

requests an extension of an unspecified amount of time. Some of these comments state that additional time is needed given the complexity of the issues, while others state that an extension of the comment period will allow time for wine industry members to reach a consensus on the proposal.

#### Determination To Reopen the Public Comment Period

In response to the requests to extend the comment period, TTB is reopening the comment period for Notice No. 160 for an additional 90 days. We believe that 90 days will provide industry members and the public with the additional time necessary to fully consider both the original proposal put forth in Notice No. 160 and the alternative proposals discussed above. Therefore, comments on Notice No. 160 are now due to TTB on or before January 9, 2018.

In addition to comments on the alternative proposals discussed above, TTB is interested in comments that address whether the alternative proposals should apply only to wines labeled under certificates of exemption for label approval, or if they should also apply to wines labeled under certificates of label approval, in which case corresponding amendments to the labeling regulations in part 4 would be necessary. TTB is also interested in comments regarding whether these proposals should apply to non-grape wines. Please provide specific information in support of your comments.

#### Submission of New Comments

Comments on the original proposal put forth in Notice No. 160 and the alternative proposals discussed above may be submitted electronically via the online comment form for this document, Notice No. 160B, as posted within Docket No. TTB-2016-0005 at “*Regulations.gov*,” the Federal e-rulemaking portal. Comments may also be submitted via U.S. mail or hand delivery as described above in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

#### Drafting Information

Jennifer Berry of the Regulations and Rulings Division drafted this document.

Signed: September 28, 2017.

**John J. Manfreda,**  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017-21817 Filed 10-10-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-31-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau

#### 27 CFR Part 24

[Docket No. TTB-2016-0010; Notice No. 164A; Re: Notice No. 164]

RIN 1513-AB61

#### Wine Treating Materials and Related Regulations; Comment Period Reopening

**AGENCY:** Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) is reopening for an additional 90 days the comment period for Notice No. 164, Wine Treating Materials and Related Regulations, a notice of proposed rulemaking published in the **Federal Register** on November 22, 2016. TTB is taking this action in response to requests from wine industry members and trade associations.

**DATES:** The comment period for the proposed rule published on November 22, 2016 (81 FR 83752) is reopened for 90 days. Written comments on Notice No. 164 are now due on or before January 9, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Please send your comments on Notice No. 164 to one of the following addresses:

- *Internet:* <https://www.regulations.gov> (via the online comment form for Notice No. 164 as posted within Docket No. TTB-2016-0010 at *Regulations.gov*, the Federal e-rulemaking portal);
- *U.S. Mail:* Director, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Box 12, Washington, DC 20005; or
- *Hand delivery/courier in lieu of mail:* Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005.

See the Public Participation section of Notice No. 164 for specific instructions and requirements for submitting comments, and for information on how to request a public hearing.

You may view copies of this document, Notice No. 164, and any comments made to TTB about the described proposals at <https://www.regulations.gov> within Docket No. TTB-2016-0010. A link to that docket is posted on the TTB Web site at <https://www.ttb.gov/wine/wine-rulemaking.shtml> under Notice No. 164. You also may view copies of this

document, Notice No. 164, and any comments made to TTB about the described proposals by appointment at the TTB Information Resource Center, 1310 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20005. Please call (202) 453-2270 to make an appointment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kara Fontaine, Regulations and Rulings Division, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, 1310 G Street NW., Box 12, Washington, DC 20005; phone (202) 453-1039, ext. 103.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In Notice No. 164, a notice of proposed rulemaking published in the **Federal Register** on November 22, 2016 (81 FR 83752), the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB) requested public comment on amendments to its regulations pertaining to the production of wine and in particular in regard to the permissible treatments that may be applied to wine and to juice from which wine is made. TTB issued the proposed amendments in response to requests from wine industry members to authorize certain wine treating materials and processes not currently authorized by TTB regulations. In Notice No. 164, TTB invited comments on the proposed regulatory changes and the wine treatments and materials issues addressed in that document. The 60-day comment period for Notice No. 164 originally closed on January 23, 2017.

On December 27, 2016, TTB received a letter from the Wine Institute, a large wine industry trade association based in San Francisco, California, requesting a six-month extension of the comment period on the wine treating materials and other regulatory amendments proposed in Notice No. 164. In its letter, the Wine Institute stated that its members required additional time to consider the “complex, highly technical proposal” contained in Notice No. 164, as well as the document’s request for input on other regulatory issues. The Wine Institute also noted that TTB’s proposal was published during the busy holiday season, and that it required additional time to reach out to its members and other wine industry trade associations to discuss how best to respond to Notice No. 164. The Wine Institute letter is posted as Comment 3 to Notice No. 164 within Docket No. TTB-2016-0010 on the *Regulations.gov* Web site at <https://www.regulations.gov>. In addition, TTB received one comment supporting the Wine Institute’s request for an extension of the comment period (see Comment 4).

