

was published in Forensic Science International in 2016 by Mr. Park et al. In the test setup, the vehicle's 12-volt battery was replaced by a programmable test battery. The power supply used in the test was changed from 12 volts to a constantly fluctuating voltage pattern ranging from 7 volts to 14 volts in one cycle that lasted 8.8 seconds. ODI believes this power supply modification does not represent a real-world condition. ODI reviewed five test video files related to this paper. In two road test videos, wide-open throttle position was achieved using the modified power supply setup and certain accelerator pedal positions (34–36% in one test and 50–55% in another test). This caused the vehicle speed to increase. However, when the accelerator pedal was released, the throttle decreased, and when the brake pedal was applied, the vehicle speed decreased rapidly. In summary, ODI does not believe there is evidence of uncontrollable SUA in the tests reviewed.

NHTSA's Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance (OVSC) also reviewed the allegations regarding the potential noncompliance with FMVSS No. 124. Petitioners provided only conclusory information about this issue, and it appeared tied to the assertion that there is SUA occurring in the vehicles. Based on the information provided, the Agency concluded there was insufficient information to warrant investigating a potential noncompliance. Based on the information available as of the time of the agency's decision on the defect petition and full consideration of appropriate factors, NHTSA determined that the petition did not warrant a formal investigation.¹ Therefore, the petition was denied. The denial of this petition does not foreclose the Agency from taking further action if warranted, or the potential for a future finding that a safety-related defect or noncompliance exists based upon additional information the Agency may receive.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30162(d) and 49 CFR part 552; delegation of authority at CFR 1.95(a).²

Eileen Sullivan,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2026–12274 Filed 6–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

¹ NHTSA denied the petition on June 20, 2023. <https://static.nhtsa.gov/odi/inv/2021/INCLA-DP21003-9396.PDF>. NHTSA stated in the closing resume announcing denial of the petition that it would publish a **Federal Register** notice further detailing the reasons for denial of the petition. The publication of this notice was inadvertently delayed.

² The authority to determine whether to approve or deny defect petitions under 49 U.S.C. 30162(d)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0060]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Notice and Request for Comment; Assessment of Contextual Driver Monitoring Systems (DMS); Correction

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

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) published a document in the **Federal Register** of June 10, 2026, concerning request for comments on a request for approval of new information on Assessment of Contextual Driver Monitoring Systems (DMS). The document contained an incorrect Docket number. This document corrects that error in the heading and the **ADDRESSES** section of the notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information, contact Jeffrey Dressel Office of Vehicle Safety Research, Human Factors/Engineering Integration Division NSR–310, West Building, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590; jeffrey.dressel@dot.gov, 202–366–7409.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of June 10, 2026, in FR Doc. 2026–11556, make the following corrections:

1. On page 35296, in the first column, correct the Docket number in the heading to read:

[Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0060].

2. On page 35296, in the second column, correct the **ADDRESSES** section to read:

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Docket No. NHTSA–2025–0060 through any of the following methods:

- **Electronic Submissions**—Go to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <https://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, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through

and 49 CFR part 552 has been further delegated to the Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

Friday, except on Federal holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 366–9322 before coming.

Dated: June 12, 2026.

Cem Hatipoglu,

Associate Administrator, Vehicle Safety Research.

[FR Doc. 2026–12306 Filed 6–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. PHMSA–2026–0529]

Pipeline Safety: Information Collection Activities

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, PHMSA invites comments on proposed revisions to incident, accident, and annual report forms for gas and hazardous liquid (carbon dioxide) pipeline facilities, as well as the National Pipeline Mapping System information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 17, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted in the following ways:

E-Gov Website: www.regulations.gov.

This site allows the public to enter comments on any **Federal Register** notice issued by any agency.

Fax: 1–202–493–2251.

Mail: Docket Management Facility; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

Hand Delivery: Room W12–140 on the ground level of DOT, West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590–0001, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Instructions: Identify the docket number, PHMSA–2026–0529, at the beginning of your comments. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. Anyone can search the electronic form of all comments received into any PHMSA docket by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Therefore,

review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000, (65 FR 19477) or visit www.regulations.gov before submitting any such comments.

Docket: For access to the docket or to read background documents or comments, go to www.regulations.gov at any time, or go to Room W12-140 on the ground level of DOT, West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590-0001, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. If you wish to receive confirmation of receipt of your written comments, please include a self-addressed, stamped postcard with the following statement: "Comments on: PHMSA-2026-0529." The Docket Clerk will date stamp the postcard prior to returning it to you via the U.S. mail. Please note that due to delays in the delivery of U.S. mail to Federal offices in Washington, DC, we recommend that persons consider an alternative method (internet, fax, or professional delivery service) of submitting comments to the docket and ensuring their timely receipt at DOT.

Privacy Act Statement: DOT may solicit comments from the public regarding certain general notices. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to www.regulations.gov, as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL-14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at www.dot.gov/privacy.

Confidential Business Information: Confidential Business Information (CBI) is commercial or financial information that is treated both customarily and actually as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA; 5 U.S.C. 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. If your comments responsive to this notice contain commercial or financial information that is treated customarily as private, that you actually treat as private, and that is relevant or responsive to this notice, it is important that you clearly designate the submitted comments as CBI. Pursuant to 49 CFR 190.343, you may ask PHMSA to give confidential treatment to information you give to the Agency by taking the following steps: (1) mark each page of the original document submission containing CBI as "Confidential;" (2) send PHMSA, along with the original document, a second copy of the original document with the CBI deleted; and (3) explain why the information you are submitting is CBI. Unless you are notified otherwise, PHMSA will treat such marked submissions as confidential under FOIA, and they will

not be placed in the public docket of this notice. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Angela Hill, U. S. Department of Transportation, PHMSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, PHP-30, Washington, DC 20590-0001. Any commentary PHMSA receives that is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket for this matter.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela Hill by email at angela.hill@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d), PHMSA provides interested members of the public and affected entities an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests. This notice identifies proposed changes to Form PHMSA F 7100.1-1, "Annual Report for Gas Distribution System," under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control No. 2137-0629; Form PHMSA F 7100.2-1, "Annual Report for Natural and Other Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems," and Form PHMSA F 7100.3-1, "Annual Report for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Facilities," under OMB Control No. 2137-0522; Form PHMSA F 7000-1.1, "Annual Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems," under OMB Control No. 2137-0614; the National Pipeline Mapping System, under OMB Control No. 2137-0596; Form PHMSA F 7000-1, "Accident Report—Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems," under OMB Control No. 2137-0047; Form PHMSA F 7100.1, "Incident Report—Gas Distribution System," under OMB Control No. 2137-0635, and Form PHMSA F 7100.2, "Incident Report—Gas Transmission, Gas Gathering, and Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities," under OMB Control No. 2137-0635. PHMSA intends to submit these revision requests to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for formal approval.

