



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. PHMSA-2026-1549]

RIN 2137-AG53

Pipeline Safety: Removing Unnecessary Provision for Material Properties Verification During MAOP Reconfirmation

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

SUMMARY: PHMSA is proposing to remove an unnecessary provision from the maximum allowable operating pressure requirements for testing pipe materials cut out from test manifold sites on gas transmission lines.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before [INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by the Docket Number PHMSA-2026-1549 using any of the following methods:

E-Gov Web: <https://www.regulations.gov>. This site allows the public to enter comments on any *Federal Register* notice issued by any agency. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Docket Management System: U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue S.E., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, Washington, D.C. 20590-0001.

Hand Delivery: U.S. DOT Docket Management System: West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue S.E., between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Fax: 1-202-493-2251.

For commenting instructions and additional information about commenting, see
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Jagger, Senior Transportation
Specialist, by telephone at 202-557-6765 or by e-mail at robert.jagger@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. GENERAL DISCUSSION:

PHMSA is proposing to clarify the requirements in 49 CFR 192.624 for reconfirming the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) of gas transmission lines. The clarification would acknowledge that an operator does not need to test the pipe materials cut out from the test manifold sites. Section 192.624(c)(1)(iii) currently states, in relevant part, that “if any of the records required by . . . this section are not documented in [traceable, verifiable, and complete (TVC)] records, the operator must obtain the missing records in accordance with § 192.607. An operator must test the pipe materials cut out from the test manifold sites at the time the pressure test is conducted. If there is a failure during the pressure test, the operator must test any removed pipe from the pressure test failure in accordance with § 192.607.”

According to comments submitted by the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA)¹ in response to the DOT request for information,² some operators and regulators believe that § 192.624(c)(1)(iii) requires operators to perform materials verification testing every time a pressure test is performed as a part of MAOP reconfirmation. This was not PHMSA’s intent. PHMSA only intended operators to perform material verification testing in those circumstances if the required records were not available. PHMSA never intended to require such testing if those records were already available.

¹ INGAA, “Re: Comments on Ensuring Lawful Regulation; Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs” at 25-26 (May 5, 2025), <https://www.regulations.gov/comment/DOT-OST-2025-0026-0872>.

² Office of the Secretary, DOT, *Request for Information: Ensuring Lawful Regulation; Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs*, 90 FR 14593 (Apr. 3, 2025).

For this reason, PHMSA is proposing to revise § 192.624(c)(1)(iii) by removing the unnecessary requirement for operators to perform material verification tests of pipe cut out during the course of a pressure test when performing MAOP reconfirmation in accordance with § 192.624, and the related testing requirement for pipe that fails its pressure test. Section 192.624 already requires operators to obtain any necessary missing material records using the process in § 192.607, making redundant any requirements for operators to test specified pipe. Further, operators are required under § 192.617 to investigate and analyze any pipe failures to determine the cause and contributing factors of the failure and minimizing the possibility of a recurrence, which makes the language at § 192.624(c)(1)(iii) redundant in connection with pipe removed for testing following a pressure test failure.

Commenting Instructions: Please include the docket number PHMSA-2026-1549 at the beginning of your comments. If you submit your comments by mail, submit two copies. If you wish to receive confirmation that PHMSA received your comments, include a self-addressed stamped postcard. Internet users may submit comments at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

Note: Comments are posted without changes or edits to <https://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. There is a privacy statement published on <https://www.regulations.gov>.

Privacy Act: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to <https://www.regulations.gov>, as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL-14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at <https://www.dot.gov/privacy>.

Confidential Business Information: Confidential Business Information (CBI) is commercial or financial information that is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. It is important that you clearly designate the comments submitted as CBI if: your comments

responsive to this document contain commercial or financial information that is customarily treated as private; you actually treat such information as private; and your comment is relevant or responsive to this notice. Pursuant to 49 CFR 190.343, you may ask PHMSA to provide confidential treatment to information you give to the agency by taking the following steps: (1) mark each page of the original document submission containing CBI as “Confidential;” (2) send PHMSA, along with the original document, a second copy of the original document with the CBI deleted; and (3) explain why the information that you are submitting is CBI. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Robert Jagger, Office of Pipeline Safety Standards and Rulemaking Division, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), 2nd Floor, 1200 New Jersey Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C. 20590-0001, or by e-mail at robert.jagger@dot.gov. Any materials PHMSA receives that is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for accessing the docket.

