

adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations, low-income populations, and/or indigenous peoples, as specified in Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994). The methodology and the results of the demographic analysis are discussed in section IV.F above.

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 63**

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hazardous substances, Reporting and record keeping requirements.

Michael S. Regan,  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2022-04571 Filed 3-4-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**

**47 CFR Part 73**

[MB Docket No. 22-78; RM-11918; DA 22-189; FR ID 74154]

**Television Broadcasting Services Wichita, Kansas**

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission has before it a petition for rulemaking filed by Gray Television Licensee, LLC (Petitioner), the licensee of KSCW-DT, channel 12, Wichita, Kansas. The Petitioner requests the substitution of channel 28 for channel 12 at in the Table of Allotments.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed on or before April 6, 2022 and reply comments on or before April 21, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Secretary, 45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve counsel for the Petitioner as follows: Joan Stewart, Esq., Wiley Rein LLP, 2050 M Street NW, Washington, DC 20036.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joyce Bernstein, Media Bureau, at (202) 418-1647; or Joyce Bernstein, Media Bureau, at *Joyce.Bernstein@fcc.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In support, the Petitioner states that the proposed channel substitution serves the public interest because it will resolve significant over-the-air reception problems in KSCW-DT's existing service area. The Petitioner further states that the Commission has recognized the deleterious effects

manmade noise has on the reception of digital VHF signals, and that the propagation characteristics of these channels allow undesired signals and noise to be receivable at relatively farther distances compared to UHF channels and nearby electrical devices can cause interference. According to the Petitioner, although the proposed channel 28 noise limited contour will fall slightly short of the licensed channel 12 noise limited contour, a terrain-limited analysis using the Commission's *TVStudy* software demonstrates that there is no predicted loss in population served.

This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, MB Docket No. 22-78; RM-11918; DA 22-189, adopted February 22, 2022, and released February 23, 2022. The full text of this document is available for download at <https://www.fcc.gov/edocs>. To request materials in accessible formats (braille, large print, computer diskettes, or audio recordings), please send an email to *FCC504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Government Affairs Bureau at (202) 418-0530 (VOICE), (202) 418-0432 (TTY).

This document does not contain information collection requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. In addition, therefore, it does not contain any proposed information collection burden "for small business concerns with fewer than 25 employees," pursuant to the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002, Public Law 107-198, *see* 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(4). Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601-612, do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited from the time a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is issued to the time the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, *see* 47 CFR 1.1208. There are, however, exceptions to this prohibition, which can be found in Section 1.1204(a) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.1204(a).

*See* Sections 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission's rules for information regarding the proper filing procedures for comments, 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

**List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73**

Television.  
Federal Communications Commission.  
Thomas Horan,  
Chief of Staff, Media Bureau.

**Proposed Rule**

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Federal Communications

Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR part 73 as follows:

**PART 73—Radio Broadcast Service**

■ 1. The authority citation for part 73 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 47 U.S.C. 154, 155, 301, 303, 307, 309, 310, 334, 336, 339.

**§ 73.622 [Amended]**

■ 2. In § 73.622 in paragraph (j), amend the Table of Allotments under Kansas by revising the entry for Wichita to read as follows:

**§ 73.622 Digital television table of allotments.**

\* \* \* \* \*  
(j) \* \* \*

	Community	Channel No.
	* * *	* * *
<b>KANSAS</b>		
Wichita .....		10, 15, 26, 28
	* * *	* * *

[FR Doc. 2022-04407 Filed 3-4-22; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**National Highway Traffic Safety Administration**

**49 CFR Part 571**

[Docket No. NHTSA-2022-00199]

**Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Denial of Petitions for Rulemaking**

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

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

**SUMMARY:** This document denies the September 27, 2021 petitions for rulemaking submitted by the Small Business in Transportation Coalition (SBTC) ("petitioner"). The petitioner requested that the agency initiate rulemaking to establish a new Federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS) on the installation of electronic logging devices (ELDs), and to amend existing FMVSSs for heavy vehicle braking and accelerator control systems (*i.e.*, FMVSS Nos. 105, 121, and 124). NHTSA is

denying the petitions based on a lack of information necessary under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act and the allocation of agency resources.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Gunyoung Lee, Safety Standards Engineer, Office of Rulemaking, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE, Washington, DC 20590, Telephone: 202-366-6005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Table of Contents**

- I. Background
- II. Petitions for Rulemaking
- III. NHTSA's Analysis and Decision

**I. Background**

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act ("Safety Act") (49 U.S.C. 30101 *et seq.*) authorizes NHTSA to issue safety standards for new motor vehicles and new items of motor vehicle equipment. Each FMVSS standard must be practicable, meet the need for motor vehicle safety, and be stated in objective terms. NHTSA does not endorse any vehicles or items of equipment. Further, NHTSA does not approve or certify vehicles or equipment. Instead, the Safety Act establishes a "self-certification" process under which each manufacturer is responsible for certifying that its products meet all applicable safety standards.

