

procedures that can (1) be used to approximate actual operations during the commissioning of a new pumping station or the installation of a new relief valve, and (2) be used to determine, during annual tests, whether a relief valve is functioning properly. (P-02-4)

The recommendation arose from NTSB's evaluation of a test Olympic had done to check the pilot of a pilot-operated pressure relief valve in a pumping station at its new Bayview products terminal. NTSB found the test was inadequate to determine if the pilot was configured properly or if it was operating reliably. Furthermore, NTSB concluded that the DOT regulations governing the testing of relief valves and other safety devices on hazardous liquid pipelines provide insufficient guidance to ensure that test protocols and procedures will effectively indicate malfunctions of pressure relief valves or their pilot controls.<sup>2</sup>

According to NTSB's accident report<sup>3</sup>—available online at [http://www.nts.gov/Publictn/P\\_Acc.htm](http://www.nts.gov/Publictn/P_Acc.htm)—Olympic installed pressure control devices to protect the Bayview terminal piping and components from overpressure by the 16-inch pipeline. These devices consisted of (1) a control valve to throttle back the inflow of product; (2) a downstream pilot-operated pressure relief valve designed to divert excess product if a set pressure was exceeded; and (3) upstream remotely controlled block valves that would stop the inflow if a pressure of 700 psig was reached inside the terminal.

The report explains that the pilot of the relief valve had been configured for low-pressure operation, with a set point of 100 psig. Consequently, during start-up of the Bayview terminal, the relief valve opened at a pressure lower than intended. To correct the problem, Olympic replaced the pilot spring (with an identical spring) and increased the set point to 700 psig. (Olympic did not consult the valve manufacturer's specifications and was unaware that a different piston, cover, and O-ring were necessary for high-pressure

configuration.) The pilot was then tested in situ with a hydraulic pump rig to be sure the pilot valve opened at the correct pressure. Olympic used the same test procedure it used to test relief valves under DOT's regulations.

The accident investigation disclosed that increasing the set pressure of the pilot had compressed the pilot spring so much that rising inlet pressure could not lift the piston, making operation of the pilot completely unreliable. Although the pilot set point apparently had been tested, the test procedure did not reveal that the pilot had been configured for low-pressure operation and thus would not consistently open at the intended pressure. NTSB observed that if the relief valve did not open because of pilot malfunction and downstream pressure rose above 700 psig, a block valve would close and increase pressure in the 16-inch pipeline, which is what happened in the accident.

#### Advisory Bulletin (ADB-05-05)

OPS shares NTSB's concern that pipeline operators could be conducting in-service tests that do not identify unreliable pilot-operated pressure relief valves. Therefore, we are issuing the following advisory bulletin:

*To:* Operators of hazardous liquid pipelines regulated by 49 CFR part 195.

*Subject:* Inspecting and testing pilot-operated pressure relief valves.

*Purpose:* To assure that pilot-operated pressure relief valves function properly.

*Advisory:* Operators should review their in-service inspection and test procedures used on new, replaced, or relocated pilot-operated pressure relief valves and during the periodic inspection and testing of these valves. Operators can use the guidance stated below to ensure the procedures approximate actual operations and are adequate to determine if the valves function properly.

*Guidance:* The procedures should provide for the following:

(a) During installation, review the valve purchase order (or comparable documentation), valve name-plate, and manufacturer's specifications. Verify that the valve is:

(1) Compatible with the material and maximum operating pressure of the pipeline;

(2) Compatible with or protected from environmental attack or damage;

(3) Compatible with the hazardous liquid transported at all anticipated operating temperatures and pressures;

(4) In conformity with the manufacturer's specifications for the valve model and type of service, and

with the purchase order (or comparable documentation);

(5) Configured according to the manufacturer's specifications for the pilot and in-line valves; and

(6) Operable at the set pressure (*i.e.*, activation of the pilot valve opens the in-line valve).

