

55484, does not appear relevant to this petition as it concerns a failure to meet the illumination ratio requirement for license plate lamps. HFT also contends, relying on language in DOT HS 808 209, “Driver Perception of Just Noticeable Differences of Automotive Signal Lamp Intensities,” that a 25 [percent] deviation from a lighting requirement is imperceptible and thus inconsequential. We reject that argument here, as we have in other recent decisions, because the study does not apply to the noncompliances in question.¹² Here, this study is not applicable to the noncompliance concerning the zones/groups requirements of paragraph S7.1.2.13, Table VII because the study did not evaluate perception of zones or groups. Further, while HFT mentioned that there is no increased risk of glare to approaching drivers for the magnetic trailer lights, the study does not directly address the risk/potential of glare.

NHTSA is not persuaded by HFT’s argument stating that their products were “designed to comply,”¹³ NHTSA’s Final Rule on ADB noted that the “designed to conform” language was a product of the technology available back in 1967, and that NHTSA may not come to the same conclusion if it were to revisit the issue today in light of the fact that lighting equipment design, technology, and manufacturing have evolved and advanced since the late 1960s.¹⁴ Notwithstanding this, due to the petitioner’s lack of root cause analysis, NHTSA cannot ascertain if the noncompliance was a result of poor design, technology, or manufacturing of the subject lamps. In the subject case, the root cause is perhaps moot as NHTSA observes that the petitioners’ own data appears to demonstrate that the subject lamps did not consistently comply with the regulation. Therefore, NHTSA is not persuaded by the petitioner’s arguments that its products were designed to conform.

VI. NHTSA’s Decision

In consideration of the foregoing, NHTSA has decided that HFT has not met its burden of persuasion that the subject FMVSS No. 108 noncompliances

are inconsequential to motor vehicle safety. Accordingly, HFT’s petition is hereby denied and HFT is consequently obligated to provide notification of and free remedy for those noncompliances under 49 U.S.C. 30118 and 30120.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30118, 30120; 49 CFR part 556; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.95 and 501.8)

Eileen Sullivan,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2026–11696 Filed 6–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2026–0859]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Notice and Request for Comment; Petitions for Exemption From the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comments on request for reinstatement with change of a previously approved information collection.

SUMMARY: NHTSA invites public comments about our intention to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to reinstate with a change previously approved information collection. Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it must receive approval from OMB. Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatement of previously approved collections. This document describes a collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval: Petitions for Exemption from the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, 49 CFR part 543. This is a reinstatement with change because it decreases the estimated burden hours. The previously approved information collection estimated 2,094 annual burden hours and this reinstatement estimates 1,828 annual burden hours due to a decrease of the estimated number of exemptions per year.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before August 10, 2026.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by the Docket No. NHTSA–2026–0859 through any of the following methods:

- *Electronic submissions:* Go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- *Fax:* (202) 493–2251.

Mail or Hand Delivery: Docket Management, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Suite W58–213, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except on Federal holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 366–9826 or (202) 366–9317 before arriving. *Instructions:* All submissions must include the agency name and docket number for this notice. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

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 (65 FR 19477–78) or you may visit <https://www.transportation.gov/privacy>.

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. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets via internet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or access to background documents, contact Mr. Walter Lysenko (walter.lysenko@dot.gov). Address: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Mr. Lysenko’s telephone number is (202) 366–1810. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control Number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), before an agency submits a proposed collection of information to OMB for approval, it must first publish a document in the **Federal Register** providing a 60-day comment period and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information. The OMB has

¹² See *Weldon, Denial of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 87 FR 6646 (February 4, 2022); see also *Mack Trucks, Inc., Grant of Petition for Decision of Inconsequential Noncompliance*, 87 FR 23017 (April 18, 2022).

¹³ While HFT’s petition uses the phrase, “designed to comply” and the Final Rule on ADB uses the phrase, “designed to conform,” both phrases are used interchangeably as seen in FMVSS No. 108’s regulatory text.

¹⁴ Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment, Adaptive Driving Beam Headlamps, 87 FR 9916, 9940 n.92 February 22, 2022.

promulgated regulations describing what must be included in such a document. Under OMB's regulation (at 5 CFR 1320.8(d)), an agency must ask for public comment on the following: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) how to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) how to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses. In compliance with these requirements, NHTSA asks for public comments on the following proposed collection of information for which the agency is seeking approval from OMB.

