

TABLE 1 TO 180.910

Inert ingredients	Limits	Uses
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *
Resin acids, esters with glycerol (CAS Reg. No. 8050–31–5)	Maximum of 50% in pesticide formulation	Surfactant.
* * * * *	* * * * *	* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2026–12272 Filed 6–17–26; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families

45 CFR Part 1336

RIN 0970–AD36

Reducing Bureaucracy and Burden for Native American Programs

AGENCY: Administration for Native Americans (ANA), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families amends the Native American Programs Act regulations to eliminate unnecessary or obsolete regulations.

DATES: This rule is effective August 17, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Adam N. Jones, Deputy Chief of Staff, Immediate Office of the Assistant Secretary, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC 202–417–0115 or Deregulation@acf.hhs.gov. A plain language summary of the final rule is posted at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Statutory Authority

This final rule is being issued under the authority granted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services by the Native American Programs Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2991 *et seq.*), hereafter referred to as the “Act.”

II. Background

The Native American Programs Act of 1974 (NAPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 2991 *et seq.*), authorizes the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) to promote social development

and economic self-sufficiency in Native communities through competitive grant funding. Under Section 803 of NAPA (42 U.S.C. 2991b), ANA provides financial assistance on a single-year or multi-year basis to public and nonprofit private agencies, including governing bodies of Indian Tribes on federal and state reservations, Alaska Native villages and regional corporations established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and public and nonprofit agencies serving Native Hawaiians and Indian and Alaska Native organizations in urban or rural areas that are not reservations or Alaska Native villages. ANA implements its mission through competitive discretionary grants that support Native-led, community-based projects aimed at strengthening families and communities and reducing long-term dependency through social and economic development, Native language preservation, and environmental regulatory enhancement. ANA typically provides short-term “seed” funding ranging from 12 to 60 months to help communities launch or expand sustainable efforts. In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2025, ANA awarded a total of \$50,738,495, which included new awards and continued funding for previously awarded projects.

III. Executive Summary

This final rule rescinds multiple regulations that are either unnecessary or wholly obsolete. The regulations removed and reserved by this final rule can be categorized into three groups: those that are duplicative, those that are better suited as a different type of sub-regulatory format, and those that are obsolete.

The duplicative regulations are those that exist yet, carry no impact as the authority and requirements stated in the regulation exist or are stated elsewhere such as in statute. This renders the language found in the regulation to be either duplicative or otherwise generally unnecessary.

The regulations that are better suited to a different format, *i.e.*, as a sub-regulatory document, are those that generally read like a Frequently Asked Questions document, or are overly

prescriptive and carry technical details that belong to programmatic instruction. ACF is rescinding this category of regulations to allow for publication in a more appropriate format following the effective date of this final rule.

Finally, obsolete regulations are those that are outdated. This includes regulations that refer to grant programs that are no longer funded, practices that are no longer followed, or are no longer relevant.

Effective Date

This final rule will become effective 60 days from the date of its publication.

Severability

The provisions of this final rule are intended to be severable, such that, in the event a court were to invalidate any particular provision or deem it to be unenforceable, the remaining provisions would continue to be valid. None of the provisions in the final rule contained herein are central to an overall intent of the final rule, nor are any provisions dependent on the validity of other, separate provisions.

IV. Discussion of Changes

HHS published a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) in the **Federal Register** on March 27, 2026, (91 FR 14800) proposing revisions to 45 CFR 1336. HHS provided a 30-day comment period during which interested parties could submit comments in writing electronically through [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) or via email to the Immediate Office of the Assistant Secretary.

During the 30-day comment period, HHS received 20 comments from advocacy groups, individual villages, Tribal consortiums, individuals ranging from students to professionals working with and for Native Communities, and one State Agency. Of the comments received, all 20 were posted on www.regulations.gov.

