request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the International Validation Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (j) of this AD and email to: *AMOC@faa.gov.*

(2) Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the local flight standards district office/certificate holding district office.

(j) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact Joseph Catanzaro, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, NY 11590; phone: (516) 228–7366; email: *joseph.catanzaro@faa.gov.*

(k) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference (IBR) of the material listed in this paragraph under 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51.

(2) You must use this material as applicable to do the actions required by this AD, unless the AD specifies otherwise.

(i) European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) Emergency AD 2026–0178–E, dated September 14, 2026.

(ii) [Reserved]

(3) For EASA material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; phone: +49 221 8999 000; email: *ADs@easa.europa.eu.* You may find this material on the EASA website at *ad.easa.europa.eu.*

(4) You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 1200 District Avenue, Burlington, MA 01803. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (817) 222–5110.

(5) You may view this material at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, visit *www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations* or email *fr.inspection@nara.gov.*

Issued on October 23, 2026.

Steven W. Thompson,

Acting Deputy Director, Compliance & Airworthiness Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2026–22307 Filed 10–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

21 CFR Part 1301

[Docket No. DEA–1302]

RIN 1117–AB89

Conforming Amendment Regarding the Criminal Law Technical Amendments Act of 2002

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Criminal Law Technical Amendments Act of 2002 (''Technical Amendments Act'') became law on November 2, 2002, as part of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act. The Technical Amendments Act amended sections 401(d), 402(c), and 403 of the Controlled Substances Act by replacing outmoded fine amounts with a reference to title 18 of the United States Code in each place that a specific fine amount had appeared. In this rulemaking, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) is amending its regulations to conform them to the statutory amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Technical Amendments Act.

DATES: This final rule is effective on November 2, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heather E. Achbach, Regulatory Drafting and Policy Support Section, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration; Telephone: (571) 776–3882.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Legal Authority

The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) implements and enforces the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, often referred to as the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act, as amended.[1] The CSA and its implementing regulations are designed to prevent, detect, and eliminate the diversion of controlled substances and listed chemicals into the illicit market while providing for the legitimate medical, scientific, research, and industrial needs of the United States. DEA publishes the implementing regulations for these statutes in 21 CFR parts 1300 through 1399.

On November 2, 2002, the Technical Amendments Act was enacted as part of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act.[2] The Technical Amendments Act amended sections 401(d), 402(c), and 403 of the CSA (21 U.S.C. 841(d), 842(c), and 843(d), respectively). Of particular relevance to this rulemaking, section 4002 of the Technical Amendments Act replaced the terms ''of not more than $30,000'' and ''of not more than $60,000'' with ''under title 18, United States Code'' each time the terms appeared in 21 U.S.C. 843(d). However, DEA regulations at 21 CFR 1301.17 continue to list ''a fine of not more than $30,000'' or a fine ''not exceeding $30,000'' as a possible penalty for providing false information on a registration application, intentionally misusing the affidavit procedure, and obtaining controlled substances through registration by fraudulent means.[3] In this final rule, DEA is amending its regulations to conform to the amendments made to the CSA by the Technical Amendments Act. This rule replaces those terms with ''under title 18, United States Code'' each time the terms appear in 21 CFR 1301.17.

Regulatory Analysis

Administrative Procedure Act

An agency may find good cause to exempt a rule from certain provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA),[4] including those requiring the publication of a prior notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) and the opportunity for public comment, if such actions are determined to be unnecessary, impracticable, or contrary to the public interest. DEA finds that there is good cause within the meaning of the APA to issue this amendment as a final rule without opportunity for public comment and with an immediate effective date.

This final rule amends DEA regulations only to the extent necessary to be consistent with current Federal law, as modified by the Technical Amendments Act. The Technical Amendments Act amended the penalty provisions of the CSA that DEA previously implemented in its regulations. Therefore, DEA is obligated to update those regulations. DEA is not exercising discretion with this final rule because this final rule merely amends the regulations to conform to the change to the CSA made by the Technical Amendments Act. Thus, publishing an NPRM or soliciting public comment is unnecessary.[5] In addition, because the statutory changes addressed in this rule have already been in effect since November 2, 2002, DEA finds good cause exists to make this rule effective immediately upon publication.[6]

[1] 21 U.S.C. 801–971.

[2] Public Law 107–273, 4002, 116 Stat. 1758 (2002).

[3] 21 CFR 1301.17(a), (b), and (d).

[4] 5 U.S.C. 553.

[5] *See EME Homer City Generation, L.P.* v. *E.P.A.,* 795 F.3d 118, 134 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (notice and comment are ''unnecessary'' when an agency ''lacks discretion'' in deciding how to amend its regulations).