Title: Petitions for Exemption from the Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard (49 CFR part 543).

OMB Control Number: 2127-0542.

Form Number(s): N/A.

Type of Request: Request for approval to reinstate with a change a previously-approved information collection.

Type of Review Requested: Regular.

Requested Expiration Date of Approval: Three years from date of approval.

Summary of Information Collection: 49 U.S.C. Chapter 331 requires the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate a theft prevention standard to provide for the identification of certain motor vehicles and their major replacement parts (parts-marking) to impede motor vehicle theft. Under 49 U.S.C. 33106, manufacturers may petition the Secretary of Transportation (NHTSA by delegation) for an exemption from the parts-marking requirement for a line of passenger motor vehicles equipped with an anti-theft device as standard equipment that the Secretary (NHTSA by delegation) decides is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements. In accordance with the statute, NHTSA promulgated 49 CFR part 543 to provide a process through which manufacturers may seek an exemption from the Theft Prevention Standard. Under these regulations, each manufacturer may request an exemption for one vehicle line per model year.

Under the current Part 543, manufacturers choose how they wish to demonstrate to the agency that the anti-theft device they are installing in a vehicle line meets the requirements for exemption: by either the factors listed in § 543.6 (specific content requirements: detailed lists, data, and explanations) or by the criteria listed in § 543.7 (performance criteria). Section 543.6 requires manufacturer to submit: (1) A statement that an anti-theft device will be installed as standard equipment on all vehicles in the line for which an exemption is sought; (2) a list naming each component in the anti-theft system, and a diagram showing the location of each of those components within the vehicle; (3) a discussion that explains the means and process by which the device is activated and functions, including any aspect of the device designed to facilitate or encourage its activation by motorists, attract attention to the efforts of an unauthorized person to enter or move the vehicle by means other than a key, prevent defeating or circumventing the device by an unauthorized person attempting to enter a vehicle by means other than a key, prevent the operation of a vehicle which an unauthorized person has entered using means other than a key, and ensure the reliability and durability of the device; (4) the reasons for the petitioner's belief that the anti-theft device will be effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft, including any theft data and other data that are available to the petitioner and form the basis for that belief; (5) the reasons for the petitioner's belief that the agency should determine that the anti-theft device is likely to be as effective as compliance with the parts-marking requirements of Part 541 in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft, including any statistical data that are available to the petitioner and form a basis for petitioner's belief that a line of passenger motor vehicles equipped with the anti-theft device is likely to have a theft rate equal to or less than that of passenger motor vehicles of the same, or similar, line which have parts marked in compliance with Part 541.

Section 543.7 requires manufacturers to submit a statement that the entire line of vehicles is equipped with an immobilizer, as standard equipment, that meets one of the following: (1) The performance criteria of (subsections 8 through 21) of C.R.C. c. 1038.114, Theft Protection and Rollaway Prevention (in effect March 30, 2011), as excerpted in appendix A of this part; (2) National Standard of Canada CAN/ULC-S338-98, Automobile Theft Deterrent

Equipment and Systems: Electronic Immobilization (May 1998); (3) United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) Regulation No. 97 (ECE R97), Uniform Provisions Concerning Approval of Vehicle Alarm System (VAS) and Motor Vehicles with Regard to Their Alarm System (AS) in effect August 8, 2007; or (4) UN/ECE Regulation No. 116 (ECE R116), Uniform Technical Prescriptions Concerning the Protection of Motor Vehicles Against Unauthorized Use in effect on February 10, 2009. Manufacturers must also submit documentation to demonstrate that the device conforms with the performance criteria and a statement that the immobilizer device is durable and reliable.

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use of the Information: NHTSA requires this information to make a determination of whether an anti-theft device a manufacturer is installing in a vehicle line is likely to be as effective in reducing and deterring motor vehicle theft as compliance with the parts-marking requirements and therefore meets the requirements for the grant of an exemption from Part 541 parts-marking.

Affected Public: Motor vehicle manufacturers of passenger motor vehicles and light-duty trucks subject to the Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard.

Estimated Number of Respondents: Approximately nine per year.

