

related events that highlight emerging systemic risks across rail transit systems, including structural failures, pantograph entanglements, and downed live wires.

FTA recommends that State Safety Oversight Agencies (SSOAs) direct Rail Transit Agencies (RTAs) within their jurisdiction to use the RTA's Safety Management System (SMS) to review and analyze safety performance data to identify hazards related to OCS and pantograph failures, conduct safety risk assessments, identify new or modified safety risk mitigations as necessary to reduce the associated safety risks, and monitor the effectiveness of those mitigations as part of the RTA's Safety Assurance process.

FTA recommends SSOAs obtain any documentation related to the recommended actions outlined above from their RTAs.

FTA recommends that SSOAs that receive such documentation submit it to the State Safety Oversight Reporting (SSOR) system within 180 days from the issuance of this Safety Advisory.

FTA's Safety Advisory 26–01, "Overhead Catenary System (OCS) and Pantograph Reliability," will be available in its entirety on the agency's public website: <https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/safety/fta-safety-advisories>.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 5329; 49 CFR 1.91 and 670.29.

Jamie D. Pfister,
Acting Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2026–22168 Filed 10–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2026–1321]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Request for Comment; State Data Transfer (SDT)

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

ACTION: Notice and request for comments on a request for renewal with modification of a currently approved information collection.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) summarized below will be submitted to

the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden. This document describes a collection of information for which NHTSA intends to seek OMB approval on the State Data Transfer (SDT) program for Vehicle Crash Information. A **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this information collection was published on June 25, 2026. NHTSA received one public comment.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before November 30, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection, including suggestions for reducing burden, should be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget at www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. To find this particular information collection, select "Currently under Review—Open for Public Comment" or use the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or access to background documents, contact Liza Lemaster-Sandbank, Office of State Data Reporting System Division (NSA–0120), telephone (202) 744–5942, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, W43–481, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Please identify the relevant collection of information by referring to its OMB Control Number, 2127–0753.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), a Federal agency must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) before it collects certain information from the public, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information by a Federal agency unless the collection displays a valid OMB control number. In compliance with these requirements, this notice announces that the following information collection request will be submitted to OMB.

Title: State Data Transfer (SDT).

OMB Control Number: 2127–0753.

Form Number(s): N/A.

Type of Request: Renewal with modification of a currently approved information collection.

Type of Review Requested: Regular.

Length of Approval Requested: Three years from date of approval.

Summary of the Collection of Information: The State Data Transfer (SDT) program is a voluntary collection of motor vehicle crash data.

Participating States electronically transfer Police Crash Report (PCR) data, supplemental crash reports, and crash images to NHTSA using automated electronic data transfer (EDT) protocols. Transfers typically occur nightly in Extensible Markup Language (XML) or JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) formats via web services. This information collection updates the burden estimates and removes the legacy State Data System (SDS) protocol, which is being sunsetted, leaving only the automated EDT protocol in place. The program includes Non-SEDC States that voluntarily transmit data under the terms of a memorandum of understanding, as well as SEDC States participating under the State Electronic Data Collection (SEDC) discretionary grant program, which requires states to modernize their crash data repositories, align with Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) Sixth Edition standards, and transfer data electronically.

Description of the Need for the Information and Proposed Use of the Information: NHTSA uses SDT data to identify existing and emerging highway safety trends, evaluate the effectiveness of motor vehicle safety standards, and develop countermeasures to reduce deaths and injuries from motor vehicle crashes. The data allows NHTSA to study the effectiveness of emerging technologies, such as advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), and supplies critical volume to support cost-benefit analyses for Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) rulemakings regarding vehicle mass and fatality rates. Furthermore, automated SDT data pre-populates several NHTSA systems and special studies, including the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), Crash Report Sampling System (CRSS), and Crash Investigation Sampling System (CISS). This electronic transfer significantly reduces the administrative and technical burden on States by eliminating manual, redundant data entry into Federal databases.

60-Day Notice: NHTSA published a 60-day notice on June 25, 2026, requesting comment on NHTSA's intention to submit this ICR to OMB for approval (91 FR 38472). During the comment period, NHTSA received one comment from Mr. Eric Hein.

