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 thereof by reason of infringement of the claims of U.S. Patent No. D749,997; U.S. Patent No. D792,815; the 'D816 patent; U.S. Patent No. D793,301; U.S. Patent No. D828,247; U.S. Patent No. D828,248; U.S. Patent No. D828,256; U.S. Patent No. D847,703; U.S. Patent No. D848,318; the 'D874 patent; U.S. Patent No. D818,406; U.S. Patent No. D826,114; U.S. Patent No. D843,025; U.S. Patent No. D883,155; U.S. Patent No. D902,807; U.S. Patent No. D930,533; U.S. Patent No. D955,939; U.S. Patent No. D859,239; U.S. Patent No. D848,647; and the 'D803 patent. *Id.* The Commission's NOI named the following as respondents: AP Auto Parts Industrial Ltd. of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; ANTRC; Auto Power Co., Ltd. of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; Best Value Auto Body Supply (''Best Value'') of Melrose Park, Illinois; CCC Intelligent Solutions Holdings Inc. of Chicago, Illinois; CCC Intelligent Solutions Inc. of Chicago, Illinois; DEPO Auto Parts Ind. Co., Ltd. of Chang Hua Shien, Taiwan; Forerunner Automotive Industrial Corp. of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; Gordon Auto Body Parts Co., Ltd. of Taoyuan City, Taiwan; Grand HC Auto Tooling Corp. of Taipei City, Taiwan; Jiangsu Srumto; Keystone Automotive Industries, Inc. of Antioch, Tennessee; LKQ Corporation of Antioch, Tennessee; Maxzone Vehicle Lighting Corp. of Fontana, California; Mitchell International, Inc. of San Diego, California; Pro Fortune Industrial Co., Ltd. of New Taipei City, Taiwan; Power Auto; Quality Collision; Tong Yang; and Y.C.C. Parts Mfg. Co., Ltd., of Chung Hua Hsien, Taiwan. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (''OUII'') is participating in this investigation. *Id.*

On June 3, 2026, the Commission terminated the investigation as to Best Value based on issuance of a consent order. Order No. 11 (May 4, 2026), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice (June 3, 2026).

On May 1, 2026, GM moved under 19 CFR 210.14 to amend the complaint and NOI to: (1) add the following 16 entities as additional respondents: Changzhou Gete, Changzhou Huirui, Changzhou Pulis, Danyang Jiatuo, Danyang Klay, Fortress Auto, Global Net, Jiangsu AoTePa, Jiangsu Juncheng, MMF Trading, YangZhou Aierfu, Yangzhou Deerma, Kong Peng, Fa Yi, Yih Sheng, and Golden Legion; (2) allege infringement of the 'D816 patent against existing Respondent ANTRC; (3) allege infringement of the 'D803 patent and the 'D874 patent against existing Respondent Jiangsu Srumto; and (4) allege infringement of the 'D803 patent against existing Respondents Quality Collision, Power Auto, and Tong Yang. ID at 1–2. GM argued that good cause exists for this amendment because ''it did not have the information necessary for the allegations until it received information during discovery.'' *Id.* at 6. On May 13, 2026, OUII filed a response in support of the motion. OUII noted that ''the information gained during discovery about the Proposed Respondents was not known prior to institution of this Investigation'' and that ''without discovery, GM cannot exhaustively identify all product imported into the United States, sold for importation into the United States, and/or sold within the United States after importation that infringe the Asserted Patents.'' *Id.* at 3. On May 18, 2026, Respondents ANTRC, Auto Power Co., Ltd.; CCC Intelligent Solutions Holdings Inc. and CCC Intelligent Solutions Inc. (collectively, ''CCC'') filed a response, which while not opposing the amendments, expressed concerns about maintaining the timeline of the scheduled 5-day hearing. *Id.* at 4–5.

On May 21, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting the motion. The ID observed that Commission Rule 210.14(b) provides that:

> [a]fter an investigation has been instituted, the complaint and notice of investigation may be amended only by leave of the Commission for good cause shown and upon such conditions as are necessary to avoid prejudicing the public interest and the rights of the parties to the investigation . . . .

Id. at 5 (citing 19 CFR 210.14(b)(1)). The ID found that good cause exists to amend the complaint and NOI, noting that ''the additional allegations that are the subject of the amendments requested in GM's Motion is that Complainants did not have the information necessary for the allegations until it received information during discovery.'' *Id.* at 6. The ID further noted that ''[t]he Complaint was filed less than four (4) months before GM filed its Motion, on February 5, 2026'' and that ''[t]here are four (4) months remaining in fact discovery.'' *Id.* at 6. The ID added that ''[a]t such an early stage, there is time for the Parties to seek discovery and/or develop claim(s) and defense(s) related to the amendments requested in GM's Motion'' and so ''granting the Motion does not prejudice the Parties.'' *Id.* The ID stated that ''it is more efficient to adjudicate all of GM's claims in a single Investigation'' as doing so would ''conserve public and private resources.'' *Id.* Regarding CCC's concern about the schedule, the ID stated that ''[i]f the Parties believe additional Hearing time will be needed, they should notify Chambers as soon as possible since Courtroom space is taken early. Even if the Parties are not certain they will need the time, they should request it sooner than later.'' *Id.*

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID. The complaint and NOI are hereby amended to: (1) add the following 16 entities as respondents: Changzhou Gete, Changzhou Huirui, Changzhou Pulis, Danyang Jiatuo, Danyang Klay, Fortress Auto, Global Net, Jiangsu AoTePa, Jiangsu Juncheng, MMF Trading, YangZhou Aierfu, Yangzhou Deerma, Kong Peng, Fa Yi, Yih Sheng, and Golden Legion; (2) allege infringement of the 'D816 patent against existing Respondent ANTRC; (3) allege infringement of the 'D803 patent and the 'D874 patent against existing Respondent Jiangsu Srumto; and (4) allege infringement of the 'D803 patent against existing Respondents Quality Collision, Power Auto, and Tong Yang.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on June 22, 2026. The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 22, 2026.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2026–12722 Filed 6–23–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–636 and 731–TA–1470 (Review)]

Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products From China

Determinations

On the basis of the record[1] developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (''Commission'') determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), that revocation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on wood mouldings and millwork products from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on January 2, 2026 (91 FR 151)

[1] The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).