At a public meeting in September 2025 (90 FR 36281), PHMSA heard suggestions for changes to information collection reporting requirements for pipeline operators. Subsequently, PHMSA reviewed reporting requirements with stakeholders and noted areas of duplicative reporting, instances where the instructions need clarification, and data requests not directly related to safety.

Collectively, all proposed changes are intended to improve pipeline safety by updating PHMSA's information collection program. By ensuring that

appropriate information is collected, these proposed changes will enhance PHMSA and stakeholder opportunities to make risk-based, data-driven decisions to improve safety.

PHMSA should collect only necessary information that is used directly to develop safety analysis. By collecting too much information without clear explanation, data sets can be corrupted with variable levels of detail that do not help PHMSA and stakeholders to make accurate assessments about safety.

The remainder of this notice describes each proposed information collection change and the rationale for proposing the change.

A. Annual and Incident Reports for Gas Distribution Pipeline Systems

Form PHMSA F 7100.1-1 Annual Report for Gas Distribution System (2137-0629)

In Part B, Question 1, operators report the total mileage of mains and the number of services categorized by pipe material. Currently, Part B Questions 2 and 3 require this same data to be further broken down by pipe diameter. Because diameter is not a significant contributor affecting the risk to the integrity of most gas distribution lines (excluding cast- and wrought-iron), PHMSA proposes to eliminate these unnecessary diameter-based breakdowns. Operators would report cast- and wrought-iron pipelines six inches or less in diameter and two types of plastic with poor material properties: polyvinyl chloride (PVC) and acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene (ABS). Under the new proposal, Part B Questions 2 and 3 will be simplified to focus only on high-risk materials.

While polyethylene (PE) plastic pipe is considered one of the most modern plastic gas pipeline materials, a subset of PE plastic pipe is known to be susceptible to brittle-like failure ("PE Brittle-Like"). PHMSA has published multiple advisory bulletins since 1999 listing "PE Brittle-Like" materials and now proposes collecting data for these materials in Part B. PHMSA proposes changing the annual report instructions to define "PE Brittle-Like" materials using the list of materials in its most recent bulletin: Advisory Bulletin 07-01 (72 FR 51301; Sep. 6, 2007). PHMSA proposes to add to its annual reporting requirements the mileage of "PE Brittle-Like" distribution mains and services, and the number of "PE Brittle-Like" fittings installed on pipelines that are not "PE Brittle-Like."

In Part G, operators report the percentage of unaccounted for gas over a one-year period. Unaccounted for gas

is a financial accounting consideration for ratemaking purposes rather than a meaningful indicator of pipeline integrity; although it is intended to provide some accounting for gas losses caused by measurement error and leaks, it is widely understood to be a poor measure of actual gas losses. Additional details about unaccounted for gas are available in a 2017 PHMSA Report to Congress.¹ However, many pipeline safety stakeholders incorrectly assume all the unaccounted for gas has leaked from the pipeline system. Since the relationship between unaccounted for gas and leaks is not known, the percentage of unaccounted for gas is not directly related to safety. Also, the Energy Information Administration already collects unaccounted for gas data from pipeline companies in its annual report. PHMSA proposes removing and reserving Part G of the PHMSA gas distribution annual report.

In Part I, operators report the preparer of the report. However, the intent is to receive the name and contact information for the person most knowledgeable about the report or the person to be contacted for more information. The title of Part I is "PREPARER," which may be different from the person most knowledgeable about the report. PHMSA proposes changing the title of Part I from "PREPARER" to "CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS" to match the instructions for selecting the person.

Form PHMSA F 7100.1, Incident Report for Gas Distribution System (2137–0635)

PHMSA reviewed Form F 7100.1 to reduce operator burden while maintaining the data necessary to analyze incidents effectively. PHMSA proposes the following revisions to streamline operator reporting while preserving essential incident oversight.

PHMSA proposes removing Questions A4a and A4b (Time Zone and Daylight Savings) and A5e (Zip Code). Since local time and GPS coordinates already provide this data, these fields are unnecessary. Additionally, Question A17 (Local Time of Confirmed Discovery Time) will be moved immediately following Question A4 to create a more logical, chronological flow of the incident timeline.

To modernize its data collection, PHMSA proposes amending Question A6 to replace "Landfill gas" with "Biogas" to reflect the broader range of biogas generation options released.

PHMSA proposes to amend Questions A9a through A9f to eliminate fatality sub-categories that have proven unnecessary for incident analysis. PHMSA has determined that the distinctions currently required in A9b through A9d are not directly safety related, are too granular, and should be struck. The revised framework will aggregate data into three primary fields: A9a (Operator/Contractor personnel), A9e (Public), and A9f (Total fatalities). This update maintains the integrity of consequence tracking while reducing the administrative burden on operators.

PHMSA proposes to amend Questions A10a through A10f to eliminate injury sub-categories that have proven unnecessary for incident analysis. PHMSA has determined that the distinctions in Questions A10b through A10d are not directly safety related, are too granular, and should be struck. The revised framework will aggregate data into three primary fields: A10a (Operator/Contractor personnel), A10e (Public), and A10f (Total injuries). This shift maintains the integrity of consequence tracking while reducing the complexity of the reporting process.

PHMSA proposes to strike Question A11a from the incident report. PHMSA has determined that the distinction between operator and contractor personnel regarding the initial notification of a failure lacks investigative utility. Its removal ensures the form remains focused on data essential for understanding the incident.

PHMSA proposes the removal of Questions A13 through A15 regarding emergency responder notifications. Should notification data become necessary, it will be addressed through case-specific investigations rather than standard reporting.

PHMSA proposes to strike Questions A18 and A19a from the incident report. PHMSA has determined that requiring operators to provide National Response Center (NRC) timestamps and additional report numbers is duplicative, as this information is natively captured in each NRC report. By leveraging existing internal data collection systems to retrieve these details, PHMSA can reduce the operator's reporting burden without losing any oversight or analytical capabilities.

PHMSA proposes to amend A21 to improve the quality and reliability of incident data. By eliminating Questions A21b and A21c, PHMSA removes reporting requirements for extinguishment methods and speculative fire-consumed volumes, neither of which contributes significantly to understanding the incident. PHMSA also proposes to

remove Question A21d as inquiry regarding whether gas exploded is not necessary for incident evaluation. Correspondingly, the instructional language for Question A21 will be removed.

PHMSA proposes adding Question A22b, requiring operators to record the specific local time that gas flow was stopped following an incident. This data is essential for determining the total duration of the release and accurately assessing the overall extent and severity of the event.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question B1, which requires operators to indicate whether an incident occurred on Federal land. Because this information can be determined using the precise longitude and latitude coordinates provided in Question A5f, the manual entry in Question B1 is redundant and unnecessary.

PHMSA proposes updating Question B3 to include a new sub-category for incident locations. To capture more precise data on transition areas, PHMSA will add "Casing" as a selectable option under the "Transition Area" category. This modification ensures that failures occurring within cased crossings are identified and tracked accurately.