Mr. Hein's comment supported the renewal of the State Data Transfer (SDT) program but was critical of how underride crashes are currently captured and transferred into NHTSA's national crash databases (such as FARS, CRSS, and CISS). He argued that underreporting and misclassification of

underride crashes is a practical utility issue under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). To resolve these data deficiencies at the source, Mr. Hein urged NHTSA to use its existing authorities under the SDT program, specifically by adding a dedicated underride data element to the State Electronic Data Collection (SEDC) discretionary grant requirements and Non-SEDC States, operating under a Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and data mapping. This would require participating States to capture and transfer a discrete underride field electronically. He also requested that NHTSA establishes adoption of timelines and completeness benchmarks for underride reporting, track vulnerable road user underride events separately from passenger-vehicle crashes, and report on progress in the administrative record.

NHTSA remains committed to improving its crash data collections wherever possible, because accurate and reliable data is essential to the agency's lifesaving mission. In response to Mr. Hein's comments, NHTSA has taken several significant steps to enhance the quality, utility, and accuracy of underride data collections, while ensuring consistency with the agency's statutory authorities:

1. **Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) Sixth Edition Alignment:** In February 2023, NHTSA published a draft 6th edition of MMUCC for public comment. The 6th edition of MMUCC was finalized and published in January 2024, formally incorporating the standardized "Vehicle Underride or Override" data element (with attributes: None or Not Applicable, Underride, Override, and Unknown) along with an Initial Contact Point clock points element. Under the SEDC discretionary grant program, participating States are required to align their centralized statewide crash repositories with the latest MMUCC 6th Edition standards at a minimum of 25 to 34 percent. While achieving 100 percent alignment is voluntary, the grant program offers a direct, funded pathway, whereas alignment remains fully voluntary for non-SEDC States.

2. **Standardization of Definition and Database Integration:** NHTSA has implemented this standardized MMUCC definition of underride and override across both the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) and the Crash Report Sampling System (CRSS) data collection programs and related documentation.

3. **Statutory Limitations on Mandating Crash Reports:** While Mr. Hein requested that NHTSA mandate an

underride/override "checkbox" on all State police crash reports, NHTSA published a denial of a related request in April 2025, explaining that the agency lacks the statutory authority to mandate specific data fields, formats, or modifications to individual State crash report forms. Participation in SDT, FARS, the SEDC grant program, and the non-SEDC electronic data transfer (EDT) protocol by States is voluntary. However, NHTSA continues to actively encourage and support States in adopting the MMUCC 6th Edition. Once a State implements the MMUCC underride data element, the SDT automated (EDT) protocol automatically maps and transfers this data nightly to NHTSA's databases.

4. **Improved Database Coding and Quality Checks:** Based on a 2020 internal study, NHTSA has implemented multiple updates to improve the accuracy of vehicle underride/override reporting in its crash databases starting in 2021. These updates include:

a. Simplified underride/override coding (assessed for each vehicle in every vehicle-to-vehicle collision),

b. Replaced coding guidance in manuals,

c. Enhanced training for analysts and coders to note the difference in procedures with the combination of underride and override crashes versus a single occurrence for the vehicle performing the action.

d. Developed new automated edit checks to verify coding accuracy by recording the action of both vehicles.

5. **GAO Recommendations Addressed:** NHTSA has successfully addressed and closed three March 2019 Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommendations (Report GAO-19-264) regarding improved underride data collection and research. This included developing and distributing an underride training pamphlet to State and local law enforcement.

6. **Vulnerable Road User Tracking:** Regarding separate tracking of vulnerable road users, researchers can currently determine underride or override details in FARS and CRSS by combining the standardized Vehicle Underride or Override data element with Sequence of Events, Initial Contact Point, Damaged Areas, and other crash-level elements.

Affected Public: State governments, the District of Columbia government, U.S. Territory governments (generically referred to as "States").

Estimated Number of Respondents: 35.

Frequency: Nightly/daily automated electronic feeds, with some respondents submitting weekly or monthly.

Estimated Total Annual Burden

Hours: 14,389 hours.

The SDT Program receives crash data from States in two ways: (1) the Non-SEDC protocol, under a voluntary MOU between NHTSA and each State, of which there are currently 22 participating States, and (2) the SEDC grant, which imposes specific grant requirements; there are 18 SEDC grantees. Of the 22 Non-SEDC States, 10 have been awarded SEDC grants and will transition to SEDC transmission requirements by January 2030. The remaining eight participating SEDC grantees are actively developing their capabilities to implement electronic data transmission under the SEDC requirements by that same deadline.

This ICR is being modified to remove the legacy SDS protocol and to reflect the ongoing EDT participation by both Non-SEDC States and SEDC grantees. As a result, NHTSA projects a total of 33 annual respondents by January 2030: 12 Non-SEDC States (the 22 original States minus the 10 transitioning to SEDC) and 18 SEDC grantees (the 10 transitioning EDT States plus the 8 SEDC-only States). The transition to the SEDC transmission will happen gradually, with approximately three States migrating per year until all 10 complete the shift by January 2030. The eight SEDC-only States will also begin their SEDC transmissions over this period. Because the transmission requirements differ for Non-SEDC and SEDC grantees, the annual burden for each group is detailed separately below.