(b) If the pilot assembly of a previously installed valve is reconfigured or repaired “

(1) Do the work according to the manufacturer's specifications;

(2) Test the valve to ensure it is operable at the set pressure (*i.e.*, activation of the pilot valve opens the in-line valve) or, if testing the in-line valve would be unsafe or environmentally hazardous, tests the pilot valve according to paragraph (d) below; and

(3) Document the work.

(c) Verify that the valve set pressure is consistent with “

(1) The design or configuration of the pilot valve and in-line valve; and

(2) Use of the valve as a primary overpressure protection device or as a backup safety relief device.

(d) Test the pilot valve at least twice and verify that it activates consistently at the intended set pressure.

(e) During periodic inspections and tests, review the valve installation to determine if it has been modified since the last inspection. If so, verify that the pilot sensor and valve inlet and discharge piping are properly sized and placed and that the installation is consistent with the intended design.

(f) Document all verifications, and sign, date, and keep for the operating life of the valve all documentation.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 4, 2005.

Stacey Gerard,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 05-15758 Filed 8-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA-05-21314; Notice 1]

#### Pipeline Safety: Petition for Waiver; BOC Gases

**AGENCY:** Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS), Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Notice; Petition for Waiver; Correction.

**SUMMARY:** PHMSA is correcting a petition for waiver published in the

<sup>2</sup> Under 49 CFR 195.262(c), the safety devices in each new pumping station must be tested under conditions approximating actual operations and found to function properly before the pumping station may be used. Also, under 49 CFR 195.428, each pressure limiting device, relief valve, pressure regulator, or other item of pressure control equipment must be inspected and tested annually to determine that it is functioning properly, is in good mechanical condition, and is adequate from the standpoint of capacity and reliability of operation for the service in which it is used.

<sup>3</sup> *Pipeline Rupture and Subsequent Fire in Bellingham, Washington, June 10, 1999*, Pipeline Accident Report NTSB/PAR-02/02, October 11, 2002.

**Federal Register** on July 14, 2005 (70 FR 40780). That petition, from BOC Gases (BOC), requested a waiver from the pipeline safety standards at 49 CFR 195.306(c)(5) to allow the use of inert gas or carbon dioxide as the test medium for pressure testing an existing carbon dioxide pipeline. This notice corrects the supplementary information of that publication, which referred to a gas pipeline safety regulation when it should have referred to a hazardous liquid pipeline safety regulation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** James Reynolds by phone at 202-366-2786, by fax at 202-366-4566, by mail at DOT, PHMSA Office of Pipeline Safety, 400 7th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, or by e-mail at [james.reynolds@dot.gov](mailto:james.reynolds@dot.gov).

#### Correction

In the **Federal Register** of July 14, 2005, in FR Doc. 05-13864, on page 40781, in the first column, correct the first paragraph of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** caption to read:

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The hazardous liquid pipeline safety regulation at 49 CFR 195.306(c)(5) allows an operator of a carbon dioxide pipeline to use inert gas or carbon dioxide as the test medium if the pipe involved is new pipe having a longitudinal joint factor of 1.00.

Issued in Washington, DC on August 1, 2005.

**Joy Kadnar,**

*Director of Engineering and Emergency Support.*

[FR Doc. 05-15757 Filed 8-9-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-60-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

##### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Docket No. AB-6 (Sub-No. 429X) and AB-882 (Sub-No. 1X)]

##### **BNSF Railway Company— Abandonment Exemption—in Ramsey County, MN; Minnesota Commercial Railway Company—Discontinuance of Service Exemption—in Ramsey County, MN**

BNSF Railway Company (BNSF) and Minnesota Commercial Railway Company (MNNR) (collectively, applicants) have jointly filed a notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1152 subpart F—*Exempt Abandonments and Discontinuances of Service* for BNSF to abandon, and MNNR to discontinue service over, a 0.67-mile line of railroad between milepost 7.19, a point approximately 100 feet north of

Interstate Highway I-694 in White Bear Township, and milepost 6.52, a point approximately 50 feet north of Beam Avenue in Maplewood, in Ramsey County, MN.<sup>1</sup>

BNSF and MNNR have certified that: (1) No traffic has moved over the line for at least 2 years; (2) any overhead traffic on the line can be rerouted over other lines; (3) no formal complaint filed by a user of rail service on the line (or by a state or local government entity acting on behalf of such user) regarding cessation of service over the line either is pending with the Surface Transportation Board or with any U.S. District Court or has been decided in favor of complainant within the 2-year period; and (4) the requirements at 49 CFR 1105.7 (environmental reports), 49 CFR 1105.8 (historic reports), 49 CFR 1105.11 (transmittal letter), 49 CFR 1105.12 (newspaper publication), and 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(1) (notice to governmental agencies) have been met.