[6] *See* 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) (relating to notice and comment procedures). ''[W]hen regulations merely restate the statute they implement, notice-and-comment procedures are unnecessary.'' *Gray Panthers Advocacy Comm.* v. *Sullivan,* 936 F. 2d

Continued

Therefore, DEA is issuing this amendment as a final rule, effective upon publication in the **Federal Register** (FR).

Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 14192

DEA has determined that this rulemaking is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review). Accordingly, this final rule has not been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review. This final rule was developed in accordance with Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review), section 1(b), Principles of Regulation; Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review), section 1(b), General Principles of Regulation; and Executive Order 14192 (Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation)

As stated above, this final rule amends DEA regulations only to the extent necessary to be consistent with current Federal law, as modified by the Technical Amendments Act. DEA has no discretion with respect to this amendment. This final rule merely codifies legal requirements that have been in effect since 2002, when the Technical Amendments Act became law. Therefore, DEA anticipates that this final rule will have no economic impact.

This final rule is not subject to Executive Order 14192 because it is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12988, (Civil Justice Reform)

This final rule meets the applicable standards set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform) to eliminate ambiguity, minimize litigation, establish clear legal standards, and reduce burden.

Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

This final rule does not have federalism implications warranting the application of Executive Order 13132 (Federalism). The final rule does not have substantial direct effects on the States, the relationship between the Federal Government and the States, or the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

Executive Order 13175, (Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments)

This final rule does not have Tribal implications warranting the application of Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments). It does not have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian Tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian Tribes.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601–612, applies to rules that are subject to notice and comment under section 553(b) of the APA. As explained above, DEA determined that there is good cause to exempt this final rule from notice and comment. Consequently, the RFA does not apply to this final rule. In any event, as explained above, this rule is a conforming amendment that makes no change to the status quo.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

In accordance with the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), 2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.,* DEA has determined that this final rule does not include a Federal mandate that might result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more (adjusted for inflation) in any one year and that it would not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, neither a Small Government Agency plan nor any other action is required under the UMRA.

Executive Order 14267 (Reducing Anti-Competitive Regulatory Barriers)

This final rule does not reduce competition, entrepreneurship, and innovation.

Executive Order 14294 (Overcriminalization of Federal Regulations)

Executive Order 14294 specifies that all NPRMs and final rules published in the FR, the violation of which may constitute a criminal regulatory offense, must identify the authorizing statute and the mens rea requirement for each element of the offense. This final rule does not involve a criminal regulatory offense, and thus Executive Order 14294 does not apply.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

This final rule does not involve a collection of information requirement under the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501–3521. This final rule does not impose recordkeeping or reporting requirements on State or local governments, individuals, businesses, or organizations. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Congressional Review Act

This final rule is not a major rule as defined by subtitle E of the Congressional Review Act (CRA), 5 U.S.C. 804. This final rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of U.S.-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets. However, pursuant to the CRA, DEA is submitting a copy of this final rule to both Houses of Congress and to the Comptroller General.

List of Subjects 21 CFR Part 1301

Administrative practice and procedure, Drug traffic control, Exports, Imports, Security measures.

For the reasons stated above, 21 CFR part 1301 is amended as follows:

PART 1301—REGISTRATION OF MANUFACTURERS, DISTRIBUTORS, AND DISPENSERS OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

■ 1. The authority citation for 21 CFR Part 1301 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 821, 822, 823, 824, 831, 871(b), 875, 877, 886a, 951, 952, 956, 957, 958, 965.

§ 1301.17 [Amended]

■ 2. Amend § 1301.17 by:

■ a. In paragraph (a), in the ''Affidavit for New Pharmacy'', removing the text ''of not more than $30,000'' and adding in its place the text ''under title 18, United States Code'';

■ b. In paragraph (b), in the ''Affidavit for Transfer of Pharmacy'', removing the text ''of not more than $30,000'' and adding in its place the text ''under title 18, United States Code''; and

■ c., In paragraph (d), removing the text ''not exceeding $30,000'' and adding in its place the text ''under title 18, United States Code''

1284, 1291 (D.C. Cir. 1991); *see also Komjathy* v. *Nat'l Transp. Safety Bd.,* 832 F.2d 1294, 1296 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam) (notice-and-comment procedures are not required when a rule ''does no more than repeat, virtually verbatim, the statutory grant of authority''). A delayed effective date is similarly unwarranted here because—by virtue of the Technical Amendments Act already being effective—''affected parties'' will not need any ''time to adjust their behavior'' to the changes in this rule. *See Riverbend Farms, Inc.* v. *Madigan,* 958 F.2d 1479, 1485 (9th Cir. 1992).

