8. Perform surveys to determine the depth of cover over pipelines and the condition of any exposed pipelines, such as those crossing scour holes. Where appropriate, surveys of underwater pipe should include the use of visual inspection by divers or instrumented detection. Information gathered by these surveys should be shared with affected landowners. Agricultural agencies may help to inform farmers of the potential hazard from reduced cover over pipelines.

9. Ensure that line markers are still in place or replaced in a timely manner. Notify contractors, highway departments, and others involved in post-flood restoration activities of the presence of pipelines and the risks posed by reduced cover.

If a pipeline has suffered damage, is shut-in, or is being operated at a reduced pressure as a precautionary measure due to flooding, the operator should advise the appropriate PHMSA regional office or state pipeline safety authority before returning the line to service, increasing its operating pressure, or otherwise changing its operating status. Furthermore, reporting a Safety Related Condition as prescribed in §§191.23 and 195.55 may also be required.

Issued in Washington, DC on July 8, 2013.

Jeffrey D. Wiese,
Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 2013–16754 Filed 7–11–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Surface Transportation Board

Transport Handling Specialists, Inc.—Continuance in Control Exemption—RSL Railroad, LLC

Transport Handling Specialists, Inc. (THS), has filed a verified notice of exemption (Notice) under 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(2) to continue in control of RSL Railroad, LLC (RSL), upon RSL’s becoming a Class III rail carrier. By decision served May 15, 2013, the Board held the publication and effectiveness of the Notice in abeyance pending record supplementation and further Board action. THS supplemented the record on June 3, 2013, and June 17, 2013. The abeyance in this proceeding will be lifted upon service of this Notice.

This transaction is related to a verified notice of exemption filed in RSL Railroad, LLC—Operation Exemption—Massillon Energy & Technology Park, Docket No. FD 35672, wherein RSL is seeking Board authority to operate an approximately 1.27-mile line in Massillon, Stark County, Ohio.

The transaction may be consummated on or after July 26, 2013 (the effective date of this exemption).

THS states that it has a 50% ownership interest in RSL, with the remaining interest equally split among three other individuals. THS states that it also owns 100% of Big Spring Rail System, Inc., a Class III rail carrier that operates in Big Spring, Texas.

THS certifies that: (1) The rail line to be operated by RSL does not connect with any other railroads in the THS corporate family; (2) the continuance in control is not part of a series of anticipated transactions that would connect the rail line to be operated by RSL with any other railroad in the THS corporate family; and (3) the transaction does not involve a Class I rail carrier. Therefore, the transaction is exempt from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 11323. See 49 CFR 1180.2(d)(2).

Under 49 U.S.C. 10502(g), the Board may not use its exemption authority to relieve a rail carrier of its statutory obligation to protect the interests of its employees. Section 11326(c), however, does not provide for labor protection for transactions under 11324 and 11325 that involve only Class III rail carriers. Accordingly, the Board may not impose labor protective conditions here because all of the carriers involved are Class III carriers.

If the notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the effectiveness of the exemption. Stay petitions must be filed no later than July 19, 2013 (at least 7 days before the exemption becomes effective).

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 35726, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be served on Baxter Wellmon, 1554 Paoli Pike #179, West Chester, PA 19380.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at “www.stb.dot.gov.”

Decided: July 9, 2013.

By the Board, Rachel D. Campbell, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Raina S. White,
Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2013–16741 Filed 7–11–13; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Surface Transportation Board

Ann Arbor Railroad, Inc.—Lease Exemption—Norfolk Southern Railway Company

Under 49 CFR 1011.7(a)(2)(x)(A), the Director of the Office of Proceedings (Director) is delegated the authority to determine whether to issue notices of exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502 for lease and operation transactions under 49 U.S.C. 10902. However, the Board reserves to itself the consideration and disposition of all matters involving issues of general transportation importance. 49 CFR 1011.2(a)(6). Accordingly, the Board revokes the delegation to the Director with respect to issuance of the notice of exemption for lease and operation of the rail line at issue in this case. The Board determines that this notice of exemption should be issued, and does so here.

