

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David L. Williams by email at: David.L.Williams@faa.gov; phone: 202–267–8051

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspect of this information collection, including (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for FAA's performance; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden; (c) ways for FAA to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (d) ways that the burden could be minimized without reducing the quality of the collected information. The agency will summarize and/or include your comments in the request for OMB's clearance of this information collection.

OMB Control Number: 2120–0595.

Title: FAA Acquisition Management System (FAAAMS).

FAA FAST Home Page: <https://fast.faa.gov/>.

Type of Review: Renewal of an information collection.

Background: The FAAAMS establishes policies and internal procedures for FAA acquisition. Section 348 of Public Law 104–50 directed FAA to establish an acquisition system. The information collection is carried out as an integral part of FAA's acquisition process. Various portions of the AMS describe information needed from vendors seeking or already doing business with FAA. FAA's contracting offices collect the information to plan, solicit, award, administer and close individual contracts. FAA's small business office collects information to promote and increase small business participation in FAA contracts. AMS requires information collection through a series of forms in the areas of (1) Solicitations and (2) Post-Award Contract Administration.

Solicitations: The FAA utilizes solicitations to evaluate vendor-specific technical solutions, capabilities, and other qualifications such as subcontracting plans that may result in the award of a contract for a defined FAA need. The extent and nature of the information required from vendors varies depending on the nature of the goods and/or services procured, as well as the size and complexity of the FAA requirements.

Post-Award Contract Administration: Depending on the complexity and size of the contract, various activities are ongoing after contract award in areas such as bonds (e.g., construction contracts), small business subcontracting (e.g., applying to large businesses), the tracking and

management of Government Property, and invoicing. Contract modifications vary from routine administrative updates to major additions of work.

Solicitations

Respondents: 3,461.

Frequency: 1 time.

Estimated Average Burden per

Response: 3 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 10,383 hours.

Post-Award Contract Administration

Respondents: 10,177.

Frequency: 3 times.

Estimated Average Burden per

Response: 23 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 702,213 hours.

Issued in Washington, DC, August 20, 2026.

Stephen Brendan Mangan,

Manager, AAP–100, Acquisition Policy Group.

[FR Doc. 2026–17259 Filed 8–24–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**Federal Aviation Administration**

[Docket No. FAA–2026–9736]

Siting New Spaceports and Use of Priority Airspace for Critical Space Launch Corridors

ACTION: Notice; Request for information (RFI).

SUMMARY: Under the leadership of President Trump and at the direction of Secretary Duffy and Administrator Bedford, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) are pursuing opportunities to ensure the United States global dominance in the commercial space transportation industry. The FAA is issuing this RFI to solicit public and industry input on two key transportation-related elements of President Trump's recently published 2026 National Space Transportation Policy (NSTP): siting a new spaceport and the development and use of priority airspace for critical space launch corridors.

DATES: Written comments, including all supporting information and documents, are requested on or before October 26, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are encouraged to submit responses to the questions posed in this RFI, along with supporting information, regarding the 2026 NSTP, to docket number FAA–

2026–9736 using any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the online instructions for sending your comments electronically.

- *Mail:* Send comments to Docket Operations, M–30; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Room W12–140, West Building Ground Floor, Washington, DC 20590–0001.

Privacy: DOT posts any comments received without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at <http://www.dot.gov/privacy>.

Docket: Background documents or comments received may be read at <http://www.regulations.gov> at any time. Follow the online instructions for accessing the docket or go to the Docket Operations in Room W12–140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590–0001, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Hatt, Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 267–4156. Email: NSTP2026@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**1. Purpose**

The purpose of this RFI is to solicit information to support the Department's analysis in expanding opportunities for commercial space transportation and support the 2026 NSTP objectives.

In 2025, the United States was responsible for 217 of the 329 launches worldwide. This rapid increase cemented the United States as the premier launch country. Looking forward, this ever-increasing launch rate is expected to reach 10,000 FAA-licensed launches and reentries a year by 2035, driving the cadence from a few launches a week to several launches and reentries a day. As of today, over half of U.S. launches originated from Cape Canaveral Space Force Station and Kennedy Space Center in Florida. Including Vandenberg Space Force Base in California, these three Federal sites account for 83 percent of U.S. launches.

On December 18, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order (E.O.) 14369, *Ensuring American Space Superiority*, to emphasize the reach of human discovery, secure the Nation's

vital economic and security interests, unleash commercial development, and lay the foundation for a new space age.¹ New and upgraded facilities, improved efficiency, and policy reforms will facilitate the security and defense of vital U.S. national and economic commercial space equities. In addition, President Trump's new 2026 NSTP directs the Secretary of Transportation to identify "potential locations for additional launch facilities and targeted development or improvement of launch infrastructure." Consistent with the Administration's E.O. and the NSTP, the Department of Transportation (Department) is requesting input regarding potential locations for new spaceports. Such spaceports would ideally be viable locations to complement or augment many of the operations from Cape Canaveral Space Force Station, Kennedy Space Center, Vandenberg Space Force Base, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Wallops Flight Facility.