States Using SDS Protocol

SDS information was previously obtained using a traditional method via electronic media through secured mail or a Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP) from participating States on an annual basis. However, this collection has been sunset, removing the associated State burden.

Non-SEDC EDT Protocol

The State burden associated with the EDT protocol varies between Non-SEDC States and SEDC grantees. This difference is driven by the distinct requirements placed on each group, such as mutually agreed upon data sharing memorandum of understanding for Non-SEDC States or mandatory data standardization and MMUCC alignment for SEDC grantees.

The burden estimate for Non-SEDC States is derived from the actual level of effort reported by states currently using the Non-SEDC EDT protocol. NHTSA

projects that each year, one additional state will implement the protocol, while several existing SEDC grantees will transition from Non-SEDC to SEDC requirements annually. Consequently,

NHTSA anticipates an average of 17 active Non-SEDC states annually over the next three years (22 in Year 1, 20 in Year 2, and 18 in Year 3) as shown in Table 1. For these states, the burden is

limited to annual maintenance, apart from the newly added state, which also includes implementation costs.

TABLE 1—NUMBER OF NON-SEDC PROTOCOL STATES

Non-SEDC protocol State	Number of Non-SEDC State each year	Number of Non-SEDC State to SEDC State conversion	Newly added Non-SEDC States
Current Year	22	0	0
Current + 1	22	1	1
Current + 2	20	3	1
Current + 3	18	3	1
Average Per Year for Next Three Years	20	3	1

Maintenance Burden Calculation for Non-SEDC States

Non-SEDC States report an annual maintenance burden of five (5) hours per respondent, primarily dedicated to troubleshooting connections and refining data mapping protocols. To calculate the economic impact, NHTSA utilizes the May 2024 BLS mean wage for Software and Web Developers (\$71.54/hour¹). Adjusting for total compensation, where wages comprise 61.7%² of the package, the fully loaded hourly rate is \$115.95. Consequently, the annual maintenance cost per state is approximately \$579.75. Based on a projected average of 20 participating Non-SEDC States, the total annual collective burden is estimated at 100 hours and \$11,595.00 in labor costs.

Implementation Burden Calculation for Non-SEDC States

States report an initial implementation burden of 150 hours per respondent. To calculate the economic impact, NHTSA utilizes the May 2024 BLS mean wage for Software and Web Developers (\$71.54/hour). Adjusting for total compensation, where wages comprise 61.7% of the package, the fully loaded hourly rate is \$115.95. Consequently, the implementation cost for a new Non-SEDC EDT State is approximately \$17,392.50 in labor costs. Based on the addition of one new participating State, the total collective implementation burden is estimated at 150 hours and \$17,392.50 in labor costs.

SEDC EDT Protocol

On January 31, 2024, NHTSA issued a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) to modernize state crash data systems and facilitate electronic data transfer to NHTSA, which is the SEDC program. Twenty-six jurisdictions, including States, Territories, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, applied for the SEDC grant. Nineteen applicants were awarded the SEDC Grant. There are currently eighteen active SEDC grantees, with one grantee terminating their agreement in the first year of the project.

SEDC grantees must commit to electronically transferring standardized crash data to NHTSA within five years of the award. Key implementation actions and funding uses were identified from each State's workplan and budget for the following three goals:

- (i) equipment to upgrade a statewide crash data repository;
- (ii) adoption of electronic crash reporting by law enforcement agencies; and
- (iii) increasing alignment of State crash data with the latest Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria.

Under the SEDC grant, States (excluding American Samoa) are required to provide a 20% non-federal match of the total grant award. Because grant applications required total budget commitments rather than granular labor categories, NHTSA's State burden estimates are derived directly from these matching funds committed. These costs cover both the initial development

effort, such as repository updates and MMUCC alignment, and the ongoing implementation of standardized data transmissions. The SEDC grant does not allow operation and maintenance costs, therefore, the same Non-SEDC State calculations are used to estimate the maintenance burden cost for the SEDC grantees.

