carriers,[6] which fails to sufficiently address the risks in this environment and inhibits CBP from verifying that a specific mail article has been entered in accordance with all applicable requirements. Carriers voluntarily participating in this test will report the tracking number generated by a foreign postal operator for each arriving international mail shipment on a manifest. Regardless of whether the entry filer opts to participate in the Entry Type 13 Test, CBP encourages carriers transporting mail to the United States to voluntarily participate in this test. If both the carrier and the filer choose to participate in this test, CBP will be able to match the tracking number reported by the carrier to the tracking number reported on the entry filing, which will allow CBP to determine the precise time of arrival for each shipment and confirm that an entry has been timely filed for an imported mail article.

III. Authorization for the Test

The Entry Type 13 Test is authorized pursuant to 19 CFR 101.9(a), which grants the Commissioner of CBP the authority to impose requirements different from those specified in the CBP regulations for purposes of conducting a test program or procedure designed to evaluate the effectiveness of new technology or operational procedures regarding the processing of passengers, vessels, or merchandise. The Entry Type 13 Test will allow CBP to test ACE functionality and operational procedures related to this new entry type.

IV. Waiver of Regulations Under the Test

For purposes of this test, the formal entry requirement in 19 CFR 145.12(a)(2)(v), for goods subject to PGA requirements, and 19 CFR 145.12(a)(2)(vi), for goods subject to duties under Chapters 98 and 99, HTSUS, will be waived for test participants. In addition, 19 CFR 145.12(b) will be waived for test participants only insofar as those informal entry procedures are inconsistent with the requirements in this notice. Additionally, the provisions in 19 CFR parts 143, subpart C, and 145, insofar as they are inconsistent with the terms of this test, are waived for test participants but only for entries filed as entry type 13 under this test. This test does not waive the remaining informal entry regulations found in 19 CFR part 143, subpart C, or the specific procedures for shipments imported by mail set forth in 19 CFR part 145.

[6] Although CBP receives additional data for mail pursuant to the regulations implementing 19 U.S.C. 1415(a)(3)(K), that information cannot be used ''for any commercial enforcement purposes, including for determining merchandise entry.'' *See* 19 U.S.C. 1415(a)(3)(F).

V. Misconduct Under the Test

If a test participant fails to follow the rules, requirements, terms, and conditions of this test, fails to exercise reasonable care in the execution of participant obligations, fails to abide by applicable laws and regulations that have not been waived, or fails to pay duties, taxes, or fees in a timely manner, the participant may be subject to civil and criminal penalties, administrative sanctions, liquidated damages, and/or other applicable enforcement action. Participation in this test does not affect a participant's obligations to comply with any other applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

VI. Comments

All interested parties are invited to comment on any aspect of this test at any time. CBP requests comments and feedback on all aspects of this test, including the design, conduct, and implementation of the test, in order to determine whether to modify, alter, expand, limit, continue, end, or fully implement this new entry type. Throughout the test, CBP will take into consideration any comments or feedback that is received from the test participants.

Susan S. Thomas,

Executive Assistant Commissioner, Office of Trade.

[FR Doc. 2026–12668 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–14–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–6614–N–01]

Notice of Intent To Relocate and Consolidate the Kansas City, Missouri Field Office Into the Kansas City, Kansas Regional Office

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that HUD is proposing to consolidate the Kansas City, Missouri Field Office (KCMFO), into the Kansas City Regional Office (KCRO), which is located approximately 5.2 miles away from the current Missouri office location just across the Kansas-Missouri state line in Kansas City, Kansas. HUD provides this notice in accordance with section 7(p) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jacqualine Watson, Director of Field Support Services, Office of the Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 77 Forsyth St, Atlanta, GA 30303; telephone 202–436–6778. (This is not a toll-free number.) HUD welcomes and is prepared to receive calls from individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing, as well as individuals with speech and communication disabilities. To learn more about how to make an accessible telephone call, please visit *https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/telecommunications-relay-service-trs.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Legal Requirements for This Notice