The 2026 NSTP also tasks the Department to "designate priority airspace for critical space launch corridors." The Department seeks input from the space and aviation industries and other interested stakeholders. Specifically, the Department is interested in considerations for developing priority airspace for critical space launch corridors, the ideal requisites for priority airspace, and concepts for differentiating standard airspace used for commercial space activities from priority airspace.

This RFI is an invitation to submit information in response to questions on the topics posed below in Section 4. Responses should be as detailed as possible to facilitate a comprehensive review.

2. Background

The United States is the unquestioned leader in space launch and reentry. Robust and varied commercial, civil, and national security space launch activities form the backbone of U.S. space-based power. Cape Canaveral Space Force Station, Kennedy Space Center, and Vandenberg Space Force Base provide unprecedented access to space. Federal ranges are strained to support both governmental and commercial space launches, however. Even with enhanced efficiency at Federal launch and reentry sites, the United States may find availability of launch and reentry sites becoming a bottleneck to achieving the goals of E.O. 14369 and the 2026 NSTP. While

enhanced efficiency at Federal launch sites will support the short-term increase in launch cadence and demand, with surges in military, commercial, and civil space activities, the United States must prepare for the rapid expansion of launch cadence by supporting increased spaceport capacity, additional launch sites, and support infrastructure to ensure continuous dominance in commercial space.

The fundamental requirements that drove site selection for the Eastern and Western Test Ranges in the 1950s remain unchanged. Geography allowing launch and reentry over open water, available infrastructure to support launch logistics (e.g., roads and utilities), and accessibility to space with minimal overflight of foreign countries were, and remain, key metrics to spaceport success. In addition to the Federal launch and reentry ranges, NASA's Wallops Flight Facility adds capacity to U.S. space launch. However, although Wallops shares many of the attributes of the major Federal ranges, certain characteristics, including tight physical constraints and only four launch pads with no option for heavy spacelift, limit Wallops' ability to support future space technology or to accommodate the expected increase in orbital launch cadence.

The Department oversees FAA-licensed commercial spaceports and private single-use launch sites. A viable spaceport involves several tradeoffs. The Office of Commercial Space Transportation developed a brief *Spaceport Licensing Primer: An Introduction to the Spaceport Licensing Process*² to provide information for individuals not familiar with the development of commercial spaceports. The 2026 NSTP recognizes, as a national space transportation goal, that "by 2030, our space transportation ranges must grow to support more than 1,000 launches and reentries every year." To ensure the United States reaches this goal, it must add and modernize launch and reentry infrastructure.

A critical aspect of spaceport development will be funding. Secretary Duffy recently established the National Infrastructure Development Office (NIDO) in the Department to expand and encourage use of public-private partnerships in infrastructure development. Public-private partnerships could be a valuable and innovative tool for structuring spaceport development in particular. This RFI solicits information on funding

mechanisms and the potential utility of public-private partnerships in spaceport development.

In addition, the 2026 NSTP directs the Department to "designate priority airspace for critical space launch corridors." Currently, U.S. launch operators work with the FAA Air Traffic Organization to establish Aircraft Hazard Areas (AHAs) for space launches to protect aircraft from space objects and falling debris. Because the same spaceports support the majority of U.S. space launches, the same or similar AHAs for safety are repeatedly used. FAA does not currently use the term 'space launch corridor.' The questions below are intended to explore the relationship and assumptions related to the current AHAs and the new critical space launch corridor concept. The concept of airspace corridors, in general, is not new, and airspace corridors for aviation users may vary in definition and use from space launch corridors. For example, airspace corridors for aviation activities may look and operate differently from a potential space launch corridor, as the foundations for space launch safety account for collision and debris. In contrast, most aviation activities need only account for collision. From a space operator's perspective, request time and availability are important factors enabling rapid launch cadence. From an aviation perspective, advance notification of time, size, and duration of AHAs are integral to maintaining both aviation safety and airspace efficiency.

3. Nature of Information Request

The Department may use information obtained through this request to assist in, inform, and research potential locations for viable spaceport sites. The Department will also accept ideas for increasing launch cadence at existing U.S. commercial spaceport sites.

The Department requests that information be provided in a written statement. The Department may request additional information or presentations from responders depending upon the details of the responder's submission. Given the short timeframe for the Department's identification and characterization of potential sites, responders should assume that their written response is the best opportunity to provide input and not hold out for an in-person meeting with the Department.

¹ 90 FR 60537.