PHMSA proposes amending Question B4 to remove the requirement for reporting the name and approximate depth of water crossings at incident sites. This change is intended to eliminate redundancy, as the specific body of water already can be identified using the geographic coordinates provided in Question A5f. Furthermore, PHMSA has determined that water depth is not a necessary data point for incident evaluation.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question C4a, which requires operators to report the seam type for steel pipelines. Because gas distribution systems operate at stress levels below 20 percent of the pipe's specified minimum yield strength (SMYS) and are not susceptible to seam failure threats, seam types are not a useful safety metric for evaluating gas distribution incidents. Additionally, PHMSA proposes to update Question C4c by adding "Adyl-A" to the list of plastic piping materials, ensuring the form captures a more comprehensive range of legacy and modern materials.

PHMSA proposes to rename Question D2 from "Estimated Property Damage" to "Estimated Cost of Incident" to reflect the data being collected more accurately and reduce operator confusion. Additionally, PHMSA proposes removing Questions D2f through D2i, which require the estimated cost of released gas. Because gas cost estimations are highly variable

¹ <https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/sites/phmsa.dot.gov/files/docs/news/17986/report-congress-lost-and-unaccounted-natural-gas-metrics-may-2017.pdf>.

and do not provide a reliable or repeatable metric for analysis, their removal will improve the overall integrity of the incident's financial data.

PHMSA proposes eliminating Questions D4 and D5, which currently require operators to report data on non-overnight hospitalizations and treatments administered by Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs). Because operators are not always notified of less severe injuries, the resulting data is often inconsistent and inaccurate. By removing these fields, PHMSA aims to improve the overall reliability and quality of the incident data set by focusing exclusively on verifiable, significant injuries.

PHMSA proposes to relocate the field for reporting the estimated number of public evacuations from Part A22 to a redesignated D4. Because this data represents a direct impact on the community, it is suited better for the section of the form dedicated to incident consequences rather than general information.

PHMSA proposes to remove Part E3a, which requires operators to provide the method used to establish the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP). 49 CFR 192.619(f) explicitly requires operators to make and retain records establishing the MAOP for the life of the pipeline. As this information is subject to both PHMSA and State inspection, PHMSA seeks to eliminate this data field to streamline the reporting process.

PHMSA proposes to remove Part E4, which asks operators to specify whether the pipeline pressure exceeded the MAOP during the incident. Because this determination can be made readily using the pressure data provided in Questions E1 and E3 within this section, PHMSA seeks to eliminate this redundant reporting requirement.

PHMSA proposes to remove Part E5, which requires operators to describe the odorization equipment used. PHMSA has determined this field is unnecessary for incident analysis.

PHMSA also proposes to strike Part E8 to eliminate regulatory redundancies. The requirement for operators to investigate whether controller or control-room issues contributed to an incident is established in 49 CFR 192.631(g)(1). As such, PHMSA has determined that a separate reporting field for this mandatory action is not needed.

PHMSA proposes to amend Question G1 to strengthen the evidentiary record for external corrosion failures. The form will request the stray current density (mA/cm²) and cathodic protection potentials as PHMSA seeks to evaluate the efficacy of corrosion mitigation

strategies. Furthermore, the removal of the "Other" category and the clarification of inhibitor application in Question 11 will eliminate reporting inconsistencies. Finally, the addition of Question 13a regarding corrosion coupon placement will facilitate a more accurate assessment of an operator's monitoring program relative to the failure cause.

PHMSA proposes to amend Question G2 to eliminate ambiguity in the reporting of natural force damage. PHMSA proposes to expand the choices of natural force damage to include those caused by animals. PHMSA also proposes to expand the sub-causes for earth movement to include options for soil creep and whether the movement was monitored prior to the incident. PHMSA proposes to add sub choices to describe the high winds that cause incidents to include straight winds, hurricane/tropical storm, tornado or other. PHMSA proposes to provide additional choices to describe incidents that are caused by extreme weather events by adding options for wildfire, straight winds, and heavy snowstorms.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G3, Question 3b, by removing the phrase "per the primary Incident Investigator report." This edit clarifies the requirement for operators to identify whether an excavator was exempt from one-call notification, eliminating confusion regarding the source of that determination and streamlining the reporting process.

PHMSA proposes to remove Questions 7, 8, and 9 from Part G4, which currently require operators to report excavator citations, vehicle control, and estimated speed information. Because these traffic-related details are extraneous to an analysis of a pipeline incident, PHMSA seeks to eliminate them. PHMSA proposes adding "Heavy Equipment" as a selectable option in Question 10 to better capture data on incidents involving agricultural or other non-excavating machinery.

PHMSA proposes adding Question 6 to Part G6, requiring operators to provide a detailed description of the failed equipment and the specific nature of the failure. This addition is essential for PHMSA to identify accurately how mechanical or equipment malfunctions served as a primary or contributing cause of the incident.

In Part J, operators provide information on additional factors that may have contributed to an incident. Currently, the options in Part J overlap with those in Part G, causing data entry confusion, redundancy, and inconsistency. To resolve this, PHMSA

proposes replacing the current options with the following distinct categories:

- Communication/Planning/Hazard Assessment
- Construction Practices
- Control Room Operations
- Data Integration
- Design
- Distracted Employee
- Excavation Practices
- Human Error Other
- Integrity Assessment Methods
- Integrity Threat Identification
- Leak Detection
- Manufacturing Defect
- Maps/Records
- Preventative Maintenance
- Procedures—Incorrect
- Procedures—Not Developed
- Procedures—Not Followed
- Repair/Maintenance Work
- Not Yet Determined
- Undefined
- Unknown
- Software Logic
- Training

Operators will be required to select all that apply, providing PHMSA with a holistic view of the contributing factors that led to the incident. PHMSA anticipates that these revisions will streamline the reporting process, resulting in a reduced reporting burden for operators.

B. Annual and Incident Reports for Natural and Other Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems

Form PHMSA F 7100.2-1 Annual Report for Natural and Other Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems (2137-0522)

In Part C, certain gas transmission operators are required to submit the volume of gas transported during the calendar year. PHMSA does not consider the aggregate volume of gas transported across a transmission system to be a pertinent indicator of the safety of those lines. In addition, reporting in Part C is not required for a transmission line operated by a gas distribution company as an integral part of its distribution pipeline system. Interstate natural gas transmission operators are already required by 18 CFR 260.1 to report volume transported to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on either FERC Form 2 or FERC Form 2A. The Energy Information Administration (EIA) aggregates the FERC volume transported data into more user-friendly summaries. Since natural gas volume transported is being reported to FERC and the data is available to the public through the EIA, PHMSA proposes removing and reserving Part C from the annual report.

