

§ 395.2 should be expanded beyond the animals identified in the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act (including, for purposes of this discussion, the animals added by Section 12104 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, as discussed above). Another possible approach would be to adopt a definition of “livestock” broad enough to include all eligible animals, including those covered by the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act (as amended), without listing them individually.

V. Questions

FMCSA requests that commenters respond to the questions below, but the Agency also welcomes comments or questions on any other issues related to the definitions of “agricultural commodity” and “livestock” as those terms are used in § 395.1(k)(1). Please provide specific examples and, to the extent practicable, quantitative or qualitative data to support your answers.

1. The statute and regulation define a term with the same term: “*Agricultural commodity* means “any agricultural commodity” Does that lack of detail cause compliance or enforcement problems? Should FMCSA consider adopting a list of specific agricultural commodities, or clarify its current approach utilizing the more general definition? If you wish to suggest that specific commodities (e.g., sod or other types of horticulture) be included in the definition, please explain how they fit within the statutory definition, and provide information about the average and maximum transportation times and the extent to which the commodities are perishable.

2. Should FMCSA define or otherwise clarify the term “non-processed,” as applied in the definition of “agricultural commodity?” If so, given the context of harvesting and planting seasons referenced in the applicable statute, how should that term be defined? Please provide examples of “non-processed” agricultural commodities that should be included and discuss the distinction between “processed” and “non-processed.”

3. Would clarification or definition of other terms used in the definition of “agricultural commodity,” such as “food,” “feed,” or “fiber,” be helpful? Please provide recommendations and data to support your suggested definition.

4. Should the definition of “livestock” be revised to include aquatic animals in addition to live fish and crawfish? Please provide data to support your answer, such as how far aquatic animals

are typically transported and why you believe the HOS exemption would be appropriate for the transportation of specific aquatic animals.

5. Is the list of animals in the definition of “livestock” in § 395.2 adequate? As noted above, the Agency intends to add llamas, alpacas, live fish, and crawfish to the definition, consistent with Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 amendment to the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act of 1988. Should other animal species be included? Please provide data on the average and maximum transportation times for additional livestock you believe should be included in the definition of “livestock” in § 395.2 and the impacts of longer transportation times.

6. Are there cost or safety implications of adding specific agricultural commodities or livestock to the current definitions of “agricultural commodity” and “livestock”? Please provide data to support your answer.

7. Are there benefits of adding specific agricultural commodities or livestock to the current definitions of “agricultural commodity” and “livestock”? Please provide data to support your answer.

8. USDA regulations define “agricultural commodity” in a variety of ways, depending on the underlying statutory authority and regulatory purpose. For transporters of agricultural commodities subject to both USDA and FMCSA regulations, what are the practical implications of *not* having consistent definitions of that term? Should FMCSA adopt or cross-reference any of the definitions applied by USDA, to the extent they are compatible with the statutory definitions of “agricultural commodity” and “livestock” incorporated in § 395.2?

9. If the definitions of “agricultural commodity” or “livestock” in § 395.2 were more consistent with applicable USDA definitions of the terms, would use of the definition for purposes of § 395.1(k)(1) result in cost or benefit impacts to CMV drivers who transport such commodities, the motor carriers who employ them, growers or distributors of those commodities, or enforcement personnel? Please provide data to support your answer.

10. Are motor carriers being exposed to financial liability in situations where their drivers complied with HOS regulations and (1) the receiver refused delivery because the shipment did not meet contract specifications requiring the driver to deliver to an alternative location; and/or (2) the freight claim was not paid or was reduced because the grade standard of quality and

condition, or temperature at destination, was not acceptable due to the driver’s compliance with HOS regulations; (3) the receiver refused delivery because the shipment was late due to the driver’s compliance with HOS regulations; (4) the receiver made the driver wait to unload because the shipment was late and charged a late delivery fee due to the driver’s compliance with HOS regulations?

11. Do you believe ambiguities in the current definition of the terms “agricultural commodity” or livestock,” as applied to the HOS exemption in § 395.1(k)(1), impact highway safety? If so, how?

Issued under the authority of delegation in 49 CFR 1.87.

Dated: July 23, 2019.

Raymond P. Martinez,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2019–15960 Filed 7–26–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-EX-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. NHTSA–2019–0036]

RIN 2127-AM00

Removing Regulatory Barriers for Vehicles With Automated Driving Systems; Extension of Comment Period

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

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM); Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the public, NHTSA is announcing a 30-day extension of the comment period on the ANPRM on Removing Regulatory Barriers for Vehicles with Automated Driving Systems. The comment period for the ANPRM was originally scheduled to end on July 29, 2019. It will now end on August 28, 2019.

DATES: The comment period for the ANPRM published on May 28, 2019 at 84 FR 24433 is extended. Written comments on the ANPRM must be received on or before August 28, 2019 in order to be considered timely.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the

online instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility, M-30, U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building, Ground Floor, Rm. W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- *Fax:* (202) 493-2251.

Regardless of how you submit your comments, they must include the docket number identified in the heading of this notice.

Not that all comments received, including any personal information provided, will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Please see the "Privacy Act" heading below.

You may call the Docket Management Facility at 202-366-9324.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> or the street address listed above. We will continue to file relevant information in the docket as it becomes available.

Privacy Act: Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association,

business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70; Pages 19477-78) or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Hines, Director, Office of Crash Avoidance Standards, Telephone: (202) 366-1810. Facsimile: (202) 366-7002. Sara Bennett, Attorney-Advisor, Vehicle Rulemaking and Harmonization, Office of Chief Counsel, Telephone (202) 366-2992. Facsimile: (202) 366-3820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 28, 2019, NHTSA published an ANPRM to obtain public comments on the near- and long-term challenges of testing and verifying compliance with existing crash avoidance (100-series) Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards for Automated Driving System-Dedicated Vehicles that lack traditional manual controls necessary for a human driver to maneuver the vehicle and other features intended to facilitate operation of a vehicle by a human driver, but that are otherwise traditional vehicles with typical seating configurations. The ANPRM stated that the closing date for comments is July 29, 2019.

On July 15, 2019, NHTSA received a request from the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) for a 60-day extension of the comment period. The request can be found in the

docket for the ANPRM identified in the heading of this notice. NHTSA has considered this request and believes that a 30-day extension beyond the original due date appropriately balances NHTSA's interest in providing the public with sufficient time to comment on the complex and novel questions raised in the ANPRM, with its interest in safely addressing regulatory barriers in a timely manner. This is to notify the public that NHTSA is extending the comment period on the ANPRM, and allowing it to remain open until August 28, 2019.

We note that, in addition to requesting an extension of the ANPRM comment period, APTA also requested NHTSA hold a public meeting or webinar on the issues raised in the ANPRM. NHTSA is considering whether to hold a public meeting or webinar on the issues raised in the ANPRM, and will decide whether to do so once the agency has considered the comments received during the full extended comment period.

Authority: Delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.5.

Heidi Renate King,

Deputy Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

[FR Doc. 2019-16040 Filed 7-26-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P