

Dated: September 8, 1988.

M.J. Schiro,

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Chief,
Office of Marine Safety, Security and
Environmental Protection.*

[FR Doc. 88-21158 Filed 9-15-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Part 52

[Federal Acquisition Circular 84-38]

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR); Miscellaneous Amendments; Correction

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DoD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Interim rule with request for comments and final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the effective date of four clauses in a final rule in Federal Acquisition Circular (FAC) 84-38 published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, July 20, 1988 (53 FR 27460).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret A. Willis, FAR Secretariat, Room 4041, GS Building, Washington, DC 20405, (202) 523-4755.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In FR Doc. 16269 beginning on page 27460, make the following correction:

52.213-1 [Corrected]

1. On page 27468, in the second column of the Item 53 amendatory language, remove the date "(JUL 1988)" and insert in its place "(AUG 1988)", the effective date of the final rule.

52.219-4 [Corrected]

2. On page 27468, in the second column, remove in the title of the clause the date "(JUL 1988)" and insert in its place "(AUG 1988)", the effective date of the final rule.

52.225-3 [Corrected]

3. On page 27468, in the second column, remove in the Item 55 amendatory language the date "(JUL 1988)" and insert in its place "(AUG 1988)", the effective date of the final rule.

52.245-18 [Corrected]

4. On page 27468, in the third column, remove in the Item 58 amendatory language the date "(JUL 1988)" and insert in its place the date "(AUG 1988)", the effective date of the final rule.

Dated: September 12, 1988.

Roger M. Schwartz,

*Acting Director, Office of Federal Acquisition
and Regulatory Policy.*

[FR Doc. 88-21115 Filed 9-15-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-61-M

48 CFR Part 52

[Federal Acquisition Circular 84-39]

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR); Miscellaneous Amendments; Correction

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DoD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a final rule in Federal Acquisition Circular (FAC) 84-39 published in the Federal Register on Friday, September 2, 1988 (53 FR 34224).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret A. Willis, FAR Secretariat, Room 4041, GS Building, Washington, DC 20405, (202) 523-4755.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In FR Doc. 88-19950, beginning on page 34224, make the following correction:

52.203-7 [Corrected]

1. On page 34228, third column, remove in the Item 21 amendatory language, the date "(XXX 1988)" and insert in its place "(OCT 1988)".

52.209-1 [Corrected]

2. On page 34229, first column, remove in the title clause the date "(XXX 1988)" and insert in its place "(OCT 1988)".

52.229-10 [Corrected]

3. On page 34229, second column, remove in the title of the clause the date "(XXX 1988)" and insert in its place "(OCT 1988)".

Dated: September 12, 1988.

Roger M. Schwartz,

*Acting Director, Office of Federal Acquisition
and Regulatory Policy.*

[FR Doc. 88-21116 Filed 9-15-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-61-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Research and Special Programs Administration

49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. PS-98, Amdt. 192-60]

Exception From Pressure Testing Non- Welded Tie-In Joints

AGENCY: Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Under existing requirements, welded joints used to tie in test segments are excepted from pressure testing because of the impracticability of conducting the test. This final rule extends this exception to non-welded tie-in joints because they are equally impracticable to pressure test. However, the final rule requires that all excepted tie-in joints be leak tested at operating pressure. Since RSPA believes current operating and enforcement practices are consistent with the final rule, a minimal economic and safety impact is anticipated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule takes effect October 17, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bernard Liebler, (202) 366-2392, regarding changes to safety standards; or the Dockets Unit, (202) 366-5046, for copies of this final rule or other material in the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Subpart J of Part 192 requires that gas pipelines be pressure tested to detect potentially hazardous leaks and, in some cases, to substantiate maximum allowable operating pressure. However, § 192.503(d) excepts from the pressure test requirements of Subpart J welds used to tie in test segments of pipeline because of the impracticability of pressure testing these welds. Notice 1 of this proceeding (53 FR 1045, January 15, 1988) proposed extending this exception to non-welded tie-in joints for the same reason of impracticability.

Thirty commenters responded to Notice 1 (3 trade groups, 2 State agencies, 25 operators). The commenters unanimously supported the proposed change, but a few expressed reservations.

Four commenters asserted that the word "joint" has two separate meanings in the gas industry: (1) A length of pipe; and (2) the connection between two lengths of pipe. They argued that this duality of meaning could in rare cases lead to misinterpretation of the exception from testing. RSPA disagrees with their contention. The word "joint"

is used unambiguously throughout Part 192 to mean the connection between two pipeline segments, which may be two lengths of pipe, a length of pipe and a pipeline component, or two components. (See, e.g., § 192.283). Thus, in the context of the regulations, there is no justification for anticipating that confusion will result from use of the word "joint" to mean the connection that ties in a test segment with another pipeline segment.