Notice

Ann Arbor Railroad, Inc. (AARR), a Class III rail carrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.41 to lease from Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NSR) two rail lines totaling 3.69 miles: (1) A line of railroad between milepost CS 1.26 and milepost CS 2.65 in Toledo, Ohio; and (2) a line of railroad between milepost GY 85.40 and GY 87.70 in Toledo (the Lines). According to AARR, it has entered into a Lease Agreement (Agreement) with NSR whereby AARR will lease the Lines from NSR. The term of the lease is 10 years.

Pursuant to 49 CFR 1150.43(h), AARR has disclosed that the Agreement contains an interchange commitment in the form of lease credits, depending on the number of carloads interchanged with NSR in a given year. AARR states that the interchange commitment will enable it to “invest in improvements on the lines and increase traffic levels.”

1 AARR has filed under seal, pursuant to 49 CFR 1150.43(b)(1)(ii), a confidential, complete version of the Agreement. On July 1, 2013, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen filed a motion for access to the Agreement. That motion will be addressed in a separate decision.

2 Notice 4.
The Lines connect with AARR at AARR milepost 0.0 (Galena Street) and AARR milepost 1.0 (Manhattan Junction) in Toledo. Traffic moving to and from the Lines will have access to AARR connecting carriers NSR, Canadian National Railway Company (CN), CSX Transportation, Inc., and Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway in Toledo; the Indiana and Ohio Railway and CN in Diann, Mich.; NSR in Milan, Mich.; and Great Lakes Central Railroad in Ann Arbor, Mich. AARR certifies that its projected annual revenues as a result of this transaction will not result in AARR becoming a Class I or Class II rail carrier but that its projected annual revenues will exceed $5 million. On June 24, 2013, AARR certified to the Board that it posted the notice required by 49 CFR 1150.42(e) at the workplace of the employees on the Lines, and that it served a copy of the notice on the national offices of the labor unions with employees on the Lines.

The earliest the transaction can be consummated is August 23, 2013, (60 days after AARR submitted its certification to the Board). See 49 CFR 1150.42(e): Progressive Rail Inc.—Acquis. & Operation Exemption—Rail Lines of Crab Orchard & Egyptian R.R., Docket No. FD 35668, slip op. at 2–3 (STB served Oct. 5, 2012).

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke would not automatically stay the effectiveness of the exemption. Any petitions must be filed no later than August 16, 2013 (at least seven days before the exemption becomes effective).

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 35729, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 395 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, one copy of each pleading must be served on Karl Morell, BALL JANIK LLP, 655 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 225, Washington, DC 20005. Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at “www.stb.dot.gov.”

It is ordered:
1. The delegation of authority to the Director of the Office of Proceedings under 49 CFR 1011.7(a)(2)(x)(A) to determine whether to issue a notice of exemption in this proceeding is revoked.
2. This decision is effective on the date of service.

Jeffrey Herzig, Clearance Clerk.

Commissioner Mulvey, Dissenting

I disagree with the Board’s decision to allow this transaction to be processed under the class exemption procedures because I believe that additional scrutiny of the interchange commitment is necessary. Although AARR asserts that the interchange commitment (which takes the form of a per car lease credit) will enable it to invest in the two leased lines, this is a generic rationale that sheds no light on how the interchange commitment will affect competition.

Moreover, the leased lines, although short, contain many potential interchange points. The interchange commitment in the lease agreement creates a disincentive for AARR to interchange with the five other carriers with which it connects. The Board needs to take a closer look at transactions such as these that purport to increase investment incentives but also serve to limit competition that might otherwise develop.3

Decided: July 9, 2013.

By the Board, Chairman Elliott, Vice Chairman Begeman, and Commissioner Mulvey. Commissioner Mulvey dissented with a separate expression.
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