

Officer, Paperwork Reduction Act Division, PRAD, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, Room 8210, Washington, DC 20410; email at PaperworkReductionActOffice@hud.gov, ATTN: Dr. John L. Murphy telephone (202) 402–8084. This is not a toll-free number. HUD welcomes and is prepared to receive calls om individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing, as well as individuals with speech or 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>. Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Ms. Guido.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice informs the public that HUD is seeking approval from OMB for the

information collection described in Section A. The **Federal Register** notice that solicited public comment on the information collection for a period of 60 days was published on April 10, 2026 at 91 FR 18476.

A. Overview of Information Collection

Title of Information Collection: Rural Capacity Building (RCB) Program.
OMB Approval Number: 2506–0195.
Type of Request: Reinstatement of a previously Approved Collection.
Form Number: DRGR Activation & Account Setup; Action Plan Setup & Submission; Action Plan Revisions; Semi-Annual Report Submissions; Voucher Submission.
Description of the need for the information and proposed use: The Rural Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing (RCB) program and the funding made

available have been authorized by the Annual Appropriations Acts each year since FY 2012. The RCB program enhances the capacity and ability of rural housing development organizations, Community Development Corporations (CDCs), Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), local governments, and Indian tribes (eligible beneficiaries) to carry out affordable housing and community development activities in rural areas for the benefit of low- and moderate-income families and persons. The RCB program achieves this by funding National Organizations with expertise in rural housing and rural community development who work directly to build the capacity of eligible beneficiaries. Grantees of the RCB program are required to submit certain information as part of the requirements as a grantee.

RCB INFORMATION COLLECTION BURDEN HOURS FOR THE PUBLIC

Description of information collection	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Responses per annum	Burden hour per response	Annual burden hours	Hourly cost per response	Annual cost
Non-recurring	DRGR Activation & Account Setup.	20	1	20	2	40	\$43.57 \$1,742.80
	Action Plan Setup & Submission.	20	1	20	12	240	43.57 10,456.80
Recurring	Action Plan Revisions ..	20	2	40	0.5	20	43.57 871.40
	Semi-Annual Report Submissions.	20	2	40	8	320	43.57 13,942.40
	Voucher Submission	20	12	240	0.25	60	43.57 2,614.20
	Total Paperwork Burden.	20	Varies	360	Varies	680	43.57 29,627.60

National Non-Profits and often staffed by mid-career individuals, the cost figures are estimated based on local staff earning the equivalent of a GS–13, Step 1, base hourly rate for FY 2026 is \$58.35/hour *OPM.gov*.

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

- (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- (2) The accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;
- (3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- (4) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

HUD encourages interested parties to submit comment in response to these questions.

C. Authority

Section 2 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3507.

John Murphy,
Compliance Officer, Department PRA Compliance Officer, Office of Policy Development and Research, Chief Data Officer.
[FR Doc. 2026–15154 Filed 7–27–26; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[Docket No. FWS–HQ–NWRS–2026–2641, FXGO166009DR000–267–FF09D00000]

National Wildlife Refuge System; Request for Information on Implementation of Drain Tile Setbacks; Correction

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.
ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) published a document in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 2026, regarding the Service’s process for calculating setbacks for the placement of drain tile by landowners on property where the Service owns wetland easements. The document contained incorrect docket number information.
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Madonna Baucum, Chief of Regulations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, by email

at Info_Coll@fws.gov, or by telephone at (703) 468–8211. Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services. Individuals outside the United States should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point-of-contact in the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of July 24, 2026, in FR document 2026–14995, on page 46796, in the first column, correct the **ADDRESSES** caption to read:

ADDRESSES:

Comment submission: All submissions must include the docket number FWS–HQ–NWRs–2026–2641 which identifies this document. You must submit comments using one of the following methods:

- *Electronic submission:* Federal eRulemaking Portal at: <https://www.regulations.gov>. In the Search box, enter FWS–HQ–NWRs–2026–2641, which is the docket number for this action. Then click the Search button. On the resulting page, you may submit a comment by clicking on “Comment.” Please ensure that you have found the correct document before submitting your comments.

- *U.S. mail:* Public Comments Processing, Attn: Docket No. FWS–HQ–NWRs–2026–2641, Policy and Regulations Branch, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS: PRB (JAO/3W), 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041–3803.

Comments submitted through any method not authorized in this document, or sent to an address not listed here, will not be considered. We will not accept comments via email, fax, or hand delivery. We are not required to consider comments that are submitted after the comment period ends or that are submitted via a method outside of these instructions. Comments containing profanity, vulgarity, threats, or other inappropriate content will not be considered.