As a condition to this exemption, any employee adversely affected by the abandonment or discontinuance shall be protected under *Oregon Short Line R. Co.—Abandonment—Goshen*, 360 I.C.C. 91 (1979). To address whether this condition adequately protects affected employees, a petition for partial revocation under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) must be filed.

Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance (OFA) has been received, this exemption will be effective on September 9, 2005,<sup>2</sup> unless stayed pending reconsideration. Petitions to stay that do not involve environmental issues,<sup>3</sup> formal expressions of intent to file an OFA under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2),<sup>4</sup> and trail use/rail banking

requests under 49 CFR 1152.29 must be filed by August 19, 2005. Petitions to reopen or requests for public use conditions under 49 CFR 1152.28 must be filed by August 30, 2005, with the: Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423-0001.

A copy of any petition filed with the Board should be sent to applicants' representatives: for BNSF, Sidney L. Strickland, Jr., Sidney L. Strickland and Associates, PLLC, 3050 K Street, NW., Suite 101, Washington, DC 20007-5108; for MNNR, Thomas F. McFarland, Thomas F. McFarland, P.C., 208 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1890, Chicago, IL 60604-1112.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void *ab initio*.

Applicants have filed environmental and historic reports which address the effects, if any, of the abandonment and discontinuance on the environment and historic resources. SEA will issue an environmental assessment (EA) by August 15, 2005. Interested persons may obtain a copy of the EA by writing to SEA (Room 500, Surface Transportation Board, Washington, DC 20423-0001) or by calling SEA, at (202) 565-1539. (Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.) Comments on environmental and historic preservation matters must be filed within 15 days after the EA becomes available to the public.

Environmental, historic preservation, public use, or trail use/rail banking conditions will be imposed, where appropriate, in a subsequent decision.

Pursuant to the provisions of 49 CFR 1152.29(e)(2), BNSF shall file a notice of consummation with the Board to signify that it has exercised the authority granted and fully abandoned the line. If consummation has not been effected by BNSF's filing of a notice of consummation by August 10, 2006, and there are no legal or regulatory barriers to consummation, the authority to abandon will automatically expire.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at <http://www.stb.dot.gov>.

Decided: August 3, 2005.

By the Board, David M. Konschnick,  
Director, Office of Proceedings.

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 05-15761 Filed 8-9-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4915-01-P**

<sup>1</sup> By memorandum to the Board's Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) dated June 24, 2005, MNNR amended its environmental and historic report in the above proceedings to reflect the correct location of the rail line and right-of-way. According to MNNR, the rail line is located in the City of Maplewood, MN, and in White Bear Township, not White Bear Lake, MN, and the outer portions of the right-of-way may be located in the municipalities of Vadnais Heights, MN, and White Bear Lake.

<sup>2</sup> In their notice filed on July 21, 2005, applicants proposed a consummation date of August 30, 2005. In a letter filed on July 28, 2005, applicants indicate that the correct consummation date is September 9, 2005, which is the earliest the exemption could become effective under 49 CFR 1152.50(d)(2).

<sup>3</sup> The Board will grant a stay if an informed decision on environmental issues (whether raised by a party or by SEA in its independent investigation) cannot be made before the exemption's effective date. See *Exemption of Out-of-Service Rail Lines*, 5 I.C.C.2d 377 (1989). Any request for a stay should be filed as soon as possible so that the Board may take appropriate action before the exemption's effective date.

<sup>4</sup> Each OFA must be accompanied by the filing fee, which currently is set at \$1,200. See 49 CFR 1002.2(f)(25).