation of rock by blasting
Class 1 Locations.....	30	18
Class 2, 3, and 4 Locations.....	36	30
Drainage ditches of public roads and railroad crossings.....	36	36

These minimums would apply to all types of materials. All other cover requirements remain unchanged.

These proposals are intended to provide additional safety for buried pipelines and mains to reduce the risk of damage by external forces. Does increased depth contribute significantly towards reducing this risk? What other industry practices are used today? Are there any other methods that could be used to minimize damage from external forces and if so, how do they compare in relative cost effectiveness?

Underground clearance. The underground clearance required between buried pipelines or mains and other underground structures would be raised from present requirements of 6 inches for

pipelines and 2 inches for mains to 12 inches for both. If this clearance were not attainable, other protective measures would have to be taken. Additional clearance would still be required for plastic piping near sources of heat.

Cast iron pipe. Bell and spigot joints would be prohibited both in new construction and the reinstallation of used pipe, unless these joints were clamped with mechanical clamps or otherwise reinforced or reconditioned. Threaded cast iron joints would be prohibited in both new construction and reinstallation of used pipe.

In cast iron pipe 6 inches in nominal diameter or smaller, threaded taps would be prohibited unless they are (1) reinforced taps, (2) existing taps that are free of cracks and have good threads, or (3) taps that are used for gas control equipment and are closed after use by means of a threaded plug or reinforcing sleeve. In cast iron pipe larger than 6 inches nominal diameter, threaded taps would have to be reinforced with sleeves if the taps are larger than 25 percent of the nominal diameter of the pipe. How much and what sizes of threaded cast iron pipe are presently in operation?

Pressure control and relief. Low pressure distribution systems would be required to maintain a minimum operating pressure high enough for the safe and continuous operation of any properly adjusted low pressure gas burning equipment that is connected to the system. Discuss low pressure service interruptions with reference to causes, adverse effects, and other possible solutions, and indicate the number of customers affected by such interruptions during the past year.

When more than one pressure regulating station or compressor station feeds into a pipeline or distribution system, each such station would be required to have a relief valve or other protective device installed to insure that the complete failure of the largest capacity regulator or compressor, or any single run of lesser capacity regulators or compressors, in that station, would not impose pressures on any part of the pipeline or distribution system in excess of those that it was designed for or that it is protected against, whichever is lower. In low pressure distribution systems, relief valves or other pressure limiting devices would have to have the capacity to limit the maximum pressure in the mains to 2 p.s.i.g. Supports for pressure relief or pressure limiting devices would have to be made of noncombustible materials.

Is relief capacity of 100 percent of the capacity of the largest single source of supply in a regulator station or compressor station sufficient to protect a distribution or pipeline system or should a larger relief capacity be required?

All pressure limiting and pressure regulating stations, other than house

regulators, and all relief valves would have to be inspected and tested at least once a year. If the capacity of a relief valve cannot be tested in place, an annual review and calculation of the required capacity of the relieving equipment at that station could be made in lieu of testing. Is annual inspection and testing sufficient to insure safe operation of this equipment?

Up-rating. Present standards do not require leakage surveys when qualifying existing steel pipelines or mains for higher operating pressures that will produce a hoop stress of 30 percent or more of SMYS. When qualifying for increased pressures of less than 30 percent on steel pipelines, mains, and distribution systems and all plastic pipe distribution systems, leakage surveys are required only if past maintenance records indicate that such a survey is advisable. These proposals would require that a leakage survey must be conducted before up-rating any part of a pipeline system and further, that all leaks discovered must be repaired before the higher pressures are applied.

Discuss present practices as to if, when, and how leakage surveys are made, with some emphasis on techniques and instruments used.

Odorization. Operators would be required to odorize gas in transmission systems as well as in distribution systems. Gas en route to storage fields would be exempt from this requirement. Have any leaks been discovered as a result of odorant being added to transmission lines? If so, how many and under what circumstances? What effect does the loss of odorant in the line have on the pipeline system? What effect does odorization of gas have on industrial users?

Interested persons should begin to develop their comments on the proposals and questions contained in this notice. However, since it is the Department's intention to propose specific rules for public comment at a later date, comments should not be submitted until that time. When specific rules have been proposed, comments should be submitted in accordance with directions set forth with those specific proposals.