In accordance with section 7(p) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3535(p)), a plan for the reorganization of any HUD regional, area, insuring, or other field office may take effect only upon the expiration of 90 days after publication in the **Federal Register** of a cost-benefit analysis of the effect of the plan on each HUD office involved. Such cost-benefit analysis shall include, but not be limited to (1) an estimate of cost savings supported by background information detailing the source and substantiating the amount of the savings; (2) an estimate of the additional cost which will result from the reorganization; (3) a study of the impact on the local economy; and (4) an estimate of the effect of the reorganization on the availability, accessibility, and quality of services provided for recipients of those services. Where any of the factors cannot be quantified, the Secretary shall provide a statement on the nature and extent of those factors in the cost-benefit analysis.

II. Required Statutory Cost-Benefit Analysis

A. Background

HUD is proposing to move the KCMFO, currently operating from a leased space of 11,465 rentable square feet (RSF) with 25 staff, into the leased KCRO, which occupies about 69,437 square feet and houses 107 staff. The two locations are separated by approximately 5.2 miles and across the Kansas-Missouri state line, minimizing potential disruption.

The objectives of this consolidation are to achieve measurable cost savings, enhance operational efficiency and optimize utilization of federally leased space. The KCRO has sufficient capacity to absorb the incoming staff. IT transition costs are anticipated to be negligible due to HUD's standardized national network and laptop-based workforce.

This analysis finds that the consolidation yields immediate net savings in the first year, a payback period of approximately two weeks, and substantial multi-year cost avoidance through elimination of lease expenses and associated overhead. Risks to program delivery, community access, and workforce continuity are minimal and short-term in nature.

At present, the following facilities are in use by HUD staff in Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas City, Kansas, despite their close proximity and the presence of another HUD field office in St. Louis, Missouri.

Category	Kansas City, MO (departing)	Kansas City, KS (receiving)
Building Name	MBL/IBM	Gateway Tower II.
Address	2345 Grand Blvd, Kansas City, MO 64108–2663.	400 State Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101–2406.
OA/Lease Number	AMO06054	AKS02005.
Lease Type	GSA-Leased (Owner Serviced)	GSA-Leased (Owner Serviced).
Security Level	Level 2	Level 4.
Congressional District	MO–5 (Emanuel Cleaver)	KS–2 (Derek Schmidt).
Building Floors	N/A (single tenant)	4 floors.
OA/Lease Expiration	July 31, 2028	February 2027 (Capital Plan; renewed 2024—new term TBC).
Termination Rights	Active—90-day notice required	N/A (receiving facility).
Total Personnel	25	107 (pre-consolidation).
HUD Occupied RSF	11,465 RSF	69,437 RSF.
HUD Occupied USF	9,969 USF	59,127 USF.
Available Capacity	N/A (departing)	Substantial—sufficient to absorb 25 incoming staff.
Allocated Parking	1 Space	On-site and adjacent structured parking.

B. Estimate of Cost Savings

The expected Cost Savings associated with this consolidation can be loosely described in terms of Rent and other costs associated with the leasing of the KCMFO that would be avoided, the Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) and infrastructure costs of operating the KCMFO, and additional efficiencies of operation created by the consolidation of these offices.

1. Annual Lease Cost Avoidance

HUD is presently paying a Shell Rent amount of $160,051.44 annually for the KCMFO, with additional lease related operating costs of $110,181.24 and Public Building Service (PBS) Fees of $18,916.32. With the consolidation of KCMFO into existing space at the KCRO, HUD will be able to avoid these costs moving forward, saving $289,149.00 annually.

2. Elimination of Reimbursable Work Authorization (RWA) Costs

In connection with the operation and maintenance of the KCMFO facility, HUD expends $298,827 annually, which includes approximately $9,678 relating to the maintenance of the facility's technical infrastructure. With the consolidation of KCMFO into existing space at the KCRO, HUD will be able to avoid these costs moving forward.

