animal identification, recordkeeping, access for inspection, confiscation of animals, and handling, among other requirements. Within part 2, subpart C contains the regulations specific to research facilities.

Among other requirements, research facilities, other than Federal research facilities, must register with APHIS and appoint an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). The IACUC, which must be composed of a chairperson and at least two other members, is required to perform certain functions in order to ensure the facility's compliance with the AWA regulations.

As one of these functions, the IACUC must review proposed activities involving animals that are performed at the facility, as well as significant changes in ongoing activities, in order to determine that the principle investigator has considered alternatives to procedures that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress to the animals, and has provided a written narrative description of the methods and sources used to determine that alternatives were not available.

On October 30, 2013, APHIS received a petition from the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (referred to below as PCRM) requesting that we initiate rulemaking to amend the AWA regulations. Specifically, PCRM asks that we amend part 1 to add a definition of the term *alternatives* in order to delineate what a primary investigator is required to consider in lieu of a procedure that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress to the animals. The petition also asks that we amend the existing definition of *painful procedure* in order to codify a long-standing APHIS policy that a procedure should be considered to be painful if it may cause more than momentary or slight pain of distress to the animals, even if this pain is subsequently relieved through anesthesia. Finally, the petition asks that we amend part 2 to specify what must occur as part of a consideration of alternatives.

The petition states that the intent of the AWA is to authorize research facilities to undertake procedures likely to produce pain or distress in animals only if no alternatives exist to these procedures, and that the AWA regulations support this interpretation of the AWA itself. The petition suggests, however, that because of ambiguities in the AWA regulations, research facilities have sometimes construed them to mean that cursory deliberation regarding alternatives suffices to meet this regulatory and statutory requirement to consider alternatives. The petition states that, by amending the AWA regulations in the manner that PCRM suggests, we would remove these ambiguities and facilitate regulatory compliance.

We are making this petition available to the public and soliciting comments to help determine what action, if any, to take in response to this request. The petition and any comments submitted are available for review as indicated under **ADDRESSES** above. We welcome all comments on the issues outlined in the petition. In particular, we invite responses to the following questions:

1. Should APHIS establish regulatory standards for consideration of alternatives to procedures that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress to animals?

2. What constitutes an alternative to a procedure that may cause more than momentary or slight pain or distress? If we amend the AWA regulations to define the term *alternative,* what definition should we use?

3. What constitutes a thorough consideration of alternatives? Does this differ depending on the nature of the research conducted? If so, how?

4. Who should make a determination regarding the thoroughness of a primary investigator's consideration of alternatives: The IACUC for a facility, APHIS, or both parties?

5. If the IACUC and APHIS should jointly make a determination, which responsibilities should fall to APHIS and which to the IACUC in terms of evaluating thoroughness?

6. What documentation should the primary investigator provide to demonstrate that he or she has done a thorough consideration of alternatives?

We encourage the submission of scientific data, studies, or research to support your comments and position. We also invite data on the costs and benefits associated with any recommendations. We will consider all comments and recommendations we receive.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2131–2159; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.7.

Done in Washington, DC, this 24th day of March 2015.

Jere L. Dick,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–07221 Filed 3–27–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Parts 51, 71, 75, 78, 85, and 86

[Docket No. APHIS–2014–0018]

RIN 0579–AE02

Livestock Marketing Facilities

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: We are reopening the comment period for our proposed rule that would amend the regulations governing approval of facilities that receive livestock moved in interstate commerce, as well as the conditions under which livestock may move to such facilities without official identification or prior issuance of an interstate certificate of veterinary inspection or alternative documentation. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

DATES: The comment period for the proposed rule published on January 2, 2015 (80 FR 6 through 13) is reopened. We will consider all comments that we receive on or before April 15, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2014-0018.*
- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS–2014–0018, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A–03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at *http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2014-0018* or in our reading room, which is located in Room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799–7039 before coming.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Neil Hammerschmidt, Program Manager, Animal Disease Traceability, VS, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 200, Riverdale, MD 20737–1236; (301) 851–3539.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 2, 2015, we published in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 6 through 13, Docket No. APHIS–2014–0018) a proposal to amend the regulations in 9 CFR subchapters B and C.

We proposed to amend the regulations in part 51 of subchapter B and several parts of subchapter C to, among other things, replace references to ''approved livestock facilities,'' ''approved stockyards'' and ''specifically approved stockyards'' with the term ''approved livestock marketing facilities.''

We proposed to amend the regulations in § 71.20, which provide the conditions under which the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the United States Department of Agriculture may approve a livestock facility to receive livestock that are moved interstate under conditions that are afforded only to such approved facilities. The current regulations in that section require the person legally responsible for the day-to-day operations of the facility to execute an agreement with APHIS regarding the manner in which the facility will operate, if approved. The provisions of the agreement are currently set forth in the regulations.