This notice is issued pursuant to the authority of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (49 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), Part 1 of the Regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR Part 1), and the delegation of authority to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, dated November 6, 1968 (33 F.R. 16468).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on November 14, 1969.

W. C. JENNINGS,
Acting Director,
Office of Pipeline Safety.

[P.R. Doc. 69-13850; Filed, Nov. 20, 1969; 8:46 a.m.]



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

Title 49—TRANSPORTATION

Chapter 1—Hazardous Materials Regulations Board, Department of Transportation

[Docket No. OPS-2]

PART 191—TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL AND OTHER GAS BY PIPELINE: REPORTS OF LEAKS

Office of Pipeline Safety; Leak Reporting Requirements

This regulation establishes requirements for the reporting of natural gas pipeline leaks and test failures by operators of transmission and distribution systems and by operators of gathering systems located in populated areas. This regulation supersedes all accident reporting requirements contained in the Interim Minimum Federal Safety Standards for the Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline, as set forth in Part 190 of this chapter.

The substance of this regulation was issued as a notice of proposed rule making on July 8, 1969 (Notice 69-1, 33 F.R. 11979). The public was also provided with copies of the forms that the Department proposed for submitting the prescribed reports. In response to these proposals, over 200 comments were submitted. All have been carefully considered and many have resulted in changes that should improve the usefulness of the regulation and the forms.

In addition to considering the comments submitted by the general public, the Department has consulted with the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee established under the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 with respect to both the proposed regulations and the forms. Their advice and comments have resulted in a number of beneficial changes.

A number of comments expressed the opinion that, due to the broad statement of nonapplicability in § 5(a) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), the receipt of a State certification under that section precludes the Secretary from requiring direct reports of accidents or incidents that occur on the intrastate pipeline facilities to which the certification applies. As was indicated in the preamble to the notice proposing these rules, the

Department considers that detailed information about the causes of pipeline accidents or incidents is essential for the development of a rational regulatory program. Notwithstanding the broad language of section 5(a) of the Act, the Secretary has a continuing responsibility for establishing new and amended standards for intrastate pipeline facilities and, where necessary, for issuing orders to abate hazardous conditions discovered therein. In order to properly discharge these responsibilities, the Secretary must have the detailed information that will be provided by this reporting system and the Department believes that there is sufficient authority to support these reporting requirements.

A number of comments indicated that there was some misunderstanding as to the purpose of the required reports. Many persons felt that all reports concerning intrastate facilities covered by a certification under section 5(a) of the Act should be sent to the State agency concerned since that Agency, and not the Secretary is responsible for enforcement. Others felt that only leaks that caused injury or property damage should be reported. In view of these and other similar comments, a restatement of the purpose of this regulation appears warranted.

The preamble to the notice of proposed rulemaking stated that " . . . the first task is to marshal . . . detailed information about the causes of [leaks]. " Thus, the primary purpose of this regulation is to provide for the accumulation of factual data that will give the Department a sound statistical base with which to define safety problems, determine their underlying causes, and propose regulatory solutions. For this purpose, an accident or leak does not become less significant because no one was injured or the damage was minimal. Nor does the existence of a regulatory violation or lack thereof have any bearing upon the statistical impact of a particular mishap. If reports were limited to instances such as these, the data base would be much narrower and therefore less likely to suggest appropriate regulatory solutions.

Another aspect of the reporting requirements that received significant attention in the comments was the question of confidentiality of the reports. Several comments requested that reports be classified as confidential and not be made available to the general public, because of the possibility they might be used "for other purposes which could be detrimental to their interests." Concern was expressed that information might be quoted out of context, distorting the truth, and presenting an erroneous image of a particular reporting company. It was further urged that confidentiality was required "to protect against unwarranted claims and nuisance litigation,"

since the required reports could include questions, the answers to which might be "self-incriminating in the event of future litigation." In this connection it was also claimed that questions relating to the value of property owned by others and damaged by pipeline accidents, are not pertinent to the cause of the incidents, and might expose the reporting company to unnecessary litigation, or at least place it at a disadvantage in contesting claims for damage. It was accordingly requested that if the reports are not kept confidential, the section concerning property damage be rewritten so as to require the submission of estimated damage to the property "of the company and others," rather than "of the company or others." This last request has to some extent been accepted as is indicated below in the discussion of changes to these forms.