Signing Authority

This document of the Drug Enforcement Administration was signed on October 23, 2026, by DEA Administrator Terrance C. Cole. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DEA. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DEA Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of DEA. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Heather Achbach,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 2026–22285 Filed 10–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

36 CFR Part 251

RIN 0596–AD68

Administrative Site Leases

AGENCY: Forest Service, Agriculture (USDA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Department of Agriculture (Department), Forest Service (Forest Service or Agency), this final rule will exempt administrative site leases from the regulations for special uses. The purpose of this deregulatory action is to better align Forest Service leasing activities with how leases are commonly legally defined to improve the feasibility of partnering with private developers and local municipalities for leasing and redeveloping administrative sites.

DATES: The final rule is effective December 2, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Matthew Fountain, Sales and Leasing Program Manager, 202–205–1464 or *matthew.fountain1@usda.gov.* Individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may call 711 to reach the Telecommunications Relay Service, then provide the phone number of the person named as a point of contact for further information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background and Need

Administrative sites are land or property controlled by the Forest Service used or acquired for administrative purposes. The 2018 Farm Bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may lease an administrative site that is under the Secretary's jurisdiction under Public Law 115–334 Sec. 8623. The Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (FSFREA), Public Law 109–54, also provides that the Forest Service may dispose of administrative sites by sale, lease, exchange, and other methods. The Administrative Site Leasing Program, which includes leasing administrative sites under both the Farm Bill and FSFREA authorities, was initially considered a special use authorization. This prevents the Agency from issuing leases that function as they are commonly legally defined, and the terms of the existing special use framework can discourage partnerships and investment. For example, special use authorization regulatory requirements, constrain the use of the leasehold interest as collateral for loans, limits assignment and transfer of the lease, and provides for unilateral termination of the authorization by the Forest Service. These requirements limit financing options and negatively impact the marketability of leasing projects.

Exempting administrative site leasing from special use regulation requirements will remove regulatory constraints incompatible with standard real estate leasing practices and reflect the unique statutory basis and long-term real property nature of these leases. Without this regulatory change, agency partners will continue to face challenges in obtaining the financing needed to pursue affordable housing and other projects under these authorities.

This final rule is intended to provide a consistent regulatory treatment of administrative site leases under both FSFREA and the 2018 Farm Bill by removing those leases from the special-use framework. Existing special use authorizations for administrative site leasing may remain in effect under their original terms or, at the authorized officer's discretion, be replaced, upon mutual agreement with the lessee, by a lease issued under the applicable statutory authority after satisfaction of all applicable requirements.

This final rule removes administrative site leasing authorized under section 8623 of the 2018 Farm Bill and FSFREA from the scope of 36 CFR part 251, subpart B. This change is expected to increase flexibility in how leasing projects are administered by separating incompatible processes that are unnecessary, irrelevant, or do not add value, while retaining processes necessary for legal sufficiency and public accountability. Additional programmatic guidance on administrative site leases can be found in Forest Service Manual 2750.

Summary of Comments and Responses

On May 6, 2026, the Forest Service published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** (91 FR 24494) to exempt administrative site leases from the special use requirements in 36 CFR 251 to ensure compatible business practices are possible under the Administrative Site Leasing program. The agency received 25 comments; 8 were supportive of the proposed change and 17 were not. Comments were received from local governments, housing and public finance organizations, the general public and one Tribe. Several commenters supported the rule, emphasizing the need for affordable workforce housing in high-cost communities and explaining that current special-use requirements make financing difficult or impracticable for many projects. Those who opposed the proposed change, including the Osage Nation's Historic Preservation Office, generally expressed concern that the rule could facilitate privatization or disposal of National Forest System lands. The Department does not agree that the rule has that effect. The rule does not authorize land sales, change existing land-disposal authority, or exempt administrative-site leasing projects from National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), public notice, local-government consultation, or other applicable statutory requirements.

After reviewing all comments, the Department is adopting the proposed rule without change. The Department does not believe the concerns raised by commenters warrant changes to the rule text because the rule addresses only the regulatory treatment of administrative-site leases and does not alter statutory requirements or other legal requirements independent of subpart B that apply to future administrative-site leasing decisions.

A summary of substantive comments and responses is provided below.

Comment: Some commenters, especially those in housing finance, public finance, and local governments, support the rule because it could help address the need for affordable workforce housing, especially in high-cost communities. The current special