

CALENDAR YEAR 2026 TRICARE PRIME AND TRICARE SELECT OUT-OF-POCKET EXPENSES RETIREE BENEFICIARY CATEGORY—Continued

[Page 2 of 2]

Out of pocket expense	Select Group A CY26	Select Group B CY26	Prime * Group A CY26	Prime * Group B CY26
Inpatient SNF/rehab facility	\$250/day up to 25% of hospital charges, plus 20% of sep. billed services (IN); 25% (OON).	\$66 per day (IN); lesser of \$397 per day or 20% (OON).	\$39 per day	\$39 per day.

‡ This is the CY25 rate. The CY26 out of pocket expense will be available mid-December once the DRG payment rates are calculated.

* When TRICARE Prime enrollees other than active duty service members self-refer to specialty or non-emergent inpatient care without a referral from a network provider and/or authorization from the regional contractor, the TRICARE Point of Service deductible and copayment applies in lieu of TRICARE Prime copayments.

The CY 2026 rates contained in this notice are effective January 1, 2026.

Dated: November 5, 2025.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2025-19819 Filed 11-7-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001-FR-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board

AGENCY: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

ACTION: Notice of Members of Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the membership of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Review Board (PRB).

DATES: These appointments are effective on November 7, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send comments concerning this notice to: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004-2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Candice Starks by telephone at (202) 360-9527, or by email at Candice.Starks@dnfsb.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 5 U.S.C. 4314 (c)(1) through (5) requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, one or more performance review boards. The PRB shall review and evaluate the initial summary rating of the senior executives' performance, the executives' responses, and the higher-level officials' comments on the initial summary rating. In addition, the PRB will recommend executive performance bonuses and pay increases.

The DNFSB is a small, independent Federal agency; therefore, the members of the DNFSB SES Performance Review Board listed in this notice are drawn from the SES ranks of other agencies. The following persons comprise a standing roster to serve as members of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board SES Performance Review Board:

Marguerite C. Garrison, Deputy Inspector General for Administrative Investigations, U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Inspector General

Theresa Perolini, Assistant Inspector General for Enterprise and External Affairs, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General

Troy M. Meyer, Deputy Inspector General for Overseas Contingency Operations, U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Inspector General

Njema Frazier, Associate Technical Director—Nuclear Weapons Program, Defense Nuclear Safety Facilities Board

Omar Lopez-Santiago, Associate Technical Director—Nuclear Materials Processing and Stabilization, Defense Nuclear Safety Facilities Board

James Biggins, Deputy Executive Director for Risk and Strategy, Defense Nuclear Safety Facilities Board

Johnathan Plaue, Technical Director, Defense Nuclear Safety Facilities Board

Katherine Herrera, Deputy Executive Director of Operations, Defense Nuclear Safety Facilities Board
Patricia Lee, Board Member, Defense Nuclear Safety Facilities Board

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 4314.

Dated: November 4, 2025.

Mary Buhler,

Executive Director of Operations.

[FR Doc. 2025-19830 Filed 11-7-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Improving Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A and B Formula Awards Using Most Recent Address Data

AGENCY: Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), Department of Health and Human Services

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program (RWHAP) Part A and B funding formulas are defined by the Public Health Service (PHS) Act and rely on the living HIV/AIDS cases reported to and confirmed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Advancements in HIV surveillance have improved the mapping of the epidemic, leading to better care strategies. Since 2017, CDC has shifted to using the most recent addresses of people with HIV for reporting, raising questions about whether RWHAP funds follow clients or remain in the jurisdiction of diagnosis. HRSA has analyzed the effects of this updated methodology on formula funding and is now seeking public feedback on proposed changes to better direct resources to where clients currently live and receive care.