These arguments are all necessarily speculative. On consideration and analysis of all of these comments, they do not contain any argument that is substantial enough to require that the reports be kept confidential.

It is the policy of the Department of Transportation to make information available to the public to the greatest extent possible in keeping with the spirit of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). In the light of the statute, a refusal to permit public access to accident reports would be contrary to sound public policy. The public interest is better served by not keeping such reports confidential.

The only statutory exceptions to the basic requirement of disclosure are set out in section 552(b). None of these exceptions provides confidentiality for the reports under consideration here. Section 552(b)(4) excepts "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential." However, the legislative history indicates that this exception refers to instances where privileged information (not required by law, and that would not customarily be released to the public) is voluntarily furnished and received in confidence. Examples are commercial or financial information submitted with loan applications, or information voluntarily given to the Government in confidence for the purpose of compiling statistics which are then published in the aggregate.

Moreover, in promulgating the regulations by which the Department implemented the Freedom of Information Act (49 CFR Part 7), the Secretary announced that "the policy of the Department will be to make all information available to the public except that which must not be disclosed in the national interest, to protect the right of an individual to personal privacy, or to insure the effective conduct of public business. To

this end, the [regulation] provides that information will be made available to the public even if it falls within one of the exemptions set forth in section 552(b), unless the release of that information would be inconsistent with the purpose of the exemption" (32 F.R. 9284 (1967)).

The exemption of documents from mandatory public disclosure merely authorizes the Secretary to withhold them, it does not compel him to do so.

Section 7.51 of the regulations provides that, even though a record is exempt from public inspection, nevertheless the Department will release it, "unless it determines that the release of that record would be inconsistent with a purpose of" the particular exemption.

There is nothing in the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 which overrides the basic policy embodied in the Freedom of Information Act favoring disclosure of public records. On the contrary, the specific provision in section 12 (d) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act that "information (which) contains or relates to a trade secret referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that Section," suggests that Congress chose not to prevent disclosure of other information obtained by the Government under the Act.

The policy statement of the Department of Transportation regarding the Office of Pipeline Safety, states that the Office, in administering the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, will "act as a clearing house of safety information, systematically distributing safety information acquired from government and industry research and development programs and from industry operating experience." It is further stated that the general public will have ample opportunity to participate in the identification and definition of safety problems, and that "while we may deal on a daily basis with representatives of the affected industry, we recognize that it is our duty to ensure that the interests of the unorganized general public are served."

Finally, it must be pointed out that accident reports are not protected from disclosure for any other mode of transportation in the Department. The availability of these reports does not appear to have caused any great difficulty to the other transportation industries, and no reason is apparent for a different treatment of gas pipeline accident reports.

A number of comments stated that leak reports with regard to intrastate pipeline facilities should be made only to the State regulatory agencies because these agencies were better equipped to deal with these essentially local safety problems. While the State agencies have a major legitimate interest in these reports and should receive them if they so desire, nonetheless the Secretary must also have full access to this information to be able to carry out his responsibilities

under the Act. The collection and compilation of these statistics on a nationwide basis gives them much greater validity and value than those which would be assembled by each individual State. Consequently, for the reasons discussed above, the general requirement for making reports directly to the Secretary is retained. However, § 191.7 has been modified to permit, under certain conditions, the submission of reports relating to intrastate facilities that are the subject of a State certification under section 5(a) of the Act, directly to a State agency rather than to the Secretary. This may be done if the regulations under which that agency operates require submission in duplicate to the State and provide for further transmittal of one copy to the Department, within 10 days for leak reports and not later than February 15th for annual reports. While not specifically set forth in the regulation, under this change each State will also have the option of requiring that only one copy of each report relating to pipeline facilities under its jurisdiction be sent to the State, in which case the requirement for direct reporting to the Secretary would remain.

A discussion of each section of the regulation follows with respect to some of the more significant comments and changes that have been made.

