

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 1, 1996.
 Phil Olekszyk,
*Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety
 Compliance and Program Implementation.*
 [FR Doc. 96-17297 Filed 7-5-96; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 4910-06-P

Research and Special Programs Administration

[Docket No. P-96-8W; Notice 1]

CNG Transmission Company; Petition for Waiver

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs
Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of petition for waiver.

SUMMARY: CNG Transmission Company (CNGT) has petitioned the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) for a waiver from compliance with provisions of 49 CFR 192.611(a) requiring confirmation of the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) by hydrostatic testing. Instead, CNGT requests they be permitted to requalify the MAOP by an alternative approach involving a combination of hydrostatic testing and inspection by an instrumented internal inspection device commonly known as a "smart pig". The need to confirm the MAOP results from a recent increase in the population density along certain segments of a 26-inch diameter gas transmission line in Ohio.

DATES: Written comments submitted in duplicate must be received on or before August 7, 1996. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all the material that is considered relevant to any statement of fact or argument made.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed or hand delivered to the Dockets Unit [DHM-20], Room 8421, Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh St., SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. Comments should specify the Docket No. stated in the heading of this document; the original and two copies should be submitted. Dockets may be reviewed and copied between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
 Albert C. Garnett, (202) 366-2036,
 Office of Pipeline Safety, regarding the
 subject matter of this notice or the
 Dockets Unit, (202) 366-5046, for copies
 of this notice or other materials in the
 docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

By correspondence dated April 23, 1996, CNGT requested a waiver from compliance with the MAOP confirmation or revision provisions of 49 CFR 192.611(a) for pipeline segments where the hoop stress corresponding to the established MAOP is not commensurate with the present class location. The requested waiver applies to ten segments (totaling 10.91 miles) and located on CNGT's transmission line TL-400.

Transmission line TL-400 begins at the Lebanon Compressor Station in Warren County, Ohio, and transports gas eastward to the Gilmore Compressor station in Tuscarawas County, Ohio, a distance of 163.19 miles. The 26-inch diameter transmission line was designed and tested to operate at an MAOP of 850 psig.

The ten line segments that are the subject of this waiver request operate at a hoop stress of greater than 40% of the specified minimum yield strength (SMYS) and are located in areas where a recent increase in population indicated a change in their class location. Accordingly, CNGT complied with the provisions of § 192.609 and completed a study of the subject segments to determine: (a) their present class location; (b) a comparison of their original design, construction, and testing procedures with the provisions required for their present class location; (c) their physical condition ascertained from available records; (d) their operating and maintenance history; (e) their maximum actual operating pressure and corresponding operating hoop stress; and (f) the extent of the area affected by the population increase and other factors which may limit further expansion of the more densely populated area.

CNGT determined from the study required by § 192.609 (a) and (f) that the recent expansion of the population density had changed the subject segments from Class 1 locations to Class 2 locations. CNGT also determined from the study required by § 192.609 (b)-(e) that the ten segments were in good physical condition. Consequently, in accordance with the provisions of § 192.611 (a) and (c), CNGT must confirm or revise the originally established MAOP (850 psig) within the 18-month period ending October 19, 1996.

The hydrostatic test which established the MAOP at 850 psig was performed at a pressure of 953 psig, although a test pressure of 935 psig would have been sufficient under the

provisions of § 192.619(a)(2)(ii). After October 19, 1996, these segments may not be operated at an MAOP above 762 psig (a reduction of 88 psig) due to their reclassification as Class 2 locations. However, CNGT seeks to maintain the MAOP at 850 psig in order to meet their gas delivery commitments. Consequently, requalification by hydrostatic testing to a minimum pressure of 1,063 psig would be in accordance with § 192.611(a)(3).

TL-400 is a single long transmission line that transports gas from third parties to local distribution companies and to underground storage facilities. CNGT states that it would be unreasonable to reduce the MAOP and thereby lose gas throughput that would prevent them from meeting their contractual obligations. CNGT also asserts that hydrostatically testing all ten segments would require the line to be taken out of service for a minimum of 16 days. Additionally, CNGT asserts that the acquisition and disposal of the water used in the hydrostatic testing would be burdensome.

Alternative Approach

Instead of hydrostatically testing all ten segments, CNGT requested a waiver permitting an alternative approach which they believe would achieve both an equivalent level of safety in the subject segments and a complete evaluation of the 163.19 mile transmission line. Additionally, CNGT expects the proposed approach to be considerably less costly and to reduce the number of days that the transmission line would be out of service.

CNGT's proposal consists of two alternatives supplemented by a work plan (dated May 14, 1996). Although, not set out as such in the petition, the alternatives are identified for the purposes of this document as *Alternative A* and *Alternative B*:

Alternative A consists of the following:

(A1) Conducting a close interval pipe-to-soil corrosion survey (CIS) of the 163.19 mile line;

(A2) Hydrostatic testing four segments (totaling 4.96 miles). If no leak occurs, or only a *specified minor leak*¹ occurs and is remediated, the hydrostatic testing is completed;

(A3) Inspecting the 163.19 mile line with a geometry pig followed by a high resolution "smart pig." Any defects impacting the MAOP are promptly

¹ *Specified minor leak*—A leak from valve packings, gaskets, threaded fittings, or hydrostatic test equipment; and from localized corrosion pitting on the 26-in line pipe.

remediated. All defects detected by the "smart pig" are cross-referenced with the CIS to correct any deficiencies in the cathodic protection system, all before October 19, 1996; and

(A4) Inspecting the 163.19 mile line with a geometry pig followed by a high resolution "smart pig" and remediation of any defects impacting the MAOP, all in the year 2001.