DATES: Submit comments no later than December 10, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Written or electronic comments should be submitted to Division of Policy and Data, HRSA, HIV/AIDS Bureau, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, or RyanWhiteComments@hrsa.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Mandsager, Senior Public Health Analyst, Division of Policy and Data, HRSA, HIV/AIDS Bureau, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, Phone 301-594-4055, Email RyanWhiteComments@hrsa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The RWHAP Part A formula is set forth in the RWHAP authorizing statute at § 2603(a) of the PHS Act, 42 U.S.C. 300ff-13(a), and is based on the relative distribution of living HIV/AIDS cases within a statutorily specified metropolitan area reported to and confirmed by CDC. The RWHAP Part B formulas are found in §§ 2618(a)(2) and (a)(2)(F) of the PHS Act, 42 U.S.C. 300ff-28(a)(2) and (a)(2)(F) and use weighted or relative distribution of living HIV/AIDS cases within the state reported to and confirmed by CDC.

Recent advancements in HIV surveillance data have resulted in more accurate mapping of the HIV epidemic, allowing for more efficient and effective HIV care and treatment efforts at the state, local, and national levels. As a result of these advancements, beginning in 2014, CDC began the transition to reporting surveillance data based on the most recent address of a person with HIV, usually reported via CD4/viral load lab reports, rather than residence at HIV diagnosis. Since that time, HRSA has received several inquiries about whether RWHAP funds follow clients as they move or if the funds stay in the jurisdiction in which the clients were originally diagnosed.

HRSA conducted multiple analyses on the impact the updated HIV surveillance data would have on the RWHAP Part A and B formula award funding after maturation of the CDC

methodology and when all jurisdictions were reporting most recent address to CDC. Now that this transition has been fully realized, to better allocate resources to the jurisdictions where clients currently reside and receive care, HRSA is seeking public comment on this proposed change in methodology and timing.

Proposed Methodology

The funding methodology used to calculate RWHAP Part A and B formula awards would use living HIV and AIDS case data based on most recent address, rather than residence at diagnosis, with a phase-in timeline and use of appropriate action to minimize funding fluctuations.

The methodology for determining RWHAP Part A and B eligibility would remain unchanged.

Proposed Timing of Implementation

The statute requires the use of “distribution factor” but the distribution factor requires only that the data be reported to and confirmed by CDC. Once CDC certifies that the data are sufficiently robust to confirm, HRSA has the authority to accept those data based on the most recent address. It does not, however, have the authority to phase in that change without providing the public with notice and an opportunity to comment.

HRSA determined that using most recent address data without a phased approach would lead to a disruption in

the HIV care and treatment system across RWHAP Part A and Part B jurisdictions as some would experience substantial funding increases or decreases. HRSA is therefore proposing a phased approach over a 5-year period (fiscal year (FY) 2026 to FY 2030) to allow for a gradual transition. Any funding increase or decrease that occurs in year one (FY 2026) as a result of the new methodology will be spread out over a 5-year period (see Tables 1 and 2). This will minimize disruption and ensure that recipients and systems of care have the time and resources to adapt. By gradually phasing in the changes, RWHAP recipients can better manage potential increases or decreases in funding and adjust their resource allocation strategies accordingly.

The RWHAP statute included a phased approach for implementation of a similar change from code-based HIV case surveillance reporting to name-based reporting in prior RWHAP reauthorizations. The statutory language permitted a phased approach to minimize disruption, allow for implementation on the local level, and for CDC verification of data. This prior approach is codified at § 2603(a)(3)(C) of the PHS Act, 42 U.S.C. 300ff-13(a)(3)(C), and § 2618(a)(2)(D) of the PHS Act, 42 U.S.C. 300ff-28(a)(2)(D). HRSA proposes to use the same phased approach as was used in the transition from code-based to name-based HIV reporting and seeks public comment on this proposal.