§ 191.1. Several comments pointed out that the scope of the proposed rules appeared to go beyond the authority contained in the Act. Therefore, § 191.1 has been modified to conform to the limits stated in the Act by excluding gathering lines outside of certain specified areas.

§ 191.3. In response to several comments, the term "system failure" and the various gradations of leaks have been removed from the definitions. In their place, the scope provisions in section 191.1 have been restated to limit the applicability of the regulation to leaks that would have been included in the proposed definition as "Grade 1" and "Grade 2" leaks and to exclude therefrom the leaks that would have been defined as "Grade 3" leaks. It appears that an adequate statistical base can be obtained by requiring the reporting of only the more significant leaks that require immediate or scheduled repair. Certain leaks will require telephonic notice as specified in section 191.5. These and other leaks must also be individually reported in accordance with criteria set forth in sections 191.9 and 191.15. These criteria replace the different gradations of leaks that were proposed.

In response to the request in the preamble to the notice of proposed rule making, a number of suggestions were made as to definitions for transmission lines of a distribution system and for transmission, gathering, and distribution systems. It appears that these terms are fairly well understood throughout the industry, and there should be no need to prescribe precise definitions at this time. If any difficulties arise, the

Department will examine the facts in each situation and will establish definitions as they are needed. Those lines of distribution systems that must be reported as a transmission system are clearly delineated by the criteria set forth in section 191.13.

The definition of "system" has been changed slightly to make it clear that service lines and customers' meters are included in that term.

A number of other definitions have been added to section 191.3. The terms "gas," "municipality," "person," "pipeline facilities," "Secretary," "State," and "transportation of gas" are included as they are defined in the Act with minor changes to conform to the purpose, language, and style of this regulation. As requested by comments, definitions of the terms "operator" and "test failure" are also included. An "operator" is defined as any person (as person is defined in section 191.3) who engages in the transportation of gas. "Test failure" is defined to include only breaks or ruptures of such magnitude that repair is required before continuation of the test. This limited definition, which encompasses testing with gas, air, or water, is intended to reduce the number of reports required due to failures during testing.

§ 191.5. This section has not been changed significantly. Some comments requested the option of reporting by telegraph in any case in which the person reporting is not able to reach the correct person by telephone. However, this problem will not arise since the published phone number will be manned 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The term "failure" was used uniformly in the proposal to describe the incident to be reported, and many comments requested that this be changed to either accident, incident, or leak. As stated above in conjunction with the changes in definitions, the scope of the regulation has been restated to clearly delineate the leaks to which it applies.

Some comments suggested the deletion of certain of the criteria for making these reports. The five stated categories are virtually identical to those developed by the Federal Power Commission for telephonic reports of accidents. The experience of the Commission indicates that these types of incidents are of sufficient magnitude to require immediate notification in order that the Department may investigate the incident and take any action that may be necessary to protect persons or property.

§ 191.9. Individual leak reports under this section will not be required from distribution companies providing service to less than 100,000 customers. Studies by the Department indicate that approximately 28 percent of the total number of distribution companies have over 100,000 customers. This group of larger companies services over 85 percent of the total number of gas customers in the United States. Requiring reports only from this group of companies will furnish a statistically valid sample and will significantly lessen the reporting burden on smaller companies who are least able to bear it.

Several comments suggested that the information on this report for distribution companies could be summarized and submitted annually or semiannually. This reporting requirement is designed to elicit information that might be the basis for prompt regulatory action or for the issuance of an order requiring immediate steps to remove a hazardous condition. A delay of 6 months or a year in receiving this information would significantly reduce the value of this information and make it unusable for most of these purposes.

Many comments also urged a longer reporting period. For the reasons discussed above and also to facilitate any investigations that may appear to be necessary, the 20-day reporting period has been retained. The forms make it clear that if certain information is not available the incomplete report should be submitted indicating this unavailability. When the information becomes available, a supplemental report will be submitted. This in effect permits operators to take as much time as is reasonably necessary to assemble all of the information while still assuring the Department of early receipt of the first written report.