Of the 20 comments posted on www.regulations.gov, 18 comments were unique and 2 were duplicates. Individuals often spoke using their own practical experience, and of the groups representing multiple tribes, used their own stories and unique situations to elucidate the issues in question here.

Many commenters used similar language outlining similar concerns, and several referenced other regulatory actions by HHS that will not be addressed here.

HHS received comments from seven individuals, 6 groups serving multiple tribes, two Alaskan villages, one limited liability corporation, one nonprofit, and one State Agency. At the conclusion of the public comment period, HHS analyzed the content of the comments to inform the development of this final rule. All comments were reviewed to determine each commenter's support or opposition towards the policies proposed in the NPRM.

Public comments reflected a range of perspectives, with commenters expressing support and opposition for the proposed rescissions. All comments were reviewed and informed the Department's consideration of the final rule.

The preamble in this final rule discusses the changes to current regulations. Where language of previous regulations remains unchanged, the preamble explanation and interpretation of that language published with all prior final rules are also retained, unless specifically modified in the preamble to this rule. (*See* 48 FR 55821, Dec. 15, 1983; 61 FR 42821, Aug. 19, 1996; 61 FR 42822, Aug. 19, 1996; 81 FR 3022, Jan. 20, 2016; 88 FR 12226, Feb. 27, 2023; 89 FR 80073, Oct. 2, 2024)

V. General Comments and Cross-Cutting Issues

This final rule includes deregulatory actions across 25 sections pertaining to grants available to "American Indians, Native Hawaiians, other Native American Pacific Islanders (including American Samoan Natives), and Alaska Natives," as described in Section 802 of NAPA (42 U.S.C. 2991a), and the Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Fund Demonstration Project (NHRLF).

Some of the large Tribal organizations cited concerns as to the purported inadequacy of Tribal consultation with regards to this regulatory action. As stated in Section VII of the NPRM, the rulemaking changes that were commented on do not presumptively trigger the consultation requirements of Executive Order 13175 as the changes represent a deregulatory action. Nevertheless, ACF is committed to consulting with Indian Tribes and Tribal leadership on this action to the extent practicable and permitted by law.

Tribal Sovereignty, Federal overreach, and claims that the proposed rulemaking was shifting away from community needs were threads that several commenters addressed. Among

commentors, there was a strong desire to keep program administration and implementation local, over federal priorities. HHS agrees with the commenters of the need to protect Tribal sovereignty and ward against Federal overreach. HHS disagrees with the comments that removing these rigid Federal requirements and inserting the language in a more appropriate vehicle such as a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), will negatively impact Tribal community needs. Rather, this gives Tribal communities the opportunity to propose changes to sub-regulatory guidance to better align with local needs, which is far easier than to change a Federal regulation.

Several of the commenters supported the changes, including the only State Agency to comment, the State of Hawai'i, Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA). These commenters appreciated that the proposal would remove outdated regulations as they recognize that statute still governs the operation of the program while removing confusing and unnecessarily duplicative Federal language.

Most commentors opposed the changes, with many insinuating that the proposal of moving regulatory language to sub regulatory documents would introduce confusion, complicate the stability of Tribal funding opportunities, and increase costs for many Tribes and villages. Of particular concern was the effect on the more remote Alaskan communities to compete alongside larger and centrally located communities when applying for grants. Predictability and stability of funding for these smaller communities was stressed, advocating to maintain the current architecture, and asking to find ways to graft new ideas and priorities onto that existing structure, such as using them as bonuses or weighted criteria.

HHS acknowledges the concerns raised by these commenters but notes that moving the existing language and requirements from regulation into guidance documents will not complicate the stability of Tribal funding opportunities, will not introduce confusion, and will not increase costs for Tribes. Rather this rulemaking will reduce duplication of requirements while not reducing funding opportunities or increasing costs.