NHTSA anticipates that during the first two (2) years of the grant, *i.e.*, the past and current year, all States will be in the development and implementation phase, meaning no data transmission is expected. Beginning next year (Current+1), States will gradually begin transmitting data using the SEDC protocol, either by converting from an existing Non-SEDC EDT system or joining as a brand-new SEDC state. Specifically, NHTSA estimates that two states will begin transmitting in Year (Current+1), five in Year (Current+2), and five in Year (Current+3), averaging four states per year. Over these final three years, an average of seven states per year will be actively transmitting data. Concurrently, for the next three years, the number of states in the maintenance phase will scale from zero Year (Current+1) to two Year (Current+2), and seven Year (Current+3), averaging three states per year. Meanwhile, the number of states remaining in the implementation phase will decrease from 16 Year (Current+1) to 11 Year (Current+2), and six (Current+3), averaging 11 states per year. The details are shown in Table 2.

¹ May 2024 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates United States, Occupational Employment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, <https://www.bls.gov/>

[news.release/ecec.t01.htm](https://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.t01.htm), last accessed April 29, 2026).

² See Table 1, Employer Costs for Employee Compensation by ownership (Dec. 2025), available

at <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.t01.htm> (accessed April 29, 2026).

TABLE 2—NUMBER OF SEDC PROTOCOL STATES

SEDC protocol	States finish implementation	Total number of SEDC State under implementation	Number of States for maintenance
Current Year	0	18	0
Current + 1	2	16	0
Current + 2	5	11	2
Current + 3	5	6	7
Average Per Year for Next Three Years	4	11	3

Implementation Burden Calculation for SEDC States

The collective burden calculation for the 17 SEDC States based on the State’s matching fund, except for American Samoa which is not required to provide matching fund. These matching funds represent eligible expenses such as state employee labor, contractual services, IT, and equipment costs. Because this comprehensive project inherently demands a mix of contractual services, IT or equipment needs, in addition to State’s personnel costs, some States agreed to a flat 20% match under personnel, contractual or a combination of eligible cost categories rather than calculating an exact mathematical breakdown for each individual line item.

Out of the eighteen SEDC States, 15 committed matching funds for State personnel costs. Among these, only four States itemized their actual labor costs and burden hours, while the remaining 11 committed to a flat percentage. Based on the four states that explicitly provided estimated burden hours for their matching personnel costs, the

baseline average per State is 1,284 burden hours annually, with a corresponding average labor cost of \$198,512.65. Applying these averages to the 11 states projected to be in the implementation phase each year, the total labor burden hours and cost are 14,121 hours and \$2,183,639.15.

Nine out of these fifteen States also committed a percentage of their State-match to contractual costs, which may be used for contractor, IT, or equipment activity costs. The remaining three States committed their entire matching requirement to the contractual cost category without exact breakdowns for contractual services, IT and equipment costs.

Maintenance Burden Calculation for SEDC States

Non-SEDC States report an annual maintenance burden of five (5) hours per respondent, primarily dedicated to troubleshooting connections and refining data mapping protocols. NHTSA will apply this same annual maintenance burden to the SEDC grantees. To calculate the economic

impact, NHTSA utilizes the May 2024 BLS mean wage for Software and Web Developers (\$71.54/hour³). Adjusting for total compensation, where wages comprise 61.7%⁴ of the package, the fully loaded hourly rate is \$115.95. Consequently, the annual maintenance cost per state is approximately \$579.75. Based on a projected average of 3 participating SEDC States under maintenance phase, the total annual collective burden is estimated at 15 hours and \$1,739.25 in labor costs.

Table 3 is a representation of implementation and maintenance burden. The breakdown is based on information received from every SEDC grantees’ workplan and budget descriptions. NHTSA estimates burden for development and implementation using actual labor hour and cost breakdowns when available, percent cost commitment, or actual monetary figures provided. Maintenance costs are based on known State maintenance burden reported by Non-SEDC EDT States currently maintaining the EDT protocol.

TABLE 3—TOTAL ANNUAL STATE IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE BURDEN

Category	Annual respondents (states)	Burden per respondent (hours)	Annual total burden hours (hours)	Labor rate w/o overhead (\$)	Overhead rate (%)	Labor rate w/overhead (\$)	Burden cost per respondent (\$)	Total labor cost (\$)
Non-SEDC Implementation	1	150	150	\$71.54	61.70	\$115.95	\$17,392.50	\$17,392.50
Non-SEDC Maintenance	20	5	100	71.54	61.70	115.95	579.75	11,595.00
SEDC Implementation	11	1,284	14,124	NA	NA	NA	198,512.65	2,183,639.15
SEDC Maintenance	3	5	15	71.54	61.70	115.95	579.75	1,739.25
Total	35	1,444	14,389					2,214,365.90

Estimated Total Annual Burden Cost: \$ 6,262,231.02.