§ 191.11. A number of comments on this section and § 191.17 requested a later reporting date for the annual report, varying from March 15 to April 15. The Department is required to submit its annual report to Congress on March 17th and in order to allow adequate time to compile the data from these annual reports for inclusion in the Departmental report, a reporting date of February 15th is necessary. However, to allow operators more time to organize their internal reporting and information systems so as to be able to meet the February 15th deadline, the first annual report will not be required until 1971 for calendar year 1970. This will also satisfy a number of comments that indicated that assembling the cumulative information for 1969 would be very difficult due to the time that has passed since most of the incidents occurred.

§ 191.13. As discussed above, a large number of suggestions were made as to classifying "transmission lines of a distribution system". This section sets forth the two basic criteria that have been selected for this purpose. Reports involving pipeline facilities that operate at 20 percent or more of specified minimum yield strength (SMYS) or that are used to

convey gas into or out of storage, are to be submitted in accordance with the requirements for transmission systems as specified in §§ 191.15 and 191.17.

§ 191.15. This section now contains the requirements both for leaks occurring during normal operations and for test failures. Both will be reported on the same form, thereby reducing the number of different forms for these operators from three to two.

The form prescribed by this section has been developed in coordination with the Federal Power Commission so as to require most of the information presently required on their accident reports. The Commission is preparing to amend its regulations to eliminate all duplicative reporting requirements. When this is completed, it is expected that the Commission will require that copies of certain of the Department of Transportation reports be submitted to it.

§ 191.17. The requirements for annual reports for transmission or gathering systems has been reworded slightly. The discussion with respect to § 191.11 applies to this section as well.

§ 191.19. This new section has been added to notify interested persons as to where copies of the prescribed forms may be obtained. It also provides that other formats may be used if acceptable to the Secretary. This will permit submission of reports in machine record form when the Department develops its statistical systems sufficiently to accommodate information in this form.

Forms. The comments on the proposed forms were very detailed and very helpful in making necessary revisions. The forms have been reorganized and reworded so as to eliminate redundant and unnecessary questions and to present the remaining questions more precisely.

Several comments objected to the requirements for reporting the pH of soil and soil resistivity. These items have been retained in the forms for reporting on corrosion caused leaks because they give environmental information needed for the determination and evaluation of corrosion control measures and because they are easily obtained. However, the requirement for reporting soil resistivity has been modified to require reporting of the most recent soil resistivity measurement in the area of the leak instead of requiring an actual test to be made at the leak site upon discovery of the leak. The requirement is stated so that if a soil resistivity measurement is not available then it will not be necessary to obtain one.

Several objections were made to requiring a report of "Unaccounted for gas". It is recognized that this information is not precise and that care must be taken in its use. Nevertheless, it is believed that this information should be obtained and studied so that it can be determined whether there is a connection between loss of gas and accidents.

Due to the time required to prepare, print, and distribute an adequate supply of the forms for public use, the printed forms may not be available at the time this regulation becomes effective. In that

event, a small supply of temporary forms will be distributed for use until receipt of the permanent printed forms. These temporary forms may be reproduced by any company if additional copies are needed in the interim period.

In consideration of the foregoing and for the reasons discussed in the preamble to Notice 69-1, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by adding a new Part 191 to read as set forth below, effective February 9, 1970.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on December 31, 1969.

W. C. JENNINGS,
Acting Director,
Office of Pipeline Safety.

PART 191—TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL AND OTHER GAS BY PIPELINE; REPORTS OF LEAKS

Sec.	
191.1	Scope.
191.3	Definitions.
191.5	Telephonic notice of certain leaks.
191.7	Addressee for written reports.
191.9	Distribution system: Leak report.
191.11	Distribution system: Annual report.
191.13	Distribution system: Certain facilities reported as a transmission system.
191.15	Transmission and gathering systems: Leak report.
191.17	Transmission and gathering systems: Annual report.
191.19	Report forms.

AUTHORITY: The provision of this Part 191 issued under the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act (49 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), Part 1 of the Regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR Part 1), and the delegation of authority to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, dated November 6, 1968 (33 F.R. 16468).

§ 191.1 Scope.

