

Recovery, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street SW, Suite 6050, Washington, DC 20416, (202) 205-6734.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given as a result of the President’s major disaster declaration on September 1, 2026, applications for disaster loans may be submitted online using the MySBA Loan Portal <https://lending.sba.gov> or in person at other locally announced locations. For further assistance please contact the SBA disaster assistance customer service center by email at disastercustomerservice@sba.gov or by phone at 1-800-659-2955. If you are deaf, hard of hearing or have a speech disability, please dial 7-1-1 to access telecommunications relay services.

The following areas have been determined to be adversely affected by the disaster:

- Primary Area (Physical Damage and Economic Injury Loans):* Oglala Sioux Tribe.
- Contiguous Counties (Economic Injury Loans Only):*
- South Dakota: Bennett, Custer, Fall River, Jackson, Mellette, Oglala Lakota, Pennington, Todd.
- Nebraska: Cherry, Dawes, Sheridan.
- The Interest Rates are:

	Percent
<i>For Physical Damage:</i>	
Homeowners with Credit Available Elsewhere	5.750
Homeowners without Credit Available Elsewhere	2.875
Businesses with Credit Available Elsewhere	8.000
Businesses without Credit Available Elsewhere	4.000
Private Non-Profit Organizations with Credit Available Elsewhere	3.625
Private Non-Profit Organizations without Credit Available Elsewhere	3.625
<i>For Economic Injury:</i>	
Business and Small Agricultural Cooperatives without Credit Available Elsewhere	4.000
Private Non-Profit Organizations without Credit Available Elsewhere	3.625

The number assigned to this disaster for physical damage is 21849B and for economic injury is 218500.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 59008)

(Authority: 13 CFR 123.3(b).)

James Stallings,
Associate Administrator, Office of Disaster Recovery.

[FR Doc. 2026-19669 Filed 9-24-26; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 8026-09-P

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

[Docket No. FD 36955]

5E SVM Railway Company, LLC—Acquisition and Operation Exemption—Assets of Trona Railway Company LLC

5E SVM Railway Company, LLC (SVMR), a noncarrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31 to acquire and operate a rail line owned by Trona Railway Company LLC, Debtor (TRC), extending from milepost 0.0 at Searles Junction, Cal., to the end of the line at milepost 30.6 in Trona, Cal., a distance of approximately 30.6 miles (the Line).

According to the verified notice, SVMR’s parent, 5E SVM, LLC (5E SVM), entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement with TRC and TRC’s parent company, Searles Valley Minerals Inc. (SVM), to acquire the assets of TRC. The verified notice indicates that SVMR will operate and provide rail common carrier service on the Line. SVMR has concurrently filed a petition for waiver of the 30-day effectiveness period specified under 49 CFR 1150.32(b) to allow the exemption to become effective immediately.¹

SVMR certifies that the proposed acquisition of the Line does not involve any provision or agreement that would limit future interchange with a third-party connecting carrier. SVMR further certifies that its projected annual revenues as a result of this transaction are not expected to exceed \$5 million and will not result in the creation of a Class II or Class I rail carrier.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the effectiveness of the exemption.

All pleadings, referring to Docket No. FD 36955, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board either via e-filing on the Board’s website or in writing addressed to 395 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20423-0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on SVMR’s representative, Thomas J. Litwiler, Fletcher & Sippel LLC, 29 North Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Chicago, IL 60606-3208.

According to SVMR, this action is categorically excluded from environmental review under 49 CFR 1105.6(c) and from historic preservation

¹ The petition for waiver will be addressed in a separate decision.

reporting requirements under 49 CFR 1105.8(b).

Board decisions and notices are available at www.stb.gov.

Decided: September 22, 2026.
By the Board, Anika S. Cooper, Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel.

Jeffrey Herzig,
Clearance Clerk.
[FR Doc. 2026-19627 Filed 9-24-26; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4915-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2026-2080]

Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition, DP26-003

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Denial of a Petition to open a defect investigation.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the reasons for denying a Petition DP26-003 submitted on February 5, 2026 by Mr. James A. Palmer to NHTSA’s Office of Defects Investigation (ODI), under 49 U.S.C. 30162 and 49 CFR part 552. The Petitioner requested that the Agency initiate a safety defect investigation into model year (MY) 2006 Nissan Frontier vehicles for alleged fuel system leaks and engine stalling. ODI has determined that the issues raised in the Petition are not likely to result in a finding that a defect related to motor vehicle safety exists. This determination is based on a technical review by ODI of available information, which included: consumer complaints submitted by the petitioner; consumer complaint information in the Agency’s databases; and other relevant information in possession of the Agency. As a result, further investigation of the issues raised by the Petition is not warranted and the Agency, accordingly, has denied the Petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Kevin Miller, Vehicle Defect Division B, Office of Defects Investigation, NHTSA 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202-873-5019. Email: kevin.miller1@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Introduction

Any interested person may petition NHTSA to request that the Agency initiate an investigation to determine

whether a motor vehicle or item of replacement equipment complies with an applicable motor vehicle safety standard or contains a defect that relates to motor vehicle safety. 49 U.S.C. 30162(a)(2); 49 CFR 552.3. Upon receipt of a properly filed petition, the Agency conducts a technical review of the petition, material submitted with the petition, and any additional information. 49 CFR 552.6. The technical review may consist solely of a review of information already in the possession of the Agency or it may include the collection of information from the motor vehicle manufacturer and/or other sources. *Id.* After conducting the technical review and considering appropriate factors, which may include, but are not limited to, the nature of the complaint, allocation of Agency resources, Agency priorities, the likelihood of uncovering sufficient evidence to establish the existence of a defect, and the likelihood of success in any necessary enforcement litigation, the Agency will grant or deny the petition. *See* 49 U.S.C. 30162(a)(2); 49 CFR 552.8.