3. Non-Quantifiable Operational Efficiencies

In addition, HUD will also realize important non-quantifiable cost savings. Because HUD currently operates two separate facilities, it bears two distinct costs of facility overhead and administrative burdens associated with their operation. The consolidation of the KCMFO into the KCRO will allow HUD to increase efficiencies and reduce cost by eliminating duplicative facility overhead and consolidating administrative functions. Additionally, HUD is currently underutilizing space in both the KCMFO and KCRO, with significant unused, excess space being funded with taxpayer dollars. This proposed consolidation will allow the existing leased footprint of the KCRO to be more fully utilized and excess space to be decommissioned and released from HUD's space management.

C. Estimate of the Additional Costs

While significant, long-term cost savings are anticipated from this consolidation, there will be minimal, one-time costs associated with this effort. These include the costs of the physical relocation of staff and resources from the KCMFO to the KCRO and the minor modifications of the space in the KCRO to incorporate the KCMFO staff into the space.

1. Relocation Expenses

Based on a fixed-price quote, HUD estimates the one-time relocation cost of $11,639.28, will be incurred in moving the KCMFO, which includes packing, transport, and project management of the relocation.

2. IT Infrastructure Transition

No material costs are anticipated due to existing standardized infrastructure.

3. Lease Termination

No penalties will be incurred due to active 90-day termination rights.

4. Facility Modifications

Only minor reconfigurations are anticipated and are not expected to result in material cost increases.

5. Indirect/Transitional Costs

Indirect costs such as temporary productivity impacts, administrative transition efforts, and minor employee commute adjustments are expected to be minimal and short-term in nature and do not materially affect the overall cost-benefit outcome.

D. Summary of Financial Analysis

Category	Amount
Total Annual Cost Avoidance	$298,827
One-Time Relocation Cost	$11,639.28
Net Year-One Savings	$287,187.72
Payback Period	~14 days
3-Year Savings	$896,481
Net Present Value (3-Year, 3.7%)	$845,435

Note: Net present value is calculated using the OMB Circular A–94 nominal discount rate of 3.7% for a 3-year period.

Year	Gross savings	Discount factor (3.7%)	Present value
Year 1	$298,827.00	0.964320	$288,164.90
Year 2	298,827.00	0.929913	277,883.22
Year 3	298,827.00	0.896734	267,968.39
Sum of PVs			834,016.51
Less: One Time Cost			−11,639.28
Net Present Value			22,377.23

The one-time relocation cost is treated as a Year 0 outflow (paid immediately), while the annual savings are treated as end-of-year inflows for Years 1, 2, and 3.

The consolidation therefore represents a high-confidence, low-risk investment in long-term fiscal efficiency, fully consistent with federal objectives to reduce underutilized real estate.

E. Study of the Impact on the Local Economy

The consolidation will have distinct, albeit localized, economic and community impacts on both Kansas City, MO, and Kansas City, KS, with a largely net-neutral effect on the broader Kansas City Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). As noted above, the physical location of these offices is only 5.2 miles apart.

1. Kansas City, Missouri (Departure)

With the relocation of the HUD staff in the KCMFO, approximately 25 federal employees will be removed from the downtown Kansas City, Missouri workforce. This may result in a small decrease in the patronage of businesses located near the KCMFO. The relatively small footprint of the KCMFO will be returned to the commercial leased space available, which could lead to a minor reduction in demand for commercial office space in the city.

2. Kansas City, Kansas (Arrival)

With the relocation of the HUD staff to the KCRO, approximately 25 federal employees will be added to the existing utilization of the Kansas City, Kansas Federal Building. This will result in a better utilization rate within the Federal Building. This may also result in a small increase in the patronage of businesses located near the KCRO. It is not anticipated that such a small number of employees will create any appreciable strain on infrastructure due to the current availability of capacity in the area.

3. Overall Metropolitan Impact

The Kansas City metropolitan area will experience a net-neutral economic impact, as jobs and economic activity remain within the same regional economy. The relocation represents a redistribution rather than a loss of federal presence.