² https://www.faa.gov/space/office_spaceports/Spaceport-Licensing-Primer.pdf.

4. Submittal Requests for RFI³

Interested members of the public, including aerospace industry stakeholders, are requested to submit information on the following:

Responder Information. Submit, as applicable:

- Name, address, and affiliation (company if appropriate);
- URL of company website (if applicable); and
- Point of contact, including telephone number and email address.

RFI Questions. Any interested member of the public, including any aerospace industry stakeholder, is invited to provide information responsive to the questions below. Responses will enable the Department to evaluate the best locations for new U.S. spaceports and assist the Department in establishing priority airspace for critical space launch corridors.

1. (*Spaceport Location criteria*) What strategic criteria should the Department use in evaluating new spaceport siting considerations?

- What geographic aspects matter most: proximity to the equator for prograde space launches, proximity to or separation from densely populated regions, or other factors?
- What logistical considerations should be evaluated, including ease of development and access, as well as impediments to be avoided?
- What unique considerations would there be with an island spaceport versus a site on the continental United States?
- What international equities should be considered with siting (e.g., early overflight of foreign territory)?
- What should the primary safety considerations be for siting of any new spaceport, given the current public safety criteria of 1×10^{-4} casualties per operation?

2. (*Existing Commercial Spaceports*) Why are existing commercial spaceports underutilized?

- What Federal actions could be taken to increase orbital launches from existing commercial spaceports?
- Why haven't these underutilized spaceports developed into operational spaceports? Can the development of existing commercial spaceports be renewed?

3. (*Previously Proposed Spaceports*) Noting that the Department has not been involved in selecting or developing new spaceports in the past, several spaceport options have been previously considered. The Department would like input on these potential locations.

- Spaceport Shiloh, Florida. Space Florida proposed the construction and operation of the Shiloh Launch Complex on approximately 150 acres of undeveloped Federal land.
- Camden Spaceport, Georgia. Initially, a site considered by NASA for the Apollo program, planning progressed on Camden Spaceport until local stakeholders pushed back in 2022, ending site development. The County's current site license runs through December 2026.
- Puerto Rico Spaceport. Initially conceptualized in the 2012–2016 timeframe. Spaceport Puerto Rico was considered for light and medium launch vehicles.
- Space launch rigs. Space launch from converted oil rigs or custom-developed launch platforms.

4. (*New Spaceport Location*) The Department would like input on potential new locations and other options not identified specifically in this RFI.

- Where might a new U.S. vertical spaceport site be developed? Considering the factors identified in the Spaceport Licensing Primer and FAA regulations on launch sites in Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 420, what changes might the Department make to encourage, facilitate, and promote development of a new spaceport site?

• Referring to the Spaceport Licensing Primer, what can the Department do to address the four challenging areas in spaceport development: (1) stakeholder engagement, (2) co-location with an airport, (3) environmental issues, and (4) airspace integration?

- Are there locations where the necessary infrastructure already exists for establishing a spaceport? For example, transport links such as wide-load highways or deep-water ports.
- What are the primary costs associated with developing a new spaceport?

• What strategies and technologies could be utilized to expedite construction?

• What are the supply chain constraints for construction, and how could they be addressed?

• What energy constraints exist, and how could they be addressed?

• What funding constraints exist, and how could they be addressed, to include

alternative financing structures? How could public-private partnerships best be leveraged to finance spaceport development?

5. (*Critical Space Launch Corridors*)

As the Department develops critical space launch corridors, what expectations do the space and aviation industries have regarding prioritization?

- How can the implementation of space launch corridors limit adverse impacts to airspace efficiency and the continued growth of the air transportation industry?
- What benefits to either or both industries would be granted when utilizing critical space launch corridors?
- What adjustments to operational and coordination timelines might be made when utilizing critical space launch corridors?
- Assuming standard existing procedures apply for activities that do not use critical space launch corridors, what activities would qualify for activation of the critical space launch corridors?

• How would the payload characterization (commercial, civil, or national security) impact the development or use of critical space launch corridors?

• What spaceports would most benefit from critical space launch corridors: all spaceports, major use spaceports, or only Federal spaceports?

• What governance structures would enhance the use of critical launch corridors, to include fees, operational restrictions, or other oversight methodologies?

• What limitations or emergency measures would need to be established to ensure public safety during commercial space activities and continued aviation safety for the flying public?

• What environmental concerns should be considered in determining where to locate, and when to activate, critical space launch corridors?

• How would the identification of a corridor as a "critical space launch corridor," which is not a current term in AHAs, increase awareness, streamline timing requirements, and enable greater launch cadence?

6. What questions are we not asking that are relevant to this effort? Please identify those questions and provide responses.