The SEDC grant, in compliance with IJA, requires a 20% match from participating State respondents. Based on information provided by the SEDC grantees, as part of the required 20% match from each grantee with the

exception of American Samoa, NHTSA estimates the annual average per State burden cost for the SEDC program (beyond the labor costs discussed above) will be about \$569,293.73 for the non-labor burdens, which includes contracts, equipment, IT cost and other miscellaneous burdens. For the eleven

states under implementation, the total burden cost is \$6,262,231.02.

Public Comments Invited: You are asked to comment on any aspects of this information collection, including (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the

³ May 2024 National Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates United States, Occupational Employment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics,

U.S. Department of Labor, <http://www.bls.gov/soc/home.htm>, last accessed April 29, 2026).

⁴ Employer Costs for Employee Compensation by ownership (Dec. 2025), available at <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/eccec.t01.htm> (accessed April 29, 2026).

agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, *e.g.*, permitting electronic submission of responses.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; 49 CFR 1.49; and DOT Order 1351.29A.

Rajesh Subramanian,

Acting Associate Administrator, National Center for Statistics and Analysis.

[FR Doc. 2026–22226 Filed 10–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA–2026–2377]

Denial of Motor Vehicle Defect Petition, DP26–009

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

ACTION: Denial of a petition as moot with Recall 26V525.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of defect petition (DP26–009) submitted by Mr. Jason Rund (petitioner) to NHTSA's Administrator. The petition requests NHTSA (the Agency) to initiate a defect investigation to determine if an issue with the rear differential (final drive) assembly of 2022 BMW 540i vehicles is causing the rear wheels to decouple from the drivetrain. Following a technical review of the petition and other information, NHTSA's Office of Defects Investigation (ODI) concluded that that the issues raised do not warrant a defect investigation at this time. Accordingly, the Agency has denied the petition.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Nelson, Vehicle Defects Division D, Office of Defects Investigation, NHTSA, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: 202–940–7086. Email: roy.nelson@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

Interested persons may petition NHTSA requesting that the Agency initiate an investigation to determine whether a motor vehicle or an item of replacement equipment does not comply 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 552.1. 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 U.S.C. 30162(a)(2); 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 a motor vehicle manufacturer and/or other sources. 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.

Background Information

On September 1, 2026, The Office of Defects Investigation (ODI) received a petition dated August 5, 2026, requesting a defect investigation into an alleged defect of the “rear differential” on the Model Year (MY) 2022 BMW 540i. The petition itself can be reviewed at [NHTSA.gov](https://www.nhtsa.gov) under ODI number 11761650.

Summary of Petition

The petition cites allegations of loss of motive power and inability to hold the vehicle stationary, originating from a severed drive connection between the driveshaft and the rear wheels.

Office of Defects Investigation Analysis

On August 12, 2026, BMW filed Safety Recall 26V525 which addresses the same condition raised in Petitioner's submission and covers certain 2022–2026 840i, 840i xDrive, 2021–2023 540i, 540i xDrive, M550i xDrive, and 2024–2026 750e xDrive vehicles. The subject of recall 26V525 addresses progressive wear leading to potential failure of the connection between the rear driveshaft and the rear differential. Petitioner's Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) falls within BMW's recall scope and is subject to BMW's reimbursement program.

Consequently, Recall 26V525 renders the petition moot. Therefore, ODI is denying this petition. The agency reserves the right to take additional action if warranted by future circumstances. To review the reports cited in the Closing Resume ODI Report Identification Number document, go to [NHTSA.gov](https://www.nhtsa.gov).

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. 2026–22125 Filed 10–29–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Community Development Financial Institutions Fund

[Docket No. CDFI–2026–0232]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; CDFI Program and NACA Program Financial Assistance and Technical Assistance Applications

ACTION: Notice of information collection; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently, the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI Fund), U.S. Department of the Treasury, is soliciting comments concerning the Community Development Financial Institutions Program (CDFI Program) and the Native American CDFI Assistance Program (NACA Program) Financial Assistance (FA) and Technical Assistance (TA) Applications (hereafter, the Application or Applications). The FA Application includes optional questions that addresses Persistent Poverty Counties—Financial Assistance (PPC–FA), Disability Funds—Financial Assistance (DF–FA), and Healthy Food Financing Initiative—Financial Assistance (HFFI–FA). Changes were made to ensure that the Applications are aligned with the Administration's Executive Orders and efforts to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse within federal programs.

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.