In Part F, gas transmission pipeline operators report the number of anomalies identified and repaired for various pipeline inspection methods. The term “anomaly” is not defined in Federal pipeline safety regulations, but the term generally is used in the regulations to refer to a deviation or an indication of a deviation from otherwise sound material where more investigation is required. Gas transmission pipeline operators also report in Part F the number of conditions repaired. Federal pipeline safety regulations identify types of conditions both inside and outside of high consequence areas (HCAs), and a single condition may include one anomaly or many anomalies. Since operators already report the number of conditions repaired, PHMSA proposes removing the number of anomalies reported from all sections of Part F, including the number of anomalies an operator excavates in a given calendar year; the total number of anomalies an operator repairs based on each assessment method; and the number of anomalies repaired or eliminated by pipe replacement based on the class location or HCA designation of the location of the anomaly.

Currently, gas transmission pipeline operators submit pipeline diameter data to PHMSA in two places: in Part H of the annual report and as an attribute in the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS). PHMSA proposes to remove Part H from the annual report to eliminate duplicative reporting. PHMSA would use NPMS submissions to generate tabular pipeline diameter data in the format currently used for the annual report diameter data. PHMSA would include this tabular diameter data, sourced from NPMS submittals, with the public website data to ensure continued stakeholder access.

In Part Q, gas transmission pipeline operators report miles of pipe by MAOP determination method. Part Q has two sections: miles with MAOP determined under 49 CFR 192.619, and miles with MAOP reconfirmed under 49 CFR 192.624. PHMSA proposes modifying the instructions by explaining the proper timing for moving miles of pipe in Part Q from the 49 CFR 192.619 portion to the 49 CFR 192.624 portion as operators implement MAOP reconfirmation.

Recently, PHMSA modified the pipeline safety regulations to allow gas transmission operators to confirm or restore the MAOP of eligible Class 3 pipeline segments by implementing requirements in 49 CFR 192.611(a)(4). In the rulemaking, PHMSA did not take any information collection action for the

miles of pipeline with MAOP confirmed or restored under the new regulation. Since PHMSA expects significant cost savings and safety improvements from the implementation of the new regulation, PHMSA proposes to collect the miles of these pipes in the annual report. Specifically, PHMSA proposes modifying Part K by requiring gas transmission operators to report the number of miles of pipe in eligible Class 3 segments with MAOP confirmed or restored pursuant to 49 CFR 192.624(a)(4).

Form PHMSA 7100.2, Incident Report for Gas Transmission, Gas Gathering, and Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities (2137–0635)

PHMSA reviewed the incident report for Gas Transmission, Gathering and Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities (PHMSA F 7100.2) to reduce operator burden while ensuring the agency maintains the necessary data to understand and analyze pipeline incidents. PHMSA proposes the following revisions to streamline the reporting requirements without compromising the Agency’s ability to conduct thorough incident investigations.

PHMSA proposes removing Questions A4a and A4b (Time Zone and Daylight Savings status) as this information is redundant given the local time and coordinates already provided. To improve the event timeline, PHMSA proposes moving Question A19 (Local Time of Confirmed Discovery) to immediately follow Question A4.

To modernize its data collection, PHMSA proposes amending Question A6 to replace “Landfill gas” with “Biogas” to reflect the broader range of biogas generation options released.

PHMSA proposes streamlining fatality (Question A10) and injury (Question A11) reporting by removing subcategories b through d. The revised fields will focus on two primary groups: (1) Operator/Contractor Employees and (2) the Public, followed by a total count. The current subcategories are too granular and are not necessary for incident analysis. PHMSA proposes removing the distinction between employees and contractors in the initial failure indication (Question A12a) and the requirement to report facility restart times (Question A16b), as neither data point is necessary for an incident analysis.

PHMSA proposes to remove Questions A17a through A17c regarding emergency responder notifications. Should notification data become necessary for consequence analysis, it will be addressed through case-specific

investigations rather than standard reporting.

PHMSA proposes removing Questions A20a (NRC report times) and A20c (NRC supplemental numbers) since PHMSA’s Work Management System (WMS) automatically collects this information when NRC reports are sent to PHMSA by the National Response Center. PHMSA also proposes removing Questions A21b (extinguishment method), A21c (estimated volume consumed by fire), and A21d (whether an explosion occurred). Reporting requirements for extinguishment methods, fire-consumed volume, and whether an explosion occurred are not necessary for incident evaluation, and fire-consumed volume estimates are often speculative.

PHMSA proposes to remove Questions A22a and A22d regarding flow control methods. Because “operational control” rarely is utilized as a reporting category, PHMSA seeks to simplify this section by focusing Questions A22b and A22e exclusively on the final upstream and downstream valve closures.

PHMSA proposes removing the fields for zip code in Question B3 and Federal Land Status in Question B8 because operators provide precise latitude and longitude in Question A5.

PHMSA proposes amending Question B11 to remove the requirement for reporting the name and approximate depth of water crossings at incident sites. This change is intended to eliminate redundancy, as the specific body of water can be identified using the geographic coordinates provided in Question A5. Furthermore, PHMSA has determined that water depth is not a necessary data point for incident evaluation.

PHMSA proposes adding “Casing” as an option under “Transition Area” in Question B10 to better track failures in these segments.

PHMSA proposes removing the specific field for “puddle or spot welds” in Question C3 due to infrequent use.

To better assess deterioration, PHMSA proposes modifying the data collected in Question C3h and C3r for field and factory coatings to instead ask for a percentage of bonded coating.

PHMSA proposes adding a field for the component manufacturer alongside the fields for the year of installation in Question C4 and year of manufacturing in Question C5, as identifying the maker is critical to understanding mechanical causes.

PHMSA proposes removing Question D2a (HCA identification method) as it is irrelevant to the evaluation of an incident. Question D3 (Potential Impact

Radius) will now be auto filled based on existing data to reduce manual entry errors.

PHMSA proposes changing “Estimated Property Damage” to “Estimated Cost of Incident” for clarity. PHMSA proposes to remove Questions D7f through D7i regarding the cost of released gas as wide fluctuations in the price of commodities do not allow for a normalized comparison when comparing the data submitted.

PHMSA proposes eliminating Questions D8 and D9, which currently require operators to report data on non-overnight hospitalizations and treatments administered by EMTs. Because operators are not always notified of less severe injuries, the resulting data is often inconsistent and inaccurate. By removing these fields, PHMSA aims to improve the overall reliability and quality of the incident data set by focusing exclusively on verifiable, significant injuries.

PHMSA proposes to relocate the data on public evacuation in Question A23 to follow Question D10 to group it with other consequences. PHMSA proposes removing Question D12a regarding Wildlife impacts and Question D13b regarding MCA/PIR contents as they are not necessary for an incident analysis.

PHMSA proposes removing Questions E1a (Gas flow rate), E2a/E2c (MAOP calculation methods), and E3 (Exceedance of MAOP). These metrics are readily calculated from Questions E1 and E2 and are better reviewed during formal inspections.