Alternatively, you may review the documents in person at the street address listed above.

II. REGULATORY ANALYSIS AND NOTICES:

A. Legal Authority

This proposed rule is published under the authority of the Secretary of Transportation set forth in the Federal Pipeline Safety Laws (49 U.S.C. § 60101 *et seq.*) and delegated to the PHMSA Administrator pursuant to 49 CFR 1.97.

B. Statutory Requirement and Executive Order 12866

The Pipeline Safety Act (49 U.S.C. § 60102(b)) requires that PHMSA prepare a risk assessment that identifies the costs and benefits associated with a proposed regulatory change. E.O. 12866, *Regulatory Planning and Review*, as implemented by DOT Order 2100.6B (“Policies and Procedures for Rulemaking”) and DOT Order 2100.7 (“Ensuring Reliance upon Sound Economic Analysis in Department of Transportation Policies, Programs, and Activities”),

requires agencies to regulate in the “most cost-effective manner,” to make a “reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs,” and to develop regulations that “impose the least burden on society.” In arriving at those conclusions, E.O. 12866 requires that agencies should consider “both quantifiable measures . . . and qualitative measures of costs and benefits that are difficult to quantify” and “maximize net benefits . . . unless a statute requires another regulatory approach.” E.O. 12866 also requires that “agencies should assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives, including the alternative of not regulating.” DOT Order 2100.6B directs that PHMSA and other Operating Administrations must generally choose the “least costly regulatory alternative that achieves the relevant objectives” unless required by law or compelling safety need. DOT Order 2100.6B also specifies that regulations should generally “not be issued unless their benefits are expected to exceed their costs.” DOT Order 2100.7 requires that “all rulemaking activities shall be based on sound economic principles and analysis supported by rigorous cost-benefit requirement.”

E.O. 12866 and DOT Order 2100.6B also require that PHMSA submit “significant regulatory actions” to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) within the Executive Office of the President’s Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. This NPRM is a not significant regulatory action pursuant to E.O. 12866; OMB also has not designated this rule as a “major rule” as defined by the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. § 801 *et seq.*).

PHMSA has complied with the procedural and analytical requirements in E.O. 12866 as implemented by DOT Order 2100.6B and DOT Order 2100.7, as well as the requirements in 49 U.S.C. § 60102(b), and preliminarily determined that this proposed rule will result in some cost savings by reducing regulatory burdens and regulatory uncertainty for gas pipeline facility operators by clarifying material verification testing requirements in conjunction with MAOP reconfirmation requirements, and avoiding unnecessary pipe material tests to reconfirm MAOP. The cost savings of this rulemaking could not be quantified because PHMSA does not have

information on how many operators have been doing pipe material tests while they have TVC records due to misunderstanding of the current requirement. However, PHMSA subject matter experts believe that it could take an engineer eight hours to complete a pipe material test.

PHMSA expects those potential cost savings from avoided testing may also result in reduced costs for the public to whom pipeline operators generally transfer a portion of their compliance costs. PHMSA also preliminarily determined that the proposed rule will not have any adverse safety impacts since it only avoids duplicative pipe material tests.

C. Executive Orders 14192 and 14219

This proposed rule, if finalized as proposed, is expected to be a deregulatory action pursuant to E.O. 14192, *Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation*. PHMSA estimates that the total costs of the NPRM on the regulated community will be less than zero. Nor does this rulemaking implicate any of the factors identified in section 2(a) of E.O. 14219, *Ensuring Lawful Governance and Implementing the President's 'Department of Government Efficiency' Deregulatory Initiative*, indicative that a regulation is “unlawful . . . [or] that undermine[s] the national interest.”