5. Timeline and Delivery of Submittal

See also the **DATES** section of this notice. Written comments, including all supporting information and documents, are requested on or before October 26, 2026.

³ This is not a Screening Information Request or Request for Offers. The Department is not seeking or accepting unsolicited proposals related to this activity. The Department will not pay for any information received or costs incurred in preparing a response to this request. Any costs associated with a submittal are solely at the interested vendor's expense. The Department reserves the right to communicate with any, some, or none of the respondents. Any submissions will remain with the Department for its use and will not be returned to the respondents.

Submittals: Interested parties must respond in writing. Responses to the RFI questions should be concise and reasonable in length.

The Department may request clarification of responses directly related to this RFI through direct contact with respondents. Respondents must identify and clearly mark any proprietary information contained in their submissions and must be prepared to provide justification for confidential treatment to the Department of such designations if requested. This proprietary information will be treated confidentially by the Department; however, nothing alters the Department's obligations under existing law, including any duties owed by the Department under the Freedom of Information Act. The Department may need the Respondent's justification of the proprietary designation to support withholding the documents or information from public disclosure upon request.

Issued in Washington, DC.

Sean P. Duffy,

Secretary of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 2026-17290 Filed 8-24-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

[Docket No. FMCSA-2026-1783]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Renewal of an Approved Information Collection: Non-Insulin-Treated Diabetes Mellitus Assessment Form, MCSA-5872

AGENCY: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, FMCSA announces its plan to submit the Information Collection Request (ICR) described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval and invites public comment. FMCSA requests approval to renew an ICR titled, "Non-Insulin-Treated Diabetes Mellitus Assessment Form, MCSA-5872." This information collection (IC) is voluntary and may be utilized by certified medical examiners (MEs) responsible for issuing Medical Examiner's Certificates (MEC), Form MCSA-5876, to individuals diagnosed with non-insulin-treated diabetes

mellitus who operate commercial motor vehicles (CMVs). MEs choosing to use this IC will do so in an effort to communicate with treating healthcare providers who manage the diabetes care of individuals diagnosed with non-insulin-treated diabetes mellitus who operate CMVs. The information obtained by MEs will assist them in determining if an individual diagnosed with non-insulin-treated diabetes mellitus meets FMCSA's physical qualification standards.

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received on or before October 26, 2026.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by Docket Number FMCSA-2026-1783 using any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- **Mail:** Dockets Operations; U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, W58-213, West Building, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

- **Hand Delivery or Courier:** Dockets Operations, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, W58-213, Washington, DC 20590-0001 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- **Fax:** (202) 493-2251.

To avoid duplication, please use only one of these four methods. See the "Public Participation and Request for Comments" portion of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Christine A. Hydock, Chief, Medical Programs Division, DOT, FMCSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590-0001; (202) 366-4001; fmcamedical@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Instructions

All submissions must include the Agency name and docket number. For detailed instructions on submitting comments, see the Public Participation heading below. Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Please see the Privacy Act heading below.

Public Participation and Request for Comments

If you submit a comment, please include the docket number for this notice (FMCSA-2026-1783), indicate the specific section of this document to which your comment applies, and

provide a reason for each suggestion or recommendation. You may submit your comments and material online or by fax, mail, or hand delivery, but please use only one of these means. FMCSA recommends that you include your name and a mailing address, an email address, or a phone number in the body of your document so FMCSA can contact you if there are questions regarding your submission.

To submit your comment online, go to <https://www.regulations.gov/docket/FMCSA-2026-1783/document>, click on this notice, click "Comment," and type your comment into the text box on the following screen.

If you submit your comments by mail or hand delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing.

FMCSA will consider all comments and material received during the comment period.

Privacy Act

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its regulatory process. DOT posts these comments, including any personal information the commenter provides, to www.regulations.gov as described in the system of records notice DOT/ALL 14 (Federal Docket Management System (FDMS)), which can be reviewed at <https://www.transportation.gov/individuals/privacy/privacy-act-system-records-notices>. The comments are posted without edits and are searchable by the name of the submitter.

Background

The primary mission of FMCSA is to reduce crashes, injuries, and fatalities involving CMVs (large trucks and buses). The Secretary of Transportation has delegated responsibility to FMCSA under 49 U.S.C. 31136 and 31502 to prescribe regulations that ensure CMVs are operated safely. As part of this mission, the Agency's Medical Programs Division works to ensure that individuals who operate CMVs engaged in interstate commerce are physically qualified and able to safely perform their work. CMVs characteristically pose a threat to highway safety if not operated properly by qualified individuals. CMVs are longer, heavier, and more difficult to maneuver than automobiles. Not only does it take a skilled driver to operate them safely, but it also takes a physically and mentally fit driver to do so as well. Information used to determine and certify driver medical fitness helps to promote and maintain safety on our nation's