Petitions for rulemaking are governed by 49 CFR 552. Pursuant to Part 552, the agency conducts a technical review of the petition, which may consist of an analysis of the material submitted, together with information already in possession of the agency. In deciding whether to grant or deny a petition, the agency considers this technical review as well as appropriate factors, which include, among others, allocation of agency resources and agency priorities.<sup>1</sup>

**II. Petitions for Rulemaking**

SBTC submitted a letter, dated September 27, 2021, that includes two rulemaking petitions pursuant to 49 CFR 552 and a defect investigation petition pursuant to 49 CFR 554. This notice focuses on the two rulemaking petitions filed by the petitioner. The other petition for opening a defect investigation will be addressed in a separate notice.

The two petitions for rulemaking focus on alleged cybersecurity vulnerabilities in commercial motor vehicles and commercial motor vehicle equipment. The first petition for rulemaking requests that NHTSA

establish a new FMVSS to regulate the installation of electronic logging devices (ELDs) in commercial motor vehicles. Because NHTSA regulates motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment, not the "installation" of any such devices, NHTSA is interpreting SBTC's request as asking the agency to issue a performance standard for ELDs. The second petition for rulemaking requests that NHTSA amend existing FMVSSs for braking and accelerator control systems (*i.e.*, FMVSS Nos. 105,<sup>2</sup> 121,<sup>3</sup> and 124<sup>4</sup>). The petitioner contended that these safety standards should be amended because the factory-installed braking and acceleration systems are out of date, asserting that the systems are vulnerable to telematics hacking. As supporting references, SBTC included various information, such as research studies, media publications, and government publications.

**III. NHTSA's Analysis and Decision**

After a thorough review of the petitions and accompanying materials provided by the petitioner, NHTSA has decided to deny the SBTC's rulemaking petitions based on a lack of sufficient data necessary to proceed under the Motor Vehicle Safety Act, 49 U.S.C. 30111(a) and (b) the allocation of agency resources. The following sections detail the primary reasons for the agency's decision.

*A. SBTC's Petition To Establish a New FMVSS for the Installation of ELDs and NHTSA's Rationale for Denying This Petition*

*1. SBTC has not provided sufficient information to establish a safety need associated with ELD installation.*

NHTSA reviewed all sources provided by the petitioner to determine whether a safety need exists that could be resolved by promulgating a FMVSS. In its first rulemaking petition, SBTC

<sup>2</sup> FMVSS No. 105, Hydraulic and Electric Brake Systems, establishes requirements for hydraulic and electric service brake systems, and associated parking brake systems to ensure safe braking performance. This safety standard applies to multipurpose passenger vehicles, trucks, and buses with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 7,716 pounds.

<sup>3</sup> FMVSS No. 121, Air Brake Systems, establishes performance and equipment requirements for braking systems on vehicles, such as trucks and buses with a GVWR less than 29,000 pounds, and trailers equipped with air brake systems to ensure safe braking performance under normal and emergency conditions.

<sup>4</sup> FMVSS No. 124, Accelerator Control Systems, establishes requirements for the return of a vehicle's throttle to idle position when the driver removes the actuating force or in the event of severance/disconnection of the accelerator control system. This standard applies to passenger cars, multi-purpose passenger vehicles, trucks, and buses.

contended that the hacking vulnerability and weak encryption of ELDs may lead to safety-critical attacks (*i.e.*, hazards) in commercial vehicles. The references cited by the petitioner do not provide support for such assertion or sufficient information, such as the nature, cause, size, and potential severity of the alleged hazard. As an example, SBTC argued that an adversary can hack into "a vulnerable ELD system" and take control of a commercial vehicle based on an academic research paper ("Burakova").<sup>5</sup> Contrary to the out-of-context excerpt petitioner included in its petition, this paper discusses the possibilities of using *physical* access to a SAE J1939 bus.<sup>6</sup> The paper makes no specific assertions concerning wireless or remote attacks, only that "Further research is needed." Also, the paper does not discuss vulnerabilities in any specific devices that span wireless and J1939 networks, ELD or otherwise. As such, it is unclear how this paper supports petitioner's assertion that a safety standard is necessary for ELDs. Additionally, petitioner also provided a 2021 Freightwaves article that describes efforts by trucking companies to alter ELD logs with physical access. There is no mention of accessing vehicle J1939 busses in that article. There is no mention of accessing ELD devices remotely either. Aside from the potential for falsified logs, the regulation of which is not within the jurisdiction of NHTSA, the article does not provide evidence of the petitioner's assertion that ELDs represent a threat to vehicle control or vehicle safety at all. Furthermore, several of the articles provided had nothing to do with heavy duty vehicles or ELDs. Therefore, NHTSA does not believe the information provided by petitioner identifies a safety need that issuing a Federal motor vehicle safety standard for ELDs might resolve.<sup>7</sup>

*2. SBTC has not provided any information on the practical means or solutions by which NHTSA might resolve petitioner concerns.*

As stated in previous NHTSA guidance,<sup>8</sup> the petition should describe technologies and designs that are or will be available to comply with the performance requirements and

<sup>5</sup> Y. Burakova et al., *Truck Hacking: An Experimental Analysis of the SAE J1939 Standard*, (2016).