D. Energy-Related Executive Orders 13211, 14154, and 14156

The President has declared in E.O. 14156, *Declaring a National Energy Emergency*, a national emergency to address America's inadequate energy development production, transportation, refining, and generation capacity. Similarly, E.O. 14154, *Unleashing American Energy*, asserts a Federal policy to unleash American energy by ensuring access to abundant supplies of reliable, affordable energy from (inter alia) the removal of “undue burden[s]” on the identification, development, or use of domestic energy resources such as PHMSA-jurisdictional gases and hazardous liquids. PHMSA preliminarily finds this proposed rule is consistent with each of E.O. 14156 and E.O. 14154. The proposed rule will give affected pipeline operators relief from performing unnecessary and redundant material verification testing when performing MAOP confirmation pressure tests. PHMSA therefore expects the regulatory amendments in this

proposed rule will in turn improve pipeline operators' ability to provide abundant, reliable, affordable natural gas in response to residential, commercial, and industrial demand.

However, this proposed rule is not a "significant energy action" under E.O. 13211, *Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use*, which requires Federal agencies to prepare a Statement of Energy Effects for any "significant energy action." Because this proposed rule is not a significant action under E.O. 12866, it will not have a significant adverse effect on supply, distribution, or energy use; OIRA has therefore not designated this proposed rule as a significant energy action.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

PHMSA analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in E.O. 13132, *Federalism*, and the Presidential Memorandum ("Preemption") published in the *Federal Register* on May 22, 2009. E.O. 13132 requires agencies to assure meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that may have "substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government."

While the proposed rule may (when finalized) operate to preempt some State requirements, it would not impose any regulation that has substantial direct effects on the States, the relationship between the National Government and the States, or the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Section 60104(c) of the Federal Pipeline Safety Laws prohibits certain State safety regulation of interstate pipelines. Under the Federal Pipeline Safety Laws, States that have submitted a current certification under section 60105(a) can augment Federal pipeline safety requirements for intrastate pipelines regulated by PHMSA but may not approve safety requirements less stringent than those required by Federal law. A State may also regulate an intrastate pipeline facility that PHMSA does not regulate. The preemptive effect of the regulatory amendments in this proposed rule is limited to the minimum

level necessary to achieve the objectives of the Federal Pipeline Safety Laws. Therefore, the consultation and funding requirements of E.O. 13132 do not apply.

F. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA, 5 U.S.C. § 601 *et seq.*) requires Federal agencies to conduct an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) for a proposed rule subject to notice-and-comment rulemaking unless the agency head certifies that the proposed rule in the rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. E.O. 13272, *Proper Consideration of Small Entities in Agency Rulemaking*, obliges agencies to establish procedures promoting compliance with the RFA. DOT posts its implementing guidance on a dedicated webpage.³ This proposed rule was developed in accordance with E.O. 13272 and DOT implementing guidance to ensure compliance with the RFA. The proposed rule is expected to reduce regulatory burdens by clarifying that, when performing a pressure test for MAOP reconfirmation in accordance with § 192.624, operators are only required to perform materials verification tests in accordance with § 192.607 if the operator does not have TVC material property records for the pipeline segment. Further, the changes proposed here are not expected to impose additional burdens on any operator. Therefore, PHMSA certifies the proposed rule (if finalized) will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

G. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA, 2 U.S.C. § 1501 *et seq.*) requires agencies to assess the effects of Federal regulatory actions on State, local, and Tribal governments, and the private sector. For any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate of \$100 million or more in 1996 dollars (\$203 million in 2024 dollars) in any given year, the agency must prepare,

³ DOT, *Rulemaking Requirements Concerning Small Entities*, <https://www.transportation.gov/regulations/rulemaking-requirements-concerning-small-entities>.

amongst other things, a written statement that qualitatively and quantitatively assesses the costs and benefits of the Federal mandate.

This proposed rule does not impose unfunded mandates under UMRA. PHMSA does not expect the proposed rule will result in costs of \$100 million or more (in 1996 dollars) per year for either State, local, or Tribal governments, or to the private sector.

H. National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*) requires that Federal agencies assess and consider the impact of major Federal actions on the human and natural environment.

