Vessels, N67–12097 (NASA CR–72124) (May 1966), or its equivalent.

* * * * *

S7.2.2 Each Type 2, Type 3, or Type 4 CNG fuel container shall not leak when subjected to burst pressure and tested in accordance with S8.2. Burst pressure shall be no less than the value necessary to meet the stress ratio requirements of Table 3, when analyzed in accordance with the requirements of S5.5.1.

TABLE THREE.—STRESS RATIOS

Material	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
E-Glass	2.65	3.5	3.5
S-Glass	2.65	3.5	3.5
Aramid	2.25	3.0	3.0
Carbon	2.25	2.25	2.25

* * * * *

S7.4. *Labeling.* Each CNG fuel container shall be permanently labeled with the information specified in paragraphs (a) through (d). Any label affixed to the container in compliance with this section shall remain in place and be legible for the manufacturer's recommended life of the container. The information specified in paragraphs (a) through (d) of this section shall be in English and in letters and numbers that are at least 6.35 mm (0.25 inch).

(a) The statement: ''If there is a question about the proper use, installation, or maintenance of this container, contact _____.'' inserting the *CNG fuel container manufacturer's name, address, and telephone number.*

(b) The statement: ''Manufactured in _____.'' inserting the month and year of manufacture of the CNG fuel container.

(c) Service Pressure _____ kPa (_____psig).

(d) The symbol DOT, constituting a certification by the CNG container manufacturer that the container complies with all requirements of this standard.

* * * * *

S8.1.3 The cycling rate for S8.1.1 and S8.1.2 shall be any value up to and including 10 cycles per minute.

* * * * *

S8.2.2 The pressurization rate throughout the test shall be any value up to and including 1,379 kPa (200 psi) per second.

* * * * *

S8.3.10 The average wind velocity at the container is any velocity up to and including 2.24 meters/second (5 mph).

* * * * *

Issued on July 18, 1995.

Ricardo Martinez,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–18109 Filed 7–19–95; 2:09 pm]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 85–06; Notice 9]

RIN 2127–AF82

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards, Passenger Car Brake Systems

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule; Response to petitions for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: In February 1995, NHTSA published a new Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 135, *Passenger Car Brake Systems*, which replaces the existing Standard No. 105, *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, as it applies to passenger cars. The agency's action was part of its efforts to harmonize its standards with international standards. The agency received three petitions for reconsideration, each of which supported the new standard, but recommended one or more changes. This document provides NHTSA's response to those petitions. As part of its response, the agency is making several minor changes in the standard's test conditions. NHTSA is also making a number of correcting amendments to the new standard.

DATES: *Effective date.* The amendments made by this rule are effective August 23, 1995.

Petitions for reconsideration. Petitions for reconsideration must be received not later than August 23, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Petitions for reconsideration should be submitted to: Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Terri Droneburg, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street SW., Room 5307, Washington, DC 20590. Phone: (202) 366–6617. Fax: (202) 366–4329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 2, 1995, NHTSA published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 6411) a final rule establishing Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 135, *Passenger Car Brake Systems*. That standard will replace Standard No. 105, *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, as it applies to passenger cars.

NHTSA received petitions for reconsideration from General Motors (GM), the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association (JAMA), and Mercedes-Benz. Each of the petitioners supported the establishment of the new standard, but identified one or more areas where they recommended changes. The issues raised by the petitioners are addressed below.

GM first identified several technical corrections to make in the text of Standard No. 135. NHTSA concurs with these corrections and has also identified several other corrections that need to be made. In this document, the agency is making those corrections.

GM next identified one substantive area of concern, involving the pedal force constraints for the hot and recovery performance tests (S7.14.3(c) and S7.16.3(c)). GM stated that NHTSA had explained in the final rule that Standard No. 135 is intended to ensure that faded brakes are capable of achieving both a minimum level of performance relative to cold effectiveness (i.e., at least 60 percent of cold effectiveness deceleration) and a minimum absolute level of performance (i.e., stopping distance less than or equal to 89 meters, from a speed of 100 km/h (62.1 mph)).

GM stated that, to make the relative performance a true comparison, it is necessary to constrain the hot stop pedal force to that which was used during the cold effectiveness stop. GM stated also that only by having similar pedal force profiles between the hot and cold stops is it possible to effectively compare hot and cold brake performance. That company cited the agency's statement in the final rule preamble that, ''(i)n order for that comparison to be meaningful, the test conditions for the two tests should be as close to identical as possible.''

GM argued, however, that the language adopted in the final rule does not facilitate test conditions for the cold and hot stops that are as close to identical as possible. GM said that the language instead precludes a legitimate comparison between hot and cold performance by forcing a significantly different pedal force on the hot stop. GM stated that a typical pedal force profile used during cold effectiveness testing shows an initial spike, followed by a lower, level force. That company stated that because the language of the final rule limits the peak hot stop pedal force to the *average* cold effectiveness pedal force, it precludes the use of an initial spike for the comparison hot stop. GM stated that this shortcoming can be easily corrected by amending the regulatory language to state that the