Alternative B would be performed only if, during the implementation of (A2), a leak *other than a specified minor leak*² occurs. *Alternative B* consists of the following:

(B1) If a leak, *other than a specified minor leak* occurs during (A2) and is remediated, the hydrostatic testing of the four segments is completed;

(B2) Inspecting the 163.19 mile line with a geometry pig followed by a high resolution "smart pig." Any defects impacting the MAOP are promptly remediated. All before October 19, 1996; and

(B3) The period to qualify the MAOP is extended until (B3) is completed. All defects detected by the "smart pig" are cross-referenced with the CIS to correct any deficiencies in the cathodic protection system. Hydrostatic testing and remediation of any leaks occurring in the remaining six segments (totaling 5.95 miles), all before June 30, 1997.

Basis for the Alternative Approach

CNGT's proposed alternative approach is based on the contention that this transmission line is in good physical condition. In the petition, they supported that assertion by providing information on the line's construction, operation, and maintenance history.

CNGT states that the 26-in diameter line is constructed of submerged-arc welded steel pipe that has been joined by welding. The pipe is internally coated with mill-applied liquid epoxy and externally coated with mill-applied coal tar enamel. The line was hydrostatically tested and commissioned in December 1968. Cathodic protection is provided by impressed current remote groundbeds and assisted with magnesium anode beds. CNGT states that the 21 test stations used to monitor the level of cathodic protection in the subject segments do not show any areas of low potential. CNGT states that, aside from one failure in 1981 due to third party damage, no other leaks have occurred since the line has been in service. Moreover, during the period 1990

through 1996, the MAOP of six other such segments in this line were requalified by hydrostatic testing under § 192.611(a) without a leak or failure.

The proposed alternative approach expresses the petitioner's confidence that the line is in good physical condition. Any leak *other than a specified minor leak* occurring during the hydrostatic testing of (A2) would trigger the requirement to implement the more costly and time consuming *Alternative B*. Under (B1) and (B3), CNGT would need to hydrostatically test all ten segments required by § 192.611(a). Moreover, under (B2), they would need to inspect the 163.19 mile line with a geometry pig and with a high resolution "smart pig."

RSPA Response

Our review of the petition for waiver showed the following:

(1) CNGT's contention that this particular line is in good physical condition is well supported with information on the pipe, internal and external coatings, cathodic protection, and the transmission line's outstanding leak record;

(2) The provisions of § 192.611(a) for requalification would be only partially waived during (A2), because four of the ten segments (representing 4.96 miles or a 45.46% sampling of the total 10.91 miles) would be hydrostatically tested;

(3) If a leak, *other than a specified minor leak* occurs during the hydrostatic testing of (A2), then under (B3) the remaining six segments would be hydrostatically tested. This would result in compliance with § 192.611(a). Additionally, during (B2) there would be an internal inspection of the complete 163.19 mile transmission line;

(4) Otherwise, during (A3) and (A4), the complete transmission line would be internally inspected during 1996 and internally inspected again during the year 2001;

(5) The implementation of either (A3) or (B2) (the in-line inspection in 1996) would be the first time transmission line TL-400 has been inspected by a "smart-pig;" and

(6) A "smart pig" is capable of detecting certain flaws in the pipe wall that (when interpreted) may disclose defects that jeopardize the safe operation of the gas transmission line. CNGT would run a "smart pig" of the high resolution type, which is considered to be state-of-the-art technology for the identification of pipe wall defects.

In view of the foregoing, it appears that neither *Alternative A* nor its back up, *Alternative B*, would be inconsistent with pipeline safety. Instead, we see the

implementation of either alternative as contributing to the safety of this 163.19 mile transmission line. Consequently, RSPA proposes to grant the waiver.

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed waiver by submitting their views or arguments with supporting data, if available, in the manner described under the heading **ADDRESSES** (above). All comments received before the date shown under **DATES** (above) will be considered before final action is taken. Late filed comments will be considered as far as practicable. No public hearing is contemplated, but one may be held at a time and place set in a notice in the Federal Register if requested by an interested person desiring to comment at a public hearing and raising a genuine issue.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 60118(c); and 49 CFR 1.53.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 2, 1996.

Richard B. Felder,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 96-17300 Filed 7-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Thrift Supervision

Proposed Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of Thrift Supervision, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently, the Office of Thrift Supervision within the Department of the Treasury is soliciting comments concerning the Mutual Holding Companies.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before September 6, 1996 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Manager, Dissemination Branch, Records Management and Information Policy, Office of Thrift Supervision, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552, Attention 1550-0071 and 1550-0072. These submissions may be hand delivered to 1700 G Street, NW. From

² *Other than a specified minor leak*—A leak from a crack, crack-like defects, general corrosion, or from any other source (except localized corrosion pitting) on the 26-inch line pipe.