

detection equipment and EFRDs. Only ten of the 16 hazardous liquid operators responded with usable data.

Meanwhile, the liquid pipeline industry, through an API formed task force, is producing a document (API Publication 1130) to assist pipeline operators in the selection, implementation, testing, and operation of leak detection systems. API's goal is to publish API Publication 1130 by the end of 1995.

## II. Workshop

Consistent with the President's regulatory policy (E.O. 12866), RSPA wants to accomplish this Congressional mandate to provide for public safety and environmental protection at the least cost to society. Toward this end, and because RSPA received limited data in response to the questionnaire in the ANPRM, RSPA is holding a public workshop at which participants, including RSPA staff, may exchange views on relevant issues. RSPA hopes the workshop will enable government and industry to reach a better understanding of the problem and the potential solutions before proposed rules are issued.

Workshop participants are encouraged to focus their remarks on the following issues and questions, but may address other issues as time permits and in supplementary written comments. Participants are urged to present supporting data for views expressed at the workshop or in written submissions:

### A. Placement of EFRDs

Congress, in 49 U.S.C. 60102, mandates RSPA to prescribe the circumstances under which hazardous liquid operators would use EFRDs. RSPA needs to identify these circumstances. Activated EFRDs can reduce release from a rupture after the rupture has been detected and located. Comments to the ANPRM endorsed the selective use of remotely controlled valves in high-risk areas after an analysis is made of the operator's particular pipeline system. The determination of what constitutes a "high-risk area" needs to be explored at this workshop.

The question of valve spacing of EFRDs on new pipelines and the costs involved should be addressed. Should EFRD spacing on new pipelines be risk-based? If so, what risks should be included? If proximity to high-density population is one of the risks, what is a precise definition for "proximity" and "high density?"

The question of valve spacing of EFRDs on existing pipelines and the

costs involved should be addressed. The existing regulations require valves at water crossings (49 CFR § 195.260). Retrofitting all water crossing valves to be remotely controlled cannot be quantified because the number of these crossings is unknown. However, there may be a subset of these water crossings at a higher risk because of high volumes of waterborne traffic which should be remotely controlled. Identification of classes of higher risk locations, if any, and the economic implications of alternatives, or reasons why there should not be higher risk locations should be addressed at the workshop.

Circumstances for requiring non-water crossing existing valves to be retrofitted to be remotely controlled needs to be explored. Should circumstances such as response time to an existing valve location, pipeline profile and draindown characteristics, proximity to population and high risk environmental areas, hazards of commodity transported, and resource requirements to respond to a release be considered? What are specific values for each circumstance cited above which should be included? What are the economic impacts of alternatives?

Following are general questions concerning EFRDs which should be addressed by workshop participants:

- (1) What conditions or situations prompt a pipeline company to install remote controlled valves?
- (2) What are the operational and economic problems with remotely controlled valves?
- (3) What are the operational and economic benefits of remotely controlled valves?
- (4) Does the presence of remotely controlled valves actually result in a more rapid response to a leak?

### B. Leak Detection Sensitivity

Congress, in 49 U.S.C. 60102, expressly stated the magnitude of release to be detected as a "rupture." Participants at this workshop should be prepared to comment on a precise definition of "rupture" since leak detection equipment must be sensitive enough to detect this size of release. Comments to the ANPRM indicated that it is not technically feasible for a leak detection system to detect "all" releases. The VNTSC study indicated that there are enormous differences both in reliability and sensitivity of SCADA and leak detection equipment.

Operators, responding to a request for information (54 FR 20945, May 15, 1989) to provide input to the 1991 EFRD Study, reported the range of sensitivity of their leak detection equipment as between 0.5 and 5 percent of flow over

a one to two hour period, with sensitivity depending on the sophistication of the SCADA system used as the primary leak detection system. Should a definition for "rupture" be based on a percentage of release over a specific time interval? If yes, what should the percentage and time interval be? Should it be a tiered requirement (as the release increases, the detection time decreases)? If not, why not and upon what criteria should a definition of "rupture" be based?

### C. Requirements for a Leak Detection System

Congress mandated RSPA to prescribe the circumstances under which hazardous liquid operators would use EFRDs and other procedures, systems, and equipment to detect and locate pipeline ruptures. This workshop also will address the "other" procedures, systems, and equipment in addition to EFRDs.

Following are general questions concerning leak detection systems which should be addressed by workshop participants:

- (1) What should these procedures, systems, and equipment include, under what circumstances should they be used, and what are their cost including installation?
- (2) What conditions or situations prompt a pipeline company to install leak detection systems?
- (3) What are the operational and economic problems with leak detection systems?
- (4) What are the operational and economic benefits of leak detection systems?
- (5) Does the presence of a leak detection system actually result in a more rapid response to a leak?
- (6) What requirements should be proposed for locating releases after they've been detected?

