

3432, FAX (303) 231-3385, e-Mail David\_Guzy@mms.gov.

Dated: April 19, 1999.

**Lucy Querques Denett,**

*Associate Director for Royalty Management.*

[FR Doc. 99-10166 Filed 4-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 50

[AD-FRL-6326-6]

RIN 2060-A148

### Revisions to Reference Method for the Determination of Fine Particulate Matter as PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Atmosphere

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** A new national network of fine particulate monitors is being established over the next two years. In order to assure that monitoring data are of the highest quality and are comparable both within and between air monitoring agencies, many specific design and performance requirements were detailed in 40 CFR part 50, appendix L. Other requirements were set forth in documents such as section 2.12 of the "Quality Assurance Handbook for Air Pollution Measurement Systems, Volume II, Ambient Air Specific Methods," EPA/600/R-94/038b.

This action proposes to revise two requirements for measurement of fine particulate in 40 CFR part 50. For transport of exposed filters from the sample location to the conditioning environment, 40 CFR part 50 will no longer specify that the protective shipping container be made of metal. For verification of sampler flow rate, 40 CFR part 50 will now specify that new calibrations shall be performed if the reading of the sampler's flow rate indicator or measurement device differs by more than  $\pm 4$  percent or more from the flow rate measured by the flow rate standard. The flow rate verification tolerance was previously set at  $\pm 2$  percent. Because the Agency views this action as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments, the EPA is approving the amendment to 40 CFR part 50 as a direct final rule without prior proposal. A detailed rationale for this action is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to that direct final rule, no further activity

is contemplated in relation to this proposed rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before May 24, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be submitted (in duplicate, if possible) to: Air Docket (A-95-54), US Environmental Protection Agency, Attn: Docket No. A-95-54, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tim Hanley, Emissions, Monitoring, and Analysis Division (MD-14), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, Telephone: (919) 541-4417, e-mail: hanley.tim@epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For additional information, see the direct final rule which is published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: April 9, 1999.

**Carol M. Browner,**

*Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 99-9594 Filed 4-21-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

#### 49 CFR Part 571

### Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Denial of Petition for Rulemaking

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

**ACTION:** Denial of petition for rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** This document denies a petition for rulemaking submitted by Mr. Keith Gross to initiate an investigation to evaluate and regulate the "high profile gas tank design" on motorcycles relating to the rider's injury potential during a frontal crash. Specifically, Mr. Gross noted that Kawasaki does not crash test their Ninja model motorcycle to evaluate the effect that a high profile gas tank design has on the rider during a crash. Mr. Gross provided insufficient information to support his contention that the high profile fuel tank design on motorcycles

presents a safety problem warranting investigation and possible regulation. Further, available data reviewed by NHTSA do not show that Kawasaki motorcycle riders suffered more injuries than other motorcycle riders.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** *For non-legal issues:* Dr. William J.J. Liu, Office of Crashworthiness Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC, 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-4923. Facsimile (202) 366-4329. *For legal issues:* Ms. Nicole Fradette, Office of Chief Counsel, NCC-20, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC, 20590. Telephone: (202) 366-2992. Facsimile (202) 366-3820.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** By petition dated September 1, 1997, Mr. Keith Gross requested NHTSA to evaluate the effect that high profile gas tank designs have on a rider's injury potential during a frontal motorcycle crash and to promulgate a Federal motor vehicle safety standard to reduce the risk of injury to the driver. The petitioner asserted that a driver was more likely to suffer an injury in a frontal collision if the driver were operating a motorcycle with a high profile fuel tank design, than one with a "tear drop" fuel tank design, i.e., a wide-based gas tank design that rises gradually above the seat of the motorcycle. The high profile gas tanks rise up abruptly by approximately 3 to 4 inches above the level of the seat and the upper surface of these gas tanks differs from that of other gas tanks.

Mr. Gross explained that, in a frontal collision, motorcycle riders move forward and contact both the gas tank and the handle bars before being separated from the motorcycle. The petitioner stated that high profile gas tank designs serve to enhance the maneuverability and handling of sporty motorcycles. However, the high profile gas tank designs prevent a rider's pelvis from sliding forward in a frontal crash. According to Mr. Gross, this impediment forces the rider's upper body to rotate against the gas tank, delaying separation and increase the potential for head and neck injuries. The petitioner explained that the more traditional "tear drop" wide-based gas tank design minimizes the risk of a groin injury to the rider by facilitating the rider's separation from the motorcycle without interference from the gas tank. Mr. Gross noted that neither Kawasaki nor the Department of Transportation (DOT) have crash tested a motorcycle to determine how much