

October 7, 1975

Mr. William V. Bud Porter
The Porter Company
New Braunfels, Texas 78130

Dear Mr. Porter:

This responds to your letter of August 7, 1975, asking whether a navigable waterway line marker is required for a gas pipeline when a liquid pipeline exists in the same right-of-way which has an existing line marker in accordance with 49 CFR 195, and if two markers are thereby necessary.

Separate line markers must be placed if gas and liquid pipeline markers are necessary to meet the requirements of 49 CFR 192.707 and 195.410.

We trust this satisfactorily answers your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Cesar DeLeon
Acting Director
Office of Pipeline
Safety Operations

September 22, 1975

Mr. Joseph C. Caldwell
Director
Office of Pipeline Safety
Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Caldwell:

On August 7, 1975 we wrote you a letter, copy of which is attached. We have not received an answer to our letter and are aware of our busy schedule but thought that perhaps it might have gotten lost in the mail or something. Would again like to bring it to your attention and ask you to let us have an answer.

With kindest personal regards.

Cordially,

WILLIAM V. BUD PORTER
President

August 7, 1975

Mr. Joseph C. Caldwell
Director
Office of Pipeline Safety
Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Caldwell:

We have a question in regard to the marking of gas pipelines according to 192.707 and petroleum pipelines according to 195.410.

If a pipeline crossing a river carrying petroleum has a navigable waterway crossing sign as required by 195 and in the same right-of-way has a natural gas pipeline carrying natural gas, which right-of-way is marked with the same sign, does an additional sign in white background, black letters and orange border have to be installed noting that there is a gas pipeline crossing in the same right-of-way?

Is it necessary to place two signs there even though the navigable waterway crossing sign meets the 195 regulations but does not meet the 192 regulations? Please advise.

Cordially,

WILLIAM V. BUD PORTER
President