While many commenters disagreed with HHS' stated proposal to remove these regulations, writing they believed it to be unnecessary, some appreciated HHS's desire to reduce the bureaucratic load facing Native Communities. HHS acknowledges concerns raised by

commenters who opposed the NPRM but moves forward with removing these regulations as these actions will help reduce overall cost and burden to Native communities seeking grants to grow their economic and social independence.

VI. Section-by-Section Discussion of Comments and Regulatory Provisions

HHS received comments about specific changes proposed to subparts of the regulation. Below, HHS identifies each subpart, summarizes the comments, and responds to them accordingly.

Subpart B—Purpose of the Native American Programs

§ 1336.20 Program Purpose

This final rule removes the program's purpose statement. The purpose statement does not carry any policy language that is not already covered in the authorizing statute, the Native American Programs Act of 1974, as amended. *See* 42 U.S.C. 2991a. As this Section is needlessly duplicative, it is removed.

Comment: Several commentors were concerned that removing this provision, which they viewed to be regarding congressional intent, could remove the "North Star" for participants, and may weaken program effectiveness, dilute Tribal authority and self-determination, lessen accountability, and increases the risk of federal overreach.

Response: The provisions in question here are already referenced in the authorizing statute, therefore preserving congressional intent. By removing this Section and deferring to the congressionally passed language authorizing the regulation, HHS is not weakening program effectiveness, diluting Tribal authority and self-determination, lessening accountability, nor increasing Federal overreach.

Subpart C—Native American Projects

§ 1336.30 Eligibility Under Sections 804 and 805 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974

This final rule removes the regulation that duplicates the statute in that financial assistance made to grantees for research, demonstration and pilot projects as well as technical assistance and training is eligible for public and private agencies. The Act specifically states in Section 803 that funding is available to both public and private non-profit agencies, thus limiting private agencies to non-profits. However, in Sections 804 and 805 of the Act, the terminology is changed to public and private agencies. The

removal of the qualifier “non-profit” from Sections 804 and 805 gives statutory authority to allow research, demonstration and pilot projects as well as technical assistance and training dollars to be awarded to for-profit private agencies. Thus, as this Section is needlessly duplicative, it is removed and reserved.

Comment: Some commentors objected to changes making for-profit entities eligible under the regulatory language, raising concerns that smaller local groups in places like Alaska and Hawaii could face unfair competition from larger for-profit entities. One commentor supported this change but raised the concern that without clear guidelines or notification, for-profit entities might remain unaware that they are eligible to participate, and as such may deny tribes the benefits of their participation.

Response: These commentors are incorrect as to the impact of this regulatory change. This regulatory change returns the implementation of the program back to the original intent authorized by Congress and does nothing more than delete duplicative language. For-profit entities are already eligible to apply for grants under sections 804 and 805 of the Act under the statutory language. This action simply removes duplicative language and ensures a singular, streamlined governance structure.

§ 1336.31 Project Approval Procedures

This final rule removes the requirements detailing project approval procedures. This regulation, as it currently exists, has two issues: (1) it essentially states that applicants for financial assistance must submit a work plan that follows the law, which is a statutory requirement, and (2) it states processes and guidelines that are better suited in sub-regulatory documents such as a NOFO. By moving this kind of unnecessary language out of regulation, grantees and applicants can more easily find important information when reading through CFR. As such, this Section is not needed and is removed.

Comment: Multiple commenters expressed concern that shifting this Section to sub-regulatory documents could impact the clarity and predictability of grants for tribes, thereby introducing uncertainty as to what requirements there will be from year to year, and potentially increasing the costs, especially to smaller tribes who may lack sophisticated administrative support staff. Commenters worried that this might prevent smaller communities from

taking full advantage of any grants they may be eligible to receive.

Response: The transfer of the non-statutory language from this Section into sub-regulatory guidance will not reduce clarity for grantees, nor increase costs. By incorporating this language into either the grant’s terms and conditions or the NOFO, grantees can clearly see what requirements they will be beholden to when they apply for funds. Furthermore, coalescing the relevant terms of the grant in one place removes the need to search through multiple resources and clearly outlines expectations for applicants. This reduces the need for large administrative staff to handle grants and can allow communities to focus time and energy back into the community.