2. Defect Petition Summary

In a letter dated February 5, 2026, Mr. James A. Palmer submitted a Petition concerning his MY 2006 Nissan Frontier. The Petition alleged two main hazardous conditions: an odor of raw gasoline indicating a potential fuel leak, and engine stalling during startup and vehicle operation. The Petition cited prior NHTSA safety recalls, specifically Recalls 10V517 (ECM Relay), 07V435 (Fuel Filler Tube), and 10V075 (Fuel Tank/Sender), arguing that his vehicle's symptoms resemble the defects associated with these actions and asserting that a safety defect is not subject to expiration.

3. Office of Defects Investigation Analysis

In evaluating a defect, ODI considers a range of factors, including the age and mileage of the subject vehicle fleet, failure frequency, defect trends, and whether component degradation is attributable to an inherent design or manufacturing flaw versus expected end-of-life wear and tear.

The subject vehicle is a model year 2006 vehicle that has been in service for approximately 20 years. Standard automotive components including fuel hoses, rubber seals, gaskets, electrical relays, and engine sensors have a finite useful lifecycle and are subject to environmental exposure, operational stress, and natural degradation over extended timeframes.

ODI routinely distinguishes between an inherent manufacturing or design defect and normal lifecycle wear-out (*see, e.g.,* Denial of DP18–002, 87 FR 16823, finding underbody component issues late in vehicle life to be “indicative of normal, wear and tear failures”). As vehicles reach advanced age, individual component degradation and maintenance requirements are a standard expectation of vehicle ownership. Isolated component failures on high-age vehicles do not, in themselves, establish the presence of an actionable safety defect across a vehicle fleet.

The Petition references three historic NHTSA safety recall campaigns, Recalls 07V435, 10V075, and 10V517, arguing that because the subject vehicle exhibits fuel odors and engine stalling, these conditions demonstrate an unaddressed or persistent safety defect. However, a technical review of these cited recall campaigns demonstrates that they do not provide compelling support for the petitioner's allegations.

Regarding Recall 07V435, the action pertained exclusively to MY 1997–2001 Nissan Pathfinder and Infiniti QX4 vehicles to address corrosion of the lower fuel filler tube bracket in specific salt-belt states. At the time Recall 07V435 was initiated, the subject vehicles were 6 to 10 years old, and the consequence of the defect was a potential vehicle fire. This campaign did not involve the MY 2006 Nissan Frontier platform. Merely experiencing a general symptom such as a fuel odor on a 20-year-old vehicle does not establish a link to a localized corrosion issue on an entirely different vehicle generation produced years prior. In the case of MY 2006 Frontiers, the Agency is not aware of a trend of fire complaints on a product with over 20 years of exposure.

Recall 10V075 addressed a fuel sender float arm contacting an internal tank embossment, which caused the fuel gauge on certain MY 2006 and 2008 Frontier vehicles to inaccurately display a one-quarter tank level when the fuel tank was empty. That campaign was directed strictly at instrument gauge accuracy and engine stalling from fuel exhaustion, not a physical fuel leak or a breach of fuel system integrity. The petitioner's allegation of raw fuel odors reflects a potential physical leak or vapor loss, which is completely distinct from the fuel-gauge indication flaw remediated under Recall 10V075.

Recall 10V517 addressed silicon oxide accumulation on Engine Control Module (ECM) relay contacts within the Intelligent Power Distribution Module on select MY 2005–2006 vehicles. After

approximately 20 years of operational service and environmental exposure, engine stalling can be caused by a wide range of normal, age-related maintenance conditions. The presence of engine stalling on a 20-year-old vehicle does not, by itself, indicate the presence of the original manufacturing defect addressed in Recall 10V517.

The Petition must present specific data establishing a defect trend that poses an unreasonable risk to safety. Broadly associating general, late-life vehicle symptoms with historic, non-applicable, or previously remediated recall campaigns on multi-decade-old vehicles does not satisfy this requirement. Furthermore, NHTSA's oversight of recall execution ensures that campaign parameters (such as affected VIN ranges and build dates) are chosen based on specific defect determinations; therefore, individual component degradation on high-age vehicles outside these parameters likely represents routine wear and tear rather than an unaddressed defect trend.

The Agency has thoroughly assessed the material submitted by the Petitioner, consumer complaint information in NHTSA's databases, and other relevant information already in possession of the Agency. NHTSA does not believe that the issues presented by the Petitioner indicate the likely existence of a safety-related defect that would warrant a formal investigation. After full consideration of the available information, and in view of NHTSA's enforcement priorities, the Petition is denied.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30162(d) and 49 CFR part 552; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.95(a).¹

Eileen Sullivan,

Associate Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2026–19685 Filed 9–24–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Bureau of Transportation Statistics

[Docket No. DOT–OST–2026–1882]

Notice of Request for Clearance of a Revision of a Currently Approved Information Collection: National Census of Ferry Operators

AGENCY: Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS), Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology (OST–R), DOT.

¹ The authority to determine whether to approve or deny defect Petitions under 49 U.S.C. 30162(d) and 49 CFR part 552 has been further delegated to the Associate Administrator for Enforcement.