

tank motor vehicles that would be affected by any rulemaking action is approximately 63,000. This number includes bottom-loaded single-unit trucks, straight trucks pulling trailers, and truck-tractors pulling trailers in flammable liquid service. Cargo tank motor vehicles average four compartments each, with piping that contains an aggregate total of approximately 40 gallons of product.

As previously discussed, we are aware of two systems that may reduce risk from wetlines. A manual onboard purging system can be installed on a newly constructed cargo tank motor vehicle for about \$2,100 (welded) or \$2,250 (non-welded) (2002 dollars). Equipment and installation costs are the same for the retrofit of existing cargo tank motor vehicles; however, additional costs in the form of lost profit or installation risk may be incurred. The independent short loading line system can be installed for \$1,540 per cargo tank motor vehicle (2002 dollars). Because of the complexity of such a design, however, it may not be appropriate for the retrofit of existing cargo tank motor vehicles. We invite comments on the feasibility of retrofits of existing vehicles to reduce or eliminate product in wetlines and on costs that may be associated with such a retrofit.

We believe there may be other cost-effective solutions that could significantly reduce or eliminate the current level of risk. We encourage commenters to identify other possible approaches to reducing or eliminating the risks posed by the transportation of flammable liquids in wetlines.

Quantified and monetized benefits realized from action to reduce the transportation risks associated with wetlines would be in the form of reductions in fatalities, major and minor injuries, product losses, carrier damages, public and private property damages, risks to emergency responders, decontamination and cleanup costs, and evacuation costs. Through the HMIS database and information provided by the NTSB, we identified 194 reported incident cases involving wetlines during the period of 1990–2001. As previously discussed, we are aware of at least six fatalities as a result of five of those incidents where piping was damaged and gasoline released.

In addition to quantified/monetized benefits, measures to reduce wetlines risks would reduce losses by the private sector (in terms of time and productivity), by government (in terms of allocation of scarce resources, including emergency responders, their support vehicles and equipment), and

by the general public (in terms of time and inconvenience). Some elements of actual and potential losses are: (1) The closure of transportation arteries; (2) the evacuation of homes, businesses and other facilities that are in harm's way; and (3) productivity losses in terms of facility and/or personnel down time attributed to traffic delays and/or facility evacuations.

#### V. Questions for Commenters

In general, we seek comments to determine whether regulatory changes are needed and can be made in a cost-effective manner. In particular, we invite commenters to respond to the following questions:

##### A. General

1. Are the statistics and data (e.g., cargo tank population, useful life of a cargo tank, accident frequency and consequences), costs (e.g., purging system, short-loading lines, new construction, retrofit), and potential benefits (e.g., fatalities, injuries, and property damages prevented) provided in this ANPRM accurate?

2. What is the useful life of a cargo tank motor vehicle utilized for the transportation of flammable liquids?

3. What percentage of cargo tank motor vehicles are operated at maximum weight limits such that any additional weight of a system to eliminate wetlines would impose a weight penalty?

4. For cargo tank motor vehicles in flammable liquid service, what is the average distance per trip?

5. In addition to the potential benefits described in this ANPRM, are there additional benefits, measurable or otherwise, that would result from implementation of measures to reduce wetlines risks?

6. Should a benefit-cost analysis include the reduction of risks associated with low-frequency, high-consequence events?

7. Would requirements for systems to reduce the risk posed by wetlines for all newly constructed cargo tank motor vehicles result in significant reductions in per unit cost because of economies of scale?

##### B. Current Market Practices

1. What safety practices, other than those described in this ANPRM, are motor carriers currently utilizing to reduce the risks associated with the transportation of flammable liquids in wetlines?

2. How effective are these safety practices in reducing the risks associated with wetlines on cargo tanks?

3. What are the costs of these safety practices currently utilized?

4. Would an industry or industry/government sponsored research initiative to explore new methods to eliminate wetlines be of value?

5. If so, what would be the value of such a partnership?

##### C. Facility Modification

1. Concerning the short and recessed loading lines systems described in this ANPRM, what modifications to loading arms or hoses at existing loading racks would be necessary to accommodate short, including recessed within the cargo tank wall, loading lines?

2. What would be the cost of these modifications?

3. Can loading rack fuel tax accounting systems be modified to allow for product reversal once the cargo tank is full and the internal valves are closed, thus draining the loading lines?

4. Is this option viable?

5. What would such a modification cost?

##### D. Alternatives

###### Independent Loading Lines

1. Are the short and recessed loading lines options practicable for installation on new cargo tank motor vehicles?

2. Are either of these options practicable for installation on existing cargo tank motor vehicles (i.e., retrofit)?

3. Are there any motor carriers actively operating or contemplating operating cargo tank motor vehicles with such a design?

4. If so, what configuration was utilized and what was the cost to modify the cargo tank?

5. Would maintaining a vehicle with such a design (i.e., independent loading lines) result in higher or lower costs than currently utilized designs?

###### Purging System

1. How effective is a purging system in reducing the risks posed by wetlines?

2. Is a purging system practicable for installation on new cargo tank motor vehicles?

3. Is a purging system practicable for installation on existing cargo tank motor vehicles (i.e., retrofit)?

4. Are there any motor carriers actively operating or contemplating operating cargo tank motor vehicles with a purging system?

5. If so, what configuration is utilized (automatic, manual, other) and what was the cost to modify the cargo tank?

6. What are the costs to maintain a cargo tank motor vehicle with a purging system installed?