§ 1336.32 Grants

This final rule removes the requirements detailing the length of grants as well as specific application submission requirements. This type of information is better located in a NOFO than in regulation as other comparable information is historically found in those kinds of sub regulatory documents. If left in its current form, grantees and applicants would be required to read the CFR for information that pertains to applications and NOFOs. Thus, this Section is not needed in regulation and is removed.

Comment: Multiple commenters expressed concern that shifting the duration of the grant to sub-regulatory documents could impact the clarity and predictability of grants for tribes, which may increase the cost to smaller tribes lacking dedicated sophisticated administrative support staff. These commenters feared that this action might inhibit smaller communities from taking full advantage of any grants they may otherwise be eligible to receive. Commenters further feared that program integrity and effectiveness may be threatened by changing these guardrails.

Response: The transfer of the non-statutory language from this Section into sub-regulatory guidance will not reduce clarity for grantees, nor increase costs. By incorporating this language into either the grant’s terms and conditions or the NOFO, grantees can clearly see what requirements they will be beholden to when they apply for funds. Furthermore, coalescing the relevant terms of the grant in one place removes the need to search through multiple resources and clearly outlines expectations for applicants. This reduces the need for large administrative staff to handle grants and can allow communities to focus time and energy back into the community.

Moving language to sub-regulatory guidance does not change the requirement that grant recipients still must abide by all aspects of the terms and conditions that accompany Federal funds, therefore program integrity will not be impacted.

§ 1336.33 Eligible Applicants and Proposed Activities Which Are Ineligible

This final rule repeals the Section of regulation that details eligible applicants and what proposed activities are ineligible for funding. As this Section is specific to essentially a grant’s terms and conditions, and will be found in both locations, it does not make sense to exist in regulation. As such, this Section is removed and going forward, will be inserted into the grant’s terms and conditions or into a related NOFO.

Comment: Commentors asked HHS to retain these regulations in their current format and not transfer them into sub-regulatory documents, citing the perceived fiscal discipline imposed by regulations, and the claim that this action would open the door for inefficiency and waste tax dollars.

Response: Moving details regarding eligible applicants and programs into the NOFO will streamline the entry process for new programs. It is already best practice to read NOFOs fully, as the document controls the terms of the grant, and centralizing the relevant details of the grant in one place removes the need to reference separate documents that communicate the same information and clearly outlines expectations for prospective awardees. This will help reduce the need for large administrative staff and create savings for communities that can be better allocated elsewhere, especially for smaller communities. This action will not reduce fiscal discipline or produce an added cost to taxpayers.

Comment: Several commenters were Alaska Native communities who stressed that they are substantively different from Tribes in the rest of the United States. Population, remoteness, and market forces may create situations where benefits for other Tribal communities may actually have unintended negative effects on Alaska Native communities.

Response: The language in the regulation is being transferred to NOFOs and therefore is not going away entirely. The authorizing statute (42 U.S.C. 2991b) lays out the purpose and spirit of the regulations, and HHS remains committed to working with Native communities to promote economic and social growth.

Subpart D—Evaluation

§ 1336.40 General

This final rule removes the unnecessary regulation that applications provide “sufficient information” for ANA to make a determination as to whether the application meets the standards. This requirement exists irrespective of the regulation as ANA has the authority to review applications and reports and make decisions to award or not award funds for a number of reasons, including the completeness of the application. This Section is removed and reserved as the authority exists with or without the regulation in place.

Comment: Several commentors worried that removing these requirements could cause downstream effects on program integrity, while also misaligning proposed projects away from real conditions facing communities to merely seeking funding.