### D. Scope

RSPA would like opinions from participants at the workshop on whether the use of EFRDs should be limited to the "cross-country" portion of operators' pipelines, or should also apply to pump stations and breakout tanks.

(49 U.S.C. Chapter 601)

Issued in Washington, DC on August 24, 1995.

**Richard B. Felder,**

*Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.*  
[FR Doc. 95-21424 Filed 8-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

**49 CFR Part 195**

[Docket PS-140, Notice 3]

RIN 2137-AC34

**Areas Unusually Sensitive to Environmental Damage****AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.**ACTION:** Public workshop notice.

**SUMMARY:** RSPA invites industry, State and local government representatives, and the public to a second workshop on unusually sensitive environmental areas. The workshop's purpose is to openly discuss the process for determining areas unusually sensitive to environmental damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release. This workshop is a continuation of the June 15-16, 1995 workshop on unusually sensitive environmental areas.

**DATES:** The workshop will be held on October 17, 1995 from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Persons who want to participate in the workshop should call (703) 218-1449 or e-mail their name, affiliation, and phone number to RSPA@walcoff.com before close of business October 2, 1995. The workshop is open to all interested persons, but RSPA may limit participation because of space considerations and the need to obtain a spectrum of views. Callers will be notified if participation is not open.

Persons who are unable to attend may submit written comments in duplicate by November 27, 1995. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all material that is relevant to a statement of fact or argument. Late filed comments will be considered so far as practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** The workshop will be held at the U.S. Department of Transportation, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., room 9230-34, Washington, DC. Non-federal employee visitors are admitted into the DOT headquarters building through the southwest entrance at Seventh and E Streets, SW.

Send written comments in duplicate to the Dockets Unit, Room 8421, Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. Identify the docket and notice numbers stated in the heading of this notice.

All comments and docketed materials will be available for inspection and copying in room 8421 between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. each business day. A summary of the workshop will be available from the Dockets Unit about three weeks after the workshop.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christina Sames, (202) 366-4561, about this document, or the Dockets Unit, (202) 366-5046, for copies of this document or other material in the docket.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** 49 U.S.C. § 60109 requires the Secretary of Transportation to:

- consult with the Environmental Protection Agency and describe areas that are unusually sensitive to environmental damage if there is a hazardous liquid pipeline accident, and
- establish criteria for identifying each hazardous liquid pipeline facility and gathering line, whether otherwise subject to regulation, located in an area unusually sensitive to environmental damage in the event of a pipeline accident.

Consistent with the President's regulatory policy (E.O. 12866), RSPA wants to accomplish this congressional mandate at the least cost to society. Toward this end, RSPA is seeking early public participation in the rulemaking process by holding public workshops at which participants, including RSPA staff, may exchange views on relevant issues. RSPA hopes these workshops will enable government and industry to reach a better understanding of the problem and the potential solutions before proposed rules are issued. (49 U.S.C. Chapter 601)

On June 15 and 16, 1995, RSPA held a public workshop to openly discuss the criteria being considered to determine areas unusually sensitive to environmental damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release (60 FR 27948, May 26, 1995). Participants included representatives from the hazardous liquid pipeline industry; the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Transportation, and Commerce; the Environmental Protection Agency; non-government agencies; and the public. Participants at the workshop requested that additional workshops be held to further discuss this complex topic.

On October 17, 1995, RSPA will hold a second workshop on areas unusually sensitive to environmental damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release. The second workshop will focus on developing a process that can be used to determine if an area is unusually sensitive to environmental damage and if an operator has pipeline facilities located within that area.

Persons interested in receiving a transcript of the first workshop, material presented at the first workshop, or comments submitted on the material presented in the first public workshop notice (60 FR 27948, May 26, 1995)

should contact the Dockets Unit at (202) 366-5046 and reference docket PS-140. (49 U.S.C. Chapter 601)

Issued in Washington, DC on August 24, 1995.

**Richard B. Felder,**

*Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.*  
[FR Doc. 95-21426 Filed 8-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****50 CFR Parts 630 and 678**

[I.D. 062695D]

RIN 0648-A110

**Options for Establishing an Interim Permit Moratorium and Eligibility Criteria for the Atlantic Swordfish and Shark Fisheries; Comment Period Extension**

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPR); extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** On July 28, 1995, NMFS published an ANPR to request comments on a temporary moratorium on the issuance of permits for the Atlantic swordfish and shark fisheries. NMFS announced the availability of a concept paper entitled "Towards Rationalization of Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species" and two supplemental papers outlining options for a permit moratorium in the Atlantic swordfish and Atlantic shark fisheries, respectively. NMFS announces that it is extending the comment period for the ANPR from August 28 to September 15, 1995.

**DATES:** Written comments on this ANPR must be received on or before September 15, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to Richard B. Stone, Chief, Highly Migratory Species Management Division (F/CM4), Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East/West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Pamela Mace, 301-713-2347.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On July 28, 1995 (60 FR 38785) NMFS published an ANPR and notice of availability of a concept paper and two supplemental