We will post all comments at <https://www.regulations.gov>. You may request that we withhold personal identifying information from public review; however, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Jillian Eanett,

*Acting Chief, Policy and Regulations Branch,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

[FR Doc. 2026–15209 Filed 7–24–26; 11:15 am]

BILLING CODE 4333–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Kerri Zavota, DVM; Decision and Order

On December 15, 2025, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) to Kerri Zavota, D.V.M., of South Daytona, Florida (Registrant).¹ OSC, at 1, 7. The OSC proposes the revocation of Registrant’s two DEA certificates of registration (registration), FZ5603952 and FZ2291451, and the denial of any pending application to renew or modify either of those registrations “because . . . [Registrant] materially falsified . . . [her] DEA renewal applications” and because her “continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest.” *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(1) and 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4), in conjunction with 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1)). More specifically, the OSC alleges that Registrant “materially falsified five DEA . . . [certificate of registration applications]” and “administered or dispensed controlled substances without maintaining complete and accurate records and inventories.”² OSC, at 4.

I. Adequacy of Service Analysis

The matter is before the Agency due to the Government’s Request for Final Agency Action (RFAA) dated February 3, 2026. In its RFAA, the Government states that a DEA Diversion Investigator (DI) personally served the OSC on Registrant on December 18, 2025. RFAA, at 1. In support of that statement, the Government attaches to its RFAA a completed and signed Form DEA–12. RFAA, Exhibit 2, Attachment A. According to a Declaration that the DI signed under penalty of perjury, the DI “witnessed” Registrant sign the DEA–12 on December 18, 2025, “to acknowledge receipt of the OSC.” Exhibit 2, at 1. For the above reasons, the Agency concludes that service of the OSC on Registrant is legally sufficient and took place on December 18, 2025.

II. Application of the Default Rule

Under 21 CFR 1301.43, a registrant or applicant entitled to a hearing who fails to file a timely hearing request “within 30 days after the date of receipt of the [OSC] . . . shall be deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default” unless “good cause” is established for the failure. 21 CFR

1301.43(a), (c)(1). In the absence of a demonstration of good cause, a registrant or applicant who fails to timely file an answer also is “deemed to have waived their right to a hearing and to be in default.” 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(2).

The OSC notified Registrant of her deadline to file a written request for hearing and answer, and that if she failed to file such a request and answer, she would be deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and be in default. OSC, at 6 (citing 21 CFR 1301.43). The Government represents in its RFAA that, as of the date of the RFAA, February 3, 2026, Registrant “has not filed a request for hearing or an answer.” RFAA, at 2. Based on the record before the Agency, consisting solely of the RFAA and its attachments, the Agency finds that more than thirty days passed since personal service of the OSC on Registrant and that Registrant did not submit a request for a hearing. *Id.* Accordingly, the Agency finds substantial record evidence, indeed uncontroverted record evidence, that Registrant did not timely request a hearing and is in default. 21 CFR 1301.37(d)(1); *id.* 1301.43(c)(1).

Further, the Agency notes that more than forty-five days have passed since Registrant received the OSC, yet the Administrator has not received a motion by Registrant to be excused from default. 21 CFR 1301.43(c)(1) (“Any person who has failed to timely request a hearing under paragraph (a) of this section may seek to be excused from the default by filing a motion with the Office of Administrative Law Judges establishing good cause to excuse the default no later than 45 days after the date of receipt of the order to show cause. Thereafter, any person who has failed to timely request a hearing under paragraph (a) of this section and seeks to be excused from the default shall file such motion with the Office of the Administrator, which shall have exclusive authority to rule on the motion.”), *see also id.* 1301.43(f)(3).

“A default, unless excused, shall be deemed to constitute a waiver of the [registrant’s] right to a hearing and an admission of the factual allegations of the [OSC].” 21 CFR 1301.43(e). Accordingly, based on the record before the Agency, the Agency finds that Registrant is in unexcused default and, therefore, is deemed to have waived her right to a hearing and to have admitted the factual allegations in the OSC. *Id.* 1301.43(e).

III. The Controlled Substances Act

The main objectives of the Controlled Substances Act (CSA), according to the Supreme Court, are to “conquer drug

¹ The default rule, whose effective date is December 14, 2022, therefore, applies.

² Here, the evidence establishing the material falsification allegation so strongly favors revocation that the Agency deems it unnecessary to analyze the public interest allegation.