PHMSA proposes removing fields regarding odorization (Question E5), reasons for non-pigability (Question E7), inspection complications (Question E8), and control room investigations (Question E11). These are compliance or operational details that are not necessary for an incident analysis. In addition, the requirement for operators to investigate whether controller or control-room issues contributed to an incident is established in 49 CFR 192.631(g)(1). As such, PHMSA has determined that a separate reporting field for this mandatory action is not needed.

PHMSA proposes adding stray current density (mA/cm²), CP criteria, and “on/off” potentials to Part E to improve the analysis of corrosion-related failures. The “Other” option in Question 8 will be removed to ensure causes are identified through metallurgical or field analysis. Additionally, a “Low Flow/Intermittent Flow” option will be added to Question 9, and Question 10 will be clarified to focus on inhibitors intended to protect the specific failure site.

PHMSA is expanding Part G2 to better capture environmental factors and improve data granularity. The revisions clarify earth movement by adding “settlement” and “soil creep,” and identifying whether the site was monitored before the incident. Weather reporting is refined similarly; high winds now include subcategories for straight winds, tornadoes, and hurricanes, while the heavy rain section now includes erosion. Additionally, the proposal adds “animal” as a sub-cause for natural force damage and expands extreme weather options to include wildfires and heavy snowstorms.

PHMSA proposes removing extraneous details of vehicle speed, vehicle control, and driver citations not necessary for incident analysis (Part G4, Questions 5–7). PHMSA proposes adding a “Heavy Equipment” category to better track incidents involving agricultural or other non-excavating machinery. Part G6, Question 7, is a new addition requiring a description of how the equipment failed.

PHMSA proposes adding Inertial Measurement Units (IMU) to technology options in Part J and adding Part J1aa to track whether prior anomalies were identified at the failure site. Means of propulsion and supplemental non-destructive examination (NDE) details in Part J4a will be removed, and the “since 2002” date restriction on NDE history will be deleted to capture the full life cycle of the pipe.

In Part K, operators provide information on additional factors that may have contributed to an incident. Currently, the options in Part K overlap with those in Part G, causing data entry confusion, redundancy, and inconsistency. To resolve this, PHMSA proposes replacing the current options with the following distinct categories:

- Communication/Planning/Hazard Assessment
- Construction Practices
- Control Room Operations
- Data Integration
- Design
- Distracted Employee
- Excavation Practices
- Human Error Other
- Integrity Assessment Methods
- Integrity Threat Identification
- Leak Detection
- Manufacturing Defect
- Maps/Records
- Preventative Maintenance
- Procedures—Incorrect
- Procedures—Not Developed
- Procedures—Not Followed
- Repair/Maintenance Work
- Not Yet Determined
- Undefined

- Unknown
- Software Logic
- Training

Operators will be required to select all that apply, providing PHMSA with a holistic view of the contributing factors that led to the incident.

C. Annual and Accident Reports for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems

Form PHMSA F 7000–1.1, Annual Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems (2137–0614)

Currently, operators submit pipeline diameter data to PHMSA in two places: in Part H of the annual report and as an attribute in NPMS. PHMSA proposes to remove Part H from the annual report to eliminate duplicative reporting. PHMSA would use NPMS submissions to generate tabular pipeline diameter data in the format currently used for the annual report diameter data. PHMSA would include this tabular diameter data, sourced from NPMS submittals, with its public website data to ensure continued stakeholder access.

In Part F, operators report the number of anomalies identified and repaired for various pipeline inspection methods. The term “anomaly” is not defined in Federal pipeline safety regulations, but the term is used generally in the regulations to refer to a deviation or an indication of a deviation from otherwise sound material where more investigation is required. In Part F, operators also report the number of conditions repaired. Federal pipeline safety regulations identify types of conditions both inside and outside of HCAs. A single condition may include one anomaly or many anomalies. Since operators already report the number of conditions repaired, PHMSA proposes removing the number of anomalies reported from all sections of Part F, including the number of anomalies an operator excavates in a given calendar year; the total number of anomalies an operator repairs based on each assessment method; and the number of anomalies repaired or eliminated by pipe replacement based on the HCA designation of the location of the anomaly.

Liquid pipeline operators currently report breakout tank data in Part M of the annual report and submit breakout tank geographic location and certain attributes to NPMS. In the annual report, operators must designate each breakout tank as interstate or intrastate. NPMS data does not include an attribute indicating whether a breakout tank is interstate or intrastate. PHMSA proposes to eliminate duplicative

reporting by adding this attribute to the information operators submit to NPMS and removing and reserving Part M from the annual report.

Form PHMSA F 7000–1, Accident Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems (2137–0047)

PHMSA reviewed the Hazardous Liquid Accident Report (Form F 7000–1) to reduce operator burden while ensuring the Agency maintains the data necessary to understand and analyze accidents and accident trends. PHMSA proposes the following revisions to streamline the reporting requirements without compromising the ability to learn about accidents and conduct accident trend analysis.

PHMSA proposes to remove the Time Zone indicator in Question A4a and the Daylight Savings Time indicator in Question A4b. Because local time and coordinates are already captured in Questions A4 and A5, this specific field is redundant for establishing the incident timeline.

PHMSA proposes to simplify fatality reporting in Questions A10a through A10f by removing the granular categories in fields A10b through A10d that do not contribute to an accident analysis. The modified section will consolidate data into three essential fields: Operator and Contractor employees (A10a), the Public (A10e), and Total Fatalities (A10f).

PHMSA proposes to amend Questions A11a through A11f to remove injury categories that are not pertinent to the evaluation of an accident. Under this proposal, Questions A11b through A11d would be deleted, and Question A11e would be modified to ensure the form captures only three data points: Operator and Contractor Personnel, the Public, and the total sum of injuries.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question A12a, which requires operators to distinguish between employees and contractors when identifying the initial indication of failure. This distinction is unnecessary for an accident analysis.

In Question A17b, operators are asked to record the local time that a pipeline or facility was restarted following a failure. Because this information is not necessary for the accident analysis, PHMSA proposes to remove Question A17b.

PHMSA proposes the removal of Questions A18a through A18c regarding emergency responder notifications. Should notification data become necessary for consequence analysis, it will be addressed through case-specific investigations rather than standard reporting.

PHMSA proposes moving the “time of confirmed discovery” field in Question A20 to immediately follow Question A4. Relocating this data point will create a more logical and chronological timeline for the accident.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question A21a, which requires the local time of initial reports to the National Response Center (NRC). Because this information is already captured in the NRC report itself, which is available to PHMSA, its inclusion in this form is redundant.

PHMSA proposes eliminating Question A21c because supplemental NRC report numbers are already tracked within PHMSA’s internal systems, making manual entry by the operator unnecessary.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question A22b, which requires operators to identify the methods used to extinguish a fire. This information is not relevant to the accident analysis.