<sup>6</sup> The excerpt included by the petitioner in support of its petitions implied that petitioner was concerned with wireless or "remote" attacks.

<sup>7</sup> See 49 U.S.C. 30111(a).

<sup>8</sup> See [https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/documents/understanding\\_nhtsas\\_current\\_regulatory\\_tools-tag.pdf](https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/documents/understanding_nhtsas_current_regulatory_tools-tag.pdf).

<sup>1</sup> 49 CFR 552.8.

demonstrate the level of effectiveness of those technologies and designs in addressing the claimed concerns regarding the installation of ELDs. However, the petitioner provided only high-level, anecdotal information about their broad, general concerns. Furthermore, petitioner failed to provide any solutions to those concerns.

3. *SBTC has not provided the substance that a standard would be comprised of.*

As stated in previous NHTSA guidance,<sup>9</sup> the petition should describe the requested standard (*i.e.*, the performance requirements, test conditions, and test procedures), the supporting research and reasons why those performance requirements, test conditions, and test procedures are appropriate and provide proposed regulatory text. However, SBTC failed to provide any substantive information regarding what a new FMVSS would be comprised of that would resolve the alleged concerns regarding the ELD installation.

*B. SBTC's Petition To Amend the Existing FMVSS Nos. 105, 121, and 124, and NHTSA's Rationale for Denying This Petition*

Like the first petition for a new FMVSS, this second petition should demonstrate a safety need that could be resolved by amending the existing FMVSSs. However, SBTC merely contended that the alleged vulnerabilities of telematics systems could impact braking and acceleration control systems and did not provide sufficient information or evidence of such attacks occurring in heavy vehicles. The resources provided by the petitioner cover a wide range of potential telematics vulnerabilities in light passenger vehicles, many of which are directly impacted by specific vehicle architectures (*i.e.*, make and model specific, in many instances). Petitioner has failed to provide evidence that indicates there is a general safety need related to telematics units in heavy vehicles that warrants modification of existing FMVSS. Without an identified safety need, it is unclear how petitioner's request would meet the need for safety.<sup>10</sup>

Similarly, the petitioner failed to provide practical means or solutions by which NHTSA could resolve its concern. SBTC provided only high-level, anecdotal information about its broad, general concerns regarding the interaction between telematics and heavy vehicle braking and acceleration

control systems regulated by the existing FMVSSs. SBTC also failed to provide any substantive information regarding the amendments of the existing FMVSSs to resolve its concerns.

Therefore, NHTSA is denying both of the SBTC's rulemaking petitions because they lacked sufficient information as discussed above. Furthermore, the agency is discretionarily allocating and managing its vehicle safety resources to those rulemakings that are mandated by Congress and others that have a demonstrated safety need with solutions available to resolve those needs.

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 30113; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95.

**Steven S. Cliff,**

*Deputy Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2022-04729 Filed 3-4-22; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-59-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 635

[Docket No. 220223-0056]

RIN 0648-BK99

#### Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; General Category Restricted-Fishing Days

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS is proposing to set Atlantic bluefin tuna (BFT) General category restricted-fishing days (RFDs) for the 2022 fishing year. This proposed rule would set RFDs for specific days during the months of July through November 2022. On an RFD, Atlantic Tunas General category permitted vessels may not fish for (including catch-and-release or tag-and-release fishing), possess, retain, land, or sell BFT. On an RFD, Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Charter/Headboat permitted vessels with a commercial sale endorsement also are subject to these restrictions to preclude fishing commercially for BFT under the General category restrictions and retention limits, but such vessels may still fish for, possess, retain, or land BFT when fishing recreationally under applicable HMS Angling category rules.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by April 6, 2022. NMFS will hold a public hearing via conference call and webinar for this proposed rule on March 24, 2022, from 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. For webinar registration information, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments on this document, identified by NOAA-NMFS-2022-0025, by electronic submission. Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal. Go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and enter "NOAA-NMFS-2022-0025" in the Search box. Click on the "Comment" icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.

Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the close of the comment period, may not be considered by NMFS. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on [www.regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.*, name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter "N/A" in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

NMFS will hold a public hearing via conference call and webinar on this proposed rule. For specific location, date and time, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

Copies of this proposed rule and supporting documents are available from the HMS Management Division website at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/topic/atlantic-highly-migratory-species> or by contacting Larry Redd at [larry.redd@noaa.gov](mailto:larry.redd@noaa.gov) or 301-427-8503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Larry Redd, Jr., [larry.redd@noaa.gov](mailto:larry.redd@noaa.gov), 301-427-8503, or Carrie Soltanoff, [carrie.soltanoff@noaa.gov](mailto:carrie.soltanoff@noaa.gov), 301-427-8503.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Atlantic HMS fisheries, including BFT fisheries, are managed under the authority of the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act (ATCA; 16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq.*) and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*). The 2006 Consolidated Atlantic HMS Fishery Management Plan (2006 Consolidated HMS FMP) and its amendments are implemented by regulations at 50 CFR part 635. Section 635.27 divides the U.S. BFT quota,

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> See 49 U.S.C. 30111(a).