(a) This part prescribes requirements for the reporting of gas leaks that are not intended by the operator and that require immediate or scheduled repair and of test failures, by persons engaged in the transportation of gas. However, it does not apply to leaks and test failures that occur in the gathering of gas outside of the following areas:

- (1) An area within the limits of any incorporated or unincorporated city, town, or village; or
- (2) Any designated residential or commercial area such as a subdivision, business or shopping center, or community development.

(b) The reporting requirements in this part supersede any accident or leak reporting requirements that were incorporated by reference in the Interim Minimum Federal Safety Standards in Part 190 of this chapter.

§ 191.3 Definitions.

As used in this part and in the DOT Forms referenced in this part—

- "Gas" means natural gas, flammable gas, or gas which is toxic or corrosive;
- "Municipality" means a city, county, or any other political subdivision of a State;
- "Operator" means a person who engages in the transportation of gas;
- "Person" means any individual, firm, joint venture, partnership, corporation, association, State, municipality, coopera-

tive association, or joint stock association, and includes any trustee, receiver, assignee, or personal representative thereof;

"Pipeline facilities" includes, without limitation, new and existing pipe, right-of-way, and any equipment facility, or building used in the transportation of gas or the treatment of gas during the course of transportation;

"Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation or any person to whom he has delegated authority in the matter concerned;

"State" includes each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

"System" means all pipeline facilities used by a particular operator in the transportation of gas, including but not limited to, line pipe, valves and other appurtenances connected to line pipe, compressor units, fabricated assemblies associated with compressor units, metering (including customers' meters) and delivery stations, and fabricated assemblies in metering and delivery stations;

"Test failure" means a break or rupture that occurs during strength-proof testing of transmission or gathering lines that is of such magnitude as to require repair before continuation of the test;

"Transportation of gas" means the gathering, transmission, or distribution of gas by pipeline, or the storage of gas in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce.

§ 191.5 Telephonic notice of certain leaks.

(a) At the earliest practicable moment following discovery, each operator shall give notice in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section of any leak that—

(1) Caused a death or a personal injury requiring hospitalization;

(2) Required the taking of any segment of transmission pipeline out of service;

(3) Resulted in gas igniting;

(4) Caused estimated damage to the property of the operator, or others, or both, of a total of \$5,000 or more; or

(5) In the judgment of the operator, was significant even though it did not meet the criteria of subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph.

An operator need not give notice of a leak that met only the criteria of subparagraph (2) or (3) of this paragraph, if it occurred solely as a result of, or in connection with, planned or routine maintenance or construction.

(b) Each notice required by paragraph (a) of this section shall be made by telephone to Area Code 202-962-6000 and shall include the following information:

(1) The location of the leak.

(2) The time of the leak.

(3) The fatalities and personal injuries, if any.

(4) All other significant facts that are known by the operator that are relevant to the cause of the leak or extent of the damages.

§ 191.7 Addressee for written reports.

Each written report required by this part must be made to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, Department of Trans-

portation, Washington, D.C. 20590. However, reports for intrastate facilities subject to the jurisdiction of a State agency pursuant to certification under section 5(a) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act, 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 for leak reports and not later than February 15 for annual reports, to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety.

§ 191.9 Distribution system: Leak report.

(a) Each operator of a distribution system serving more than 100,000 customers shall, as soon as practicable but not more than 20 days after detection, report the following on Department of Transportation Form DOT-F-7100.1:

(1) A leak that required notice by telephone under § 191.5.

(2) A leak that, because of its location, required immediate repair and other emergency action to protect the public such as evacuation of a building, blocking off an area, or rerouting of traffic.

(b) Where additional related information is obtained after a report is submitted under paragraph (a) of this section, the operator shall make a supplemental report as soon as practicable with a clear reference by date and subject to the original report.

§ 191.11 Distribution system: Annual report.

Each operator of a distribution system shall submit an annual report on Department of Transportation Form DOT-F-7100.1-1. This report must be submitted for the preceding calendar year not later than February 15, 1971, and not later than February 15 of each year thereafter.

§ 191.13 Distribution system: Certain facilities reported as a transmission system.

Each operator of a distribution system shall, for pipeline facilities that operate at 20 percent or more of specified minimum yield strength, or that are used to convey gas into or out of storage, submit reports for those facilities under § 191.15 and § 191.17.