F. Estimate of the Effect of the Reorganization

1. Impact on Availability, Accessibility and Quality of Services

The consolidation is designed to maintain, if not enhance, the quality and continuity of services provided to the public, stakeholders, and program beneficiaries. Several factors contribute to this objective.

a. Continuity of Program Delivery

The availability of HUD's services will remain unchanged. Currently, the KCMFO staff provide specialized Financial Management Center (FMC) with a national scope, which may be accomplished effectively from any location. In fact, integrating the FMC into the larger KCRO is expected to centralize expertise and potentially improve coordination for financial management activities across Region VII and beyond.

Additionally, all programs and staffing levels will be retained through the relocation, and no reductions in Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) are planned. HUD's core programs, including those related to Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage insurance, Public and Indian Housing (PIH), and Community Planning and Development (CPD), which are critical for housing stability and community development, will continue to provide uninterrupted delivery of services. The physical proximity of the two offices (5.2 miles apart) means the operational transition should have minimal impact on staff's ability to continue their work.

b. Accessibility for Stakeholders, Housing Authorities, and the General Public

Concerns regarding accessibility for local housing authorities, community partners, and the general public are paramount in any office consolidation. Accessibility will not be materially impacted due to the short relocation distance (approximately 5.2 miles) within the same metropolitan area. Stakeholders will continue to access services through in-person visits, as well as established virtual channels including phone, email, and online platforms.

c. Quality

Service quality is expected to be maintained or modestly improved by this relocation. Co-location within a larger regional office enhances coordination, allows for shared expertise, and improves access to centralized administrative and technical resources.

2. Impact on HUD Employees

The consolidation is expected to have only minimal impacts on HUD staff and is not expected to result in workforce reductions.

a. Commute Impact

The short relocation distance is unlikely to significantly affect commute times for most employees. The distance between the KCMFO and the KCRO is approximately 5.2 miles, making it a relatively short commute across the state line. For most of the 25 employees, this change is unlikely to significantly alter their daily commute time or cost, especially for those already residing in the broader Kansas City metropolitan area.

b. Transit Support

No relocation assistance is required; however, HUD may adjust transit guidance or commuter support resources as appropriate.

c. Tax Considerations

Employees may experience changes in state tax obligations due to cross-state commuting. These impacts are modest and vary by residency status.

i. *Employees Residing in Missouri:* Most affected employees will now be subject to Kansas non-resident income tax withholding wages earned at the new KS facility. For 2025, the top marginal tax rate in Kansas (5.58%) is slightly higher than Missouri's flat rate (4.70%). These employees must file a Kansas nonresident return and a

Missouri resident return. To prevent double taxation, Missouri allows a resident credit (Form MO–CR) for taxes paid to Kansas. The net effect is that Missouri residents will pay the higher of the two state rates (effectively the KS 5.58% rate), resulting in a modest increase in their overall state tax burden (approximately 0.88% of their wages).

ii. *Employees Residing in Kansas:* Employees who already live in Kansas and currently commute to Missouri will experience a simplification of their tax filing. They will no longer need to file a Missouri nonresident return or claim credit for taxes paid to another state. Their wages will be taxed solely by their home state of Kansas, resulting in a net-neutral financial impact but reduced administrative burden.

iii. *Kansas City, MO Earnings Tax (E-Tax):* Kansas City, MO levies a 1% earnings tax on all its residents, regardless of where they work, and on all nonresidents who work within the city limits. Employees who live in KCMO will continue to pay this 1% tax even after their workplace moves to Kansas. However, employees who live outside KCMO but currently work at the departing MO facility will experience a financial benefit: by moving their workplace to Kansas, they will no longer be subject to the 1% KCMO earnings tax as nonresidents.

iv. *No Relocation-related taxes:* Because the physical relocation costs are borne directly by the agency through a fixed-price vendor contract, individual employees will not receive taxable moving expense reimbursements. Therefore, federal Relocation Income Tax Allowance (RITA) or Withholding Tax Allowance (WTA) provisions are not triggered by this consolidation.