PHMSA proposes deleting Part A22c. PHMSA already captures the total quantity of the commodity released in A7. The volume of a released commodity consumed by fire is a subset of this volume and can be difficult to quantify accurately. The estimates can be speculative and do not contribute to the accident analysis, so PHMSA seeks to reduce this reporting burden.

PHMSA proposes to delete Question A22d. Removing this specific explosion indicator simplifies the form and eliminates a point of frequent reporting ambiguity.

PHMSA proposes to remove Questions A23a and A23d regarding flow control methods. From 2010 to 2025, 0.47 percent of reports submitted had operators selecting “operational control” for using valves to isolate. Because “operational control” is utilized rarely as a reporting category, PHMSA seeks to simplify this section by focusing Questions A23b and A23e exclusively on the final upstream and downstream valve closures.

PHMSA proposes to delete Questions A24a, A24b, and A24d. As the essential details concerning spill response notifications and resource activations are addressed in Questions A24c and A24e, removing these requirements reduce unnecessary reporting burden for operators.

PHMSA proposes removing Question B4. Since the longitude and latitude data in Question A4 provide a more exact location for the accident or incident than a zip code, PHMSA has determined that Question B4 is an unnecessary reporting requirement.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question B9, which asks whether an accident occurred on Federal land. This

information is redundant, as the incident location is precisely identified by the coordinates provided in Question A5.

PHMSA proposes amending Question B12 to remove the requirement for reporting the name and approximate depth of water crossings at incident sites. This change is intended to eliminate redundancy, as the specific body of water can be identified using the geographic coordinates provided in Question A5. Furthermore, PHMSA has determined that water depth is not a necessary data point for incident evaluation.

PHMSA proposes to amend Question C3 to delete the requirement for identifying puddle or spot welds. In 2010, PHMSA initiated the collection of C3. Between 2010 and 2025, “puddle/spot weld” was not a chosen specification in any submitted reports. PHMSA has determined that its removal will streamline the report without compromising data quality.

To better assess the condition of all coating types, PHMSA proposes modifying Questions C3h and C3o to request a bonded coating percentage rather than simply identifying if field coating was applied.

PHMSA proposes amending Question C4 to require the identification of the pipe manufacturer in addition to installation and manufacturing dates. Given that the manufacturer is a key variable in failure investigations, this modification ensures that all relevant production data is captured for accident analysis.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question D1a, which requires operators to specify the type of wildlife impact resulting from an accident. PHMSA has determined that this information is not necessary for incident analysis.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question D3, which asks operators to indicate if a long-term impact assessment is planned or underway. Because environmental remediation and assessments generally fall outside of the scope of PHMSA’s accident analysis and are overseen by local, State, Tribal or Federal environmental agencies, PHMSA has determined that removing these fields will streamline reporting by eliminating overlapping reporting with other agencies. For the same reasons, PHMSA proposes to delete Questions D4 and D4a regarding environmental remediation.

PHMSA proposes to remove Question D5c, which requires the name of the body of water impacted by an accident. This information is redundant, as the location is identified precisely by the coordinates provided in Question A4.

PHMSA proposes eliminating Questions D9 and D10, which currently require operators to report data on non-overnight hospitalizations and treatments administered by EMTs. Because operators are not always notified of less severe injuries, the resulting data is often inconsistent and inaccurate. By removing these fields, PHMSA aims to improve the overall reliability and quality of the incident data set by focusing exclusively on verifiable, significant injuries.

PHMSA proposes moving Question A23, which requires an estimated number of public evacuations, to a new location just above Question D10. This change ensures that evacuation data is grouped more logically within the section of the form dedicated to accident consequences.

PHMSA proposes eliminating Questions E2a, E2c, and E2d to reduce duplicative reporting. 49 CFR 195.404(a)(3) requires operators to maintain records of maximum operating pressure (MOP) that satisfy this requirement and are subject to PHMSA inspection and post-accident investigations.

PHMSA proposes deleting Question E3. As the relationship between operating pressure and MOP is calculable from other data points captured in this section, removing this field eliminates a duplicative requirement and streamlines the reporting process.

PHMSA proposes deleting a portion of Question E6 and E7. PHMSA has determined that the reasoning behind a pipeline's inability to accommodate internal inspection tools, as well as any associated operational complications, is not necessary for accident evaluation. Removing these fields streamlines the form without compromising safety data. PHMSA has elected to retain the overall Question of whether the pipeline could accommodate internal inspection tools.

PHMSA proposes eliminating Question E11 because internal investigations into controller or control room issues are a regulatory requirement under 49 CFR 195.446, making this field unnecessary.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G1, Question 2c, to include a field for stray current density, measured in mA/cm². By capturing this specific metric, PHMSA can better evaluate the magnitude of stray currents and their contribution to pipeline failures.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G1, Question 4c, to include fields for cathodic protection criteria and "on" and "off" potentials. Given that external corrosion is a primary driver of pipeline failures, capturing this specific

performance data will enhance PHMSA's ability to assess the adequacy of corrosion control at the time of an incident.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G1, Question 8, by removing "Other" as a selectable cause for corrosion. Given that a definitive determination of corrosion requires rigorous field examination or metallurgical analysis, PHMSA seeks to improve data quality by requiring operators to select from verified technical categories.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G1, Question 9 to include "Low Flow/Intermittent Flow segment" as a location where corrosion may be identified. Given the causal link between intermittent flow conditions and corrosion, adding this category will enhance PHMSA's ability to analyze the operational circumstances surrounding pipeline incidents.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G1, Question 10, by adding the phrase "intended to protect the location of the failure" to the inquiry regarding corrosion inhibitors and biocides. This edit clarifies that the Question specifically concerns treatments applied to protect the point of failure, rather than general system-wide applications.

PHMSA proposes to add Question 13a to Part G1, requiring operators to describe the location of corrosion coupons. This data is essential for evaluating the effectiveness of the coupons and determining their relevance to the cause of the accident.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G2 to enhance the precision of data regarding natural force damage. By expanding the nomenclature for earth movement and erosion and introducing sub-causes for wind events and animal-related damage, PHMSA seeks to eliminate ambiguity in reporting. Furthermore, the addition of Question 1a regarding movement monitoring and the inclusion of wildfires and snowstorms in Question 6a will provide a more comprehensive overview of the environmental conditions associated with pipeline failures.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G3, Question 1b, by striking the phrase "per the primary Accident Investigator results." PHMSA has determined that this language is extraneous and may lead to inconsistent reporting; its removal ensures that operators provide a clear indication of whether an excavator was legally exempt from one-call notification requirements.

PHMSA proposes to refine Part G4 by removing Questions 5, 6, and 7, which request details on citations, vehicle control, and estimated speed. Because these factors have little relevance to

accident analyses, PHMSA seeks to eliminate them. Simultaneously, PHMSA proposes adding "Heavy Equipment" as an option for Question 8 to ensure the form captures data involving agricultural equipment or excavating equipment not engaged in excavation.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part G5, Question 3, by inserting Question 3a. By requiring operators to provide quantitative data on soil pH and cathodic protection potentials (mV), PHMSA seeks to enhance its ability to evaluate the relationship between the local environment and the occurrence of environmental cracking.