On January 9, 2017, TTB received a letter from Laffort USA, a producer of wine treating materials, which also

requested a six-month extension of the comment period for Notice No. 164. In its letter, Laffort USA noted the proposed rulemaking requested comments “on many other topics of great relevance to the U.S. wine industry,” and that it the comment period “covered the entire holiday season.” The Laffort USA letter is posted as Comment 5 to Notice No. 164 within Docket No. TTB–2016–0010 on the *Regulations.gov* Web site at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

In response to these requests, TTB is reopening the comment period for Notice No. 164 for an additional 90 days. TTB notes that the wine treating materials discussed in the regulatory amendments in Notice No. 164 have been previously approved administratively for use by wine industry members in the treatment of their wine. TTB believes that a 90-day reopening of the comment period for Notice No. 164 will allow all interested parties to fully consider the regulatory amendments proposed in that document.

Therefore, comments on Notice No. 164 are now due to TTB on or before January 9, 2018. Comments on Notice No. 164 may be submitted as described above in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document.

### Drafting Information

Michael Hoover of the Regulations and Rulings Division drafted this document.

Signed: September 28, 2017.

**John J. Manfreda,**  
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2017–21809 Filed 10–10–17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810–31–P**

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

### 39 CFR Part 3050

[Docket No. RM2018–1; Order No. 4142]

### Data Enhancements and Reporting Requirements for Flats

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is initiating a proceeding to explore enhancements to the Postal Service’s data systems and to facilitate the development of consistent reporting requirements. This document informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

**DATES:** *Comments are due:* December 4, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission’s Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Background
- III. Next Step
- IV. Ordering Paragraphs

#### I. Introduction

The Commission initiates this proceeding to explore potential enhancements to the Postal Service’s data systems and to facilitate the development of consistent reporting requirements. These data enhancements and reporting requirements will be used to measure, track, and report the cost and service performance issues concerning flat-shaped mailpieces (flats).

#### II. Background

In the FY 2015 ACD, the Commission identified and analyzed six “pinch points” that contribute to cost and service issues for flats:<sup>1</sup>

- Bundle processing
- Low productivity on automated equipment
- Manual sorting
- Productivity and service issues in allied operations
- Increased transportation time and cost
- Last mile/delivery

Using data available at the time, the Commission identified and discussed flats cost and/or service issues for each individual pinch point. *See* FY 2015 ACD at 165–180. However, the Commission acknowledged that there was a “lack of comprehensive data” which prevents the Postal Service and the Commission from measuring the impact of specific initiatives designed to improve cost and service issues for flats. *Id.* at 180.

The Commission directed the Postal Service to identify a method to measure, track, and report the cost and service performance issues relating to each individual pinch point identified by the Commission at the most granular level practicable. *Id.* at 181. To increase

transparency, the Commission requested certain information in support of the identified method: Available data to support methods to measure, track and report on cost and service issues related to flats, information on the cost to produce and aggregate current data, additional data that would be needed to support a method to measure, track and report on cost and service issues related to flats and the cost to produce that data, and the identification of information necessary to develop, implement, monitor, and quantify results for a comprehensive plan to improve flats service performance and cost coverage if an ideal data system were available. *Id.*

The Postal Service responded to the Commission’s Chapter 6 directive on July 26, 2016.<sup>2</sup> The Postal Service provided an extensive discussion of data systems that could be used to measure certain aspects of individual pinch points; however, it did not provide a specific method for each pinch point to measure, track, and report on cost and service issues related to flats. To redirect the Postal Service’s response, the Commission issued Commission Information Request No. 1.<sup>3</sup> In Order No. 3539, the Commission scheduled an off-the-record technical conference on October 21, 2016, to determine the status of the Postal Service’s proposed methods as requested in the original Commission Directive.<sup>4</sup> The Postal Service filed its response to CIR No. 1 on November 28, 2016.<sup>5</sup> In both its 120-Day Response and in its Response to CIR No. 1, the Postal Service provided general information related to all pinch points, and information specific to each individual pinch point. The Postal Service’s responses were informative; however, the Commission found that neither response addressed the Commission’s original and main request to develop a method to measure, track, and report the cost and service performance issues relating to the individual pinch points.<sup>6</sup> The Postal Service stated that the information it provided is “the first step

<sup>2</sup> Docket No. ACR2015, Third Response of the United States Postal Service to Commission Requests for Additional Information in the FY 2015 Annual Compliance Determination, Report Regarding Information about Flats Data Systems, July 26, 2016 (120-Day Response).

<sup>3</sup> Docket No. ACR2015, Commission Information Request No. 1, September 27, 2016 (CIR No. 1).

<sup>4</sup> *See* Docket No. ACR2015, Order Scheduling Technical Conference, September 27, 2016 (Order No. 3539).

<sup>5</sup> Docket No. ACR2015, Response of the United States Postal Service to Commission Information Request No. 1, November 28, 2016 (Response to CIR No. 1).

<sup>6</sup> Docket No. ACR2016, Annual Compliance Determination Report, March 28, 2017, at 170.

<sup>1</sup> Docket No. ACR2015, Annual Compliance Determination Report, Fiscal Year 2015, March 28, 2016, at 165 (FY 2015 ACD).