We proposed to remove the terms of the agreement from the regulations, and place them instead in a document titled ''The Approved Livestock Marketing Facility Agreement,'' which we would maintain on the Internet. We also proposed to update the terms of the agreement and to make other amendments to § 71.20 that would update and clarify the section's content.

We proposed to revise § 86.4 in order to clarify the conditions under which cattle and bison may be moved interstate to an approved livestock marketing facility without official identification. We also proposed to revise § 86.5 in order to clarify the conditions under which cattle or bison may be moved interstate to an approved livestock facility without an accompanying interstate certificate of veterinary inspection or owner-shipper statement.

Comments on the proposed rule were required to be received on or before March 3, 2015. We are reopening the comment period on Docket No. APHIS–2014–0018. The comment period will now close on April 15, 2015. We will also accept all comments received between March 4, 2015 (the day after the close of the original comment period) and the date of this notice. This action will allow interested persons additional time to prepare and submit comments.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 8301–8317; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

Done in Washington, DC, this 24th day of March 2015.

Jere L. Dick,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–07217 Filed 3–27–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

11 CFR Part 111

[Notice 2015–05]

Rulemaking Petition: Administrative Fines Program and Commission Forms

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission.

ACTION: Rulemaking Petition: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: On January 23, 2015, the Federal Election Commission received a Petition for Rulemaking asking the Commission to expand its Administrative Fines Program and to revise and update several Commission forms and their instructions. The Commission seeks comments on this petition.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before May 29, 2015.

ADDRESSES: All comments must be in writing. Commenters are encouraged to submit comments electronically via the Commission's Web site at *http://www.fec.gov/fosers,* reference REG 2015–01, or by email to *FinesAndForms@fec.gov.* Alternatively, commenters may submit comments in paper form, addressed to the Federal Election Commission, Attn.: Robert M. Knop, Assistant General Counsel, 999 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20463.

Each commenter must provide, at a minimum, his or her first name, last name, city, state, and zip code. All properly submitted comments, including attachments, will become part of the public record, and the Commission will make comments available for public viewing on the Commission's Web site and in the Commission's Public Records room. Accordingly, commenters should not provide in their comments any information that they do not wish to make public, such as a home street address, personal email address, date of birth, phone number, social security number, or driver's license number, or any information that is restricted from disclosure, such as trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert M. Knop, Assistant General Counsel, Mr. Neven F. Stipanovic, Attorney, or Ms. Holly Ratliff, Office of General Counsel, 999 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20463, (202) 694–1650 or (800) 424–9530.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 23, 2015, the Federal Election Commission received a Petition for Rulemaking from seven attorneys [1] (collectively ''petitioners'') regarding the Commission's Administrative Fines Program (''AFP'') and several of the Commission's forms and their accompanying instructions. Under the AFP, the Commission assesses civil monetary penalties for late filing and failure to file certain reports as required by 52 U.S.C. 30104(a) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 434(a)) (requiring political committee treasurers to report receipts and disbursements within certain time periods). 11 CFR 111.30; *see also* 52 U.S.C. 30109(a)(4)(C) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 437g(a)(4)(C)). If the Commission determines that such a violation has occurred, it may assess a civil monetary penalty according to the AFP penalty schedules at 11 CFR 111.43–.44.

In December 2013, Congress authorized the Commission to expand the scope of the AFP to encompass reporting violations for reports filed under 52 U.S.C. 30104(c) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 434(c)) (certain independent expenditure reports), 52 U.S.C. 30104(e) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 434(e)) (certain federal election activity reports), 52 U.S.C. 30104(f) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 434(f)) (electioneering communications reports), 52 U.S.C. 30104(g) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 434(g)) (24- and 48-hour independent expenditure reports), 52 U.S.C. 30104(i) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 434(i)) (bundled contribution reports), and 52 U.S.C. 30105 (formerly 2 U.S.C. 437) (certain convention reports). *See* Public Law 113–72, 127 Stat. 1210 (2013). The petitioners ask the Commission to conduct a rulemaking to expand the scope of the AFP to these additional categories of reporting violations, using an approach that considers the criteria in the penalty schedule found at 11 CFR 111.43 (election sensitivity, level of activity, number of days late, and number of previous violations) and similar factors but eschews a strict formulaic penalty.

The petitioners also ask the Commission to revise several of its

[1] Messrs. Robert F. Bauer, Allen Dickerson, Benjamin L. Ginsberg, Donald F. McGahn II, Laurence E. Gold, Robert D. Lenhard, and Bradley A. Smith.