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED FUTURE PART A TOTAL AWARDS, 5-YEAR TRANSITION
 [Based on the FY 2025 Appropriation, not any future appropriations]

Part A jurisdiction	FY 2025 final	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	Est. % change FY 2025–FY 2030
Atlanta, GA	\$32,339,493	\$32,974,435	\$33,609,378	\$34,244,320	\$34,879,263	\$35,514,205	10
Austin, TX	5,702,606	5,769,180	5,835,753	5,902,327	5,968,900	6,035,474	6
Baltimore, MD	15,660,695	15,631,048	15,601,402	15,571,755	15,542,109	15,512,462	–1
Baton Rouge, LA	4,551,433	4,540,914	4,530,395	4,519,876	4,509,357	4,498,838	–1
Boston, MA	15,183,838	15,195,167	15,206,495	15,217,824	15,229,152	15,240,481	0
Charlotte, NC	6,913,452	6,897,092	6,880,732	6,864,371	6,848,011	6,831,651	–1
Chicago, IL	27,666,573	27,284,549	26,902,525	26,520,500	26,138,476	25,756,452	–7
Cleveland, OH	4,772,432	4,773,163	4,773,894	4,774,625	4,775,356	4,776,087	0
Columbus, OH	5,006,629	4,994,876	4,983,123	4,971,369	4,959,616	4,947,863	–1
Dallas, TX	21,184,061	21,442,742	21,701,423	21,960,103	22,218,784	22,477,465	6
Denver, CO	7,340,580	7,368,672	7,396,764	7,424,857	7,452,949	7,481,041	2
Detroit, MI	10,075,549	9,998,181	9,920,813	9,843,444	9,766,076	9,688,708	–4
Fort Lauderdale, FL	16,023,456	16,393,018	16,762,580	17,132,143	17,501,705	17,871,267	12
Fort Worth, TX	5,547,578	5,642,526	5,737,474	5,832,422	5,927,370	6,022,318	9
Hartford, CT	2,944,998	2,951,034	2,957,070	2,963,107	2,969,143	2,975,179	1
Houston, TX	27,558,403	27,795,071	28,031,740	28,268,408	28,505,077	28,741,745	4
Indianapolis, IN	4,910,030	4,898,222	4,886,414	4,874,605	4,862,797	4,850,989	–1
Jacksonville, FL	6,108,505	6,117,798	6,127,091	6,136,385	6,145,678	6,154,971	1
Kansas City, MO	4,513,410	4,415,080	4,316,750	4,218,421	4,120,091	4,021,761	–11
Las Vegas, NV	7,551,492	7,755,684	7,959,876	8,164,067	8,368,259	8,572,451	14
Los Angeles, CA	46,295,740	45,729,574	45,163,409	44,597,243	44,031,078	43,464,912	–6
Memphis, TN	6,902,702	6,886,126	6,869,550	6,852,973	6,836,397	6,819,821	–1
Miami, FL	26,788,349	26,566,917	26,345,485	26,124,054	25,902,622	25,681,190	–4
Mineola, NY	5,653,528	5,638,727	5,623,925	5,609,124	5,594,322	5,579,521	–1
Minneapolis, MN	6,129,008	6,180,187	6,231,366	6,282,546	6,333,725	6,384,904	4

TABLE 1—ESTIMATED FUTURE PART A TOTAL AWARDS, 5-YEAR TRANSITION—Continued

[Based on the FY 2025 Appropriation, not any future appropriations]