§ 191.15 Transmission and gathering systems: Leak report.

(a) Each operator of a transmission system or a gathering system shall, as soon as practicable but not more than 20 days after detection, report the following on Department of Transportation Form DOT-F-7100.2:

(1) A leak that required notice by telephone under § 191.5.

(2) A leak in a transmission line that required immediate repair.

(3) A test failure that occurred while testing either with gas or another test medium.

(b) Where additional related information is obtained after a report is submitted under paragraph (a) of this section, the operator shall make a supplemental report as soon as practicable with

a clear reference by date and subject to the original report.

§ 191.17 Transmission and gathering systems: Annual report.

Each operator of a transmission system or a gathering system shall submit an annual report on Department of Transportation Form DOT-F-7100.2-1. This report must be submitted for the preceding calendar year not later than February 15, 1971, and not later than February 15 of each year thereafter.

§ 191.19 Report forms.

Copies of the prescribed report forms are available without charge upon request from the Office of Pipeline Safety. Additional copies in this prescribed format may be reproduced and used if in the same size and kind of paper. In addition, the information required by these forms may be submitted by any other means that is acceptable to the Secretary.

NOTE: The recordkeeping and reporting requirements of this regulation have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

[F.R. Doc. 70-318; Filed, Jan. 7, 1970; 8:50 a.m.]



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

Office of Pipeline Safety
[49 CFR Part 190]

[Notice 69-4, Docket No. OPS-4]

INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE
PLANS

Notice of Proposed Rule Making

The Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety, is considering adopting regulations to implement the requirements for inspection and maintenance plans, as prescribed by section 11 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

Section 11 provides as follows:

Each person who engages in the transportation of gas or who owns or operates pipeline facilities not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act shall file with the Secretary or, where a certification or an agreement pursuant to section 5 is in effect, with the State agency, a plan for inspection and maintenance of each such pipeline facility owned or operated by such person, and any changes in such plan, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or appropriate State agency. The Secretary may, by regulation, also require persons who engage in the transportation of gas or who own or operate pipeline facilities subject to the provisions of this Act to file such plans for approval. If at any time the agency with responsibility for enforcement of compliance with the standards established under this Act finds that such plan is inadequate to achieve safe operation, such agency shall, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, require such plan to be revised. The plan required by the agency shall be practicable and designed to meet the need for pipeline safety. In determining the adequacy of any such plan, such agency shall consider—

- (1) relevant available pipeline safety data;
- (2) whether the plan is appropriate for the particular type of pipeline transportation;
- (3) the reasonableness of the plan; and
- (4) the extent to which such plan will contribute to public safety.

* The purpose of this section was explained in the report of the House of Representatives, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (House Report No. 1390, 90th Cong., second session p. 24) as follows:

An important part of the program proposed by this legislation to achieve pipeline safety is the plan of inspection and maintenance according to which the company maintains surveillance of its lines and facilities.

Section 11 of the reported bill requires each person who engages in the transportation of gas or owns or operates pipeline facilities to file a plan for inspection and maintenance with the Secretary of Transportation, or with the State agency where a certification under section 5(a) or an agreement under section 5(b) is in effect. The filing of such plans is mandatory under the bill as to all gathering, transmission and distribution pipelines and pipeline facilities which are not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural

Gas Act. The filing by interstate transmission lines subject to Commission jurisdiction is optional with the Secretary.

The Department's regulation would apply to (1) all interstate gas transmission lines subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, (2) all gas gathering lines in nonrural areas, and (3) all transmission and distribution pipeline facilities not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The regulation would not apply to gas facilities subject to a similar State regulation of a State agency that has in effect a certification under section 5(a) of the Act or an agreement under section 5(b) of the Act.

The Department is considering requiring the filing of inspection and maintenance plans for both interstate and other lines by July 1, 1970.

Section 8 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act requires each person who engages in the transportation of gas or who owns or operates pipeline facilities to file and comply with any inspection and maintenance plans required by section 11. Therefore, the failure of any person either to file a plan or to comply with any plan filed with the Department under the proposed regulation would be a violation of the Act and could subject that person to the enforcement provisions provided in the Act.