PHMSA proposes adding Question 7 to Part G6, requiring operators to describe the failed equipment and the specific nature of the failure. This addition is necessary to help PHMSA identify exactly how equipment malfunction served as a primary or contributing cause of the accident.

PHMSA proposes to remove Questions 5 and 5a from Part G7, which inquire whether an accident-related task was part of an Operator Qualification (OQ) program and if the individuals involved were qualified. Because OQ status is a compliance matter more appropriately addressed during inspections or subsequent investigations, PHMSA seeks to eliminate these fields from the initial report.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part J by inserting Part J1aa. By requiring operators to disclose if prior internal inspection tools identified an anomaly at the point of failure, PHMSA can better evaluate the effectiveness of existing data in predicting or preventing the potential causes of the accident.

PHMSA proposes to amend Part J1 by adding Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) as an available technology category for internal inspections. By incorporating this frequently utilized technology, PHMSA ensures that the reporting requirements remain complete and technically relevant to current industry practices.

PHMSA proposes to delete the fields in Part J1 requiring operators to report the means of propulsion for previous internal inspections. Because propulsion methods are generally irrelevant to accident analysis, removing these instances streamlines the reporting process.

PHMSA proposes to refine Part J4 by striking the temporal limitation "since January 1, 2002." By removing this specific date threshold, PHMSA seeks to ensure that the reporting of non-destructive examinations is not restricted, thereby providing a more

complete historical record of the pipe's condition at the point of failure.

PHMSA proposes to remove Part J4a, which requires operators to provide supplemental details regarding prior non-destructive examinations at the point of failure. Because this granular information generally is not required for an accident analysis, PHMSA seeks to eliminate this reporting field.

In Part K, operators provide information on additional factors that may have contributed to an accident. Currently, the options in Part K overlap with those in Part G, causing data entry confusion, redundancy, and inconsistency. To resolve this, PHMSA proposes replacing the current options with the following distinct categories:

- Communication/Planning/Hazard Assessment
- Construction Practices
- Control Room Operations
- Data Integration
- Design
- Distracted Employee
- Excavation Practices
- Human Error Other
- Integrity Assessment Methods
- Integrity Threat Identification
- Leak Detection
- Manufacturing Defect
- Maps/Records
- Preventative Maintenance
- Procedures—Incorrect
- Procedures—Not Developed
- Procedures—Not Followed
- Repair/Maintenance Work
- Not Yet Determined
- Undefined
- Unknown
- Software Logic
- Training

Operators are to select all that apply.

D. Annual Reports for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Facilities

Form PHMSA F 7100.3–1 Annual Report for Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities (2137–0522)

Currently, operators of LNG facilities report to PHMSA in two places: once using the annual report and once by submitting to NPMS. PHMSA proposes adding the latitude and longitude of an LNG plant to the annual report. Once this change is implemented, PHMSA intends to eliminate the requirement in 49 CFR 191.29 for LNG operators to submit to NPMS. These changes would preserve PHMSA's ability to generate maps showing the location of LNG plants and eliminate duplicative reporting.

Currently, the annual report includes three status code options for LNG plants: in service, retired, and abandoned. Neither retired nor

abandoned are defined for LNG facilities in 49 CFR part 191, 49 CFR part 193, or the annual report instructions. PHMSA proposes to define retired in the annual report instructions and remove the abandoned status code option from the report. An abandoned LNG plant would no longer be included in the annual report. Some LNG plants may include facilities with different status codes. For example, a plant may have an in-service tank facility and an in-service vaporizer facility but a retired liquefaction facility. To accommodate this possibility, PHMSA proposes adding the reporting of status code at the facility level. The status code for the plant would not be entered by the operator but will be inferred from the status code entered by the operator for each facility comprising the plant. These changes would ensure consistent reporting across the industry.

Currently, Part B requires reporting “maximum liquefaction rate” and “maximum vaporization capacity” but these phrases are not defined. PHMSA proposes adding definitions for these phrases to ensure consistent reporting across the industry.

In Part C, operators report the number of leaks from piping or welds in three categories but vibration- or fatigue-related are not among the choices. Since vibration and fatigue have been known to cause piping or weld failures, PHMSA proposes adding vibration- or fatigue-related as a fourth cause category for leaks from piping or welds.

In Part D, operators report the number of times certain events have occurred during the calendar year, including emergency shutdown device (ESD) actuations that resulted from conditions other than an actual emergency. A plant shutdown without an emergency is not directly related to safety. PHMSA proposes to remove ESD actuations that resulted from conditions other than an actual emergency from Part D.

In Part D, operators report the number of security breaches during the calendar year. Currently, operators are required to report cybersecurity breaches to the Department of Homeland Security. PHMSA proposes to modify the form and instructions to ensure only physical, not cyber, security breaches are reported in Part D to ensure consistent reporting across the industry.

E. National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) (2137–0596)

As noted above, hazardous liquid pipeline operators currently report breakout tank data in Part M of the “Annual Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems” and submit breakout tank geographic location and certain attributes to NPMS.

In the annual report, operators must designate each breakout tank as interstate or intrastate. NPMS submittal does not include an attribute indicating whether a breakout tank is interstate or intrastate. PHMSA proposes to eliminate duplicative reporting by adding this attribute to NPMS and removing Part M from the annual report.

II. Summary of Impacted Collection

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d) PHMSA provides interested members of the public and affected agencies an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests. This notice identifies information collection requests that PHMSA will submit to OMB for revision.

The following information is provided for these information collections: (1) Title of the information collection; (2) OMB control number; (3) Current expiration date; (4) Type of request; (5) Abstract of the information collection activity; (6) Description of affected public; (7) Estimate of total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden; and (8) Frequency of collection. PHMSA will request a three-year term of approval for these information collections. PHMSA requests comments on the following information:

1. Title: Annual Report for Gas Distribution Operators.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0629.

Current Expiration Date: 6/30/2026.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: This mandatory information collection covers the collection of data from operators of gas distribution pipeline systems for annual reports. 49 CFR 191.11 requires operators of gas distribution systems to submit an annual report by March 15 for the preceding calendar year. PHMSA proposes revisions modifying Parts B2, B3, G, and I of DOT Form PHMSA F 7100.1–1 by removing certain data elements and clarifying others. As a result, PHMSA expects the time burden for completing this report to decrease by two hours, from 20 hours to 18 hours per report.

