

C James Scott - Comment

This is a Comment on the **Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration** (PHMSA) Proposed Rule: **Hazardous Materials; Amendments**

For related information, [Open Docket Folder](#) 

Comment Period Closed

Mar 24 2015, at 11:59 PM ET

ID: PHMSA-2013-0225-0060

Tracking Number: 1jz-8hwm-mfgv

Document Information

Date Posted:

Mar 26, 2015

RIN:

2137-AF04

[Show More Details](#) 

Submitter Information

Submitter Name:

James Scott

Mailing Address:

10005 McDonald Park Rd

City:

Sidney

Country:

Canada

ZIP/Postal Code:

V8L 5Y2

Comment

I would like to comment on PHMSA's NPRM related to P-1601, submitted by the United Parcel Service (UPS) that was published on pages 3791-3792 of the Federal Register / Vol. 80, No. 15 / Friday, January 23, 2015 / Proposed Rules.

I agree the additional safety measures proposed in the NPRM are warranted. I have many years experience manufacturing, packing and shipping nitric acid < 90% and have received reports of 4G packaging catching fire as well as seen it replicated in controlled tests. I believe a rule needs to be published that requires an additional level of safety when shipping nitric acid in glass containers.

The NPRM would obviously result in a cost burden for companies that still pack nitric acid in glass. The addition of intermediate packagings and absorbent material may require current combination packagings to be modified. I believe this impact can be minimized if flexible intermediate packagings are allowed. If the rule is published I suggest the word 'rigid' not appear. Packagings will have the ability to remain smaller and more cost effective if flexible intermediate packagings are permitted. Solutions such as sealed absorbent pouches or other bag/absorbent systems would then be possible.

The safety concern that was identified in UPS' proposal is nitric acid reacting with fibreboard and wooden outer packagings. Therefore I believe it would be beneficial to require intermediate packagings be included when combination packagings intended to carry nitric acid are UN tested. This would ensure the entire package performed as intended.

Further to my comments above, I believe the use of glass containers for shipping certain dangerous goods should be reviewed by PHMSA as a separate project. Advances in plastics technology have resulted in more robust, safer, more environmentally friendly alternatives to glass becoming available. These alternatives are also cost competitive with glass. Use of these superior alternatives might result in less and/or smaller packaging being required to achieve an equivalent level of safety. That is something in almost everyone's best interest.