PHMSA analyzed this proposed rule in accordance with NEPA and issues this draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) because it has preliminarily determined that the rulemaking will not adversely affect safety and will not significantly affect the quality of the human and natural environment. The public is invited to comment on the impact of the proposed action.

I. Executive Order 13175

PHMSA analyzed this proposed rule according to the principles and criteria in E.O. 13175, *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments*, and DOT Order 5301.1A (“Department of Transportation Tribal Consultation Policies and Procedures”). E.O. 13175 requires agencies to assure meaningful and timely input from Tribal government representatives in the development of rules that significantly or uniquely affect Tribal communities by imposing “substantial direct compliance costs” or “substantial direct effects” on such communities or the relationship or distribution of power between the Federal Government and Tribes.

PHMSA assessed the impact of the proposed rule and determined that it will not significantly or uniquely affect Tribal communities or Indian Tribal governments. The rulemaking’s regulatory amendments have a broad, national scope; therefore, this proposed rule

will not significantly or uniquely affect Tribal communities, much less impose substantial compliance costs on Native American Tribal governments or mandate Tribal action. For these reasons, PHMSA has concluded that the funding and consultation requirements of E.O. 13175 and DOT Order 5301.1A do not apply.

J. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. § 3501 *et seq.*) and its implementing regulations at 5 CFR 1320.8(d) requires that PHMSA provide interested members of the public and affected agencies with an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests. This rulemaking will not create, amend, or rescind any existing information collections.

K. Executive Order 13609 and International Trade Analysis

E.O. 13609, *Promoting International Regulatory Cooperation*, requires agencies to consider whether the impacts associated with significant variations between domestic and international regulatory approaches are unnecessary or may impair the ability of American business to export and compete internationally. In meeting shared challenges involving health, safety, labor, security, environmental, and other issues, international regulatory cooperation can identify approaches that are at least as protective as those that are or would be adopted in the absence of such cooperation. International regulatory cooperation can also reduce, eliminate, or prevent unnecessary differences in regulatory requirements.

Similarly, the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (Pub. L. No. 96-39), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (Pub. L. No. 103-465), prohibits Federal agencies from establishing any standards or engaging in related activities that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. For purposes of these requirements, Federal agencies may participate in the establishment of international standards, so long as the standards have a legitimate domestic objective, such as providing for safety, and do not operate to exclude imports

that meet this objective. The statute also requires consideration of international standards and, where appropriate, that they be the basis for U.S. standards.

PHMSA engages with international standards setting bodies to protect the safety of the American public. PHMSA has assessed the effects of the proposed rule and has determined that its proposed regulatory amendments will not cause unnecessary obstacles to foreign trade.

L. Cybersecurity and Executive Order 14028

E.O. 14028, *Improving the Nation's Cybersecurity*, directs the Federal Government to improve its efforts to identify, to deter, and to respond to “persistent and increasingly sophisticated malicious cyber campaigns.” PHMSA has considered the effects of the proposed rule and has determined that its proposed regulatory amendments would not materially affect the cybersecurity risk profile for pipeline facilities.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline safety, Materials verification, Maximum allowable operating pressure reconfirmation, Pressure test.

For the reasons set forth above, PHMSA proposes to amend 49 CFR part 192 as follows:

**PART 192 – TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL AND OTHER GAS BY PIPELINE:
MINIMUM FEDERAL SAFETY STANDARDS**

1. The authority citation for 49 CFR part 192 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 30 U.S.C. 185(w)(3), 49 U.S.C. 5103, 60101 *et seq.*, and 49 CFR 1.97.

2. In § 192.624, revise paragraph (c)(1)(iii) to read as follows:

§ 192.624 Maximum allowable operating pressure reconfirmation: Onshore steel transmission pipelines.

*	*	*	*	*
	(c)	*	*	*
	(1)	*	*	*

(iii) If the material properties required by paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section are not documented in traceable, verifiable, and complete records, an operator must obtain the missing records in accordance with § 192.607.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, D.C., on April 22, 2026, under the authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.97.

Paul J. Roberti,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2026-08067 Filed: 4/23/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 4/24/2026]