One commenter recommended that the following language be added to the proposed new text of § 192.503(d):

However, all such exempted joints must be nondestructively tested, where proven technology exists, and comply with 192.243 for welded joints and 192.273 for non-welded joints.

RSPA does not agree with this recommendation. DOT's gas pipeline incident data do not suggest a need to require nondestructive testing (so far as technology permits) of all joints used to tie in test segments. High stress welds that tie in test segments are already required to be nondestructively tested under § 192.243, while the acceptability of other welds that tie in test segments is governed by § 192.241(a). Non-welded joints that tie in test segments must meet the joining requirements of § 192.273. RSPA believes that compliance with these existing requirements is sufficient to assure the integrity of joints that tie in test segments without the additional testing the commenter suggested.

This commenter also recommended that any exception from pressure testing be limited to strength testing rather than both strength and leak testing. RSPA believes this comment has merit. Post-installation strength testing is impracticable for joints that tie in test segments because strength testing requires raising the pressure beyond the operating pressure of the pipeline. However, such joints can be leak tested at the pipeline's operating pressure without any of the difficulties that gave rise to the proposed exception. It is only prudent to leak test joints used to tie in test segments either before or at the time they are placed in service. RSPA believes that most operators follow this practice for both welded and non-welded tie-in joints. Therefore, RSPA is revising the final rule to require that each tie-in joint excepted from the test requirements of Subpart J be leak tested at not less than its operating pressure. Under this requirement, joints used to tie in test segments must be checked for potentially hazardous leaks in accordance with § 192.503(a)(2). The "soap test" that operators often use to detect leaks would be an acceptable

way to conduct the test, although other effective methods may be used.

Section 192.503(d) now provides that welds which tie in test segments are excepted from all pressure test requirements, including leak test requirements. Notice 1 did not propose to change this exception. However, since leak testing such welds at operating pressure is a prudent, simple and common procedure in the interest of safety, RSPA believes it is unnecessary to provide prior notice and opportunity for comment on the issue of leak testing welded joints used to tie in test segments. Therefore, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, the requirement to test these welded joints is final as published.

Advisory Committee Review

Section 4(b) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1673(b)), requires that each proposed amendment to a safety standard established under this statute be submitted to the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee for its consideration. This Committee, composed of persons knowledgeable about transportation of gas by pipeline, discussed the proposed rule at a meeting held September 22, 1987. The Committee voted unanimously that the proposal was technically feasible, reasonable and practicable. The Committee's official report for the meeting is in the docket. The Committee recommended that a final rule be adopted as proposed. However, for the reasons discussed above, the final rule is changed from the version proposed.

Impact Assessment

This final rule is considered to be nonmajor under Executive Order 12291 and is not significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). Since the rule codifies existing compliance procedures, it will have a minimal effect on the economy, and further evaluation of this effect is unnecessary. Based on the facts available concerning the impact of this rulemaking action, I certify pursuant to section 605 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act that the action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. RSPA has analyzed this action in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in E.O. 12612, and has determined that it does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant preparing a Federalism Assessment.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline Safety, Test, Tie-in, Joint.

In view of the foregoing, RSPA amends 49 CFR Part 192 as follows:

PART 192—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 192 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 App. U.S.C. 1672 and 1804; 49 CFR 1.53.

2. Section 192.503(d) is revised to read as follows:

§ 192.503 General requirements.

(d) Each joint used to tie in a test segment of pipeline is excepted from the specific test requirements of this subpart, but it must be leak tested at not less than its operating pressure.

Issued in Washington, DC on September 13, 1988.

M. Cynthia Douglass,
Administrator, Research and Special
Programs Administration.

[FR Doc. 88-21216 Filed 9-15-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To Determine Five Texas Cave Invertebrates To Be Endangered Species

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Service determines endangered status under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, for five species of cave-dwelling, invertebrate animals in Texas. The five species are the Tooth Cave pseudoscorpion (*Microcreagris texana*), the Tooth Cave spider (*Leptoneta myopica*), the Bee Creek Cave harvestman (*Texella reddelli*), the Tooth Cave ground beetle (*Rhadine persephone*), and the Kretschmarr Cave mold beetle (*Texamaurops reddelli*). Each of these species is known from only six or fewer small, shallow, dry caves near Austin in Travis and Williamson Counties, Texas. Urban, industrial, and highway expansion are planned or ongoing in the area containing the cave habitat of these species. This development could result in filling or collapse of these shallow caves, disturbances of water drainage patterns that affect cave habitat, introduction of exotic competitive and predatory insects and other organisms,