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of these proposed rules by submitting written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the regulatory docket and notice number and be submitted in duplicate to the Office of Pipeline Safety, Department of Transportation, 400 Sixth Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590. Communications received before March 31, 1970, will be considered before taking final action on the notice. All comments will be available for examination by interested persons at the Office of Pipeline Safety before and after the closing date for comments. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received.

The final location of this proposed regulation will depend on several other rule-making actions presently being considered. Therefore while this notice proposes to add a new section to Part 190,

the interim Federal safety standards, the final regulation may, in fact, be added to a different part.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend 49 CFR Part 190 by adding the following new section:

§ 190.7 Inspection and maintenance plans.

(a) Each person engaged in the transportation of gas or who owns or operates pipeline facilities shall file with the Office of Pipeline Safety not later than July 1, 1970, a plan for inspection and maintenance of each pipeline facility he owns or operates. This requirement shall not apply to any person who is required to file such a plan with a State agency that has in effect a certification under section 5(a) or agreement under section 5(b) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

(b) Any person who changes an inspection and maintenance plan required to be filed under paragraph (a) of this section shall file each change with the Office of Pipeline Safety within 10 days after the date the change is made.

This notice is issued under the authority of section 11 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 (49 U.S.C. § 1671, et seq.), Part 1 of the Regulations of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (49 CFR Part 1), and the delegation of authority to the Director, Office of Pipeline Safety, dated November 6, 1968 (33 F.R. 16468).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on December 31, 1969.

W. C. JENNINGS,
Acting Director,
Office of Pipeline Safety.

[F.R. Doc. 70-820; Filed, Jan. 7, 1970;
8:50 a.m.]

* This sentence should not be in italics.

Table I Attachment # 6
 STATUS OF STATE AGENCY CERTIFICATIONS AND AGREEMENTS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 5(a) and
 5(b) OF THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968 (AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1969)

State	Sec. 5(a) certifica- tion covers all intra- state facilities	Sec. 5(a) certifica- tion does not cover all intra- state facilities	Sec. 5(a) certifica- tion and Sec. 5(b) agreement	Sec. 5(b) Agreement only	No State Agency Submis- sion
ALABAMA			X		
ALASKA		X			
ARIZONA			X		
ARKANSAS			X		
CALIFORNIA		X			
COLORADO		X			
CONNECTICUT		X			
DELAWARE	X				
FLORIDA		X			
GEORGIA		X			
HAWAII					X
IDAHO	X				
ILLINOIS		X			
INDIANA		X			
IOWA	X				
KANSAS			X		
KENTUCKY		X			
LOUISIANA				X	
MAINE	X				
MARYLAND	X				
MASSACHUSETTS	X				
MICHIGAN	X				
MINNESOTA	X				
MISSISSIPPI			X		
MISSOURI		X			
MONTANA	X				
NEBRASKA					X
NEVADA	X				
NEW HAMPSHIRE	X				
NEW JERSEY					X
NEW MEXICO			X		
NEW YORK	X				
NORTH CAROLINA		X			
NORTH DAKOTA		X			
OHIO		X			
OKLAHOMA			X		
OREGON	X				
PENNSYLVANIA			X		
RHODE ISLAND	X				
SOUTH CAROLINA			X		
SOUTH DAKOTA					X
TENNESSEE		X			
TEXAS	X				
UTAH	X				
VERMONT	X				
VIRGINIA		X			
WASHINGTON			X		
WEST VIRGINIA		X			
WISCONSIN	X				
WYOMING	X				
DIST. OF COL.	X				
PUERTO RICO	X				
TOTAL	21	16	10	1	4

States serving as agents for interstate lines as
of December 31, 1969 - 21 States

1. Connecticut
2. Florida
3. Iowa
4. Kentucky
5. Maryland
6. Michigan
7. Montana
8. New Hampshire
9. New Jersey
10. New York
11. North Carolina
12. Ohio
13. Oklahoma
14. Pennsylvania
15. Rhode Island
16. Utah
17. Virginia
18. Washington
19. Wisconsin
20. Wyoming
21. Washington, D.C.