Response: HHS asserts that removal of regulatory text will not have an impact on program operations. A regulation telling applicants to complete forms or give comprehensive plans about their intent to use awarded funds is unnecessary as whether or not the regulation exists, applicants competing for grants will still be incentivized to submit comprehensive plans and complete applications, as to do otherwise may jeopardize their chances of receiving an award.

Subpart E—Financial Assistance Provisions

§ 1336.51 Project Period

This final rule removes the unneeded regulation specifying that the length of the funding award will be included in the NOFO. This Section is not needed as it is standard practice for agencies to include in the NOFO the length of time for any particular funding opportunity. The removal of this Section will not preclude the duration of the award being included in the NOFOs. As such, this Section is removed and reserved.

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern that shifting this Section into sub regulatory documents could impact the clarity and predictability of grants for tribes, therefore introducing uncertainty as to how long a particular grant period may last and how long funding streams may remain. Additionally, some commentors expressed that the certainty of the regulation stating the time frame of a grant is preferable to sub-regulatory documents and liable to create confusion among Tribal Communities.

Response: Moving the specified length of a grant’s funding into the

terms and conditions of the award will not introduce confusion or uncertainty for grantees. This is because it will ensure that all important grant information is located in one place. Furthermore, it is already best practice to read NOFOs fully, as the document lays out the terms of the grant. Coalescing the relevant terms of the grant in one place removes the need to sift through multiple resources and clearly outlines expectations for prospective awardees.

Subpart F—Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Fund Demonstration Project

§ 1336.60 Through § 1336.77

This final rule removes the regulations pertaining to the unfunded Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Fund (NHRLF) program. This program had its appropriations end in FY2001 and the demonstration project period has since ended. As such, this regulation is removed and reserved.

Comment: Comments were divided on whether to remove the NHRLF regulations, with some stating that it should not be removed, on the chance it is funded again, while others, including the OHA, supported the removal of outdated text. Specifically, the OHA discussed their appreciation for the removal of outdated text and stated that they were still able to implement the program in following the statutory and sub-regulatory language pertaining to the NHRLF.

Response: This program has not received Federal appropriations in half a decade. If this situation changes and Congress reappropriates funds, HHS will reestablish applicable regulations appropriate to the needs of the funding and within the context of the new appropriation.

VII. Regulatory Process Matters*Paperwork Reduction Act*

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, as amended) (PRA), all Departments are required to submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval any reporting or recordkeeping requirements inherent in a proposed or final rule. This final rule does not contain any information collection requirements requiring OMB approval under the PRA and, therefore, will not create any new paperwork burdens or modify existing burdens subject to OMB review.

Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132 requires federal agencies to consult with State and local government officials if they

develop regulatory policies with federalism implications. Federalism is rooted in the belief that issues that are not national in scope or significance are most appropriately addressed by the level of government close to the people. This final rule will not have substantial direct impact on the States, on the relationship between the federal government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. This final rule would not pre-empt State law. The changes made in this final rule are removing unnecessary and obsolete regulations from the Native American Program rules. Therefore, in accordance with Section 6 of Executive Order 13132, it is determined that this action does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

Assessment of Federal Regulations and Policies on Families

Assessment of Federal Regulations and Policies on Families Section 654 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act of 1999 (Pub. L. 105–277) requires federal agencies to determine whether a policy or regulation may negatively affect family well-being. If the agency determines a policy or regulation negatively affects family well-being, then the agency must prepare an impact assessment addressing seven criteria specified in the law. HHS determined it is not necessary to prepare a family policymaking assessment because the actions made by this final rule will not have any impact on the autonomy or integrity of the family as an institution.

VIII. Regulatory Impact Analysis

We have examined the impacts of the final rule under Executive Order 12866, Executive Order 13563, Executive Order 14192, the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–4).

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct us to assess all benefits and costs of available regulatory alternatives and, when regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. Rules are “significant” under Executive Order 12866 Section 3(f)(1) if they “have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities.” Executive Order 14192

requires that any new incremental costs associated with significant new regulations “shall, to the extent permitted by law, be offset by the elimination of existing costs associated with at least ten prior regulations.” The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) has determined that this final rule is not a significant action under Executive Order 12866 Section 3(f).