Affected Public: Operators of Gas Distribution Pipeline Systems.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

- *Estimated number of responses:* 1,446.
- *Estimated annual burden hours:* 26,028.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

2. Title: Annual Reports for Gas Pipeline Operators.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0522.

Current Expiration Date: 8/31/2026.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: This mandatory information collection covers the requirements for operators of natural gas pipelines (not distribution systems), underground natural gas storage facilities, and liquefied natural gas facilities to submit annual reports to PHMSA. 49 CFR 191.17 requires operators of underground natural gas storage facilities, gas transmission systems, liquefied natural gas facilities, and gas gathering systems to submit an annual report by March 15 for the preceding calendar year.

For Form PHMSA F 7100.2–1, *Annual Report for Natural and Other Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems*, PHMSA proposes to remove Parts C and H, modify Parts F and K, and revise the instructions for Part Q to improve clarity. PHMSA expects the time burden for completing Form PHMSA F 7100.2–1 to decrease by four hours, from 54 hours to 50 hours per report. PHMSA has also updated the estimated number of annual submissions for this form from 1,810 to 1,461 based on a three-year average. For Form PHMSA F 7100.3–1, *Annual Report for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Facilities*, PHMSA proposes to modify Parts B, C, and D. These modifications are not expected to change the per-report time burden. PHMSA has updated the estimated number of annual submissions for this form, from 113 to 184 based on a three-year average.

Affected Public: Operators of Natural Gas Pipelines, Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities, and Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

- *Estimated number of responses:* 2,167.
- *Estimated annual burden hours:* 80,758.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

3. *Title:* Annual Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0614.

Current Expiration Date: 3/31/2029.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: 49 CFR 195.49 requires operators of hazardous liquid pipelines to submit specific data on the safety of their pipelines by annually completing Form PHMSA F 7000–1.1. This mandatory information collection requires operators to submit data on the preceding year electronically by June 15 of each calendar year.

PHMSA proposes to modify Form PHMSA F 7000–1.1 to remove Parts H and M, and revise Part F to remove the requirement to report on anomalies. As a result, PHMSA expects the time

burden for completing this report to decrease by two hours, from 20 hours to 18 hours per report. PHMSA has updated the estimated number of annual submissions from 475 to 678 based on a three-year average. Additionally, PHMSA is removing a one-time burden of 18 hours per operator previously allotted for system updates related to excavation damage data, resulting in a reduction of 475 responses and 8,550 hours.

Affected Public: Operators of Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Facilities.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

- *Estimated number of responses:* 678.
- *Estimated annual burden hours:* 12,204.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

4. *Title:* National Pipeline Mapping Program.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0596.

Current Expiration Date: 3/31/2029.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: The Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–355), 49 U.S.C. 60132, requires an operator of a pipeline facility (except distribution lines and gathering lines) to submit to PHMSA geospatial data appropriate for use in the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS), including operator contact information. PHMSA proposes to modify this data collection to require an operator to indicate whether a hazardous liquid breakout tank is intrastate or interstate when submitting geospatial data. PHMSA does not expect a change in burden due to this modification.

Affected Public: Operators of Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Facilities.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

- *Estimated number of responses:* 1,346.
- *Estimated annual burden hours:* 162,208.

Frequency of Collection: Annual.

5. *Title:* Transportation of Hazardous Liquids and Carbon Dioxide by Pipeline: Record Keeping and Accident Reporting.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0047.

Current Expiration Date: 03/31/2029.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: To ensure adequate public protection from exposure to potential hazardous liquid and carbon dioxide pipeline failures, PHMSA collects information on reportable hazardous liquid pipeline accidents. This mandatory information collection covers hazardous liquid pipeline

accident report requirements in 49 CFR 195.50 and general record keeping burden associated with complying with Federal hazardous liquid pipeline safety regulations in Part 195. The definition of an “accident” and the reporting criteria for submitting a Hazardous Liquid Accident Report (form PHMSA F7000–1) is detailed in 49 CFR 195.54. Section 195.54 requires hazardous liquid operators to file an accident report, as soon as practicable, but not later than 30 days after discovery of the accident, on DOT Form 7000–1, whenever there is a reportable accident.

PHMSA proposes to modify the Hazardous Liquid Accident Report (Form F 7000–1) to reduce operator burden while refining data collection for causal analysis. The revisions eliminate redundant, granular, or non-essential fields—such as zip codes, duplicative NRC details, and speculative cost estimates—relying instead on precise geographic coordinates and existing records. Conversely, PHMSA proposes to add technical requirements for pipe manufacturer identification and quantitative corrosion metrics to better track failure trends. PHMSA also proposes to reorganize the accident data into a chronological timeline and expand “contributing factors” to include human and software variables, ensuring the data collected remains relevant to modern accident investigation.

PHMSA estimates that the proposed revisions will result in a net reduction of approximately three hours per respondent, from 12 hours to nine hours per report. While the proposal introduces new technical data requirements for corrosion and manufacturing analysis, the elimination of speculative environmental and financial reporting—combined with the removal of duplicative information is expected to lower the total annual burden hour estimate for the F 7000–1 collection by 1,218 hours.

Affected Public: Operators hazardous liquid pipeline systems.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

- *Estimated number of responses:* 1,646.
- *Estimated annual burden hours:* 52,559.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

6. *Title:* Incident Reports for Natural Gas Pipeline Operators.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0635.

Current Expiration Date: 1/31/2029.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: Operators of natural gas pipelines and liquefied natural gas (LNG) facilities are required to report

incidents, on occasion, to PHMSA per the requirements in 49 CFR part 191. This mandatory information collection covers the collection of incident report data from natural gas pipeline operators. This information is an essential part of PHMSA's overall effort to minimize natural gas transmission, gathering, and distribution pipeline failures.

PHMSA proposes to modify the Incident Report for Gas Transmission, Gas Gathering, and Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities (PHMSA Form 7100.2) and the Incident Report for Gas Distribution Systems (PHMSA F 7100.1) to reduce operator burden while focusing on data essential for causal analysis. The revisions eliminate redundant, granular, or speculative fields—such as zip codes, duplicative NRC details, and estimated gas costs—relying instead on GPS coordinates and existing agency records.

To modernize the forms, PHMSA is adding the option for biogas, alongside technical requirements for corrosion metrics and component manufacturer identification. Furthermore, the proposal simplifies casualty reporting and removes compliance-related

questions better suited for inspections. Reorganized for chronological clarity, the updated forms include an expanded list of contributing factors, such as software logic and human error, to better identify the root causes of incidents.

PHMSA estimates that the proposed revisions will result in a net reduction of approximately three hours per respondent, from 12 hours to nine hours per report. While the proposal introduces new technical data requirements, the elimination of speculative data combined with the removal of duplicative information is expected to lower the total annual burden estimate for this information collection by 828 hours.

Affected Public: Operators gas pipeline systems.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

- Estimated number of responses: 999.
- Estimated annual burden hours: 3,628.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Comments are invited on:

(a) The need for the renewal and revision of these information collections 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) 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 those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued in Washington, DC under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.97.

Keith Coyle,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2026–12315 Filed 6–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P