The number of submissions under Part 543 varies from year to year, because the submission of an exemption petition is voluntary. The Agency's estimation is based on recent history with petitions for exemptions received. Currently, there are approximately 21 vehicle manufacturers that have one or more car lines exempted. NHTSA received 34 petitions for exemption from the parts-marking requirements for MYs 2021-2024 (an average of nine petitions), and six petitions received for the most recent year: five respondents filing under § 543.6 and one respondent filing under § 543.7. We anticipate that the number of petitions received in each of the next three years will be the same as the average number of petitions received for the previous four years. In 2024, there was one petition submitted under § 543.7 and eight submitted under § 543.6 for a total of nine petitions. Because each manufacturer is limited to requesting an exemption for one vehicle line per model year, NHTSA estimates that each petition will be submitted by a different vehicle manufacturer. Therefore, we estimate the total number

of responses and respondents will be nine per year.

Frequency: As needed.

Number of Responses: Approximately nine per year.

Estimated Total Annual Burden

Hours: 1,828 hours per year.

Based on information provided by manufacturers, NHTSA estimates that 226 hours will be required for exemptions requested under § 543.6, and 20 hours for exemptions requested under § 543.7. The agency expects that

nine manufacturers will choose to file for an exemption under § 543.6 and three manufacturers will choose to file for an exemption under § 543.7. The estimated total annual burden hours are shown below:

	Average number of petitions per year	Average time per petition submittal (hrs)	Total annual hours
Preparation and Submittal of Petition for Exemption under § 543.6	8	226	1,808
Preparation and Submittal of Petition for Exemption under § 543.7	1	20	20
Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:			1,828

The labor cost associated with the burden hours for this collection is derived by (1) applying appropriate average hourly labor rate for “Compliance Officers,” Occupation Code 13–1041, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics,[1] (2) dividing by 0.701[2] (70.1%) to obtain the total compensation rate for private industry workers, and (3) multiplying by the estimated labor hours for each exemption type.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Cost: \$0.

NHTSA estimates that there will be no costs to respondents other than costs associated with burden hours.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspects of this information collection, including (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Department’s estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; 49 CFR 1.49; and DOT Order 1351.29A.

Issued on May 12, 2026.

Jane Doherty,

Acting Associate Administrator, Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2026–11651 Filed 6–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

Superfund Tax on Chemical Substances; Request To Modify List of Taxable Substances; Notice of Filing for Methyl Methacrylate-ethyl Methacrylate-methacrylic Acid Copolymer in a Styrene Solution (x=75.76, y=8.46, z=1, s=168.4); Hearing Cancellation

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Cancellation of public hearing on a notice of filing.

SUMMARY: This document cancels a hearing on the notice of filing announcing that a petition has been filed requesting that methyl methacrylate-ethyl methacrylate-methacrylic acid copolymer in a styrene solution ((C₅H₈O₂)_x-(C₆H₁₀O₂)_y-(C₄H₆O₂)_z-(C₈H₈)_s; x=75.76, y=8.46, z=1, s=168.4) be added to the list of taxable substances.

DATES: The hearing scheduled for June 18, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. Eastern Time (ET) is cancelled.

ADDRESSES: See public comments submitted electronically via the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov> by searching IRS and IRS–2025–0599.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martina Greene of the Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure and Administration) at (202) 317–6901 (not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A notice of filing published in the **Federal Register** on January 14, 2026 (91 FR 1599). A notice of public hearing published in the **Federal Register** on May 18, 2026 (91 FR 28759) announced

that a hearing was scheduled for June 18, 2026, at 10 a.m. ET. The subject of the hearing is under public docket number: IRS–2025–0599. The notice of public hearing instructed those interested in testifying to submit a request to testify and an outline of the topics to be addressed by June 4, 2026. We did not receive any requests to testify or outlines of topics. Therefore, the hearing scheduled for June 18, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. ET is cancelled.

Oluwafunmilayo A. Taylor,
Section Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel, (Procedure & Administration).

[FR Doc. 2026–11733 Filed 6–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4831–GV–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[Docket No. VA–2025–VACO–0001]

Privacy Act of 1974; System of Records

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice of a modified system of records.

SUMMARY: As required by the Privacy Act of 1974, notice is hereby given that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is modifying the system of records titled, “Criminal Investigations—VA” (11VA51). The purpose of this system of records is to compile evidence to prove or disprove criminal conduct, identify individual criminal offenders and alleged offenders, and identify witnesses and documents relevant to the investigation of the allegations.

DATES: Comments on this modified system of records must be received no later than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. If no public