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) requires agencies to consider the impact of their regulatory proposals on small entities. Because this is simply repealing obsolete and unnecessary language, we certify that the final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) generally requires that each agency conduct a cost-benefit analysis; identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives; and select the least costly, most cost effective, or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule before promulgating any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of more than \$100 million (adjusted for inflation) in at least one year by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector. Each agency issuing a rule with relevant effects over that threshold must also seek input from State, local, and tribal governments. The current threshold after adjustment for inflation is \$193 million, using the most current (2025) Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product. This final rule would not result in an expenditure in any year that meets or exceeds this amount.

IX. Tribal Consultation Statement

Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, requires agencies to consult with Indian Tribes when regulations have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes. *Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*, 65 FR 67249. Similarly, ACF’s Tribal Consultation Policy says that consultation is triggered for any legislative proposal, new rule adoption, or other policy change that significantly affects tribes, meaning there exists a reasonable presumption that it has or may have substantial direct effects on

one or more Indian tribes, on the amount or duration of ACF program funding, on the delivery of ACF programs or services to one or more Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. However, as this is a deregulatory action, per OMB M–25–36, *Streamlining the Review of Deregulatory Actions*, this action presumptively does not trigger the consultation requirements of Executive Order 13175. ACF is nevertheless committed to consulting with Indian Tribes and Tribal leadership on this action to the extent practicable and permitted by law.

List of Subjects in 45 CFR Part 1336

Administrative practice and procedure, American Samoa, Grant programs—Indians, Grant programs—social programs, Guam, Hawaiian Natives, Indians, Northern Mariana Islands, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, ACF amends 45 CFR part 1336 to read as follows:

PART 1336—NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS

- 1. The authority citation for part 1336 continues to read:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 2991 *et seq.*

§§ 1336.20, 1336.30, 1336.31, 1336.32, 1336.33, 1336.40, 1336.51, 1336.60, 1336.61, 1336.62, 1336.63, 1336.64, 1336.65, 1336.66, 1336.67, 1336.68, 1336.69, 1336.70, 1336.71, 1336.72, 1336.73, 1336.74, 1336.75, 1336.76, and 1336.77 [Removed and Reserved]

- 2. Remove and reserve subpart B consisting of § 1336.20, §§ 1336.30, 1336.31, 1336.32, 1336.33, subpart D consisting of § 1336.40, § 1336.51, and subpart F consisting of §§ 1336.60, 1336.61, 1336.62, 1336.63, 1336.64, 1336.65, 1336.66, 1336.67, 1336.68, 1336.69, 1336.70, 1336.71, 1336.72, 1336.73, 1336.74, 1336.75, 1336.76, and 1336.77.

Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

[FR Doc. 2026–12324 Filed 6–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 190

[Docket No. PHMSA–2026–1537]

RIN 2137–AG41

Pipeline Safety: Declaratory Order Procedures; Response To Petition for Reconsideration

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

ACTION: Response to petition for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: PHMSA alerts the public to a petition for reconsideration and PHMSA’s response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Timothy O’Shea, Attorney Advisor, Office of Chief Counsel, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590, at timothy.o'shea@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 24, 2026, PHMSA issued the final rule *Pipeline Safety: Declaratory Order Procedures*, 91 FR 21968. The Pipeline Safety Trust filed a petition for reconsideration of this final rule on May 26, 2026, which challenged various issues. PHMSA denied the petition on June 11, 2026. Each of these documents is available in the rulemaking docket that is accessible on <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching for docket number PHMSA–2026–1537.

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

Keith Coyle,

Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2026–12314 Filed 6–17–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 260209–0039; RTID 0648–XF845]

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer From North Carolina to Virginia

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