Part A jurisdiction	FY 2025 final	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	Est. % change FY 2025–FY 2030
Nashville, TN	4,443,640	4,432,440	4,421,239	4,410,039	4,398,838	4,387,638	–1
New Brunswick, NJ	2,803,890	2,764,620	2,725,349	2,686,079	2,646,808	2,607,538	–7
New Haven, CT	5,273,601	5,275,392	5,277,183	5,278,974	5,280,765	5,282,556	0
New Orleans, LA	8,058,405	7,911,429	7,764,453	7,617,477	7,470,501	7,323,525	–9
New York, NY	89,662,231	90,053,722	90,445,213	90,836,703	91,228,194	91,619,685	2
Newark, NJ	12,277,381	12,122,018	11,966,656	11,811,293	11,655,931	11,500,568	–6
Norfolk, VA	5,990,787	5,892,750	5,794,712	5,696,675	5,598,637	5,500,600	–8
Oakland, CA	7,360,883	7,304,436	7,247,989	7,191,542	7,135,095	7,078,648	–4
Orlando, FL	10,939,376	11,032,797	11,126,219	11,219,640	11,313,062	11,406,483	4
Paterson, NJ	3,918,044	3,864,059	3,810,075	3,756,090	3,702,106	3,648,121	–7
Philadelphia, PA	22,766,093	22,594,485	22,422,877	22,251,268	22,079,660	21,908,052	–4
Phoenix, AZ	11,049,463	11,194,456	11,339,448	11,484,441	11,629,433	11,774,426	7
Portland, OR	4,088,295	4,182,057	4,275,820	4,369,582	4,463,345	4,557,107	11
Sacramento, CA	3,832,752	3,919,081	4,005,410	4,091,739	4,178,068	4,264,397	11
Saint Louis, MO	6,388,344	6,243,701	6,099,057	5,954,414	5,809,770	5,665,127	–11
San Antonio, TX	6,221,586	6,228,572	6,235,558	6,242,543	6,249,529	6,256,515	1
San Bernardino, CA	9,283,666	9,971,030	10,658,395	11,345,759	12,033,124	12,720,488	37
San Diego, CA	12,325,778	12,221,689	12,117,599	12,013,510	11,909,420	11,805,331	–4
San Francisco, CA	14,841,000	14,267,393	13,693,786	13,120,180	12,546,573	11,972,966	–19
San Jose, CA	3,496,090	3,418,963	3,341,836	3,264,708	3,187,581	3,110,454	–11
San Juan, PR	10,360,633	10,045,103	9,729,573	9,414,043	9,098,513	8,782,983	–15
Santa Ana, CA	6,679,132	6,523,893	6,368,654	6,213,416	6,058,177	5,902,938	–12
Seattle, WA	7,189,780	7,135,849	7,081,919	7,027,988	6,974,058	6,920,127	–4
Secaucus, NJ	4,797,408	4,679,436	4,561,464	4,443,491	4,325,519	4,207,547	–12
Tampa, FL	10,650,266	10,961,615	11,272,965	11,584,314	11,895,664	12,207,013	15
Washington, DC	32,044,482	31,995,758	31,947,034	31,898,309	31,849,585	31,800,861	–1
West Palm Beach, FL ..	7,428,827	7,419,646	7,410,465	7,401,284	7,392,103	7,382,922	–1

TABLE 2—ESTIMATED FUTURE PART B TOTAL AWARDS, 5-YEAR TRANSITION

[Based on the FY 2025 Appropriation, not any future appropriations]