G. Conclusion

The proposed consolidation of the KCMFO into the KCRO is a financially and operationally sound decision that aligns with federal real property optimization goals. It generates significant and immediate cost savings, minimizes duplication of resources, and maintains continuity of services. The cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that this consolidation results in substantial net cost savings, minimal additional and indirect costs, negligible localized economic disruption, and no adverse impact on service availability, accessibility, or quality. Moreover, the integration of the KCMFO into the KCRO, particularly the integration of the Financial Management Center into a larger regional office, is expected to enhance operational synergies and overall efficiency.

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

A Finding of No Significant Impact with respect to the environment has been completed in accordance with HUD regulations in 24 CFR part 50 that implement section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)). The Finding is available for public inspection during regular business hours in the Regulations Division, Office of General Counsel; Department of Housing and Urban Development; 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314. Due to security measures at the HUD building, please schedule an appointment to review the Finding by calling the Regulations Division at 202–402–3055 (this is not a toll-free number). HUD welcomes and is prepared to receive calls from individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing, as well as individuals with speech and communication disabilities. To learn more about how to make an accessible telephone call, please visit *https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/telecommunications-relay-service-trs.*

Chad Cowan,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration.

[FR Doc. 2026–12655 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1491]

Certain Vehicle Parts and Components Thereof; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting an Unopposed Motion To Amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's (''ALJ'') initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 14) granting an unopposed motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation (''NOI'') to: (1) add the following 16 entities as additional respondents: Changzhou Gete Vehicle Parts Co. LTD (''Changzhou Gete''), Changzhou Huirui Car Industry Co. LTD (''Changzhou Huirui''), Changzhou Pulis Auto Parts Co. LTD (''Changzhou Pulis''), Danyang Jiatuo Auto Parts Co. LTD (''Danyang Jiatuo''), Danyang Klay Gold Auto Parts Co. LTD (''Danyang Klay''), Fortress Auto International LTD (''Fortress Auto''), Global Net Automotive Co. LTD (''Global Net''), Jiangsu AoTePa Autoparts Co. LTD (''Jiangsu AoTePa''), Jiangsu Juncheng Vehicle Industry Co. LTD (''Jiangsu Juncheng''), MMF Trading Industries Co. LTD (''MMF Trading''), YangZhou Aierfu Auto Parts Co. LTD (''YangZhou Aierfu''), Yangzhou Deerma Vehicle Industry Co. LTD (''Yangzhou Deerma''), Kong Peng Enterprise Co. LTD (''Kong Peng''), Fa Yi Enterprise Co. LTD (''Fa Yi''), Yih Sheng Auto Parts Ind. Co. LTD (''Yih Sheng''), and Golden Legion Automotive Corp. (''Golden Legion''); (2) allege infringement of U.S. Patent No. D792,816 (''the 'D816 patent'') against existing Respondent ANTRC Industrial Corp. (''ANTRC'') of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; (3) allege infringement of U.S. Patent No. D826,803 (''the 'D803 patent'') and U.S. Patent No. D856,874 (''the 'D874 patent'') against existing Respondent Jiangsu Srumto Auto Parts Co., Ltd. (''Jiangsu Srumto'') of Jiangsu Province, China; and (4) allege infringement of the 'D803 patent against existing Respondents Quality Collision Parts, Inc. (''Quality Collision'') of Warren, Michigan, Power Auto Parts Inc. (''Power Auto'') of Warren, Michigan, and Tong Yang Industry Co. Ltd. (''Tong Yang'') of Tainan, Taiwan.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–3042. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.* For help accessing EDIS, please email *EDIS3Help@usitc.gov.* General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at *https://www.usitc.gov.* Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal, telephone (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 12, 2026, the Commission instituted this investigation based on a complaint filed by General Motors LLC of Detroit, Michigan and GM Global Technology Operations LLC of Detroit, Michigan (collectively, ''GM''). 91 FR 12218–19 (Mar. 12, 2026). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 based on the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain vehicle parts and components