Part B grantee	FY 2025 final*	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	Est. % change FY 2025–FY 2030
Alabama	\$20,126,410	\$19,941,311	\$19,756,212	\$19,571,114	\$19,386,015	\$19,200,916	–5
Alaska	1,057,741	1,055,218	1,052,695	1,050,173	1,047,650	1,045,127	–1
Arizona	17,593,880	17,802,676	18,011,473	18,220,269	18,429,066	18,637,862	6
Arkansas	8,467,112	8,412,595	8,358,077	8,303,560	8,249,042	8,194,525	–3
California	140,896,380	139,520,418	138,144,456	136,768,493	135,392,531	134,016,569	–5
Colorado	13,159,341	13,301,576	13,443,811	13,586,047	13,728,282	13,870,517	5
Connecticut	10,028,100	10,018,521	10,008,941	9,999,362	9,989,782	9,980,203	0
Delaware	4,559,579	4,643,438	4,727,296	4,811,155	4,895,013	4,978,872	9
District of Columbia	15,877,251	15,577,494	15,277,736	14,977,979	14,678,221	14,378,464	–9
Florida	117,953,889	118,297,990	118,642,091	118,986,193	119,330,294	119,674,395	1
Georgia	65,937,492	66,625,016	67,312,540	68,000,063	68,687,587	69,375,111	5
Hawaii	3,352,217	3,285,288	3,218,358	3,151,429	3,084,499	3,017,570	–10
Idaho	1,567,448	1,639,775	1,712,102	1,784,428	1,856,755	1,929,082	23
Illinois	43,632,706	42,894,324	42,155,943	41,417,561	40,679,180	39,940,798	–8
Indiana	14,826,971	14,923,455	15,019,939	15,116,423	15,212,907	15,309,391	3
Iowa	3,671,105	3,783,456	3,895,806	4,008,157	4,120,507	4,232,858	15
Kansas	3,874,733	3,864,859	3,854,986	3,845,112	3,835,239	3,825,365	–1
Kentucky	10,928,564	11,047,437	11,166,309	11,285,182	11,404,054	11,522,927	5
Louisiana	23,907,778	23,576,125	23,244,472	22,912,820	22,581,167	22,249,514	–7
Maine	1,744,812	1,866,696	1,988,579	2,110,463	2,232,346	2,354,230	35
Maryland	31,501,279	31,596,615	31,691,952	31,787,288	31,882,625	31,977,961	2
Massachusetts	20,049,557	20,111,599	20,173,642	20,235,684	20,297,727	20,359,769	2
Michigan	18,646,797	18,494,389	18,341,980	18,189,572	18,037,163	17,884,755	–4
Minnesota	8,739,953	8,871,333	9,002,713	9,134,092	9,265,472	9,396,852	8
Mississippi*	14,270,758	14,037,073	13,803,388	13,569,703	13,336,018	13,102,333	–8
Missouri	13,771,559	13,679,499	13,587,439	13,495,380	13,403,320	13,311,260	–3
Montana	868,081	897,158	926,235	955,311	984,388	1,013,465	17
Nebraska	3,366,792	3,400,072	3,433,352	3,466,632	3,499,912	3,533,192	5
Nevada	10,233,918	10,494,661	10,755,404	11,016,148	11,276,891	11,537,634	13
New Hampshire	1,408,963	1,453,490	1,498,017	1,542,545	1,587,072	1,631,599	16
New Jersey	36,785,442	36,225,650	35,665,857	35,106,065	34,546,272	33,986,480	–8
New Mexico	4,461,845	4,593,522	4,725,199	4,856,877	4,988,554	5,120,231	15
New York	121,693,828	121,502,862	121,311,896	121,120,931	120,929,965	120,738,999	–1

TABLE 2—ESTIMATED FUTURE PART B TOTAL AWARDS, 5-YEAR TRANSITION—Continued
 [Based on the FY 2025 Appropriation, not any future appropriations]

Part B grantee	FY 2025 final*	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	FY 2030	Est. % change FY 2025–FY 2030
North Carolina	36,933,968	37,344,393	37,754,819	38,165,244	38,575,670	38,986,095	6
North Dakota	865,271	870,269	875,267	880,265	885,263	890,261	3
Ohio	25,253,858	25,312,408	25,370,959	25,429,509	25,488,060	25,546,610	1
Oklahoma*	9,505,525	9,559,364	9,613,203	9,667,041	9,720,880	9,774,719	3
Oregon	6,647,795	6,823,869	6,999,943	7,176,016	7,352,090	7,528,164	13
Pennsylvania	41,565,377	42,048,395	42,531,413	43,014,432	43,497,450	43,980,468	6
Puerto Rico	20,773,717	20,155,207	19,536,697	18,918,186	18,299,676	17,681,166	-15
Rhode Island	3,586,062	3,617,595	3,649,129	3,680,662	3,712,196	3,743,729	4
South Carolina	25,101,893	25,026,412	24,950,930	24,875,449	24,799,967	24,724,486	-2
South Dakota	1,018,404	1,028,291	1,038,178	1,048,066	1,057,953	1,067,840	5
Tennessee	19,798,995	19,775,561	19,752,126	19,728,692	19,705,257	19,681,823	-1
Texas	118,321,330	118,926,803	119,532,276	120,137,749	120,743,222	121,348,695	3
Utah	5,084,544	5,130,773	5,177,003	5,223,232	5,269,462	5,315,691	5
Vermont	863,866	895,162	926,459	957,755	989,052	1,020,348	18
Virginia	25,905,308	25,818,054	25,730,801	25,643,547	25,556,294	25,469,040	-2
Washington	15,920,820	16,212,199	16,503,578	16,794,956	17,086,335	17,377,714	9
West Virginia	2,779,989	2,808,260	2,836,530	2,864,801	2,893,071	2,921,342	5
Wisconsin	8,976,297	9,042,676	9,109,055	9,175,435	9,241,814	9,308,193	4
Wyoming	759,202	763,113	767,024	770,936	774,847	778,758	3
Guam	280,781	279,217	277,652	276,088	274,523	272,959	-3
Virgin Islands	966,648	951,454	936,259	921,065	905,870	890,676	-8
American Samoa	50,001	50,004	50,007	50,009	50,012	50,015	0
Marshall Islands	50,702	50,699	50,696	50,694	50,691	50,688	0
Mariana Island	59,834	59,794	59,755	59,715	59,676	59,636	0
Republic of Palau*	56,322	56,297	56,271	56,246	56,220	56,195	0
F. States Micronesia	50,702	50,975	51,247	51,520	51,792	52,065	3

Note: Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Palau FY 2025 amounts are estimates that do not include penalties assessed in FY 2025 and as such do not reflect actual FY 2025 funding amounts.

Thomas J. Engels,
 Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2025–19838 Filed 11–7–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4165–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–6271–N–06]

Final Determination: Adoption of Energy Efficiency Standards for New Construction of HUD- and USDA-Financed Housing; Additional Extension of HUD Compliance Dates

AGENCY: Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
ACTION: Notice; extension of compliance dates.

SUMMARY: On April 26, 2024, HUD and the U.S. Department of Agriculture published the “Final Determination: Adoption of Energy Efficiency Standards for New Construction of HUD- and USDA-Financed Housing” Notice (Final Determination) in the *Federal Register*. The Final Determination provides compliance dates for HUD programs covered by the Final Determination. On March 10, 2025, HUD published a Notice of Extension of Compliance Dates in the

Federal Register for covered projects in the following HUD programs: Federal Housing Administration-Insured (FHA-Insured) Multifamily, FHA-Insured Single Family, Public Housing Capital Fund, and Competitive Grants (Choice Neighborhoods, Section 202, Section 811) and Section 8 Project Based Vouchers (PBV). This notice provides an additional extension of the compliance dates for these programs as specified below.

DATES: Applicable November 10, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bryan Horne, Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, Room 7272, Washington, DC 20410, telephone number 202–402–4270 (this is not a toll-free number). HUD welcomes and is prepared to receive calls from individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing, as well as individuals with speech or communication disabilities. To learn more about how to make an accessible telephone call, please visit: <https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/telecommunications-relay-service-trs>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On April 26, 2024, HUD and the U.S. Department of Agriculture published the Final Determination (89 FR 33112), which adopted the 2021 edition of the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) and the 2019 edition of ANSI/ASHRAE/IES Standard 90.1: Energy Standard for Buildings, Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings (ASHRAE 90.1) as the minimum energy standards for new construction of buildings in programs covered by section 109 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12709), as amended by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) (Pub. L. 110–140).

In Section VI of the Final Determination, the Departments provided Table 32, which lists compliance dates for the updated energy efficiency standards, also available with further guidance for HUD programs at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/minimum-energy-standards/>.

On March 10, 2025, HUD published “Final Determination: Adoption of Energy Efficiency Standards for New Construction of HUD- and USDA-Financed Housing; Extension of HUD Compliance Dates” (90 FR 11622), which extended the compliance dates for the following HUD programs: