AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 90 Monday,

No. 157 August 18, 2025

Pages 40025–40218

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL REGISTER

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** (ISSN 0097–6326) is published daily, Monday through Friday, except official holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, under the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). The Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office, is the exclusive distributor of the official edition. Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, DC.

The **FEDERAL REGISTER** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders, Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress, and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless the issuing agency requests earlier filing. For a list of documents currently on file for public inspection, see *www.federalregister.gov.*

The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates the Federal Register as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. Under 44 U.S.C. 1507, the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper and on 24x microfiche. It is also available online at no charge at *www.govinfo.gov*, a service of the U.S. Government Publishing Office.

The online edition of the **Federal Register** is issued under the authority of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register as the official legal equivalent of the paper and microfiche editions (44 U.S.C. 4101 and 1 CFR 5.10). It is updated by 6:00 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published and includes both text and graphics from Volume 1, 1 (March 14, 1936) forward. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800 or 866-512-1800 (toll free). E-mail, *gpocusthelp.com.*

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $860 plus postage, or $929, for a combined **Federal Register, Federal Register** Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the **Federal Register** Index and LSA is $330, plus postage. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The prevailing postal rates will be applied to orders according to the delivery method requested. The price of a single copy of the daily **Federal Register,** including postage, is based on the number of pages: $11 for an issue containing less than 200 pages; $22 for an issue containing 200 to 400 pages; and $33 for an issue containing more than 400 pages. Single issues of the microfiche edition may be purchased for $3 per copy, including postage. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA, MasterCard, American Express, or Discover. Mail to: U.S. Government Publishing Office—New Orders, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000; or call toll free 1-866-512-1800, DC area 202-512-1800; or go to the U.S. Government Online Bookstore site, see *bookstore.gpo.gov.*

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

How To Cite This Publication: Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 90 FR 12345.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, Federal Register, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

PUBLIC

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public subscriptions	**202–512–1806**
General online information	**202–512–1530; 1–888–293–6498**

Single copies/back copies:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public single copies	**1–866–512–1800 (Toll-Free)**

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Subscriptions:

Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions:	
Email	*FRSubscriptions@nara.gov*
Phone	**202–741–6000**

The Federal Register Printing Savings Act of 2017 (Pub. L. 115-120) placed restrictions on distribution of official printed copies of the daily **Federal Register** to members of Congress and Federal offices. Under this Act, the Director of the Government Publishing Office may not provide printed copies of the daily **Federal Register** unless a Member or other Federal office requests a specific issue or a subscription to the print edition. For more information on how to subscribe use the following website link: *https://www.gpo.gov/frsubs.*

Printed on recycled paper.

Contents

Federal Register

Vol. 90, No. 157

Monday, August 18, 2025

Agriculture Department
See Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
See Farm Service Agency
See Forest Service
See Rural Business-Cooperative Service
See Rural Housing Service
See Rural Utilities Service

Air Force Department
NOTICES
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Beddown and Infrastructure Upgrades at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, Record of Decision, 40065–40066

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
NOTICES
Environmental Impact Statements; Availability, etc.:
Petitions Seeking Determination of Nonregulated Status; Withdrawal, 40050

Antitrust Division
NOTICES
Changes under the National Cooperative Research and Production Act:
American Massage Therapy Association, 40082
Bytecode Alliance Foundation, 40084
Canton Foundation (F/K/A Global Synchronizer Foundation), 40083
Dynamic Spectrum Alliance, Inc., 40082–40083
Mercury Consortium, Inc., 40084–40085
MLCommons Association, 40083–40084
R Consortium, Inc., 40083
Rust Foundation, 40083

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 40073–40074

Civil Rights Commission
NOTICES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Maryland Advisory Committee, 40054
Ohio Advisory Committee, 40054–40055

Commerce Department
See Economic Analysis Bureau
See International Trade Administration
See National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Defense Department
See Air Force Department
See Navy Department
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 40066–40068

Economic Analysis Bureau
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Direct Investment Surveys: Annual Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad, 40055

Education Department
PROPOSED RULES
William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program, 40154–40176
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Loan Cancellation in the Federal Perkins Loan Program, 40069

Energy Department
See Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board, Savannah River Site, 40069–40070

Export-Import Bank
NOTICES
Application for Final Commitment for a Long-Term Loan or Financial Guarantee in Excess of $100 million, 40072

Farm Service Agency
NOTICES
Emergency Commodity Assistance Program, 40050–40051

Federal Aviation Administration
RULES
Airworthiness Directives:
Airbus Helicopters, 40025–40028
Airbus SAS Airplanes, 40028–40037
Various Airplanes, 40038–40041
Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification, 40041–40042
PROPOSED RULES
Airspace Designations and Reporting Points:
Wilmington International Airport, NC; Public Meeting, 40048–40049
NOTICES
Petition for Exemption; Summary:
Helicopter Consultants of Maui dba Blue Hawaiian Helicopters, 40138

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Combined Filings, 40070–40072

Federal Railroad Administration
NOTICES
Petition for Waiver of Compliance, 40138–40140

Federal Reserve System
NOTICES
Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies, 40072

Fish and Wildlife Service
RULES
Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment, 40045–40046
Migratory Bird Hunting; Final 2025 Frameworks for Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations, 40178–40218

NOTICES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, 40075–40077

Foreign Assets Control Office
NOTICES
Sanctions Action, 40143–40148

Forest Service
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Workforce Development Participant Tracking, 40051–40052
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
West Virginia Resource Advisory Committee, 40052–40053

Health and Human Services Department
See Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
See National Institutes of Health

Homeland Security Department
See U.S. Customs and Border Protection
See U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Interior Department
See Fish and Wildlife Service
See National Park Service

International Trade Administration
NOTICES
Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Investigations, Orders, or Reviews:
Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from India, 40055–40059
Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Determinations, Investigations, etc.:
Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from the Czech Republic and India, 40059–40064

Justice Department
See Antitrust Division

Labor Department
RULES
Obsolete Grant and Contract Regulations, 40044–40045

Maritime Administration
NOTICES
Use of Foreign-Built Small Passenger Vessel in United States Coastwise Trade:
S/V Endangered Species, 40140–40141

National Institutes of Health
NOTICES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Center for Scientific Review, 40074
National Institute on Aging, 40074

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOTICES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Advisory Panel, 40065
New England Fishery Management Council, 40064–40065

National Park Service
NOTICES
Inventory Completion:
The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, 40077–40082

Navy Department
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 40068–40069

Postal Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Competitive Postal Products, 40085
New Postal Products, 40085–40087

Rural Business-Cooperative Service
RULES
Removal of Obsolete Regulation, 40025

Rural Housing Service
RULES
Removal of Obsolete Regulation, 40025

Rural Utilities Service
RULES
Removal of Obsolete Regulation, 40025
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals, 40053–40054

Securities and Exchange Commission
NOTICES
Joint Industry Plan:
National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail to Add 24 National Exchange LLC as a Participant, 40092–40093
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 40132
Self-Regulatory Organizations; Proposed Rule Changes:
Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc., 40124–40132
Cboe Exchange, Inc., 40093–40106
Investors Exchange LLC, 40087–40090
Long-Term Stock Exchange, Inc., 40090–40092
New York Stock Exchange LLC, 40106–40108
NYSE American LLC, 40132–40134
NYSE National, Inc., 40108–40114
NYSE Texas, Inc., 40114–40123

Small Business Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Access to All Agency Financial Assistance, Contracting, Business Counseling and Technical Assistance Programs, Identifying Issues and Best Practices; Tribal Consultation, 40047–40048

Surface Transportation Board
NOTICES
Release of Waybill Data, 40134

Tennessee Valley Authority
NOTICES
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 40134

Trade Representative, Office of United States
NOTICES
2025 Review of Notorious Markets for Counterfeiting and Piracy, 40134–40136

Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
China's Compliance with World Trade Organization Commitments, 40136–40138

Transportation Department
See Federal Aviation Administration
See Federal Railroad Administration
See Maritime Administration
NOTICES
Request for Information:
Research Ideas to Support Nationwide Automated Vehicle Deployment, 40141–40143

Treasury Department
See Foreign Assets Control Office
See United States Mint
NOTICES
Innovative Methods to Detect Illicit Activity Involving Digital Assets, 40148–40151

U.S. Customs and Border Protection
RULES
Updated Mailing Address for the Office of Finance, Revenue Division, 40042–40044

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
ICE Mutual Agreement between Government and Employers, 40074–40075

United States Mint
NOTICES
Hearings, Meetings, Proceedings, etc.:
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee, 40151–40152

Veterans Affairs Department
NOTICES
Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposals, Submissions, and Approvals:
Application for Accrued Amounts Due a Deceased Beneficiary, 40152

Separate Parts In This Issue

Part II
Education Department, 40154–40176

Part III
Interior Department, Fish and Wildlife Service, 40178–40218

Reader Aids

Consult the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue for phone numbers, online resources, finding aids, and notice of recently enacted public laws.

To subscribe to the Federal Register Table of Contents electronic mailing list, go to https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USGPOOFR/subscriber/new, enter your e-mail address, then follow the instructions to join, leave, or manage your subscription.

CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

7 CFR
1930.....40025

13 CFR
Proposed Rules:
124.....40047
125.....40047

14 CFR
39 (6 documents) 40025, 40028, 40030, 40032, 40035, 40038
43.....40041
45.....40041
61.....40041
Proposed Rules:
71.....40048

19 CFR
24.....40042
128.....40042

29 CFR
95.....40044
96.....40044
97.....40044
99.....40044

34 CFR
Proposed Rules:
685.....40154

50 CFR
11.....40045
20.....40178

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 90, No. 157
Monday, August 18, 2025

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Business Cooperative Service

Rural Housing Service

Rural Utilities Service

7 CFR Part 1930

[Docket No. RUS–25–Agency-0167]

RIN 0572–AC71

Removal of Obsolete Regulation

AGENCY: Rural Housing Service (RHS), Rural Business-Cooperative Service (RBCS), Rural Utilities Service (RUS), Department of Agriculture.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Rural Development (RD), a mission area within the Department of Agriculture consisting of RHS, RBCS, and RUS, is in the process of reviewing all regulations within its purview to reduce regulatory burdens and costs. Pursuant to this review, RD has identified the provisions in 7 CFR part 1930 as obsolete, unnecessary, and outdated due to lack of substantive material. RD is removing these provisions to streamline and clarify the dictates of title 7.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This rule is effective August 18, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lauren Cusick, Division Director, Regulations Management Division, *lauren.cusick@usda.gov,* 202–720–1414.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The President's Executive Order 14219 of February 19, 2025, *Ensuring Lawful Governance and Implementing the President's ''Department of Government Efficiency'' Deregulatory Initiative,* 90 FR 10583, and subsequent implementing memorandum directed all agency heads to review regulations within their purview and rescind those that are, among other things, unlawful or unnecessary. RD has undertaken such a review and is accordingly rescinding 7 CFR 1930.

Regulatory Certifications

Executive Orders

This document does not meet the criteria for a significant regulatory action as specified by Executive Order (E.O.) 12866. This action also has no federalism or tribal implications and will not impose substantial unreimbursed compliance costs on States, local governments, or Indian tribal governments. Therefore, impact statements are not required under E.O. 13132 or 13175.

Environmental Evaluation

This rule will have no significant effect on the human environment; therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor impact statement is required.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain reporting or recordkeeping requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Explanation of Provisions

The regulations removed are: General, 7 CFR part 1930.

Part 1930 of title 7 is already blank. RD is therefore amending this part to clarify these regulations no longer exist.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1930

Fair housing, Grant programs-housing and community development, Loan programs-housing and community development, Low and moderate income housing, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Rural areas.

PART 1930—[Removed and Reserved]

For the reasons stated in the preamble, under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301 and 7 U.S.C. 1989 Rural Development removes 7 CFR part 1930.

Todd Lindsey,

Deputy Under Secretary, Rural Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[FR Doc. 2025–15642 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–XY–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2024–0765; Project Identifier MCAI–2022–00981–R; Amendment 39–23106; AD 2025–16–08]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all Airbus Helicopters Model EC 130 B4 and EC 130 T2 helicopters. This AD was prompted by the determination that fatigue cracks may develop at the root section of certain tail rotor blades (TRBs). This AD requires inspecting those TRBs and, depending on the results, replacing the TRB with a serviceable TRB. This AD also prohibits installing those TRBs unless certain actions are accomplished. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD is effective September 22, 2025.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of September 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

AD Docket: You may examine the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2024–0765; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this final rule, the mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI), any comments received, and other information. The address for Docket Operations is U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

Material Incorporated by Reference:

- For European Union Aviation Safety Agency (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;* website: *easa.europa.eu.* You may find

the EASA material on the EASA website at *ad.easa.europa.eu.*

• You may view this material at the FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 10101 Hillwood Parkway, Room 6N–321, Fort Worth, TX 76177. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (817) 222–5110. It is also available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2024–0765.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: C. Jason Franklin, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, NY 11590; phone: (817) 222–5291; email: *carl.j.franklin@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The FAA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to all Airbus Helicopters Model EC 130 B4 and EC 130 T2 helicopters. The NPRM published in the **Federal Register** on April 1, 2024 (89 FR 22356). The NPRM was prompted by EASA AD 2022–0150, dated July 21, 2022 (EASA AD 2022–0150) (also referred to as ''the MCAI''), issued by EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union. The MCAI states that fatigue cracks may develop at the root section of certain part-numbered TRBs.

In the NPRM, the FAA proposed to require repetitively fluorescent penetrant inspecting those TRBs and, depending on the results, accomplishing corrective action. The FAA also proposed to prohibit installing those TRBs unless certain actions are accomplished. The FAA is issuing this AD to address fatigue cracks on a TRB, which if not addressed, could result in crack propagation, TRB failure, and consequent loss of control of the helicopter.

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2024–0765.

Discussion of Final Airworthiness Directive

Comments

The FAA received comments from four commenters. The commenters were Air Medical Operators Association (AMOA), Air Methods, Airbus Helicopters, and Metro Aviation, Inc. The commenters requested changes regarding the repetitive fluorescent penetrant inspection (FPI) and inspector level requirements, and two commenters made remarks regarding differences between the FAA and EASA AD actions. The following presents the comments received on the NPRM and the FAA's response to each comment.

Comments Regarding Inspector Level Requirements

Air Methods, Airbus Helicopters, and Metro Aviation, Inc., requested the FAA change the proposed requirement for the inspection to be performed by a certified Level II or III inspector. Airbus Helicopters and Metro Aviation, Inc., stated that the Level II or Level III inspector requirement is burdensome and prohibitive to immediate operations. Air Methods requested the FAA explain this proposed requirement, which is not required by the Airbus Helicopters service information or EASA AD 2022–0150. Air Methods commented that a similar requirement was recently included in AD 2024–04–10, Amendment 39–22689 (89 FR 15431, March 4, 2024) (AD 2024–04–10), which resulted in the need for operators to immediately request FAA approval of an alternative method of compliance (AMOC) to avoid grounding the fleet due to unavailability of certified inspectors.

The FAA agrees and has removed paragraph (h)(3) from this final rule.

Comments Regarding FPI Requirements

All commenters requested the FAA remove the proposed requirement for FPIs instead of Die Penetrant Inspection (DPI) and instead adopt EASA AD 2022–0150 without restrictions. Metro Aviation, Inc., stated that it has successfully accomplished DPIs of the affected TRBs with no unsatisfactory findings. Metro Aviation, Inc. also noted that the FAA's proposal is inconsistent with past ADs, as AD 2021–10–25, Amendment 39–21558 (86 FR 29176, June 1, 2021) (AD 2021–10–25), requires DPI of the same part-numbered TRBs and a global AMOC approved for AD 2024–04–10 showed that DPI provided an acceptable level of safety. AMOA expressed concern about the FAA's inconsistency and differences with the State of Design Authority as to the use of DPIs for cracks on certain TRBs. AMOA stated that the FAA did not explain what changed since the FAA issued AD 2021–10–25, which required the DPI method. AMOA further stated that it is unclear if the FAA followed its terms under the relevant bilateral agreement to accept the State of Design Authority's requirements and resolve differences.

The FAA agrees to remove paragraph (h)(3) of the proposed AD, which would have required an FPI instead of a DPI. However, FPI remains the preferred method of compliance for this AD. Dye penetrant inspection methods involve the use of either visible (colored) penetrant or fluorescent penetrant. Alert Service Bulletin (ASB) EC130–05A041 specifies to perform a DPI with a general reference to Airbus Standard Practices Manual (MTC) 20–02–09–101. MTC 20–02–09–101, Crack detection through dye-penetrant inspection, dated May 25, 2016, identifies Type I (fluorescent penetrant) as the type of penetrant to be used and states Type II (colored penetrant) should be only used for a cross-check once a crack has been detected or otherwise with approval from Airbus Helicopters. The FAA reminds operators of the airworthiness concern regarding liquid penetrant inspection discussed in FAA Special Airworthiness Information Bulletin (SAIB) CE–18–26R1, dated October 30, 2018 (SAIB CE–18–26R1). SAIB CE–18–26R1 explains the risks associated with using visible DPI methods, including the prohibition in American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E1417 on the use of type 2 visible dye penetrant prior to the use of type 1 fluorescent penetrant on the same surface. SAIB CE–18–26R1 also advises of the importance of pre- and post-inspection cleaning to ensure proper detection of cracks. You can find SAIB CE–18–26R1 at *drs.gov.*

Additional Changes Made From the NPRM

The FAA added paragraph (k) of this AD to allow revising the maintenance or inspection program as an optional terminating action for the repetitive inspections. Since the FAA issued the NPRM, EASA revised AD 2022–0150 and issued EASA AD 2022–0150R1, dated July 10, 2024 (EASA AD 2022–0150R1). EASA AD 2022–0150R1 does not require repeating the DPI because Airbus Helicopters revised the airworthiness limitations section (ALS) of the aircraft maintenance manual to include the repetitive inspection requirements addressed by EASA AD 2022–0150. The FAA is considering further rulemaking action to require incorporating the revised ALS into the existing maintenance manual or instructions for continued airworthiness and the existing maintenance or inspection program, as applicable, as terminating action for the repetitive inspections.

The FAA removed paragraph (h)(4) of the proposed AD, which replaced the text ''affected parts'' with ''serviceable parts,'' since this exception is not necessary.

The FAA revised paragraph (j) of the proposed AD, which would have prohibited special flight permits if there were a crack in the TRB, to instead

prohibit all special flight permits. The TRB is a critical component of the helicopter, and flight in exceedance of the compliance threshold of this AD, as well as flight with a crack in the TRB, should not be permitted.

Conclusion

These products have been approved by the aviation authority of another country and are approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to the FAA's bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, it has notified the FAA of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI referenced above. The FAA reviewed the relevant data, considered the comments received, and determined that air safety requires adopting this AD as proposed. Accordingly, the FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products. Except for minor editorial changes and other changes described previously, this AD is adopted as proposed in the NPRM. None of the changes increase the economic burden on any operator.

Related AD

AD 2021–10–25 applies to certain Airbus Helicopters Model EC 130 B4 and EC 130 T2 helicopters. AD 2021–10–25 was prompted by EASA AD 2020–0187, dated August 21, 2020. The FAA issued AD 2021–10–25 to address geometrical non-conformities of the TRBs, which could lead to crack initiation and consequent blade failure and possible loss of control of the helicopter. AD 2021–10–25 requires cleaning the TRBs, visual and dye penetrant inspections for cracks in the TRBs, a dimensional inspection to verify conformity of the TRB, and corrective actions if necessary. AD 2021–10–25 and this AD require a DPI of the same TRB part-numbers for the same helicopter models. However, AD 2021–10–25 requires performing a DPI of the drain holes, whereas this AD requires performing a DPI of the area surrounding the drain holes.

Material Incorporated by Reference Under 1 CFR Part 51

The FAA reviewed EASA AD 2022–0150, which specifies procedures for repetitive DPIs on certain part-numbered TRBs for cracking and, depending on the results, replacing the TRB with a serviceable TRB. Also, EASA AD 2022–0150 prohibits installing certain TRBs on any helicopter unless its requirements are met.

This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Costs of Compliance

The FAA estimates that this AD affects 275 helicopters of U.S. Registry. Labor rates are estimated at $85 per hour. Based on these numbers, the FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this AD.

Inspecting a TRB takes 1 work-hour for an estimated cost of up to $850 per helicopter (up to 10 affected TRBs per helicopter) and $233,750 for the U.S. fleet. If required, replacing a TRB takes 4 work-hours and parts cost $4,175 for an estimated cost of $4,515 per TRB.

Revising the maintenance or inspection program as an optional terminating action, if done, takes 1 work-hour, for an estimated cost of $85 per helicopter.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

The FAA is issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements. Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(3) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

2025–16–08 Airbus Helicopters: Amendment 39–23106; Docket No. FAA–2024–0765; Project Identifier MCAI–2022–00981–R.

(a) Effective Date

This airworthiness directive (AD) is effective September 22, 2025.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to Airbus Helicopters Model EC 130 B4 and EC 130 T2 helicopters, certificated in any category.

(d) Subject

Joint Aircraft Service Component (JASC) Code: 6410, Tail Rotor Blades.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by the determination that fatigue cracks may develop at the root section of a tail rotor blade (TRB). The FAA is issuing this AD to address fatigue cracks on a TRB. The unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in crack propagation, TRB failure, and consequent loss of control of the helicopter.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraphs (h) and (i) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, European Union Aviation Safety Agency AD 2022–0150, dated July 21, 2022 (EASA AD 2022–0150).

(h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2022–0150

(1) Where EASA AD 2022–0150 requires compliance in terms of flight hours, this AD requires using hours time-in-service.

(2) Where EASA AD 2022–0150 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(3) This AD does not adopt the ''Remarks'' section of EASA AD 2022–0150.

(i) No Reporting Requirement

Although the service information referenced in EASA AD 2022–0150 specifies to submit certain information to the manufacturer, this AD does not include that requirement.

(j) Special Flight Permit

Special flight permits are prohibited.

(k) Optional Terminating Action

Revising the Airworthiness Limitations section of your existing helicopter maintenance manual or instructions for continued airworthiness and your existing approved maintenance or inspection program, as applicable, to include the repetitive inspections in paragraph (g) of this AD is terminating action for the repetitive inspections required by this AD.

(l) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(1) The Manager, International Validation Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your 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 (m) 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.

(m) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact C. Jason Franklin, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 1600 Stewart Avenue, Suite 410, Westbury, NY 11590; phone: (817) 222–5291; email: *carl.j.franklin@faa.gov.*

(n) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference 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 this AD specifies otherwise.

(i) European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2022–0150, dated July 21, 2022.

(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;* website: *easa.europa.eu.* You may find this EASA material on the EASA website at *ad.easa.europa.eu.*

(4) You may view this material at the FAA, Office of the Regional Counsel, Southwest Region, 10101 Hillwood Parkway, Room 6N–321, Fort Worth, TX 76177. 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 August 1, 2025.

Steven W. Thompson,

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

[FR Doc. 2025–15657 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2025–0907; Project Identifier MCAI–2024–00634–T; Amendment 39–23104; AD 2025–16–06]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Airbus SAS Model A319–112 and –132 airplanes, and Model A320–214, –232, –233, –251N, and –271N airplanes. This AD was prompted by rivet holes being left unplugged after bracket relocation or removal accomplished during certain modifications, potentially resulting in fatigue damage starting from those rivet holes. This AD requires a one-time special detailed inspection (SDI) of the rivet holes and applicable corrective actions; and allows the installation of certain modifications, provided rivets are installed after the modification. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD is effective September 22, 2025.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of September 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

AD Docket: You may examine the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0907; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this final rule, the mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI), any comments received, and other information. The address for Docket Operations is U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

Material Incorporated by Reference:

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

• You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195. It is also available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0907.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nathan Weigand, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone 206–231–3531; email *nathan.p.weigand@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The FAA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to certain Airbus SAS Model A319–112 and –132 airplanes, and Model A320–214, –232, –233, –251N, and –271N airplanes. The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 2025 (90 FR 21247). The NPRM was prompted by AD 2024–0204, dated October 22, 2024, issued by EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union (EASA AD 2024–0204) (also referred to as the MCAI). The MCAI states that rivet holes were left unplugged after bracket relocation or removal, potentially resulting in fatigue damage starting from those rivet holes and consequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane. The rivet holes were left unplugged due to certain optional modification material not providing instructions to reinstall rivets after removing brackets.

In the NPRM, the FAA proposed to require a one-time SDI of the rivet holes and applicable corrective actions; and to allow the installation of certain modifications, provided rivets are installed after the modification, as specified in EASA AD 2024–0204. The FAA is issuing this AD to address this condition, which if not detected and corrected, could affect the structural integrity of the airplane.

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0907.

Discussion of Final Airworthiness Directive

Comments

The FAA received no comments on the NPRM or on the determination of the cost to the public.

Conclusion

These products have been approved by the civil aviation authority of another country and are approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to the FAA's bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, that authority has notified the FAA of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI referenced above. The FAA reviewed the relevant data, considered any comments received, and determined that air safety requires adopting this AD as proposed. Accordingly, the FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products. Except for minor editorial changes, this AD is adopted as proposed in the NPRM. None of the changes will increase the economic burden on any operator.

Material Incorporated by Reference Under 1 CFR Part 51

The FAA reviewed EASA AD 2024–0204, which specifies procedures for a one-time SDI of the rivet holes for any discrepancy (missing or incorrect rivets and cracks) and, depending on findings, accomplishment of applicable corrective actions (*i.e.,* repairing cracks, obtaining instructions for addressing incorrect rivets, and installing oversized rivets). For airplanes that have not installed certain optional modifications, EASA AD 2024–0204 allows installing an optional modification, provided that rivets are installed after the modification. This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Costs of Compliance

The FAA estimates that this AD affects 289 airplanes of U.S. registry. The FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR REQUIRED ACTIONS

Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per product	Cost on U.S. operators
Up to 8 work-hours × $85 per hour = $680	Minimal	$680	Up to $196,520.

The FAA has received no definitive data on which to base the cost estimates for the on-condition actions specified in this AD.

The FAA has included all known costs in its cost estimate. According to the manufacturer, however, some or all of the costs of this AD may be covered under warranty, thereby reducing the cost impact on affected operators.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

The FAA is issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements. Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(3) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

2025–16–06 Airbus SAS: Amendment 39–23104; Docket No. FAA–2025–0907; Project Identifier MCAI–2024–00634–T.

(a) Effective Date

This airworthiness directive (AD) is effective September 22, 2025.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to Airbus SAS airplanes identified in paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this AD, certificated in any category, as identified in European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2024–0204, dated October 22, 2024 (EASA AD 2024–0204).

(1) Model A319–112 and –132 airplanes.

(2) Model A320–214, –232, –233, –251N, and –271N airplanes.

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 53, Fuselage.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by rivet holes being left unplugged after bracket relocation or removal accomplished during certain modifications, potentially resulting in fatigue damage starting from those rivet holes. The FAA is issuing this AD to address this condition, which, if not detected and corrected, could affect the structural integrity of the airplane.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraphs (h) and (i) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, EASA AD 2024–0204.

(h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2024–0204

(1) Where EASA AD 2024–0204 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(2) Where EASA AD 2024–0204 refers to ''discrepancies,'' this AD defines discrepancies as missing or incorrect rivets and cracks.

(3) Where paragraph (2) of EASA AD 2024–0204 specifies ''within the compliance time identified therein,'' this AD requires replacing that text with ''before further flight''.

(4) Where paragraph (3) of EASA AD 2024–0204 specifies ''it is allowed to modify an aeroplane in accordance with the instructions of any modification SB provided that, before next flight after that modification, rivets are installed'' this AD requires replacing that text with ''for airplanes on which an applicable modification SB has been accomplished in service, before further flight following modification, rivets must be installed''.

(5) This AD does not adopt the ''Remarks'' section of EASA AD 2024–0204.

(i) No Reporting Requirement

Although the material referenced in EASA AD 2024–0204 specifies to submit certain information to the manufacturer, this AD does not include that requirement.

(j) Additional AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or responsible Flight Standards Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the Continued Operational Safety Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (k) of this AD and email to: *AMOC@faa.gov*. Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the responsible Flight Standards Office.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain instructions from a manufacturer, the instructions must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA; or EASA; or Airbus SAS's EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(3) *Required for Compliance (RC):* Except as required by paragraphs (i) and (j)(2) of this AD, if any material contains procedures or tests that are identified as RC, those procedures and tests must be done to comply with this AD; any procedures or tests that are not identified as RC are recommended. Those procedures and tests that are not identified as RC may be deviated from using accepted methods in accordance with the operator's maintenance or inspection program without obtaining approval of an AMOC, provided the procedures and tests identified as RC can be done and the airplane can be put back in an airworthy condition. Any substitutions or changes to procedures or tests identified as RC require approval of an AMOC.

(k) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact Nathan Weigand, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone 206–231–3531; email *nathan.p.weigand@faa.gov.*

(l) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference 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 this AD specifies otherwise.

(i) European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2024–0204, dated October 22, 2024.

(ii) [Reserved]

(3) For EASA material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +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, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

(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 August 4, 2025.

Peter A. White,

Deputy Director, Integrated Certificate Management Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15685 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2025–0755; Project Identifier MCAI–2024–00633–T; Amendment 39–23108; AD 2025–16–10]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA is superseding Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2020–06–18, which applied to all Airbus SAS Model A318 series airplanes; A319 series airplanes; A320–211, –212, –214, –216, –231, –232, –233, –251N, –252N, –253N, –271N, –272N, and –273N airplanes; and A321 series airplanes. AD 2020–06–18 required replacement of affected trimmable horizontal stabilizer actuators (THSAs) with serviceable THSAs. Since the FAA issued AD 2020–06–18, a new Airbus airplane model (A321–253NY) has been certified, on which affected parts could be installed in service. This AD continues to require the actions in AD 2020–06–18, revises the applicability to include Model A321–253NY airplanes, and prohibits the installation of affected parts. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD is effective September 22, 2025.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of September 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

AD Docket: You may examine the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0755; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this final rule, the mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI), any comments received, and other information. The address for Docket Operations is U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

Material Incorporated by Reference:

- For European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +49 221 8999 000; email *ADs@easa.europa.eu.* You may find this material on the EASA website at *ad.easa.europa.eu.*
- You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195. It is also available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0755.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Timothy Dowling, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone 206–231–3667; email *timothy.p.dowling@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The FAA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 to supersede AD 2020–06–18,

Amendment 39–19887 (85 FR 18428, April 2, 2020) (AD 2020–06–18). AD 2020–06–18 applied to all Airbus SAS Model A318 series airplanes; A319 series airplanes; A320–211, –212, –214, –216, –231, –232, –233, –251N, –252N, –253N, –271N, –272N, and –273N airplanes; and A321 series airplanes. AD 2020–06–18 required replacement of affected THSAs with serviceable THSAs. The FAA issued AD 2020–06–18 to address improper installation of the THSA ball screw jack, which can compromise the failsafe design of the THSA.

The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 2025 (90 FR 21242). The NPRM was prompted by AD 2024–0203, dated October 22, 2024, issued by EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union (EASA AD 2024–0203) (also referred to as the MCAI). The MCAI states a new airplane model (A321–253NY) has been certified by EASA, on which affected parts could be installed in service. EASA AD 2024–0203 extends the applicability to include Model A321–253NY airplanes and prohibits installation of affected parts on those airplanes in service.

In the NPRM, the FAA proposed to continue to require the actions in AD 2020–06–18, to revise the applicability to include Model A321–253NY airplanes, and to prohibit the installation of affected parts, as specified in EASA AD 2024–0203. The FAA is issuing this AD to address improper installation of the THSA ball screw jack, which can compromise the failsafe design of the THSA. The unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in uncontrolled movement of the horizontal stabilizer as a result of a single failure of the THSA, and consequent loss of control of the airplane.

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0755.

Discussion of Final Airworthiness Directive

Comments

The FAA received comments from the Air Line Pilots Association, International (ALPA) and United Airlines who supported the NPRM without change.

Conclusion

These products have been approved by the civil aviation authority of another country and are approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to the FAA's bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, that authority has notified the FAA of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI referenced above. The FAA reviewed the relevant data, considered any comments received, and determined that air safety requires adopting this AD as proposed. Accordingly, the FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products. Except for minor editorial changes, this AD is adopted as proposed in the NPRM. None of the changes will increase the economic burden on any operator.

Material Incorporated by Reference Under 1 CFR Part 51

The FAA reviewed EASA AD 2024–0203, which specifies procedures for replacing affected THSAs with serviceable THSAs. EASA AD 2024–0203 also prohibits the installation of affected parts. This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Costs of Compliance

The FAA estimates that this AD affects 90 airplanes of U.S. registry. For airplanes affected by AD 2020–06–18, and for any affected airplane that is imported and placed on the U.S. Register in the future, the FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR REQUIRED ACTIONS

Action	Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per product	Cost on U.S. operators
Replacement	Up to 8 work-hours × $85 per hour = Up to $680	$326,608	Up to $327,288	Up to $29,455,920.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

The FAA is issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements. Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(3) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by:

■ a. Removing Airworthiness Directive (AD) 2020–06–18, Amendment 39–19887 (85 FR 18428, April 2, 2020); and

■ b. Adding the following new AD:

2025–16–10 Airbus SAS: Amendment 39–23108; Docket No. FAA–2025–0755; Project Identifier MCAI–2024–00633–T.

(a) Effective Date

This airworthiness directive (AD) is effective September 22, 2025.

(b) Affected ADs

This AD replaces AD 2020–06–18, Amendment 39–19887 (85 FR 18428, April 2, 2020) (AD 2020–06–18).

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to all Airbus SAS airplanes identified in paragraphs (c)(1) through (4) of this AD, certificated in any category.

(1) Model A318–111, –112, –121, and –122 airplanes.

(2) Model A319–111, –112, –113, –114, –115, –131, –132, –133, –151N, –153N, and –171N airplanes.

(3) Model A320–211, –212, –214, –216, –231, –232, –233, –251N, –252N, –253N, –271N, –272N, and –273N airplanes.

(4) Model A321–111, –112, –131, –211, –212, –213, –231, –232, –251N, –251NX, –252N, –252NX, –253N, –253NX, –253NY, –271N, –271NX, –272N, and –272NX airplanes.

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 27, Flight controls.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by a maintenance repair organization's report of deviations from the component maintenance manual acceptance test procedure for certain trimmable horizontal stabilizer actuators (THSAs). This AD was also prompted by a determination that affected parts could also be installed on Model A321–253NY airplanes. The FAA is issuing this AD to address improper installation of the THSA ball screw jack, which can compromise the failsafe design of the THSA. The unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in uncontrolled movement of the horizontal stabilizer as a result of a single failure of the THSA, and consequent loss of control of the airplane.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraph (h) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2024–0203, dated October 22, 2024 (EASA AD 2024–0203).

(h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2024–0203

(1) Where EASA AD 2024–0203 refers to ''02 April 2020 [the effective date of EASA AD 2020–0073]'', this AD requires using ''April 2, 2020 (the effective date of AD 2020–26–18)''.

(2) Where EASA AD 2024–0203 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(3) Where EASA AD 2024–0203 defines a serviceable part as ''Any THSA, eligible for installation in accordance with Airbus instructions, which is not an affected part'' this AD requires replacing that text with ''Any THSA, eligible for installation, that is not an affected part''.

(4) This AD does not adopt the ''Remarks'' section of EASA AD 2024–0203.

(i) Additional AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or responsible Flight Standards Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the Continued Operational Safety Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (j) of this AD and email to: *AMOC@faa.gov*. Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the responsible Flight Standards Office.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain instructions from a manufacturer, the instructions must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA; or EASA; or Airbus SAS's EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(3) *Required for Compliance (RC):* Except as required by paragraph (i)(2) of this AD, if any material contains procedures or tests that are identified as RC, those procedures and tests must be done to comply with this AD; any procedures or tests that are not identified as RC are recommended. Those procedures and tests that are not identified as RC may be deviated from using accepted methods in accordance with the operator's maintenance or inspection program without obtaining approval of an AMOC, provided the procedures and tests identified as RC can be done and the airplane can be put back in an airworthy condition. Any substitutions or changes to procedures or tests identified as RC require approval of an AMOC.

(j) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact Timothy Dowling, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; telephone 206–231–3667; email *timothy.p.dowling@faa.gov.*

(k) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference 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 this AD specifies otherwise.

(i) European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2024–0203, dated October 22, 2024.

(ii) [Reserved]

(3) For EASA material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +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, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

(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 August 4, 2025.

Peter A. White,

Deputy Director, Integrated Certificate Management Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15689 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2025–0342; Project Identifier MCAI–2024–00477–T; Amendment 39–23103; AD 2025–16–05]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for certain Airbus SAS Model A300 B4–2C, A300 B4–203, A300 B4–603, A300 B4–605R, A300 B4–622, A300 B4–622R, and A300 F4–605R airplanes. This AD was prompted by reports of cracking of the main landing gear (MLG) support rib 5 lower flange on certain modified airplanes due to incorrect accomplishment of modification instructions. This AD requires a special detailed inspection (geometrical inspection) of the MLG rib 5 lower flange holes on the left-hand wing and right-hand wing and repair if necessary. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD is effective September 22, 2025.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of September 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

AD Docket: You may examine the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0342; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this final rule, the mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI), any comments received, and other information. The address for Docket Operations is U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

Material Incorporated by Reference:

- For European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +49 221 8999 000; email *ADs@easa.europa.eu.* You may find this material on the EASA website at *ad.easa.europa.eu.*
- You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195. It is also available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0342.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Rodina, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; phone: 206–231–3225; email: *dan.rodina@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The FAA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to certain Airbus SAS Model A300 B4–2C, A300 B4–203, A300 B4–603, A300 B4–605R, A300 B4–622, A300 B4–622R, A300 C4–203, A300 C4–620, A300 F4–203, A300 F4–605R, and A300 F4–608ST airplanes. The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 2025 (90 FR 11815). The NPRM was prompted by AD 2024–0162, dated August 20, 2024 (EASA AD 2024–0162) (also referred to as the MCAI), issued by EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union. The MCAI states that as a result of in-service cracking in an MLG attachment fitting at rib 5, the gear rib 5 lower flange area is the subject of two consecutive mandated retrofit modifications (mandated by EASA AD 2011–0029, dated February 24, 2011 (which corresponds to FAA AD 2012–01–05, Amendment 39–16917 (77 FR 26937, May 8, 2012)) and EASA AD 2011–0028, dated February 24, 2011 (for Model A300 F4–608ST airplanes)) to increase the corner radius, diameter, and depth of the critical spotfaces in order to decrease the stress level generated in the structure. Following occurrences of lower flange cracking reported on airplanes in mandated retrofit post-modification but production pre-modification 11912 configuration, Airbus published an all operators telex (AOT) to require a one-time fluorescent penetrant inspection for cracks of all pre-modification Airbus 11912 airplanes. Airbus conducted an additional investigation after that AOT was published and determined the root cause of the cracking was the incorrect accomplishment of the instructions of a modification service bulletin, leading to deviation from approved design. This condition, if not detected and corrected, could reduce the structural integrity of the airplane.

In the NPRM, the FAA proposed to require a special detailed inspection (geometrical inspection) of the MLG rib 5 lower flange holes on the left-hand wing and right-hand wing and repair if necessary, as specified in EASA AD 2024–0162. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–0342.

Discussion of Final Airworthiness Directive

Comments

The FAA received comments from FedEx Express and ProTech Aero Services Limited who supported the NPRM without change.

The FAA received additional comments from one anonymous commenter, several of which are outside the scope of the NPRM. The following presents the relevant comments received on the NPRM and the FAA's response to each comment.

Request for Clarification on Remarks Section

The commenter requested that the FAA clarify whether the exception in paragraph (h)(2) of the proposed AD excludes any critical safety information from the Remarks section of the EASA AD that should be considered.

During development of the NPRM, the FAA reviewed the Remarks section of EASA AD 2024–0162 and determined that it does not contain any safety critical information. No change to this AD is necessary in this regard.

Request for Clarification Flexibility for Small Operators

The commenter asked if the FAA will provide additional technical support or compliance flexibility to smaller carriers disproportionately affected by costly repair mandates.

During development of the NPRM, the FAA determined that the proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. Further, the FAA did not receive any comments on the proposal from small air carriers regarding their ability to comply with the requirements or the economic impact. Therefore, the FAA does not foresee the need to provide any additional support or flexibility beyond what is normally provided under the FAA's regulatory and oversight responsibilities. No change to this AD is necessary in this regard.

Request for Clarification on Aircraft Converted to Cargo

An anonymous commentator asked if the FAA will assess whether A300 airplanes converted to cargo airplanes have different stress profiles that could accelerate flange cracking, and if so, whether supplementary inspections are needed.

The FAA will adhere to its bilateral agreement with EASA. Should EASA notify the FAA that further action is necessary to address the unsafe condition on any Model A300 airplane, the FAA would at that time evaluate the need for rulemaking. No change to this AD is necessary in this regard.

Conclusion

These products have been approved by the civil aviation authority of another country and are approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to the FAA's bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, that authority has notified the FAA of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI referenced above. The FAA reviewed the relevant data, considered any comments received, and determined that air safety requires adopting this AD as proposed. Accordingly, the FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products. Except for minor editorial changes, this AD is adopted as proposed in the NPRM. None of the changes will increase the economic burden on any operator.

Material Incorporated by Reference Under 1 CFR Part 51

The FAA reviewed EASA AD 2024–0162, which specifies procedures for performing a one-time geometrical inspection of the spotfaces of the MLG rib 5 lower flange holes on the left-hand wing and right-hand wing to assess

geometric compliance to a terminating modification, including a spotface geometry check using ''GO/NO–GO'' gauges, and repair. This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Costs of Compliance

The FAA estimates that this AD affects 128 airplanes of U.S. registry. The FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR REQUIRED ACTIONS

Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per product	Cost on U.S. operators
137 work-hours × $85 per hour = $11,645	$0	$11,645	$1,490,560

The FAA has received no definitive data on which to base the cost estimates for the on-condition repair specified in this AD.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

The FAA is issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements. Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(3) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

2025–16–05 Airbus SAS: Amendment 39–23103; Docket No. FAA–2025–0342; Project Identifier MCAI–2024–00477–T.

(a) Effective Date

This airworthiness directive (AD) is effective September 22, 2025.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to Airbus SAS Model A300 B4–2C, A300 B4–203, A300 B4–603, A300 B4–605R, A300 B4–622, A300 B4–622R, and A300 F4–605R airplanes, certificated in any category, as identified in European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2024–0162, dated August 20, 2024 (EASA AD 2024–0162).

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 57, Wings.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by reports of cracking of the main landing gear (MLG) support rib 5 lower flange on certain modified airplanes due to incorrect accomplishment of modification instructions. The FAA is issuing this AD to address such cracking, which, if not addressed, could result in reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraph (h) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, EASA AD 2024–0162.

(h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2024–0162

(1) Where EASA AD 2024–0162 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(2) This AD does not adopt the ''Remarks'' section of EASA AD 2024–0162.

(i) No Reporting Requirement

Although the material referenced in EASA AD 2024–0162 specifies to submit certain information to the manufacturer, this AD does not include that requirement.

(j) Additional AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or responsible Flight Standards Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the Continued Operational Safety Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (k) of this AD and email to: *AMOC@faa.gov.* Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the responsible Flight Standards Office.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain instructions from a manufacturer, the instructions must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA; or EASA; or Airbus SAS's EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(3) *Required for Compliance (RC):* Except as required by paragraphs (i) and (j)(2) of this AD, if any material contains procedures or tests that are identified as RC, those procedures and tests must be done to comply with this AD; any procedures or tests that are not identified as RC are recommended. Those procedures and tests that are not identified as RC may be deviated from using accepted methods in accordance with the operator's maintenance or inspection program without obtaining approval of an AMOC, provided the procedures and tests identified as RC can

be done and the airplane can be put back in an airworthy condition. Any substitutions or changes to procedures or tests identified as RC require approval of an AMOC.

(k) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact Dan Rodina, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; phone: 206–231–3225; email: *dan.rodina@faa.gov.*

(l) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference 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 this AD specifies otherwise.

(i) European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2024–0162, dated August 20, 2024.

(ii) [Reserved]

(3) For EASA material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +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, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

(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 August 4, 2025.

Peter A. White,

Deputy Director, Integrated Certificate Management Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15686 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2025–1731; Project Identifier MCAI–2025–00491–T; Amendment 39–23109; AD 2025–16–11]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all Airbus SAS Model A321–271NY airplanes. This AD was prompted by the determination that affected parts addressed by other ADs could be installed in service on this airplane model. This AD requires corrective action if necessary and prohibits the installation of affected parts. The FAA is issuing this AD to address unsafe conditions on these products.

DATES: This AD is effective September 2, 2025.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in this AD as of September 2, 2025.

The FAA must receive comments on this AD by October 2, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, using the procedures found in 14 CFR 11.43 and 11.45, by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *regulations.gov*. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* 202–493–2251.
- *Mail:* U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building, Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.
- *Hand Delivery:* Deliver to Mail address above between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

AD Docket: You may examine the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–1731; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this final rule, the mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI), any comments received, and other information. The street address for Docket Operations is listed above.

Material Incorporated by Reference:

- For European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +49 221 8999 000; email *ADs@easa.europa.eu.* You may find this material on the EASA website at *ad.easa.europa.eu.*
- You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195. It is also available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–1731.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Rodina, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; phone: 206–231–3225; email: *Dan.Rodina@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

The FAA invites you to send any written data, views, or arguments about this final rule. Send your comments using a method listed under the **ADDRESSES** section. Include ''Docket No. FAA–2025–1731; Project Identifier MCAI–2025–00491–T'' at the beginning of your comments. The most helpful comments reference a specific portion of the final rule, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include supporting data. The FAA will consider all comments received by the closing date and may amend this final rule because of those comments.

Except for Confidential Business Information (CBI) as described in the following paragraph, and other information as described in 14 CFR 11.35, the FAA will post all comments received, without change, to *regulations.gov*, including any personal information you provide. The agency will also post a report summarizing each substantive verbal contact received about this final rule.

Confidential Business Information

CBI is commercial or financial information that is both customarily and actually treated as private by its owner. Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552), CBI is exempt from public disclosure. If your comments responsive to this AD contain commercial or financial information that is customarily treated as private, that you actually treat as private, and that is relevant or responsive to this AD, it is important that you clearly designate the submitted comments as CBI. Please mark each page of your submission containing CBI as ''PROPIN.'' The FAA will treat such marked submissions as confidential under the FOIA, and they will not be placed in the public docket of this AD. Submissions containing CBI should be sent to Dan Rodina, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; phone: 206–231–3225; email: *Dan.Rodina@faa.gov.* Any commentary that the FAA receives which is not specifically designated as CBI will be placed in the public docket for this rulemaking.

Background

EASA, which is the Technical Agent for the Member States of the European Union, has issued EASA AD 2025–0075R1, dated July 21, 2025 (EASA AD 2025–0075R1) (also referred to as ''the MCAI''), to correct unsafe conditions for all Model A321–271NY airplanes. The MCAI states that EASA issued several ADs to address various possible unsafe conditions. Those EASA ADs include

requirements to prohibit installation of affected parts (*i.e.,* certain overheat detection system (OHDS) sensing elements, SafeLav gaseous oxygen containers (SLOGCs), chemical oxygen generators, and trimmable horizontal stabilizer actuators (THSAs)) on Model A321 series airplanes (among other models). Since those EASA ADs were issued, a new airplane model, A321–271NY, has been certified, on which the affected parts could be installed in service.

The FAA is issuing this AD to address the following unsafe conditions:

- OHDS sensing elements that do not properly detect thermal bleed leak events. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in an air leak remaining undetected by the OHDS at an affected position and not being isolated during flight, possibly resulting in localized areas of the main landing gear bay and keel beam being exposed to high temperatures and consequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane.
- Missing heat treatment of the actuation pin of the SLOGC, which could cause its jamming, with consequent failure of oxygen flow activation. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in lack of supplemental oxygen supply in case of decompression in the cabin/lavatory, possibly resulting in injury to lavatory occupants.
- Poor reactivity of the start powder used inside the affected oxygen generators. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could lead to a reduction of the available oxygen capacity of the airplane and could result in injury to airplane occupants.
- Improper installation of the THSA ball screw jack, which can compromise the failsafe design of the THSA. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in uncontrolled movement of the horizontal stabilizer as a result of a single failure of the THSA and consequent loss of control of the airplane.
- Erroneous accumulated life information in the THSA release certificate, which could lead to operation of the THSA beyond the certificated life limit. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in failure of the THSA and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

You may examine the MCAI in the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–1731.

Material Incorporated by Reference Under 1 CFR Part 51

The FAA reviewed EASA AD 2025–0075R1, which specifies procedures for obtaining approved instructions if an affected part is installed and prohibits installation of affected parts. This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

FAA's Determination

These products have been approved by the civil aviation authority of another country and are approved for operation in the United States. Pursuant to the FAA's bilateral agreement with this State of Design Authority, that authority has notified the FAA of the unsafe condition described in the MCAI referenced above. The FAA is issuing this AD after determining that the unsafe condition described previously is likely to exist or develop on other products of the same type design.

Requirements of This AD

This AD requires accomplishing the actions specified in EASA AD 2025–0075R1 described previously, except for any differences identified as exceptions in the regulatory text of this AD.

Explanation of Required Compliance Information

In the FAA's ongoing efforts to improve the efficiency of the AD process, the FAA developed a process to use some civil aviation authority (CAA) ADs as the primary source of information for compliance with requirements for corresponding FAA ADs. The FAA has been coordinating this process with manufacturers and CAAs. As a result, EASA AD 2025–0075R1 is incorporated by reference in this AD. This AD requires compliance with EASA AD 2025–0075R1 in its entirety through that incorporation, except for any differences identified as exceptions in the regulatory text of this AD. Using common terms that are the same as the heading of a particular section in EASA AD 2025–0075R1 does not mean that operators need comply only with that section. For example, where the AD requirement refers to ''all required actions and compliance times,'' compliance with this AD requirement is not limited to the section titled ''Required Action(s) and Compliance Time(s)'' in EASA AD 2025–0075R1. Material required by EASA AD 2025–0075R1 for compliance will be available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2025–1731 after this AD is published.

Justification for Immediate Adoption and Determination of the Effective Date

Section 553(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*) authorizes agencies to dispense with notice and comment procedures for rules when the agency, for ''good cause,'' finds that those procedures are ''impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.'' Under this section, an agency, upon finding good cause, may issue a final rule without providing notice and seeking comment prior to issuance. Further, section 553(d) of the APA authorizes agencies to make rules effective in less than thirty days, upon a finding of good cause.

There are currently no domestic operators of these products. Accordingly, notice and opportunity for prior public comment are unnecessary, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b). In addition, for the foregoing reason(s), the FAA finds that good cause exists pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d) for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

The requirements of the RFA do not apply when an agency finds good cause pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553 to adopt a rule without prior notice and comment. Because the FAA has determined that it has good cause to adopt this rule without notice and comment, RFA analysis is not required.

Costs of Compliance

Currently, there are no affected U.S.-registered airplanes. The FAA has received no definitive data on which to base the cost estimate for addressing an affected part installed on an airplane, nor has any way to determine the number of airplanes that may have an affected part installed.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

The FAA is issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements. Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an

unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866, and

(2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

2025–16–11 Airbus SAS: Amendment 39–23109; Docket No. FAA–2025–1731; Project Identifier MCAI–2025–00491–T.

(a) Effective Date

This airworthiness directive (AD) is effective September 2, 2025.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to all Airbus SAS Model A321–271NY airplanes, certificated in any category.

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code 27, Flight Controls; 32, Landing Gear; 35, Oxygen; 36, Pneumatic.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by the determination that affected parts addressed by other ADs could also be installed in service on this airplane model. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe conditions identified in paragraphs (e)(1) through (5) of this AD.

(1) Overheat detection system (OHDS) sensing elements that do not properly detect thermal bleed leak events. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in an air leak remaining undetected by the OHDS at an affected position and not being isolated during flight, possibly resulting in localized areas of the main landing gear bay and keel beam being exposed to high temperatures and consequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

(2) Missing heat treatment of the actuation pin of the SafeLav gaseous oxygen container, which could cause its jamming, with consequent failure of oxygen flow activation. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in lack of supplemental oxygen supply in case of decompression in the cabin/lavatory, possibly resulting in injury to lavatory occupants.

(3) Poor reactivity of the start powder used inside the affected oxygen generators. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could lead to a reduction of the available oxygen capacity of the airplane and could result in injury to airplane occupants.

(4) Improper installation of the trimmable horizontal stabilizer actuator (THSA) ball screw jack, which can compromise the failsafe design of the THSA. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in uncontrolled movement of the horizontal stabilizer as a result of a single failure of the THSA and consequent loss of control of the airplane.

(5) Erroneous accumulated life information in the THSA release certificate, which could lead to operation of the THSA beyond the certificated life limit. This unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in failure of the THSA and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Requirements

Except as specified in paragraph (h) of this AD: Comply with all required actions and compliance times specified in, and in accordance with, European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2025–0075R1, dated July 21, 2025 (EASA AD 2025–0075R1).

(h) Exceptions to EASA AD 2025–0075R1

(1) Where EASA AD 2025–0075R1 refers to its effective date, this AD requires using the effective date of this AD.

(2) This AD does not adopt the ''Remarks'' section of EASA AD 2025–0075R1.

(i) Additional AD Provisions

The following provisions also apply to this AD:

(1) *Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs):* The Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or responsible Flight Standards Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the Continued Operational Safety Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (j) of this AD and email to: *AMOC@faa.gov*. Before using any approved AMOC, notify your appropriate principal inspector, or lacking a principal inspector, the manager of the responsible Flight Standards Office.

(2) *Contacting the Manufacturer:* For any requirement in this AD to obtain instructions from a manufacturer, the instructions must be accomplished using a method approved by the Manager, AIR–520, Continued Operational Safety Branch, FAA; or EASA; or Airbus SAS's EASA Design Organization Approval (DOA). If approved by the DOA, the approval must include the DOA-authorized signature.

(j) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact Dan Rodina, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA 98198; phone: 206–231–3225; email: *Dan.Rodina@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 this AD specifies otherwise.

(i) European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) AD 2025–0075R1, dated July 21, 2025.

(ii) [Reserved]

(3) For EASA material identified in this AD, contact EASA, Konrad-Adenauer-Ufer 3, 50668 Cologne, Germany; telephone +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, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

(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 August 5, 2025.

Peter A. White,

Deputy Director, Integrated Certificate Management Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15687 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2024–0230; Project Identifier AD–2023–01064–A,Q,T; Amendment 39–23107; AD 2025–16–09]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Various Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The FAA is adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for all airplanes with certain Pacific Scientific Company rotary buckle assemblies (buckles) installed. This AD was prompted by a report of a manufacturing defect in the screws used inside the buckle. This AD requires inspecting the buckle screws, and depending on the results, reidentifying the buckle, replacing the screws and reidentifying the buckle, or replacing the buckle. This AD also allows optionally prohibiting use of the seat until the actions required by this AD are accomplished. This AD also prohibits installing certain buckles on any airplane. The FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

DATES: This AD is effective September 22, 2025.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in this AD as of September 22, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

AD Docket: You may examine the AD docket at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2024–0230; or in person at Docket Operations between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. The AD docket contains this final rule, any comments received, and other information. The address for Docket Operations is U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20590.

Material Incorporated by Reference:

- For Parker Meggitt material identified in this AD, contact Parker Meggitt Services, 1785 Voyager Avenue, Simi Valley, CA 93063; phone: 877–666–0712; email: *TechSuppor@meggitt.com;* website: *Meggitt.com/services_and_support/customer_experience/update-on-buckle-assembly-service-bulletins.*
- You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th St., Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195. It is also available at *regulations.gov* under Docket No. FAA–2024–0230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Kim, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, CA 90712; phone: 562–627–5274; email: *David.Kim@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The FAA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to all airplanes with a restraint system with a Pacific Scientific Company rotary buckle assembly (buckle) part number (P/N) 1111475 (all dash numbers) or P/N 1111548–01 installed having a date of manufacture (DOM) between January 2012 and September 2012 inclusive, or an unknown DOM. The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on February 29, 2024 (89 FR 14783). The NPRM was prompted by a report of a manufacturing defect in the screws used inside the buckle. In the NPRM, for airplanes with the identified buckle, the FAA proposed to require inspecting the buckle screws, and depending on the results of that screw inspection, replacing the screws and reidentifying the buckle, or replacing the buckle.

The FAA issued a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 by adding an AD that would apply to all airplanes with a restraint system with a Pacific Scientific Company rotary buckle assembly (buckle) P/N 1111475 (all dash numbers) or P/N 1111548–01 installed having a DOM between January 2012 and April 2013 inclusive, or an unknown DOM. The SNPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on February 11, 2025 (90 FR 9293). The SNPRM was prompted by discovery that an additional lot of screws are affected by the unsafe condition. The SNPRM proposed to require the same actions as those proposed in the NPRM, but with a broader applicability and updated service information. As an alternative, the SNPRM also proposed to allow removing the male side from the lap of the restraint system assembly and installing a placard stating that use of the seat is prohibited; use of that crewmember seat or passenger seat would then be prohibited until the proposed actions are accomplished and the male side from the lap of the restraint system assembly is reinstalled.

The FAA is issuing this AD to prevent cracking and missing screw heads when under load. The unsafe condition, if not addressed could result in a failure of the buckle to restrain the occupant.

Discussion of Final Airworthiness Directive

Comments

The FAA received comments from Boeing and United Airlines who supported the SNPRM without change.

The FAA received additional comments from three commenters, including Delta Air Lines (Delta) and American Airlines (American). The following presents the comments received on the SNPRM and the FAA's response to each comment.

Request To Apply Distinct P/N for Modified Buckles

An individual commenter requested the FAA revise the SNPRM to require identifying the buckle with a distinct P/N and/or more durable label. The commenter stated that the current labeling system wears off over time, potentially increasing the risk of confusion regarding compliance status. Further, the commenter contended that a unique identifier for compliant buckles would prevent unnecessary reinspection and improve long-term regulatory adherence.

The FAA disagrees. As the FAA stated in the SNPRM, the manufacturer introducing a new P/N for newly-manufactured parts is ideal; however, the FAA cannot mandate a company to change a P/N for an article. Applicable part-numbered buckles with an illegible or missing DOM, including those that may have never been marked, are considered as having an unknown DOM for the purposes of this AD and would be required to comply with the AD actions. The DOM marking was added to buckle P/N 1111475 (all dash numbers) starting in September 2012, while buckle P/N 1111548–01 has always been marked with the DOM. Additionally, part marking preservation and reidentification is the responsibility of the operators. No change has been made to this AD as a result of this comment.

Request To Clarify Screw Replacement Requirement

American requested that the FAA clarify whether all four screws must be replaced if at least one of the four screws has a Torx head. American noted that the ''Differences Between This SNPRM and the Referenced Material'' section of the SNPRM stated that all four screws must be replaced with hex head screws if any number of Torx head

screws are found, but that the required actions specify replacement of only Torx head screws. American stated it was not sure if a buckle would have a mix of screws. Delta requested that the FAA revise paragraphs (g)(1)(ii)(B) and (g)(2)(ii)(B) of the proposed AD to require replacing all four screws if at least one of the fours screws is found to have a Torx head. Delta explained that the current language might lead operators to interpret that only Torx head screws found need to be replaced, rather than all four, as stated in the referenced material.

The FAA agrees to clarify the screw replacement requirement in this AD and disagrees with the request to require replacement of all four screws if at least one of the four screws has a Torx head. Although the material referenced in this AD specifies replacing all four screws if at least one screw is a Torx head, this AD only requires the replacement of Torx head screws. Hex head screws are not subject to the unsafe condition and therefore do not need to be replaced for the buckle to be considered airworthy.

No change is necessary to this AD regarding these comments.

Request To Extend Compliance Time

An individual commenter requested that the FAA extend the proposed 12-month compliance time to a compliance time of 18 to 24 months, due to constraints such as parts availability and fleet size. The commenter stated that the FAA's assertion that replacement parts are readily available may not fully account for global supply chain delays.

The FAA disagrees. The FAA determined the proposed 12-month compliance time after factoring the time needed to process the proposed AD before issuance of the final rule, as well as after evaluating the associated safety risks. According to the manufacturer, an ample number of spare parts and screws are in stock and will be available to modify the U.S. fleet within the required compliance time. To the extent spare parts may become unavailable, the FAA cannot base AD actions upon parts availability. While every effort is made to avoid grounding airplanes, the FAA must address the unsafe condition. The FAA did not make any changes to this final rule as a result of this comment.

Conclusion

The FAA reviewed the relevant data, considered any comments received, and determined that air safety requires adopting this AD as proposed. Accordingly, the FAA is issuing this AD to address the unsafe condition on these products.

Material Incorporated by Reference Under 1 CFR Part 51

The FAA reviewed Parker Meggitt Service Bulletin SB 1111475–25–001–2023 and SB 1111548–25–001–2023, both Revision 002, both dated April 1, 2024. This material specifies procedures for inspecting the buckle for any missing or loose screw heads and, depending on the results, replacing the buckle and sending the removed buckle to Parker Meggitt for repair or replacement. If after that first inspection, all of the screw heads are intact, this material specifies procedures for inspecting the buckle for any Torx head screws (alloy steel) and, depending on the results, allowing the buckle assembly to remain in-service temporarily, replacing any Torx head screws (alloy steel) with new hex head screws (stainless steel), and checking the functionality of the buckle. This material also specifies procedures for removing a buckle from a restraint system, installing a buckle on a restraint system, and returning buckles to Parker Meggitt. If the buckle passes the specified inspections or is modified by replacing Torx head screws (alloy steel) with new hex head screws (stainless steel), this material specifies procedures for reidentifying the back of the buckle. The buckle may be included as a component of a different part-numbered restraint system assembly. This material identifies known affected restraint system assembly P/Ns. These documents are distinct since they apply to different airplane configurations. This material is reasonably available because the interested parties have access to it through their normal course of business or by the means identified in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Costs of Compliance

The FAA estimates that this AD affects 21,313 buckles installed on restraint systems on airplanes worldwide. The FAA has no way of knowing the number of airplanes of U.S. Registry that may have a restraint system with an affected buckle installed. The estimated costs on U.S. operators reflects the maximum possible costs based on affected buckles installed on restraint systems in airplanes worldwide. Labor rates are estimated at $85 per work-hour. Based on these numbers, the FAA estimates the following costs to comply with this AD:

ESTIMATED COSTS

Action	Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per buckle	Cost on U.S. operators
Inspecting a buckle	.1 work-hour × $85 per hour = $9	$0	$9	Up to $191,817.

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR OPTIONAL ACTIONS

Action	Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per product
Removing male side of lap belt and placarding seat inoperative.	1.5 work-hours × $85 per hour = $128	nominal	$128

The FAA estimates the following costs to do any necessary repairs that would be required based on the results of the inspection. The agency has no way of determining the number of buckles that might need this repair:

ON-CONDITION COSTS

Action	Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per buckle
Replacing a set of screws (four)	.5 work-hour × $85 per hour = $43	nominal	$43.
Replacing a buckle	.5 work-hour × $85 per hour = $43	$740	783.

ON-CONDITION COSTS—Continued

Action	Labor cost	Parts cost	Cost per buckle
Reidentifying a buckle	minimal	nominal	nominal.

The FAA has included all known costs in its cost estimate. According to the manufacturer, however, some of the costs of this AD may be covered under warranty, thereby reducing the cost impact on affected operators.

Authority for This Rulemaking

Title 49 of the United States Code specifies the FAA's authority to issue rules on aviation safety. Subtitle I, section 106, describes the authority of the FAA Administrator. Subtitle VII: Aviation Programs, describes in more detail the scope of the Agency's authority.

The FAA is issuing this rulemaking under the authority described in Subtitle VII, Part A, Subpart III, Section 44701: General requirements. Under that section, Congress charges the FAA with promoting safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing regulations for practices, methods, and procedures the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce. This regulation is within the scope of that authority because it addresses an unsafe condition that is likely to exist or develop on products identified in this rulemaking action.

Regulatory Findings

This AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this AD:

(1) Is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866,

(2) Will not affect intrastate aviation in Alaska, and

(3) Will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

The Amendment

Accordingly, under the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the FAA amends 14 CFR part 39 as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

■ 2. The FAA amends § 39.13 by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

2025–16–09 Various Airplanes: Amendment 39–23107; Docket No. FAA–2024–0230; Project Identifier AD–2023–01064–A,Q,T.

(a) Effective Date

This airworthiness directive (AD) is effective September 22, 2025.

(b) Affected ADs

None.

(c) Applicability

This AD applies to all airplanes, certificated in any category, with a restraint system with a Pacific Scientific Company rotary buckle assembly (buckle) part number (P/N) 1111475 (all dash numbers) or P/N 1111548–01 installed having a date of manufacture (DOM) between January 2012 and April 2013 inclusive, or an unknown DOM. These buckles may be installed on, but not limited to, The Boeing Company model airplanes.

Note 1 to paragraph (c): The buckle may be included as a component of a different part-numbered restraint system assembly.

Note 2 to paragraph (c): These buckles may also be installed on helicopters; however, the FAA determined that a shorter compliance time to accomplish the required actions is required for buckles installed on helicopters. Accordingly, the FAA published a separate AD (AD 2024–20–04, Amendment 39–22863 (89 FR 85040, October 25, 2024)) to address all helicopters with an affected buckle installed.

(d) Subject

Air Transport Association (ATA) of America Code: 25, Equipment/Furnishings, or Joint Aircraft System Component (JASC) Code 2500, Cabin Equipment/Furnishings; and 2510, Flight Compartment Equipment.

(e) Unsafe Condition

This AD was prompted by a report of a manufacturing defect in the screws used inside the buckle. The FAA is issuing this AD to prevent cracking and missing screw heads when under load. The unsafe condition, if not addressed, could result in a failure of the buckle to restrain the occupant.

(f) Compliance

Comply with this AD within the compliance times specified, unless already done.

(g) Required Actions

(1) For airplanes with buckle P/N 1111475 (all dash numbers), within 12 months after the effective date of this AD, inspect each buckle screw for cracked, loose, and missing screw heads by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraphs B.(1) and (2), of Parker Meggitt Service Bulletin SB 1111475–25–001–2023, Revision 002, dated April 1, 2024 (SB 1111475–25–001–2023 Rev 002).

(i) If any screw has a cracked, loose, or missing screw head, before further flight, replace the buckle with an airworthy buckle.

(ii) If none of the four screw heads are cracked, loose, or missing, before further flight, inspect each screw to determine if any screw has a Torx head by using one of the following methods in the Accomplishment Instructions of SB 1111475–25–001–2023 Rev 002: paragraph B.(4)(a) (Magnet Test); paragraph B.(4)(b) (Inspection); or paragraphs C.(2) through (4) (removing the buckle from the restraint system) and paragraphs D.(1)(a) through (d) (disassembling the buckle).

(A) If none of the four screws have a Torx head, before further flight, reassemble the buckle (if necessary) by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraphs D.(1)(f) through (l), of SB 1111475–25–001–2023 Rev 002, and reidentify the buckle with ''INS. A'' by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraph B.(6), of SB 1111475–25–001–2023 Rev 002.

(B) If at least one of the four screws has a Torx head, before further flight, with the buckle removed, replace each Torx head screw with a hex head screw, reassemble the buckle, and reidentify the buckle with ''MOD. A'' by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraphs D.(1)(e) through (m), of SB 1111475–25–001–2023 Rev 002, except you are not required to return any parts to Parker Meggitt. If a screw head breaks off during disassembly, before further flight, replace the buckle with an airworthy buckle.

Note 3 to paragraph (g)(1): SB 1111475–25–001–2023 Rev 002 refers to a magnifying glass as an ''eye loupe.''

(2) For airplanes with buckle P/N 1111548–01, within 12 months after the effective date of this AD, inspect each buckle screw for cracked, loose, and missing screw heads by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraph B.(1), of Parker Meggitt SB 1111548–25–001–2023, Revision 002, dated April 1, 2024 (SB 1111548–25–001–2023 Rev 002).

(i) If any screw has a cracked, loose, or missing screw head, before further flight, replace the buckle with an airworthy buckle.

(ii) If none of the four screw heads are cracked, loose, or missing, before further

flight, inspect each screw to determine which screws have a Torx head by using one of the following methods in the Accomplishment Instructions of SB 1111548–25–001–2023 Rev 002: paragraph B.(3)(a) (Inspection); or paragraph C. (removing the buckle from the restraint system) and paragraphs D.(1)(a) through (c) (disassembling the buckle).

(A) If none of the four screws have a Torx head, before further flight, reassemble the buckle (if necessary) by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraphs D.(1)(e) through (l), of SB 1111548–25–001–2023 Rev 002, and reidentify the buckle with ''INS. A'' by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraph B.(5), of SB 1111548–25–001–2023 Rev 002.

(B) If at least one of the four screws has a Torx head, before further flight, with the buckle removed, replace each Torx head screw with a hex head screw, reassemble the buckle, and reidentify the buckle with ''MOD. A'' by following the Accomplishment Instructions, paragraphs D.(1)(d) through (m), of SB 1111548–25–001–2023 Rev 002, except you are not required to return any parts to Parker Meggitt. If a screw head breaks off during disassembly, before further flight, replace the buckle with an airworthy buckle.

Note 4 to paragraph (g)(2): SB 1111548–25–001–2023 Rev 002 refers to a magnifying glass as an ''eye loupe.''

(3) For a crewmember seat or passenger seat with a restraint system with a buckle identified in paragraph (c) of this AD installed, as an option for the actions required by paragraph (g)(1) or (2) of this AD, as applicable, within 12 months after the effective date of this AD:

(i) Remove the male side from the lap of the restraint system assembly.

(ii) Fabricate a placard using at least ⅛ inch letters with the words ''USE OF THIS SEAT IS PROHIBITED'' on it and install the placard on the seat within the crewmember or passenger's clear view. The seat is then inoperative until the actions required by paragraph (g)(1) or (2) of this AD, as applicable, are accomplished and the male side from the lap of the restraint system assembly is reinstalled.

(h) Parts Installation Prohibition

As of the effective date of this AD, do not install a buckle identified in paragraph (c) of this AD on any airplane unless the buckle is marked with ''MOD. A'' or ''INS. A.''

(i) Credit for Previous Actions

You may take credit for actions required by paragraph (g)(1) or (2) of this AD, as applicable, if the corresponding actions were performed before the effective date of this AD using Parker Meggitt SB 1111475–25–001–2023, Revision 001, dated December 1, 2023, or Parker Meggitt SB 1111548–25–001–2023, Revision 001, dated December 1, 2023, as applicable, and provided torque of 15 to 25 in-lbs. (1.69 to 2.82 N-m) was applied on the four hex head screws (P/N 0901101–149) during any repair of the buckle.

(j) Alternative Methods of Compliance (AMOCs)

(1) The Manager, West Certification Branch, FAA, has the authority to approve AMOCs for this AD, if requested using the procedures found in 14 CFR 39.19. In accordance with 14 CFR 39.19, send your request to your principal inspector or local Flight Standards District Office, as appropriate. If sending information directly to the manager of the West Certification Branch, send it to the attention of the person identified in paragraph (k) of this AD. Information may be emailed 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.

(k) Additional Information

For more information about this AD, contact David Kim, Aviation Safety Engineer, FAA, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, CA 90712; phone: 562–627–5274; email: *David.Kim@faa.gov.*

(l) Material Incorporated by Reference

(1) The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference 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) Parker Meggitt Service Bulletin SB 1111475–25–001–2023, Revision 002, dated April 1, 2024.

(ii) Parker Meggitt Service Bulletin SB 1111548–25–001–2023, Revision 002, dated April 1, 2024.

(3) For Parker Meggitt material identified in this AD, contact Parker Meggitt Services, 1785 Voyager Avenue, Simi Valley, CA 93063; phone: 877–666–0712; email: *TechSupport@meggitt.com;* website: *meggitt.com/services_and_support/customer_experience/update-on-buckle-assembly-service-bulletins.*

(4) You may view this material at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 2200 South 216th Street, Des Moines, WA. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call 206–231–3195.

(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 August 12, 2025.

Steven W. Thompson,

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

[FR Doc. 2025–15688 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Parts 43, 45, and 61

[Docket No. FAA–2023–1377]

RIN 2120–AL50

Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification; Correction

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: On July 24, 2025, the FAA published a final rule titled ''Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification''. That document amended rules for the manufacture, certification, operation, maintenance, and alteration of lightsport aircraft. After publication of the final rule, FAA became aware of errors in it.

DATES: Effective October 22, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Newberger, Aircraft Certification Service (AIR–632), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave. SW, Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–1636; email *james.e.newberger@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access and Filing

A copy of the Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification final rule may be viewed online at *https://www.regulations.gov* using the docket number listed above. A copy of this correction will be placed in the same docket. Electronic retrieval help and guidelines are available on the website. It is available 24 hours each day, 365 days each year. An electronic copy of this document may also be downloaded from the Office of the Federal Register's website at *www.federalregister.gov* and the Government Publishing Office's website at *www.govinfo.gov.* A copy may also be found at the FAA's Regulations and Policies website at *www.faa.gov/regulations_policies.*

Copies may also be obtained by sending a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, ARM–1, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591, or by calling (202) 267–9677. Commenters must identify the docket number of this rulemaking.

All documents the FAA considered in developing the final rule and this correction, including economic analyses and technical reports, may be accessed

in the electronic docket for this rulemaking.

Background

On July 24, 2025, the ''Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification'' final rule (RIN 2120–AL50) published in the **Federal Register** at 90 FR 35034. After publication, FAA discovered that it inadvertently:

- Included 49 U.S.C. 106(g) in the authority section for Parts 43 and 45 in amendatory instructions numbers 27 and 30.
- Excluded a mention of (c)(21) in amendatory instruction number 46.
- Excluded a mention of introductory text in amendatory instruction number 53.
- Referenced ''dection'' rather than ''section'' in the first two column headers of Table 5.

This document makes those corrections.

Correction

In FR Doc. 2023–1377, beginning on page 35211, in the **Federal Register** of July 24, 2025, make the following corrections:

■ 1. Revise amendatory instruction number 27 on page 35221 to read as follows:

27. The authority citation for part 43 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7572; 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 40105, 40113, 44701–44702, 44704, 44707, 44709, 44711, 44713, 44715, 45303.

■ 2. Revise amendatory instruction number 30 on page 35221 to read as follows:

30. The authority citation for part 45 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 40103, 40113–40114, 44101–44105, 44107–44111, 44504, 44701, 44708–44709, 44711–44713, 44725, 45302–45303, 46104, 46304, 46306, 47122.

■ 3. Amend amendatory instruction number 46 on page 35215 by adding paragraph (c)(21) to read as follows:

46. Amend § 61.315 by revising paragraphs (a), (c) introductory text, and (c)(5), and adding paragraphs (c)(20) and (c)(21) to read as follows:

■ 4. Revise amendatory instruction number 53 on page 35216 to read as follows:

53. Amend § 61.415 by adding introductory text and paragraphs (k) through (n) to read as follows:

■ 5. Amend Table 5 on page 35119 by removing the word ''Dection'' and adding in its place the word ''Section'' in the first two column headers of Table 5 to read as follows:

Proposed section 61.313(a)(9)(i)–(iv)	Adopted section 61.313(a)(9)(i)–(iv)	Adopted training delta

Issued under authority provided by 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 44701(a), and 44703 in Washington, DC.

Brandon Roberts,

Executive Director, Office of Rulemaking.

[FR Doc. 2025–15649 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

19 CFR Parts 24 and 128

[CBP Dec. 25–11]

Updated Mailing Address for the Office of Finance, Revenue Division

AGENCY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Final rule; technical amendments.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regulations to update the address of the Office of Finance, Revenue Division. Additionally, this final rule amends the CBP regulations to reflect the restructuring of the Office of Finance, Revenue Division. All correspondence directed to the CBP Office of Finance, Revenue Division, should be sent to the new address.

DATES: The final rule is effective August 18, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shandy Plicka, Management and Program Analyst, Revenue Division, Office of Finance, (317) 298–1717, *shandy.r.plicka@cbp.dhs.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On May 13, 2024, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Office of Finance, Revenue Division, relocated its physical office to 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249. As a result, this final rule amends part 24 (Customs Financial and Accounting Procedure) and part 128 (Express Consignments) of title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) to reflect this change in mailing address. The Office of Finance, Revenue Division's address is provided to the public to allow for: the receipt of express consignment carrier applications; the freezing of importer identification (ID) requests; and the mailing of automated clearinghouse enrollments to the Office of Finance, Revenue Division. In addition to the change in mailing address, this document updates references to CBP's National Finance Center and the Office of Administration to reflect internal restructuring. The telephone numbers for the Office of Finance, Revenue Division, remain unchanged.

II. Discussion of Changes to Parts 24 and 128

CBP is making the following changes within 19 CFR parts 24 and 128 to reflect the address change of the Office of Finance, Revenue Division, and changes to the internal organizational structure of the agency:

- In § 24.3a(c)(1), CBP is removing the phrase ''the CBP's Revenue Division, Office of Administration'' and adding in its place ''CBP's Revenue Division.''
- In § 24.5(f), CBP is removing the phrase ''the National Finance Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Administration, Revenue Division, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN 46278, Attn: Freeze Program'' and adding in its place ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Freeze Program, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.'' Additionally, in § 24.5(f), CBP is replacing ''Customs'' with ''CBP'' where appropriate to reflect the renaming of the U.S. Customs Service to U.S. Customs and Border Protection on March 31, 2007 (*see* Homeland Security Act of 2002, Public Law 107–296; 72 FR 20131, dated April 23, 2007).
- In § 24.22(c)(3) and (e)(2), CBP is removing the phrase ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Attn: DTOPS Program Administrator, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN 46278'' and adding in its place ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: DTOPS Program Administrator, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.''
- In § 24.22(i), CBP is removing the phrase ''6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN 46278'' and adding in its place ''8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.'' Additionally, CBP is removing the phrase ''Office of Administration,'' to reflect internal structuring changes.

• In § 24.23(b)(4)(iii)(A) and (b)(4)(iii)(C)(1), CBP is removing the phrase ''Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division/Attention: Reimbursables, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, Indiana 46278'' and adding in its place ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Reimbursables, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.''

• In § 24.24(c)(8)(i), (e)(1)(ii), (e)(2)(iii), (e)(3)(ii), (e)(4)(iii), and (e)(4)(iv)(A), CBP is removing the phrase ''Office of Administration, Revenue Division, Customs and Border Protection, using the current address posted at *Forms.CBP.gov*'' and adding in its place ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Finance, Revenue Division, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.''

• In § 24.24(g), CBP is removing the phrase ''at the current address posted at *Forms.CBP.gov*'' and adding in its place ''at U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Finance, Revenue Division, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.''

• In § 24.26(b), CBP is removing the phrase ''the National Finance Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Administration, Revenue Division, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN 46278'' and adding in its place ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.'' Additionally, CBP is removing the phrase ''facsimile number'' and adding in its place ''email address'' to correct a discrepancy with the approved information collection.

• In § 128.11(b)(7)(iv), CBP is removing the phrase ''Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division/ Attention: Reimbursables, 6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, Indiana 46278'' and adding in its place ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Reimbursables, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.''

III. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

A. Inapplicability of Notice and Delayed Effective Date

The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) requirements in 5 U.S.C. 553 govern agency rulemaking procedures. Section 553(b) of the APA generally requires notice and public comment before issuance of a final rule. In addition, section 553(d) of the APA requires that a final rule have a 30-day delayed effective date. The APA, however, provides exceptions from the prior notice and the public comment and the delayed effective date requirements, for rules of ''agency organization, procedure, and practice.'' 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A). Because these amendments are technical, non-substantive changes, which are necessary to ensure the accuracy and clarity of the CFR and do not alter any substantive regulatory requirements, this rule is exempted from the notice-and-comment requirements of the APA.

Additionally, the APA provides exceptions from the notice-and-comment requirements when an agency for good cause finds that such procedures are ''impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.'' *See* 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B), (d)(3). In this case, CBP finds that good cause exists for dispensing with prior notice and public comment procedure as unnecessary, as required in 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B), because the amendments to the regulations are merely technical, removing outdated provisions and making non-substantive administrative changes reflecting current practice. For the same reasons, CBP finds that good cause exists for dispensing with the requirement for a delayed effective date as required in 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

B. Signing Authority

In accordance with Treasury Order 100–20, the Secretary of the Treasury delegated to the Secretary of Homeland Security the authority related to the customs revenue functions vested in the Secretary of the Treasury as set forth in 6 U.S.C. 212 and 215, subject to certain exceptions. This regulation is being issued in accordance with DHS Directive 07010.3, Revision 03.2, which delegates to the Commissioner of CBP the authority to prescribe and sign regulations related to customs revenue functions.

Rodney S. Scott, Commissioner, having reviewed and approved this document, has delegated the authority to electronically sign this document to the Director (or Acting Director, if applicable) of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division of CBP, for purposes of publication in the **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects

19 CFR Part 24

Accounting, Claims, Exports, Freight, Harbors, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Taxes.

19 CFR Part 128

Administrative practice and procedure, Freight, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Amendments to the CBP Regulations

For the reasons set forth above, parts 24 and 128 of title 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations (19 CFR part 24 and 128) are amended as set forth below:

PART 24—CUSTOMS FINANCIAL AND ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE

■ 1. The general and specific authority citations for part 24 continue to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 19 U.S.C. 58a–58c, 66, 1202 (General Note 3(i), Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States), 1505, 1520, 1624; 26 U.S.C. 4461, 4462; 31 U.S.C. 3717, 9701; Pub. L. 107–296, 116 Stat. 2135 (6 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*).

* * * * *

Section 24.22 also issued under Sec. 892, Pub. L. 108–357, 118 Stat. 1418 (19 U.S.C. 58c); Sec. 32201, Pub. L. 114–94, 129 Stat. 1312 (19 U.S.C. 58c); Pub. L. 115–271, 132 Stat. 3895 (19 U.S.C. 58c).

Section 24.23 also issued under 19 U.S.C. 4531; Sec. 892, Pub. L. 108–357, 118 Stat. 1418 (19 U.S.C. 58c); Sec. 32201, Pub. L. 114–94, 129 Stat. 1312 (19 U.S.C. 58c); Pub. L. 115–271, 132 Stat. 3895 (19 U.S.C. 58c).

* * * * *

§ 24.3a [Amended]

■ 2. Amend § 24.3a, in paragraph (c)(1), in the second sentence, by removing the phrase ''the CBP's Revenue Division, Office of Administration'' and adding in its place ''CBP's Revenue Division''.

§ 24.5 [Amended]

■ 3. Amend § 24.5 by revising paragraph (f) to read as follows:

§ 24.5 Filing identification number.

* * * * *

(f) ''*Freezing*'' *importer identification information.* Those importers identifying customs transactions through the procedure specified in paragraph (d) of this section and desiring to ensure that they receive such customs transaction notifications as may be issued may request CBP to ''freeze'' the name and address information, regardless of what is shown on the CBP Form 5106 or request for services, by designating the name and title/position of the individual in their company authorized to effect name/address changes to the Importer's Record Number (IRN) identification information, and specifying the IRNs and suffixes to be frozen and the mailing address and/or physical location address of the company where CBP notifications are to be directed. The request must be made in a separate writing on letterhead paper signed by the importer of record or the importer of record's agent, whose name and title are clearly indicated. Participation in the

''Freeze'' Program is voluntary. Requests to participate should be sent to: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Freeze Program, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.

■ 4. Amend § 24.22 by:

■ a. Revising the fourth sentence of paragraph (c)(3);

■ b. Revising the last sentence of paragraph (e)(2); and

■ c. Amend the first sentence of the introductory text of paragraph (i) by removing the phrase ''6650 Telecom Drive, Suite 100, Indianapolis, IN 46278'' and adding in its place ''8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249''; and amend the fourth sentence of the introductory text of paragraph (i) by removing the phrase ''Office of Administration,''.

The revisions read as follows:

§ 24.22 Fees for certain services.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) *Prepayment.* * * * Alternatively, prepayment may be sent by mail with credit card information, check, or money order made payable to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, along with a completed CBP Form 339C (Annual User Fee Decal Request—Commercial Vehicle) for each commercial truck to the following address: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: DTOPS Program Administrator, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.

* * *

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(2) *Prepayment.* * * * Alternatively, prepayment may be sent by mail with credit card information, check, or money order made payable to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, along with a properly completed CBP Form 339V (Annual User Fee Decal Request—Vessels) or CBP Form 339A (Annual User Fee Decal Request—Aircraft), to the following address: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: DTOPS Program Administrator, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249.

* * * * *

■ 5. Amend § 24.23 by revising paragraphs (b)(4)(iii)(A) and (b)(4)(iii)(C)*(1)* to read as follows:

§ 24.23 Fees for processing merchandise.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(4) * * *

(iii) * * *

(A) The quarterly payment must conform to the requirements of § 24.1 of this part, must be submitted electronically via Fedwire or *pay.gov*, or mailed to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Reimbursables, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249, and must be received by CBP no later than the last day of the month that follows the close of the calendar quarter to which the payment relates.

* * * * *

(C) * * *

(1) In the case of an overpayment, the carrier or operator may request a refund by writing to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Reimbursables, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249. The refund request must specify the grounds for the refund and must be received by CBP within one year of the date the fee for which the refund is sought was paid to CBP; and

* * * * *

§ 24.24 [Amended]

■ 6. In § 24.24:

■ a. Amend the third sentence of paragraph (c)(8)(i), the last sentence of paragraph (e)(1)(ii), the second sentence of (e)(2)(iii), the last sentence of paragraph (e)(3)(ii), the second sentence of paragraph (e)(4)(iii), and the fifth sentence of paragraph (e)(4)(iv)(A) by removing the text ''the Office of Administration, Revenue Division, Customs and Border Protection, using the current address posted at *Forms.CBP.gov*'' and replacing with ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Finance, Revenue Division, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249''.

■ b. Amend the third sentence of paragraph (g) by removing the text ''at the current address posted at *Forms.CBP.gov*'' and replacing with ''at U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Finance, Revenue Division, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249''.

■ 7. Amend § 24.26 by revising paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 24.26 Automated Clearinghouse credit.

* * * * *

(b) *Enrollment procedure.* A payer interested in enrolling in the ACH credit program must indicate such interest by providing the following information to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249: Payer name and address; payer contact name(s); payer telephone number(s) and email address; payer identification number (importer number or Social Security number or CBP assigned number); and 3-digit filer code.

* * * * *

PART 128—EXPRESS CONSIGNMENTS

■ 8. The authority citation for part 128 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 19 U.S.C. 58c, 66, 1202 (General Note 3(i), Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States), 1321, 1484, 1498, 1551, 1555, 1556, 1565, 1624.

■ 9. Amend § 128.11 by revising paragraph (b)(7)(iv) to read as follows:

§ 128.11 Express consignment carrier application process.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(7) * * *

(iv) If the entity is an express consignment carrier facility, provide to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Revenue Division, Attn: Reimbursables, 8899 E 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN 46249, at the beginning of each calendar quarter, a list of all carriers or operators currently using the facility and notify that office whenever a new carrier or operator begins to use the facility or whenever a carrier or operator ceases to use the facility.

* * * * *

Robert F. Altneu,

Director, Regulations & Disclosure Law Division Regulations & Rulings, Office of Trade U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

[FR Doc. 2025–15647 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–14–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

29 CFR Parts 95, 96, 97, and 99

[Docket No. ETA–2025–0002]

RIN 1291–AA48

Obsolete Grant and Contract Regulations

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Labor.

ACTION: Direct final rule; confirmation of effective date.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (Department) is confirming the effective date of September 2, 2025, for the direct final rule that was published in the **Federal Register** on July 1, 2025. This direct final rule removed obsolete grant and contract regulations in the Department of Labor's regulations. These grant and contract regulations were superseded by the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's)

Guidance for Grants and Agreements, codified in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), which the Department adopted and gave regulatory effect to in 2014. Accordingly, these regulations were no longer necessary, and the Department removed the regulations from the CFR since they are no longer operative.

DATES: The effective date of September 2, 2025, for the direct final rule published July 1, 2025, at 90 FR 28002, is confirmed.

ADDRESSES: Please refer to Docket ID ETA–2025–0002 when contacting the Department about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly-available information related to this action by visiting *https://www.regulations.gov* and search for Docket ID ETA–2025–0002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Kodiak, Administrator, Office of Grants Management, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room S–4519, Washington, DC 20210, Telephone: (202) 693–6617 (voice) (this is not a tollfree number). For persons with a hearing or speech disability who need assistance using the telephone system, please dial 711 to access telecommunications relay services.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 1, 2025 (90 FR 28002), the Department published a direct final rule removing its regulations in parts 95, 96, 97, and 99 of title 29 of the CFR for programs that are no longer operative. In the direct final rule, the Department stated that, if no significant adverse comments were received, then the direct final rule would become effective on September 2, 2025. The Department received no comments on the direct final rule. Therefore, the direct final rule will become effective as scheduled.

Dean Heyl,

Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Labor.

[FR Doc. 2025–15652 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 11

[Docket No. FWS–HQ–LE–2025–0001; FF09L00200–FX–LE12200900000]

RIN 1018–BI02

Civil Penalties; 2025 Inflation Adjustments for Civil Monetary Penalties

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or we) issues this final rule to adjust for inflation the statutory civil monetary penalties that may be assessed for violations of Service-administered statutes and their implementing regulations. We issue this rule in accordance with the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Improvements Act of 2015 (the 2015 Act) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) memorandum M–25–02. We are required to adjust civil monetary penalties annually for inflation according to a formula specified in the 2015 Act. This rule replaces the previously issued amounts with the updated amounts after using the 2025 inflation adjustment multiplier provided in M–25–02.

DATES: This rule is effective August 18, 2025.

ADDRESSES: This rule may be found on the internet at *https://www.regulations.gov* in Docket No. FWS–HQ–LE–2025–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Stull, Special Agent in Charge, Headquarters Investigations Unit, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Law Enforcement, (470) 512–0690. Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services. Individuals outside the United States should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point-of-contact in the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations at 50 CFR part 11 provide uniform rules and procedures for the assessment of civil penalties resulting from violations of certain laws and regulations enforced by the Service. Under section 4 of the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. 2461 note (the Inflation Adjustment Act), as amended by the 2015 Act, each Federal agency must issue regulations adjusting for inflation the statutory civil monetary penalties (civil penalties) that can be imposed under the laws administered by that agency. The 2015 Act (sec. 701 of Pub. L. 114–74) amended the Inflation Adjustment Act to require Federal agencies to adjust their civil monetary penalties with an initial ''catch up'' adjustment through rulemaking in 2016 and then make subsequent annual adjustments for inflation. The purpose of these adjustments is to maintain the deterrent effect of civil penalties and to further the policy goals of the underlying statutes.

The 2015 Act provided that the initial ''catch up adjustment'' take effect no later than August 1, 2016, followed by subsequent adjustments no later than January 15 every year thereafter. This final rule adjusts the civil penalty amounts that may be imposed pursuant to each statutory provision beginning on the date specified above in the **DATES** caption above. On June 28, 2016, the Service published in the **Federal Register** (81 FR 41862) an interim rule that revised 50 CFR part 11 to carry out the Inflation Adjustment Act. The Service subsequently published a final rule to that interim rule on December 23, 2016 (81 FR 94274). The Service has published final rules every year thereafter, further adjusting the civil penalty amounts in 50 CFR 11.33 per OMB guidance:

- 82 FR 6307, January 19, 2017;
- 83 FR 5950, February 12, 2018;
- 84 FR 15525, April 16, 2019;
- 85 FR 10310, February 24, 2020;
- 86 FR 15427, March 23, 2021;
- 87 FR 13948, March 11, 2022;
- 88 FR 5796, January 30, 2023; and
- 89 FR 7295, February 2, 2024.

This final rule adjusts the 2024 civil monetary penalty amounts codified at 50 CFR 11.33 by using the 2025 inflation multiplier provided by OMB in M–25–02, ''Implementation of Penalty Inflation Adjustments for 2025, Pursuant to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Improvements Act of 2015.'' The cost-of-living adjustment multiplier for 2025 is 1.02598. Therefore, we multiplied each penalty in the table in 50 CFR 11.33 by 1.02598 to obtain the 2025 annual adjustment. The new amounts are reflected in the table in the rule portion of this document and replace the current amounts in 50 CFR 11.33.

Required Determinations

Regulatory Planning and Review (Executive Orders 12866 and 13563)

Executive Order (E.O.) 12866, as reaffirmed by E.O. 13563, provides that OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) will review all significant rules. OIRA has determined that this rule is not significant.

In addition, in this final rule, we affirm the required determinations that we made in the June 28, 2016, interim rule (81 FR 41862). For descriptions of our actions to ensure compliance with the following statutes and Executive orders, see that interim rule:

- National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*);
- Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C. 804(2));
- Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*); and
- Executive Orders 12630, 12988, 13132, 13175, and 13211.

Administrative Procedure Act

Section 553(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*) provides that, when an agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, the agency may issue a rule without providing notice and an opportunity for prior public comment. Additionally, under the 2015 Act, agencies must adjust their civil penalties notwithstanding the notice and comment requirements of section 553. See M–25–02, p. 4. Finally, the Service finds that providing for public comment before issuing this rule is unnecessary as this rulemaking is a nondiscretionary action. The Service is required to publish this rule to update the civil penalty amounts by the specified formula described above. The Service has no discretion to vary the amount of the adjustment to reflect any views or suggestions provided by commenters. Since this update to the February 2, 2024, final rule (89 FR 7295) is merely ministerial, we find that pre-publication notice and public comment with respect to the revisions set forth in this rule is unnecessary. We also posit that we have good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(d) to make this rule effective upon publication.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 11

Administrative practice and procedure, Exports, Fish, Imports, Penalties, Plants, Transportation, Wildlife.

Regulation Promulgation

For the reasons described above, we amend part 11, subchapter B of chapter I, title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations as set forth below.

PART 11—CIVIL PROCEDURES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 11 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 470aa–470mm, 470aaa–470aaa–11, 668–668d, 1361–1384, 1401–1407, 1531–1544, 3371–3378, 4201–4245, 4901–4916, 5201–5207, 5301–5306; 18 U.S.C. 42–43; 25 U.S.C. 3001–3013; and Sec. 701, Pub. L. 114–74, 129 Stat. 599, unless otherwise noted.

■ 2. Revise the table in § 11.33 to read as follows:

§ 11.33 Adjustments to penalties.

* * * * *

Law	Citation	Type of violation	Maximum civil monetary penalty
(a) African Elephant Conservation Act ..	16 U.S.C. 4224(b)	Any violation	$13,132
(b) Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.	16 U.S.C. 668(b)	Any violation	16,590
(c) Endangered Species Act of 1973	16 U.S.C. 1540(a)(1)	(1) Knowing violation of section 1538 ...	65,653
		(2) Other knowing violation	31,513
		(3) Any other violation	1,659
(d) Lacey Act Amendments of 1981	16 U.S.C. 3373(a)	(1) Violations referred to in 16 U.S.C. 3373(a)(1).	33,181
		(2) Violations referred to in 16 U.S.C. 3373(a)(2).	829
(e) Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972.	16 U.S.C. 1375	Any violation	33,181
(f) Recreational Hunting Safety Act of 1994.	16 U.S.C. 5202(b)	(1) Violation involving use of force or violence or threatened use of force or violence.	21,114
		(2) Any other violation	10,556
(g) Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1998.	16 U.S.C. 5305a(b)(2)	Any violation	23,097
(h) Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992	16 U.S.C. 4912(a)(1)	(1) Violation of section 4910(a)(1), section 4910(a)(2), or any permit issued under section 4911.	55,652
		(2) Violation of section 4910(a)(3)	26,711
		(3) Any other violation	1,114

Kevin Lilly,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 2025–15720 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333–15–P

Proposed Rules

Federal Register
Vol. 90, No. 157
Monday, August 18, 2025

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

13 CFR Parts 124 and 125

Tribal Consultation for SBA's Office of Capital Access and Access to All Agency Financial Assistance, Contracting, Business Counseling and Technical Assistance Programs, Identifying Issues and Best Practices

AGENCY: U.S. Small Business Administration.

ACTION: Notice of tribal consultation meeting.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) announces that it is holding a tribal consultation meeting in Wayland, Michigan requesting comments and input on all issues or concerns relating to any of SBA's programs. Specifically, SBA seeks comments on how best SBA can provide access for tribally-owned small businesses to SBA's various financial assistance programs under SBA's Office of Capital Access as well as its contracting, business counseling and technical assistance programs. SBA is requesting general comments and input on how these programs are working and is inviting suggestions on potential avenues for making the programs more efficient or reducing any unnecessary regulatory burden associated with the programs.

DATES: The Tribal Consultation meeting date is Wednesday, September 17, 2025, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EDT), Wayland, Michigan. The Tribal Consultation meeting pre-registration deadline date is September 12, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

1. The Tribal Consultation meeting will be held at Gun Lake Casino Resort, 1123 129th Avenue, Wayland, MI 49348.

2. Send pre-registration requests to attend and/or testify to Diane Cullo, Assistant Administrator of SBA's Office of Native American Affairs, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street SW, Washington, DC 20416; *Diane.Cullo@sba.gov;* or Facsimile to (202) 481–2177.

3. You may submit written comments to SBA by sending them to Diane Cullo, Assistant Administrator, Office of Native American Affairs, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street SW, Washington, DC 20416; or *Diane.Cullo@sba.gov;* or Facsimile to (202) 481–2177.

If you wish to submit confidential business information (CBI), please submit the information to Diane Cullo, Assistant Administrator, Office of Native American Affairs, U.S. Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street SW, Washington, DC 20416 and highlight the information that you consider to be CBI and explain why you believe this information should be held confidential. SBA will review the information and make a final determination of whether the information will be published or not.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Cullo, Assistant Administrator, Office of Native American Affairs, at *Diane.cullo@sba.gov* or (202) 619–0518 or by facsimile to (202) 481–2177.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

SBA is seeking input from the Native American community on any concerns relating to the general management and operation of SBA's Capital Access and Government Contracting and Business Development programs. Specifically, SBA is seeking comments and input on access to capital for tribal entities. SBA reduces risk and enables easier access to capital through the 7(a) Loan Program, SBA's primary business loan program, the 504-loan program, and the microloan program. SBA is requesting general comments and input on how SBA's financial assistance programs and services are working and is inviting comments and suggestions on potential avenues for continuing to make all programs and services more effective and efficient while continuing to reduce regulatory burden on customers and participants.

Additionally, SBA is asking for input on best practices on how entity-owned firms market their capabilities to procuring agencies. SBA has found that certain practices may be negatively impacting entity-owned firms' ability to receive awards. For example, contracting officers may consider entity-owned firms to be affiliated with each other when several appear on the same web page or where multiple firms owned by the same entity have the exact same capabilities and contact points. SBA is seeking comments and input from firms who have encountered these or similar issues and how they have been able to successfully market their sophisticated capabilities while still making clear to procuring agencies that they are independent small businesses.

Lastly, within the contracting area, the Nonmanufacturer Rule (NMR) requires that recipients of Federal supply contracts provide the product of a small business manufacturer or processor if the recipient of the set-aside contract is not the actual manufacturer or processor of the product. The NMR generally applies to all business contracts (*i.e.,* small business set-aside, service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB), Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone), women-owned small business (WOSB) or economically disadvantaged women-owned small business (EDWOSB), and 8(a) contracts). SBA has received some input that the NMR unnecessarily increases the price of manufactured items purchased by the Government. SBA has also been told that nonmanufacturers play an integral role in assisting the Government procure manufactured items when original manufacturers do not wish to deal directly with the Government. SBA requests comments on the role of nonmanufacturers, whether there should be any limitations imposed on the rule, whether the entire value of manufactured items should count as an award to small business through one of SBA's small business contracting programs (or only the portion added by the small business nonmanufacturer), and any other suggestions relating to the NMR.

Tribal Consultation Meeting

The purpose of this tribal consultation meeting is to conform to the requirements of Executive Order 13175, Tribal Consultations; to provide interested parties with an opportunity to discuss their views on the issues; and for SBA to obtain the views of SBA's stakeholders on ways to maximize efficiency and reduce the burden on small businesses. SBA considers tribal consultation meetings a valuable

component of its deliberations and believes that this tribal consultation meeting will allow for constructive dialogue with the Tribal community, Tribal Leaders, Tribal Elders, elected members of Alaska Native Villages or their appointed representatives, and principals of tribally-owned and ANC-owned firms participating in SBA programs.

The format of this tribal consultation meeting will consist of a panel of SBA representatives who will preside over the session. The oral and written testimony as well as any comments SBA receives will become part of the administrative record for SBA's consideration. Written testimony may be submitted in lieu of oral testimony. SBA will analyze the testimony, both oral and written, along with any written comments received. SBA officials may ask questions of a presenter to clarify or further explain the testimony. The purpose of the tribal consultation is to assist SBA with gathering information to guide SBA's review process and to potentially develop new proposals. SBA is open to receiving comments on any SBA small business program that concerns the Native community but specifically requests comments on those issues set forth above. Presenters are encouraged to provide a written copy of their testimony. SBA will accept written material that the presenter wishes to provide that further supplements his or her testimony. Electronic or digitized copies are encouraged.

The tribal consultation meeting will be held for one day. The meeting will begin at 1:00 a.m. and end at 4:00 p.m. (EDT). SBA will adjourn early if all those scheduled have delivered their testimony.

II. Registration

SBA respectfully requests that any elected or appointed representative of the tribal communities or principal of a tribally-owned, ANC-owned or NHO-owned 8(a) firm that is interested in attending please pre-register in advance and indicate whether you would like to testify at the hearing. Registration requests should be received by SBA by September 12, 2025. Please contact Diane Cullo, Assistant Administrator, Office of Native American Affairs in writing at *Diane.Cullo@sba.gov* or by facsimile to (202) 481–2950. If you are interested in testifying please include the following information relating to the person testifying: Name, Organization affiliation, Address, Telephone number, Email address and Fax number. SBA will attempt to accommodate all interested parties that wish to present testimony. Based on the number of registrants it may be necessary to impose time limits to ensure that everyone who wishes to testify has the opportunity to do so. SBA will confirm in writing the registration of presenters and attendees.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 634 and E.O. 13175, 65 FR 67249.

* * * * *

Dated: August 14, 2025.

Diane Cullo,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Native American Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2025–15704 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8026–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

Proposed Establishment of Class C Airspace at Wilmington International Airport, NC; Public Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This document announces a fact-finding informal airspace meeting regarding a plan to establish Class C airspace at Wilmington International Airport, NC (KILM). The purpose of the meeting is to solicit aeronautical comments on the proposal's effects on local aviation operations. All comments received during the meeting, and the subsequent comment period, will be considered prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

DATES: The meeting will be held virtually on October 1, 2025, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). Comments must be received on or before October 31, 2025.

ADDRESSES: *Comments:* Send comments on the proposal to: Matthew Cathcart, Manager, Operations Support Group, Eastern Service Center, Air Traffic Organization, Federal Aviation Administration, 1701 Columbia Avenue, College Park, GA 30337; or via email to: *9-AJO-ILM-Class-C-Comments@faa.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clayton Smith, Acting Air Traffic Manager, Wilmington Airport Traffic Control Tower, 2220 Control Tower Drive, Wilmington, NC 28405–8895. Telephone Number 910–815–4642, Email: *clayton.j.smith@faa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Meeting Procedures

The meeting will provide interested parties an opportunity to present views, recommendations, and comments on the proposed airspace. This will be a virtual informal airspace meeting using the Zoom teleconferencing tool. The meeting will also be recorded and available to watch on the FAA YouTube channel.

(a) *Registration:* To attend the meeting, the public can register here: *https://airportnetwork.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_OOInhwMFT4KDHTL1t9tS2Q#/registration.*

(b) The meeting will be informal in nature and will be conducted by one or more representatives of the FAA Eastern Service Area. A representative from the FAA will present a briefing on the planned airspace.

(c) Each participant will be given an opportunity to deliver comments or make a presentation, although a time limit may be imposed to accommodate closing times. Only comments concerning the plan to establish the Wilmington International Airport Class C airspace area will be accepted.

(d) Each person wishing to make a presentation will be asked to note their intent when registering for the meeting so those time frames can be established. This meeting will not be adjourned until everyone registered to speak has had an opportunity to address the panel. This meeting may be adjourned at any time if all persons present have had an opportunity to speak.

(e) This meeting will be formally recorded and available on the FAA YouTube channel. A summary of the comments made at the meeting will be filed in the rulemaking docket.

Information gathered through this meeting will assist the FAA in drafting an NPRM that would be published in the **Federal Register**. The public will be afforded the opportunity to comment on any NPRM published on this matter.

A graphic depiction of the proposed airspace modifications may be viewed at the following URL: *www.faa.gov/go/wilmington.*

Agenda for the Meeting

- Presentation of Meeting Procedures
- Informal Presentation of the proposed Class C Airspace area
- Public Presentations
- Discussions and Questions
- Closing Comments

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g), 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O.10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389)

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 13, 2025.

Brian Eric Konie,

Acting Manager, Rules and Regulations Group.

[FR Doc. 2025–15643 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 90, No. 157
Monday, August 18, 2025

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2025–0029]

Petitions Seeking Determination of Nonregulated Status; Notice of Intent of Withdrawal of Notices of Intent

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is withdrawing notices of intent to prepare environmental impact statements for two petitions seeking determinations of nonregulated status for organisms developed using genetic engineering. APHIS' decision to withdraw the notices of intent is consistent with APHIS' July 9, 2025 Program Update that as of that date, APHIS will no longer prepare an analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act to accompany its review of petitions seeking a determination of nonregulated status. This document provides public notice of this withdrawal.

DATES: On August 18, 2025, the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement published in the **Federal Register** on April 28, 2021 (86 FR 22384–22386, Docket No. APHIS–2020–0021) and the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement published in the **Federal Register** on August 6, 2021 (86 FR 43160–43162, Docket No. APHIS–2020–0030) are withdrawn.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Joseph Tangredi, Biotechnology Regulatory Services, APHIS, USDA, 5601 Sunnyside Avenue, AP100–3–1106, Beltsville, MD 20705; (301) 851–4061; email: *joseph.tangredi@usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 28, 2021, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of intent (86 FR 22384–22386; Docket No. APHIS–2020–0021) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for Determination of Nonregulated Status for Maize Developed Using Genetic Engineering for Dicamba, Glufosinate, Quizalofop, and 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid Resistance, With Tissue-Specific Glyphosate Resistance Facilitating the Production of Hybrid Maize Seed.

On August 6, 2021, APHIS published in the **Federal Register** a notice of intent (86 FR 43160–43162; Docket No. APHIS–2020–0030) to prepare an EIS for Determination of Nonregulated Status for Blight-Tolerant Darling 58 American Chestnut (*Castanea Dentata*) Developed Using Genetic Engineering.

APHIS is providing the public with notice of its withdrawal of the notices of intent to prepare EIS's for the aforementioned two petitions seeking determinations of nonregulated status for organisms developed using genetic engineering. Since publication of these notices of intent, two recent developments informed this decision and the need for this notice.

First, on July 3, 2025, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) issued an Interim Final Rule (90 FR 29632–29674) that amongst other changes, revised, moved and republished, or removed portions of USDA's existing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations in 7 CFR part 1b as well as added new portions to those regulations that apply USDA-wide. New 7 CFR 1b.7(b)(3) requires USDA subcomponents to publish a notice of intent in the **Federal Register** if a decision is made to withdraw the intent to complete an EIS.

Second, on July 9, 2025, APHIS published a Program Update titled ''APHIS Announces Update to Practices for Reviewing Petitions Seeking a Determination of Nonregulated Status for Organisms Altered or Produced Through Genetic Engineering''.[1] In this Program Update, APHIS stated that as of July 9, 2025, when evaluating a petition seeking a determination of nonregulated status that meets the information requirements in 7 CFR 340.6, APHIS will first determine whether a modified organism is subject to regulation under 7 CFR part 340 and the plant pest provisions in the Plant Protection Act. If APHIS determines that a modified organism is unlikely to pose a greater plant pest risk relative to its comparator and, as such, is not a plant pest, APHIS will end its review and, because it lacks jurisdiction over the modified organism, APHIS must issue a determination that the modified organism is not subject to 7 CFR part 340.

Therefore, in accordance with the Program Update, APHIS will no longer prepare an analysis under NEPA to accompany its review of petitions seeking determination of nonregulated status. As such, APHIS is providing the public with notice that it is withdrawing the notices of intent to prepare EIS's in accordance with new 7 CFR 1b.7(b)(3) for two petitions seeking determinations of nonregulated status for organisms developed using genetic engineering under 7 CFR part 340.

Done in Washington, DC.

Sarah Helming,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15702 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

[1] The Program Update is available at *https://www.aphis.usda.gov/news/program-update/aphis-announces-update-practices-reviewing-petitions-seeking-determination.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Farm Service Agency

[Docket ID FSA–2025–0002]

Notice; Emergency Commodity Assistance Program (ECAP)

AGENCY: Farm Service Agency, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Farm Service Agency (FSA) is issuing this notice to announce a change to ECAP related to subsequent acres of eligible commodities. It also announces the deadline to apply for an ECAP payment for the additional acres that are now eligible as a result of the change announced in this notice.

DATES: We will accept applications from producers for acres that are eligible as a result of the change announced in this notice through September 30, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathy Sayers; telephone: (202) 720–6870; email: *Kathy.Sayers@usda.gov.* Individuals with disabilities who require alternative means for communication should contact the USDA Target Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and text telephone (TTY mode)) or dial 711 for Telecommunications Relay Service (both voice and text telephone users can initiate this call from any telephone).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: ECAP was authorized by section 2102 of Title I of Division B of the American Relief Act, 2025 (Pub. L. 118–158) and announced in a notice of funds availability (NOFA) on March 19, 2025 (90 FR 12696). This document announces a change to the provisions regarding eligible acres under ECAP. It also announces the application deadline for producers to apply for payment for the additional acres that are now eligible as a result of that change.

The NOFA provided that in cases where a producer reported both an initial eligible commodity and a subsequent eligible commodity on the same acreage and the combination did not meet the definition of an approved double cropping situation, only the initial commodity was considered eligible for an ECAP payment. This rule applied even in cases where the initial eligible commodity failed or was prevented from being planted (90 FR 12699).

This notice announces a change to the eligibility of acres of subsequent eligible commodities. In situations where a producer planted, or was prevented from planting, both an initial crop and a subsequent crop on the same acreage for the 2024 crop year, the initial crop will continue to be eligible for ECAP if it was an eligible commodity as provided in the NOFA. If the subsequent crop that was planted or prevented from being planted was also an eligible commodity and was reported to FSA by August 15, 2025, on FSA–578, Report of Acreage, the subsequent crop will now also be eligible for ECAP regardless of whether it meets the definition of ''double cropping'' provided in the NOFA. FSA is making this change to align the administration of ECAP with the broad intent of the authorizing legislation to address the gap between the cost of production and market prices for all eligible commodities that were planted or prevented from being planted, due to feedback from industry leaders, commodity groups, and producers who were directly impacted.

The NOFA provided a deadline of August 15, 2025, for all applicants to submit an FSA–63 ECAP, Emergency Commodity Assistance Program (ECAP) Application. This notice announces the enrollment period for the additional acres of subsequent eligible commodities that now are eligible for ECAP as a result of the change announced in this notice. Applicants must submit an FSA–63 ECAP for those additional, eligible acres to their local FSA county office by September 30, 2025. FSA will mail postcards to producers who reported acres of subsequent eligible commodities to inform them of the additional eligibility and timeframe to apply. Producers may contact their local FSA county office to obtain a copy of their pre-filled application or complete their application electronically as described in the NOFA.

This notice does not extend the deadline of August 15, 2025, to apply for acres that were eligible under the initial NOFA or submit late-filed acreage reports. As provided in the NOFA, all applicants must also submit required eligibility forms to FSA by August 17, 2026, if not already on file with FSA for the 2024 program year.

William Beam,

Administrator, Farm Service Agency.

[FR Doc. 2025–15654 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3411–E2–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Information Collection; Workforce Development Participant Tracking

AGENCY: Forest Service, Agriculture (USDA).

ACTION: Notice; request for comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Forest Service (Agency) is seeking comments from all interested individuals and organizations on the renewal of a currently approved information collection request 0596–0247, titled Workforce Development Participant Tracking. This renewal will also provide a common form for use by other Federal agencies.

DATES: Comments must be received in writing on or before October 17, 2025 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments concerning this notice may be sent to Amy Firestone, Assistant Director (Acting)—Workforce Development Partnerships, USDA Forest Service, 201 14th Street SW, 2CE, Washington, DC 20250. Comments also may be submitted by email to *SM.FS.wdp@usda.gov.*

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be available to the public through relevant websites and upon request. For this reason, please do not include in your comments information of a confidential nature, such as sensitive personal information or proprietary information. If you send an email comment, your email address will be automatically captured and included as part of the comment that is placed in the public docket and made available for public viewing. Please note that comments containing any routine notice about the confidentiality of the communication will be treated as public comments that may be made available to the public notwithstanding the inclusion of the routine notice.

The supporting documents for the information collection request and/or any comments received are available for public inspection at the Office of the Director, National Partnership Office, 2nd Floor Central, Sidney R. Yates Federal Building, 201 14th Street SW, Washington, DC, on business days between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Visitors are encouraged to call ahead to (800) 832–1355 to facilitate entry to the building. The public may request that an electronic copy of the supporting documents for the information collection and/or any comments received be sent via return email. Requests should be emailed to *SM.FS.wdp@usda.gov.* The information collection request is posted online at *https://www.regulations.gov/.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amy Firestone, Assistant Director (Acting)—Workforce Development Partnerships, by phone at (202) 317–2807 or by email at *SM.FS.wdp@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:

Title: Workforce Development Participant Tracking.

OMB Number: 0596–0247.

Expiration Date of Approval: June 30, 2026.

Type of Review: Extension with non-substantive changes of a currently approved information collection, with a new request for common form.

Abstract: Federal land management and other agencies are authorized to offer work and education programs for individuals in natural and cultural resources careers. Some of the

applicable statutes and regulations include special hiring authorities, upon completion of certain requirements. This information collection request will enable participating agencies to capture required and other information that will aid in workforce development and job training for young people, returning veterans, and others who are unemployed or underemployed, and to monitor compliance with statutory laws and associated hiring authorities. A primary, but not exclusionary, authorizing source for the information collection is 16 U.S.C. 1702–1727, chapter 37—Youth Conservation Corps, Public Lands Corps, Resource Assistants Program, and Indian Youth Service Corps. The Public Lands Corps is a work and education program involving the Nation's land management agencies, conservation and service corps, and environmental organizations that contribute to the rehabilitation, restoration, and repair of public land resources and infrastructures. Public Lands Corps projects provide opportunities for community and national public service, work experience and training for young people who are unemployed or underemployed, students, recent graduates, and others with an interest in natural and cultural resources careers.

The Workforce Development Participant Tracking form supports effective management of the Public Lands Corps and other workforce development programs hosted in partnership with public land management agencies. Utilization of a common form will contribute to the following: assist Federal agencies to uniformly collect information regarding work accomplished; track and monitor participant engagement to determine the completion of requirements for noncompetitive hiring eligibility as defined in the Public Lands Corps Act; comply with statutory reporting requirements; inform effective outreach; and provide data about project activities that can be aggregated across Federal agencies.

Information collected, such as participant demographic information and project information, will allow the Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies to monitor the effectiveness of Federal efforts to meet the intent of the authorizing statutes. This information collection request will ensure that partners maintain a record of all workforce development agreements, grants and contracts established, participant demographics and education, project information and work hours, project locations and dates, and status of special hiring eligibilities conferred upon eligible participants.

Affected Public: Non-Profit Organizations and non-Federal Government entities.

Estimated Annual Burden per Response: 2 hours.

Estimated Annual Number of Respondents: 500.

Estimated Annual Number of Responses per Respondent: 1; annually. The application will be available for respondents to input data more frequently if they choose.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 1,000 hours.

Comment is Invited: Comment is invited on (1) whether this collection of information is necessary for the stated purposes and the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical or scientific utility; (2) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

All comments received in response to this notice, including names and addresses when provided, will be a matter of public record. Comments will be summarized and included in the submission request for Office of Management and Budget approval.

Beattra Wilson,

Associate Deputy Chief State, Private, and Tribal Forestry, National Forest System.

[FR Doc. 2025–15637 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3411–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

West Virginia Resource Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Forest Service, Agriculture (USDA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The West Virginia Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) will hold a public meeting according to the details shown below. The committee is authorized under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (the Act) and operates in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). The purpose of the committee is to improve collaborative relationships and to provide advice and recommendations to the Forest Service concerning projects and funding consistent with Title II of the Act as well as make recommendations on recreation fee proposals for sites on the Monongahela National Forest within Greenbrier, Pocahontas, Randolph, Tucker, and Webster Counties, consistent with the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.

DATES: A virtual meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 17, 2025, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time and on Monday, September 29, 2025, from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time.

Written and Oral Comments: Anyone wishing to provide virtual oral comments must pre-register by 11:59 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time) on September 12, 2025. Written public comments will be accepted until 11:59 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time) on September 8, 2025. Comments submitted after this date will be provided by the Forest Service to the committee, but the committee may not have adequate time to consider those comments prior to the meeting.

All RAC meetings are subject to cancellation. For status of the meeting prior to attendance, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held virtually via telephone and/or video conference. Members of the public may participate in the meeting by joining virtually via videoconference at: Microsoft Teams/Meeting ID: 271 300 283 751 8, Passcode: Hy6QW383; or Dial in by phone +1 (202) 650–0123, 673784298# United States, Washington, phone conference ID: 673 784 298#. Committee information and meeting details can be found at the following website, *https://www.fs.usda.gov/r09/monongahela/working-with-us/committees,* or by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Written Comments: Written comments must be sent by email to *kristopher.hennig@usda.gov* or via mail (postmarked) to Kristopher Hennig, Partnership Coordinator, Monongahela National Forest, 200 Sycamore Street, Elkins, West Virginia 26241. The Forest Service strongly prefers comments to be submitted electronically.

Oral Comments: Persons or organizations wishing to make oral comments must pre-register by 11:59

p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, September 12, 2025, and speakers can only register for one speaking slot. Oral comment requests must be sent by email to *kristopher.hennig@usda.gov or* via mail (postmarked) to Kristopher Hennig, Partnership Coordinator, Monongahela National Forest, 200 Sycamore Street, Elkins, West Virginia 26241.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Sandeno, West Virginia RAC Designated Federal Officer, by phone at (304) 635–4482 or email at *Cynthia.Sandeno@usda.gov;* or Kristopher Hennig, West Virginia RAC Coordinator, by phone at (304) 635–4475 or email at *kristopher.hennig@usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of the meeting is to:

1. Add, remove, or edit the below agenda items, as needed;
2. Hear from the Forest Service and discuss recreation fee proposals;
3. Make recommendations on recreation fee proposals;
4. Receive updates on previously funded Title II projects;
5. Establish timeline for soliciting new Title II project proposals;
6. Other.

Please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, by or before the deadline, for all questions related to the meeting. All comments, including names and addresses when provided, are placed in the record and are available for public inspection and copying. The public may inspect comments received upon request.

Meeting Accommodations: If you are a person requiring reasonable accommodation, please make a request in advance for sign language interpreting, assistive listening devices, or other reasonable accommodation. For access to proceedings, please contact the person listed in the section titled **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. All reasonable accommodation requests are managed on a case-by-case basis.

Equal opportunity practices, in accordance with USDA policies, will be followed in all membership appointments to the committee.

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Dated: August 14, 2025.

Cikena Reid,

USDA Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–15677 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3411–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

[Docket #: RUS–25–ELECTRIC–0035]

Notice of Revision of a Currently Approved Information Collection

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Rural Utilities Service (RUS or Agency), an agency within the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Rural Development (RD), announces its intention to request a revision to a currently approved information collection package for the RUS Electric Loan programs. The Agency invites comments on this information collection for which it intends to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by October 17, 2025 to be assured of consideration.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Adyam Negasi, RD Innovation Center—Regulations Management Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20250, Telephone: 202–211–9298, email: *adyam.negasi@usda.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The OMB regulation (5 CFR part 1320) implementing provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13) requires that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)). This notice identifies an information collection that the Agency is submitting to OMB for revision.

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (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 those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments may be submitted electronically by the Federal eRulemaking Portal, *regulations.gov.* In the ''Search for dockets and documents on agency actions'' box enter the Docket No. RUS–25–ELECTRIC–0035 and click the ''Search'' button. From the search results, click on or locate the document title: ''Notice of Revision of a Currently Approved Information Collection'' and select the ''Comment'' button. Before inputting comments, commenters may review the ''Commenter's Checklist'' (optional). To submit a comment: Insert comments under the ''Comment'' title, click ''Browse'' to attach files (if available), input email address, select box to opt to receive email confirmation of submission and tracking (optional), select the box ''I'm not a robot,'' and then select ''Submit Comment.'' Information on using *Regulations.gov*, including instructions for accessing documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket after the close of the comment period, is available through the site's ''FAQ'' link. All comments will be available for public inspection online at the Federal eRulemaking Portal (*regulations.gov*).

A federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. Data furnished by the applicants will be used to determine eligibility for program benefits. Furnishing the data is voluntary; however, failure to provide data could result in program benefits being withheld or denied.

Title: Request for Approval to Sell Capital Assets.

OMB Control Number: 0572–0020.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: The RUS is a credit agency of the USDA. It makes mortgage loans and loan guarantees to finance electric, telecommunications, and water and waste facilities in rural areas. In addition to providing loans and loan guarantees, one of the Agency's main

objectives is to safeguard loan security until the loan is repaid. When a borrower enters into the mortgage agreement with the Agency, all current and future capital assets of the borrower are ordinarily mortgaged or pledged to the Federal Government as security for Agency loans. The Agency's policy on sales of capital assets requires that the sale meet several requirements including the following: (1) the selling price shall be greater than or equal to the fair market value; and (2) the sale shall not jeopardize the repayment of the Agency's loan.

The selling of assets reduces the security and increases the risk to the government. RUS Form 369 allows the borrower to seek agency permission to sell some of its assets. The form collects detailed information regarding the proposed sales of a portion of the borrower's systems. RUS electric utility borrowers complete this form to request RUS approval in order to sell capital assets when the fair market value exceeds 10 percent of the borrower's net utility plant.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 2.074 hours per response.

Respondents: Nonprofit corporations and institutions of higher education.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 35.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 2.31.

Estimated Number of Responses: 81.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 168 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Adyam Negasi, RD Innovation Center—Regulations Management Division, Telephone: 202–211–9298, email: *adyam.negasi@usda.gov.*

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Karl Elmshaeuser,

Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, USDA Rural Development.

[FR Doc. 2025–15617 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the Maryland Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

AGENCY: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Notice of virtual business meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, that the Maryland Advisory Committee (Committee) to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will a public meeting via Zoom. The purpose is for the committee to discuss possible topics of study.

DATES: Monday, September 8, 2025, at 3:00 p.m. EDT.

ADDRESSES:

Registration Link (Audio/Visual): https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_CAHd6B0IQA6UQq1nNPMJFg.

Join by Phone (Audio Only): 1–833–435–1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: 161 229 9884 #.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brooke Peery, Designated Federal Officer, at *bpeery@usccr.gov* or 1–202–701–1376.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Committee meetings are available to the public through a registration link (above). Any interested members of the public may attend committee meetings. An open comment period will be provided to allow members of the public to make oral statements as time allows. Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, public minutes of each meeting will include a list of persons who are present. If joining via phone, callers can expect to incur regular charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, according to their wireless plan. The Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Closed captioning is available by selecting ''CC'' in the meeting platform. To request additional accommodations, please email *ebohor@usccr.gov* at least 10 business days prior to the meeting.

Members of the public are entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received in the regional office within 30 days following the scheduled meeting. Written comments may be emailed to Evelyn Bohor at *ebohor@usccr.gov*. Persons who desire additional information may contact the Regional Programs Coordination Unit at 1–202–656–8937.

Records generated from this meeting may be inspected and reproduced at the Regional Programs Coordination Unit Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Records of the meetings will be available via the file sharing website, *https://tinyurl.com/mnshz8n9*. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's website, *http://www.usccr.gov,* or may contact the Regional Programs Coordination Unit at *ebohor@usccr.gov*.

Agenda

I. Welcome & Roll Call
II. Chair's Comments
III. Committee Discussion on Topics of Study
IV. Next Steps
V. Public Comment
VI. Other Business
VII. Adjourn

Dated: August 13, 2025.

David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.

[FR Doc. 2025–15638 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the Ohio Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

AGENCY: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Notice of virtual business meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, that the Ohio Advisory Committee (Committee) to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will hold a public meeting via Zoom. The purpose of this meeting is to debrief on testimony received from panel briefings I–III and determine the next course of action.

DATES: Friday, September 19, 2025, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

ADDRESSES: This meeting will be held via Zoom.

Registration Link (Audio/Visual): https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_MXo-PdyHSBmFjVVHZv8ajA.

Join by Phone (Audio Only): 1–833–435–1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: 160 934 7066.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mallory Trachtenberg, Designated Federal Officer, at *mtrachtenberg@usccr.gov* or 1–202–809–9618.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This Committee meeting is available to the public through the registration link above. Any interested members of the public may attend this meeting. An open comment period will be provided to allow members of the public to make oral comments as time allows. Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act,

public minutes of the meeting will include a list of persons who are present at the meeting. If joining via phone, callers can expect to incur regular charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, according to their wireless plan. The Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Closed captioning is available by selecting ''CC'' in the meeting platform. To request additional accommodations, please email *svillanueva@usccr.gov* at least 5 business days prior to the meeting.

Members of the public are entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received in the regional office within 30 days following the scheduled meeting. Written comments may be emailed to Sarah Villanueva at *svillanueva@usccr.gov.* Persons who desire additional information may contact the Regional Programs Coordination Unit at 1–202–809–9618.

Records generated from these meetings may be inspected and reproduced at the Regional Programs Coordination Unit Office, as they become available, both before and after each meeting. Records of the meetings will be available via the file sharing website, *https://bit.ly/4g3IB4K.* Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's website, *http://www.usccr.gov,* or may contact the Regional Programs Coordination Unit at *svillanueva@usccr.gov.*

Agenda

I. Welcome and Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes

III. Announcements and Updates

IV. Committee Discussion

V. Next steps

VI. Public Comment

VII. Adjournment

Dated: August 13, 2025.

David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.

[FR Doc. 2025–15639 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Economic Analysis

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Direct Investment Surveys: BE–11, Annual Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad

The Department of Commerce will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, on or after the date of publication of this notice. We invite the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed, and continuing information collections, which helps us assess the impact of our information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. Public comments were previously requested via the **Federal Register** on 06/16/2025 during a 60-day comment period. This notice allows for an additional 30 days for public comments.

Agency: Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), Department of Commerce.

Title: Annual Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad.

OMB Control Number: 0608–0053.

Form Number: BE–11.

Type of Request: Reinstatement with change of a previously approved collection.

Number of Respondents: 3,000 respondents (U.S. parents). A complete response includes a BE–11 A form for the U.S. parent's domestic operation and one or more BE–11 B or D forms for its foreign affiliates that meet the BE–11 survey requirements. BEA estimates that U.S. parents will submit 3,000 A forms, 22,000 B forms, 130 D forms, and 500 Claim for Exemption forms.

Average Hours per Response: 95.2 hours per respondent (285,630 hours/3,000 U.S. parents) is the average but may vary considerably among respondents because of differences in company structure, complexity, and the number of foreign affiliates each U.S. parent must report.

Burden Hours: 285,630 hours. Total annual burden is calculated by multiplying the estimated number of submissions of each form by the average hourly burden per form, which is 7 hours for the A form, 12 hours for the B form, 1 hour for the D form, and 1 hour for the Claim for Exemption form.

Needs and Uses: The Annual Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad (BE–11) obtains sample data on the financial structure and operations of U.S. parents and their foreign affiliates. The data are needed to provide reliable, useful, and timely measures of U.S. direct investment abroad to assess its impact on the U.S. and foreign economies. The sample data are used to derive universe estimates in nonbenchmark years from similar data reported in the BE–10, Benchmark Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad, which is conducted every five years. The data collected include balance sheets; income statements; property, plant, and equipment; employment and employee compensation; merchandise trade; sales of goods and services; taxes; and research and development activity.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: Annual.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

Legal Authority: International Investment and Trade in Services Survey Act (P. L. 94–472, 22 U.S.C. 3101–3108, as amended).

This information collection request may be viewed at *www.reginfo.gov.* Follow the instructions to view Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be submitted within 30 days of the publication of this notice on the following website *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.* Find this particular information collection by selecting ''Currently under Review—Open for Public Comments'' or by using the search function and entering either the title of the collection or the OMB Control Number 0608–0053.

Sheleen Dumas,

Departmental PRA Compliance Officer, Office of the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Commerce Department.

[FR Doc. 2025–15645 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–941]

Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof From India: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: Applicable August 12, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joshua Jacobson, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance,

International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0266.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On July 23, 2025, the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) received a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning imports of certain freight rail couplers and parts thereof (freight rail couplers) from India filed in proper form on behalf of the Coalition of Freight Coupler Producers (the petitioner).[1] The CVD Petition was accompanied by antidumping duty (AD) petitions concerning imports of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and India.[2]

Between July 28 and August 8, 2025, Commerce requested supplemental information pertaining to certain aspects of the Petition in supplemental questionnaires.[3] Between July 30 and August 11, 2025, the petitioner filed timely responses to these requests for additional information.[4]

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the petitioner alleges that the Government of India (GOI) is providing countervailable subsidies, within the meaning of sections 701 and 771(5) of the Act, to producers of freight rail couplers in India, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, the domestic industry producing rebar in the United States. Consistent with section 702(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(b), for those alleged programs on which we are initiating a CVD investigation, the Petition was accompanied by information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting its allegations.

Commerce finds that the petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry, because the petitioner is an interested party, as defined in section 771(9)(F) of the Act.[5] Commerce also finds that the petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the requested CVD investigation.[6]

Period of Investigation

Because the Petition was filed on July 23, 2025, the period of investigation (POI) for the India CVD investigation is January 1, 2024, through December 31, 2024.[7]

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is freight rail couplers from India. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, *see* the appendix to this notice.

Comments on the Scope of the Investigation

On August 4, 2025, Commerce requested information and clarification from the petitioner regarding the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petition is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.[8] On August 6, 2025, the petitioner provided clarifications and revised the scope.[9] The description of the merchandise covered by this investigation, as described in the appendix to this notice, reflects these clarifications.

As discussed in the *Preamble* to Commerce's regulations, we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (*i.e.,* scope).[10] Commerce will consider all comments received from interested parties and, if necessary, will consult with interested parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations. If scope comments include factual information, all such factual information should be limited to public information.[11] Commerce requests that interested parties provide at the beginning of their scope comments a public executive summary for each comment or issue raised in their submission. Commerce further requests that interested parties limit their public executive summary of each comment or issue to no more than 450 words, not including citations. Commerce intends to use the public executive summaries as the basis of the comment summaries included in the analysis of scope comments. To facilitate preparation of its questionnaires, Commerce requests that scope comments be submitted by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on September 2, 2025, which is the next business day after 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice.[12] Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, and should also be limited to public information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on September 12, 2025, which is 10 calendar days from the initial comment deadline.

Commerce requests that any factual information that parties consider relevant to the scope of this investigation be submitted during that time period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigation may be relevant, the party must contact Commerce and request permission to submit the additional information. All scope comments must be filed simultaneously on the records of the concurrent AD and CVD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to Commerce must be filed electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS), unless an exception applies.[13] An electronically filed document must be

[1] *See* Petitioner's Letter, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders,'' dated July 23, 2025 (Petition). The members of the Coalition of Freight Coupler Producers (Coalition) are McConway and Torley, LLC (McConway and Torley), and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW).

[2] *Id.*

[3] *See* Commerce's Letters, ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated July 28, 2025 (First General Issues Questionnaire), ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated July 28, 2025 (First India CVD Questionnaire); ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated August 4, 2025 (Second General Issues Questionnaire); and ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated August 8, 2025 (August 8, 2025, Supplemental Questionnaire).

[4] *See* Petitioner's Letters, ''Response to Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition,'' dated July 30, 2025 (First General Issues Supplement), ''Response to Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume IV of the Petition,'' dated August 4, 2025 (India CVD Supplement), ''Response to the Second Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition'', dated August 6, 2025 (Second General Issues Supplement), and ''Response to Second Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume IV of the Petition,'' dated August 11, 2025 (August 11, 2025, Supplement).

[5] The members of the Coalition (McConway and Torley and the USW) are interested parties as defined under sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act, respectively.

[6] *See* section on ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petition,'' *infra.*

[7] *See* 19 CFR 351.204(b)(2).

[8] *See* Second General Issues Supplemental Questionnaire.

[9] *See* Second General Issues Supplement at 1–3 and Exhibits II–Supp–1 through II–Supp–3.

[10] *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule,* 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997) (*Preamble*); *see also* 19 CFR 351.312.

[11] *See* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) (defining ''factual information'').

[12] The deadline for scope comments falls on September 1, 2025, which is a federal holiday. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(b)(1), Commerce will accept scope comments filed by 5.00 p.m. ET on September 2, 2025 (''For both electronically and manually filed documents, if the applicable due date falls on a non-business day, the Secretary will accept documents that are filed on the next business day.'').

[13] *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures,* 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011); *see also Enforcement and Compliance; Change of Electronic Filing System Name,* 79 FR 69046 (November 20, 2014), for details of Commerce's electronic filing requirements, effective August 5, 2011. Information on using ACCESS can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx* and a handbook can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook_on_Electronic_Filing_Procedures.pdf.*

received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due.

Consultations

Pursuant to sections 702(b)(4)(A)(i) and (ii) of the Act, Commerce notified the GOI of the receipt of the Petition and provided an opportunity for consultations with respect to the Petition.[14] Commerce held consultations with the GOI on August 4, 2025.[15]

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, Commerce shall: (i) poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the ''industry.''

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs Commerce to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both Commerce and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,[16] they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, Commerce's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[17]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as ''a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation'' (*i.e.,* the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, the petitioner does not offer a definition of the domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigation.[18] Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that freight rail couplers, as defined in the scope, constitute a single domestic like product, and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.[19]

In determining whether the petitioner has standing under section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petition with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigation,'' in the appendix to this notice. To establish industry support, the petitioner provided the 2024 production of the domestic like product for the U.S. producers that support the Petition and compared this to total production of the domestic like product by the U.S. freight rail couplers industry.[20] We relied on data provided by the petitioner for purposes of measuring industry support.[21]

Our review of the data provided in the Petition, the First General Issues Supplement, and other information readily available to Commerce indicates that the petitioner has established industry support for the Petition.[22] First, the Petition established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, Commerce is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.,* polling).[23] Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product.[24] Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 702(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petition account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petition.[25] Accordingly, Commerce determines that the Petition was filed on behalf of the domestic industry within the meaning of section 702(b)(1) of the Act.[26]

Injury Test

Because India is a ''Subsidies Agreement Country'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, section 701(a)(2) of the Act applies to this investigation. Accordingly, the ITC must determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from India materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petitioner alleges that imports of subject merchandise are benefiting from countervailable subsidies and that such imports are causing, or threaten to cause, material injury to the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product. In addition, the petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.[27]

[14] *See* Commerce's Letter, ''Invitation for Consultations to Discuss the Countervailing Duty Petition,'' dated July 23, 2025.

[15] *See* Memorandum, ''Consultations with the Government of India,'' dated August 7, 2025; *see also* GOI's Letter, ''Pre-initiation Comments and Consultations Note,'' dated August 5, 2025.

[16] *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

[17] *See USEC, Inc.* v. *United States,* 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

[18] For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis as applied to this case and information regarding industry support, *see* Checklist, ''Countervailing Duty Investigation Initiation Checklist: Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from India'' dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice, at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from the Czech Republic and India (Attachment II). This checklist is on file electronically via ACCESS.

[19] For further discussion, *see* Attachment II of the India CVD Initiation Checklist.

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.*

[22] *Id.*

[23] *Id.; see also* section 702(c)(4)(D) of the Act.

[24] *See* Attachment II of the India CVD Initiation Checklist.

[25] *Id.*

[26] *Id.*

[27] For further information regarding negligibility and the injury allegation, *see* India CVD Initiation Checklist at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty

Continued

The petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by the significant volume of subject imports; reduced market share; underselling and price depression and/or suppression; negative impact on financial performance; declines in the domestic industry's production, capacity utilization, and U.S. shipments; decrease in production related workers, total hours worked, and wages; and lost sales and revenues.[28] We assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, causation, cumulation, as well as negligibility, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.[29]

Initiation of CVD Investigation

Based upon the examination of the Petition and supplemental responses, we find that they meet the requirements of section 702 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating a CVD investigation to determine whether imports of freight rail couplers from India benefit from countervailable subsidies conferred by the GOI. In accordance with section 703(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 65 days after the date of this initiation.

Based on our review of the Petition, we find that there is sufficient information to initiate a CVD investigation on all programs alleged by the petitioner. For a full discussion of the basis for our decision to initiate on each program, *see* the India CVD Initiation Checklist. A public version of the initiation checklist for this investigation is available on ACCESS.

Respondent Selection

In the Petition, the petitioner identified five companies in India as producers and/or exporters of freight rail couplers.[30]

Commerce intends to follow its standard practice in CVD investigations and calculate company-specific subsidy rates in this investigation. In the event that Commerce determines that the number of companies is large and it cannot individually examine each company based on Commerce's resources, Commerce normally selects mandatory respondents in CVD investigations using U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) entry data for U.S. imports under the appropriate Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading(s) listed in the ''Scope of the Investigation'' in the appendix. However, for this investigation, the main HTSUS subheading under which the subject merchandise entered during the POI (8607.30.1000) is a basket category under which non-subject merchandise may also enter. Therefore, instead of relying on CBP entry data in selecting respondents, we intend to issue quantity and value (Q&V) questionnaires to each potential respondent for which there is complete address information on the record.

Commerce will post the Q&V questionnaires along with filing instructions on Commerce's website at *https://www.trade.gov/ec-adcvd-case-announcements.* Producers/exporters of freight rail couplers in India that do not receive Q&V questionnaires may still submit a response to the Q&V questionnaire and can obtain a copy of the Q&V questionnaire from Commerce's website. Responses to the Q&V questionnaire must be submitted by the relevant producers/exporters no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on August 26, 2025, which is two weeks from the signature date of this notice. All Q&V questionnaire responses must be filed electronically via ACCESS. An electronically filed document must be received successfully, in its entirety, by ACCESS no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on the deadline noted above.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order (APO) in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(b). Instructions for filing such applications may be found on Commerce's website at *https://www.trade.gov/administrative-protective-orders.*

Distribution of a Copy of the Petition

In accordance with section 702(b)(4)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), a copy of the public version of the Petition has been provided to the GOI via ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petition to each exporter named in the Petition, as provided under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

Commerce will notify the ITC of its initiation, as required by section 702(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petition was filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of freight rail couplers from India are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.[31] A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated.[32] Otherwise, this CVD investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors of production under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by Commerce; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)–(iv). Section 351.301(b) of Commerce's regulations requires any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted [33] and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct.[34] Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Interested parties should review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.

Extensions of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by Commerce. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by Commerce.[35] For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed

Petitions Covering Freight Rail Couplers from the Czech Republic and India (Attachment III).

[28] *See* Attachment III of the India CVD Initiation Checklist.

[29] *Id.*

[30] *See* August 11, 2025, Supplement at Exhibit IV–2SUPP–5.

[31] *See* section 703(a)(1) of the Act.

[32] *Id.*

[33] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b).

[34] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b)(2).

[35] *See* 19 CFR 351.302.

after 10:00 a.m. ET on the due date. Under certain circumstances, Commerce may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in a letter or memorandum of the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, standalone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely filed requests for the extension of time limits, where we determine, based on 19 CFR 351.302, that extraordinary circumstances exist. Parties should review Commerce's regulations concerning the extension of time limits and the *Time Limits Final Rule* prior to submitting factual information in this investigation.[36]

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or CVD proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.[37] Parties must use the certification formats provided in 19 CFR 351.303(g).[38] Commerce intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Parties wishing to participate in this investigation should ensure that they meet the requirements of 19 CFR 351.103(d) (*e.g.,* by filing the required letters of appearance). Note that Commerce has amended certain of its requirements pertaining to the service of documents in 19 CFR 351.303(f).[39]

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 702 and 777(i) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.203(c).

[36] *See* 19 CFR 351.301; *see also Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule,* 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013) (*Time Limits Final Rule*), available at *https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm.*

[37] *See* section 782(b) of the Act.

[38] *See Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (*Final Rule*); *see also* frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule,* available at *https://enforcement.trade.gov/tlei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.*

[39] *See Administrative Protective Order, Service, and Other Procedures in Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 88 FR 67069 (September 29, 2023).

Dated: August 12, 2025.

Christopher Abbott,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

Scope of the Investigation

The scope of this investigation covers certain freight railcar couplers (also known as ''fits'' or ''assemblies'') and parts thereof. Freight rail couplers are composed of two main parts, namely knuckles and coupler bodies but may also include other items (*e.g.,* coupler locks, lock lift assemblies, knuckle pins, knuckle throwers, and rotors). The parts covered by the investigation include: (1) E coupler bodies; (2) E/F coupler bodies; (3) F coupler bodies; (4) E knuckles; (5) F knuckles; as set forth by the Association of American Railroads (AAR). The freight rail coupler parts are included within the scope of the investigation when imported individually.

Subject freight rail couplers and parts are included within the scope whether finished or unfinished, whether imported individually or with other subject or nonsubject parts, whether assembled or unassembled, whether mounted or unmounted, or if joined with nonsubject merchandise, such as other nonsubject parts or a completed railcar. Finishing includes, but is not limited to, arc washing, welding, grinding, shot blasting, heat treatment, machining, and assembly of various parts. When a subject coupler or subject parts are mounted on or to other nonsubject merchandise, such as a railcar, only the coupler or subject parts are covered by the scope.

The finished products covered by the scope of this investigation meet or exceed the AAR specifications of M–211, ''Foundry and Product Approval Requirements for the Manufacture of Couplers, Coupler Yokes, Knuckles, Follower Blocks, and Coupler Parts,'' and/or AAR M–215 ''Coupling Systems,'' or other equivalent domestic or international standards (including any revisions to the standard(s)).

The country of origin for subject couplers and parts thereof, whether fully assembled, unfinished or finished, or attached to a railcar, is the country where the subject coupler parts were cast or forged. Subject merchandise includes coupler parts as defined above that have been further processed or further assembled, including those coupler parts attached to a railcar in third countries. Further processing includes, but is not limited to, arc washing, welding, grinding, shot blasting, heat treatment, painting, coating, priming, machining, and assembly of various parts. The inclusion, attachment, joining, or assembly of nonsubject parts with subject parts or couplers either in the country of manufacture of the in-scope product or in a third country does not remove the subject parts or couplers from the scope.

The couplers that are the subject of this investigation are classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) statistical reporting numbers 8607.30.1010, 8607.30.1050, and 8607.30.1090. Subject merchandise attached to finished railcars may also enter under HTSUS statistical reporting numbers 7326.90.8688, 8606.10.0000, 8606.91.0000, 8606.92.0000, 8606.99.0130, or under subheading 8606.99.0160. Subject merchandise may also be imported under HTSUS statistical reporting number 7325.99.5000. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only; the written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2025–15636 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–940, A–851–806]

Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof From the Czech Republic and India: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigations

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: Applicable August 12, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sofia Pedrelli and Andrew Hart (the Czech Republic) at (202) 482–4310 and (202) 482–1058, respectively, and Colin Thrasher and Eliza DeLong (India) at (202) 482–3004 and (202) 482–3878, respectively, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petitions

On July 23, 2025, the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) received antidumping duty (AD) petitions concerning imports of certain freight rail couplers and parts thereof (freight rail couplers) from the Czech Republic and India filed in proper form on behalf of the Coalition of Freight Coupler Producers (the petitioner).[1] The AD Petitions were accompanied by a countervailing duty (CVD) petition concerning imports of freight rail couplers from India.[2]

[1] *See* Petitioner's Letter, ''Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders,'' dated July 23, 2025 (Petitions). The members of the Coalition of Freight Coupler Producers are McConway and Torley, LLC (McConway and Torley), and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW).

[2] *Id.*

Between July 28 and August 8, 2025, Commerce requested supplemental information pertaining to certain aspects of the Petitions in supplemental questionnaires.[3] The petitioner responded to Commerce's supplemental questionnaires between July 30 and August 11, 2025.[4]

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the petitioner alleges that imports of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and India are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV) within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that imports of such products are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, the freight rail couplers industry in the United States. Consistent with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the Petitions were accompanied by information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting its allegations.

Commerce finds that the petitioner filed the Petitions on behalf of the domestic industry, because the petitioner is an interested party, as defined in section 771(9)(F) of the Act.[5] Commerce also finds that the petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support for the initiation of the requested LTFV investigations.[6]

Periods of Investigation

Because the Petitions were filed on July 23, 2025, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1), the period of investigation (POI) for the Czech Republic and India LTFV investigations is July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025.

Scope of the Investigations

The products covered by these investigations are freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and India. For a full description of the scope of these investigations, *see* the appendix to this notice.

Comments on the Scope of the Investigations

On August 4, 2025, Commerce requested information and clarification from the petitioner regarding the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petitions is an accurate reflection of the products for which the domestic industry is seeking relief.[7] On August 6, 2025, the petitioner provided clarifications and revised the scope.[8] The description of the merchandise covered by these investigations, as described in the appendix to this notice, reflects these clarifications.

As discussed in the *Preamble* to Commerce's regulations, we are setting aside a period for interested parties to raise issues regarding product coverage (*i.e.,* scope).[9] Commerce will consider all scope comments received from interested parties and, if necessary, will consult with interested parties prior to the issuance of the preliminary determinations. If scope comments include factual information,[10] all such factual information should be limited to public information. Commerce requests that interested parties provide at the beginning of their scope comments a public executive summary for each comment or issue raised in their submission. Commerce further requests that interested parties limit their public executive summary of each comment or issue to no more than 450 words, not including citations. Commerce intends to use the public executive summaries as the basis of the comment summaries included in the analysis of scope comments. To facilitate preparation of its questionnaires, Commerce requests that scope comments be submitted by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time (ET) on September 2, 2025, which is the next business day after 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice.[11] Any rebuttal comments, which may include factual information, and should also be limited to public information, must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on September 12, 2025, which is 10 calendar days from the initial comment deadline.

Commerce requests that any factual information that parties consider relevant to the scope of these investigations be submitted during that period. However, if a party subsequently finds that additional factual information pertaining to the scope of the investigations may be relevant, the party must contact Commerce and request permission to submit the additional information. All scope comments must be filed simultaneously on the records of the concurrent LTFV and CVD investigations.

Filing Requirements

All submissions to Commerce must be filed electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS), unless an exception applies.[12] An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the time and date it is due.

Comments on Product Characteristics

Commerce is providing interested parties an opportunity to comment on the appropriate physical characteristics of freight rail couplers to be reported in response to Commerce's AD questionnaires. This information will be used to identify the key physical characteristics of the subject merchandise in order to report the relevant cost of production (COP) accurately, as well as to develop appropriate product comparison criteria.

Interested parties may provide any information or comments that they feel are relevant to the development of an accurate list of physical characteristics. Specifically, they may provide comments as to which characteristics are appropriate to use as: (1) general

---

[3] *See* Commerce's Letters, ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated July 28, 2025 (First General Issues Questionnaire); *see also* First Country-Specific AD Supplemental Questionnaires: Czech Republic Supplemental and India Supplemental, dated July 28, 2025; ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated August 4, 2025 (Second General Issues Questionnaire); Second Country-Specific AD Supplemental Questionnaires: Czech Republic Supplemental and India Supplemental, dated August 4, 2025; and ''Supplemental Questions,'' dated August 8, 2025 (August 8, 2025, Supplemental Questionnaire).

[4] *See* Petitioner's Letters, ''Response to Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition,'' dated July 30, 2025 (First General Issues Supplement); *see also* First Country-Specific AD Supplemental Responses: Czech Republic AD Supplement and India AD Supplement, dated July 31, 2025; ''Response to Second Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume I of the Petition,'' dated August 6, 2025 (Second General Issues Supplement); Second Country-Specific Second AD Supplemental Responses: Second Czech Republic AD Supplement, dated August 6, 2025, and Second India AD Supplement, dated August 7, 2025; and ''Response to Second Supplemental Questions Regarding Volume IV of the Petition,'' dated August 11, 2025 (August 11, 2025, Supplement).

[5] The members of the Coalition (McConway and Torley and the USW) are interested parties as defined under sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act, respectively.

[6] *See* section on ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions,'' *infra.*

[7] *See* Second General Issues Supplemental Questionnaire.

[8] *See* Second General Issues Supplement at 1–3 and Exhibits I–Supp–1 through I–Supp–3.

[9] *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties, Final Rule,* 62 FR 27296, 27323 (May 19, 1997) (*Preamble*); *see also* 19 CFR 351.312.

[10] *See* 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) (defining ''factual information'').

[11] The deadline for scope comments falls on September 1, 2025, which is a federal holiday. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(b)(1), Commerce will accept scope comments filed by 5.00 p.m. ET on September 2, 2025 (''For both electronically and manually filed documents, if the applicable due date falls on a non-business day, the Secretary will accept documents that are filed on the next business day.'').

[12] *See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures,* 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011); *see also Enforcement and Compliance: Change of Electronic Filing System Name,* 79 FR 69046 (November 20, 2014) for details of Commerce's electronic filing requirements, effective August 5, 2011. Information on using ACCESS can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help.aspx* and a handbook can be found at *https://access.trade.gov/help/Handbook_on_Electronic_Filing_Procedures.pdf.*

product characteristics; and (2) product comparison criteria. We note that it is not always appropriate to use all product characteristics as product comparison criteria. We base product comparison criteria on meaningful commercial differences among products. In other words, although there may be some physical product characteristics utilized by manufacturers to describe freight rail couplers, it may be that only a select few product characteristics take into account commercially meaningful physical characteristics. In addition, interested parties may comment on the order in which the physical characteristics should be used in matching products. Generally, Commerce attempts to list the most important physical characteristics first and the least important characteristics last.

In order to consider the suggestions of interested parties in developing and issuing the AD questionnaires, all product characteristics comments must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on September 2, 2025, which is the next business day after 20 calendar days from the signature date of this notice.[13] Any rebuttal comments must be filed by 5:00 p.m. ET on September 12, 2025, which is 10 calendar days from the initial comment deadline. All comments and submissions to Commerce must be filed electronically using ACCESS, as explained above, on the record of each of the LTFV investigations.

Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions

Section 732(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (i) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (ii) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition. Moreover, section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act provides that, if the petition does not establish support of domestic producers or workers accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, Commerce shall: (i) poll the industry or rely on other information in order to determine if there is support for the petition, as required by subparagraph (A); or (ii) determine industry support using a statistically valid sampling method to poll the ''industry.''

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers as a whole of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs Commerce to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both Commerce and the ITC apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product,[14] they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, Commerce's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.[15]

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as ''a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.'' Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is ''the article subject to an investigation'' (*i.e.,* the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the petition).

With regard to the domestic like product, the petitioner does not offer a definition of the domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations.[16] Based on our analysis of the information submitted on the record, we have determined that freight rail couplers, as defined in the scope, constitute a single domestic like product, and we have analyzed industry support in terms of that domestic like product.[17]

In determining whether the petitioner has standing under section 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we considered the industry support data contained in the Petitions with reference to the domestic like product as defined in the ''Scope of the Investigations,'' in the appendix to this notice. To establish industry support, the petitioner provided the 2024 production of the domestic like product for the U.S. producers that support the Petitions and compared this to total production of the domestic like product by the U.S. freight rail couplers industry.[18] We relied on data provided by the petitioner for purposes of measuring industry support.[19]

Our review of the data provided in the Petitions, the First General Issues Supplement, and other information readily available to Commerce indicates that the petitioner has established industry support for the Petitions.[20] First, the Petitions established support from domestic producers (or workers) accounting for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product and, as such, Commerce is not required to take further action in order to evaluate industry support (*e.g.,* polling).[21] Second, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(i) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petitions account for at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product.[22] Finally, the domestic producers (or workers) have met the statutory criteria for industry support under section 732(c)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act because the domestic producers (or workers) who support the Petitions account for more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petitions.[23] Accordingly, Commerce determines that the Petitions were filed on behalf of the domestic industry

[13] The deadline for comments on product characteristics falls on September 1, 2025, which is a federal holiday. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(b)(1), Commerce will accept scope comments filed by 5.00 p.m. ET on September 2, 2025 (''For both electronically and manually filed documents, if the applicable due date falls on a non-business day, the Secretary will accept documents that are filed on the next business day.'').

[14] *See* section 771(10) of the Act.

[15] *See USEC, Inc.* v. *United States,* 132 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd.* v. *United States,* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

[16] For a discussion of the domestic like product analysis as applied to these cases and information regarding industry support, *see* Checklists, ''Antidumping Duty Investigation Initiation Checklists: Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from the Czech Republic and India,'' dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists), at Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from the Czech Republic and India (Attachment II). These checklists are on file electronically via ACCESS.

[17] *See* Attachment II of the Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists.

[18] *Id.*

[19] For further discussion, *see* Attachment II of the Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists.

[20] *Id.*

[21] *Id.; see also* section 732(c)(4)(D) of the Act.

[22] *See* Attachment II of the Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists.

[23] *Id.*

within the meaning of section 732(b)(1) of the Act.[24]

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petitioner alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, by reason of the imports of the subject merchandise sold at LTFV. In addition, the petitioner alleges that subject imports exceed the negligibility threshold provided for under section 771(24)(A) of the Act.[25]

The petitioner contends that the industry's injured condition is illustrated by the significant volume and market share of subject imports; underselling and price depression and/or suppression; negative impact on financial performance; declines in the domestic industry's production, capacity utilization, and U.S. shipments; decrease in production related workers, total hours worked, and wages; and lost sales and revenues.[26] We assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, causation, cumulation, as well as negligibility, and we have determined that these allegations are properly supported by adequate evidence, and meet the statutory requirements for initiation.[27]

Allegations of Sales at LTFV

The following is a description of the allegations of sales at LTFV upon which Commerce based its decision to initiate LTFV investigations of imports of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and India. The sources of data for the deductions and adjustments relating to U.S. price and normal value (NV) are discussed in greater detail in the Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists.

U.S. Price

For the Czech Republic and India, the petitioner based export price (EP) on pricing information for freight rail couplers produced in each country and sold or offered for sale in the U.S. market during the POI.[28] The petitioner made certain adjustments to U.S. price to calculate a net ex-factory U.S price, where applicable.[29]

Normal Value[30]

For the Czech Republic and India, the petitioner stated that it was unable to obtain home market or third-county pricing information for freight rail couplers produced in the respective countries to use as the basis for NV.[31] Therefore, for both countries, the petitioner calculated NV based on CV. For further discussion of CV, *see* the section ''Normal Value Based on Constructed Value.''

Normal Value Based on Constructed Value

As noted above for the Czech Republic and India, the petitioner stated that it was unable to obtain home market or third-country prices for freight rail couplers to use as a basis for NV. Therefore, for both countries, the petitioner calculated NV based on CV.[32]

Pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, the petitioner calculated CV as the sum of the cost of manufacturing, selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses, financial expenses, and profit.[33] In calculating the cost of manufacturing, the petitioner relied on the production experience and input consumption rates for a U.S. producer of freight rail couplers, valued using publicly available information applicable to the Czech Republic and India.[34] For calculating SG&A expenses, financial expenses, and profit ratios, the petitioner relied on the financial statements of a producer of comparable or identical merchandise domiciled in the respective countries.[35]

Fair Value Comparison

Based on the data provided by the petitioner, there is reason to believe that imports of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and India are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at LTFV. Based on comparisons of EP to NV in accordance with sections 772 and 773 of the Act, the estimated dumping margins for freight rail couplers for each of the countries covered by this initiation are as follows: (1) the Czech Republic—119.96 percent; (2) India—7.86 to 71.01 percent.[36]

Initiation of LTFV Investigations

Based upon the examination of the Petitions and supplemental responses, we find that they meet the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating LTFV investigations to determine whether imports of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and India are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at LTFV. In accordance with section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1), unless postponed, we will make our preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Respondent Selection

Czech Republic

In the Petitions, the petitioner identified one company in the Czech Republic (*i.e.,* CKD Kutná Hora a.s. (Kutna Hora)) as a producer/exporter of freight rail couplers and provided independent third-party information as support.[37]

We currently know of no additional producers/exporters of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic. Accordingly, Commerce intends to individually examine the only known producer/exporter in the investigation from the Czech Republic (*i.e.,* the company cited above). We invite interested parties to comment on this issue. Such comments may include factual information within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21). Parties wishing to comment must do so within three business days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Comments must be filed electronically using ACCESS. An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety via ACCESS by 5:00 p.m. ET on the specified deadline. Because we intend to examine the only known producer/exporter in the Czech Republic, if no comments are received, or if comments received further support the existence of only this one producer/exporter, we do not intend to conduct respondent selection and will proceed to issuing the initial AD questionnaires to the identified company. However, if comments are received which create a need for a respondent selection process, we intend to finalize our decision regarding respondent selection for the Czech Republic within 20 days of publication of this notice.

[24] *Id.*

[25] For further discussion, *see* Czech Republic and India AD Initiation Checklists at Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping Duty Petition Covering Certain Freight Rail Couplers and Parts Thereof from the Czech Republic and India.

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.*

[28] *See* Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists.

[29] *Id.*

[30] In accordance with section 773(b)(2) of the Act, for these investigations, Commerce will request information necessary to calculate the constructed value (CV) and COP to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the COP of the product.

[31] *See* Country-Specific AD Initiation Checklists.

[32] *Id.*

[33] *Id.*

[34] *Id.*

[35] *Id.*

[36] *Id.*

[37] *See* Petitions at Volume I (page 11 and Exhibit I–11); *see also* First General Issues Supplement at 1.

India

In the Petitions, the petitioner identified five companies in India as producers and/or exporters of freight rail couplers.[38]

Following standard practice in AD investigations involving market economy countries, Commerce would normally select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) entry data for imports under the appropriate Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading(s) listed in the ''Scope of the Investigations'' in the appendix. However, for these investigations, the main HTSUS subheading under which the subject merchandise entered during the POI (8607.30.1000) is a basket category under which non-subject merchandise may also enter. Therefore, for India, instead of relying on CBP entry data in selecting respondents, we intend to issue quantity and value (Q&V) questionnaires to each potential respondent for which there is complete address information on the record.

Commerce will post the Q&V questionnaires along with filing instructions on Commerce's website at *https://www.trade.gov/ec-adcvd-case-announcements.* Producers/exporters of freight rail couplers in India that do not receive Q&V questionnaires may still submit a response to the Q&V questionnaire and can obtain a copy of the Q&V questionnaire from Commerce's website. Responses to the Q&V questionnaire must be submitted by the relevant producers/exporters no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on August 26, 2025, which is two weeks from the signature date of this notice. All Q&V questionnaire responses must be filed electronically via ACCESS. An electronically filed document must be received successfully, in its entirety, by ACCESS no later than 5:00 p.m. ET on the deadline noted above.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order (APO) in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(b). Instructions for filing such applications may be found on Commerce's website at *https://www.trade.gov/administrative-protective-orders.*

Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.202(f), a copy of the public version of the Petitions has been provided to the governments of the Czech Republic and India via ACCESS. To the extent practicable, we will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the Petitions to each exporter named in the Petitions, as provided under 19 CFR 351.203(c)(2).

ITC Notification

Commerce will notify the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will preliminarily determine, within 45 days after the date on which the Petitions were filed, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of freight rail couplers from the Czech Republic and/or India are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, a U.S. industry.[39] A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country.[40] Otherwise, these LTFV investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

Submission of Factual Information

Factual information is defined in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) as: (i) evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by Commerce; and (v) evidence other than factual information described in (i)-(iv). Section 351.301(b) of Commerce's regulations requires any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted [41] and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct.[42] Time limits for the submission of factual information are addressed in 19 CFR 351.301, which provides specific time limits based on the type of factual information being submitted. Interested parties should review the regulations prior to submitting factual information in these investigations.

Particular Market Situation Allegation

Section 773(e) of the Act addresses the concept of particular market situation (PMS) for purposes of CV, stating that ''if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology.'' When an interested party submits a PMS allegation pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act (*i.e.,* a cost-based PMS allegation), the submission must be filed in accordance with the requirements of 19 CFR 351.416(b), and Commerce will respond to such a submission consistent with 19 CFR 351.301(c)(2)(v). If Commerce finds that a cost-based PMS exists under section 773(e) of the Act, then it will modify its dumping calculations appropriately.

Neither section 773(e) of the Act, nor 19 CFR 351.301(c)(2)(v), sets a deadline for the submission of cost-based PMS allegations and supporting factual information. However, in order to administer section 773(e) of the Act, Commerce must receive PMS allegations and supporting factual information with enough time to consider the submission. Thus, should an interested party wish to submit a cost-based PMS allegation and supporting new factual information pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, it must do so no later than 20 days after submission of a respondent's initial section D questionnaire response.

We note that a PMS allegation filed pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) or 773(a)(1)(C)(iii) of the Act (*i.e.,* a sales-based PMS allegation) must be filed within 10 days of submission of a respondent's initial section B questionnaire response, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.301(c)(2)(i) and 19 CFR 351.404(c)(2).

Extensions of Time Limits

Parties may request an extension of time limits before the expiration of a time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by Commerce. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the expiration of the time limit established under 19 CFR 351.301, or as otherwise specified by Commerce.[43] For submissions that are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. ET on the due date. Under certain circumstances, Commerce may elect to specify a different time

[38] *See* August 11, 2025, Supplement at Exhibit IV–2SUPP–5.

[39] *See* section 733(a) of the Act.

[40] *Id.*

[41] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b).

[42] *See* 19 CFR 351.301(b)(2).

[43] *See* 19 CFR 351.301; *see also Extension of Time Limits; Final Rule,* 78 FR 57790 (September 20, 2013) (*Time Limits Final Rule*), available at *https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm.*

limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, we will inform parties in a letter or memorandum of the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. An extension request must be made in a separate, standalone submission; under limited circumstances we will grant untimely filed requests for the extension of time limits, where we determine, based on 19 CFR 351.302, that extraordinary circumstances exist. Parties should review Commerce's regulations concerning the extension of time limits and the *Time Limits Final Rule* prior to submitting factual information in these investigations.[44]

Certification Requirements

Any party submitting factual information in an AD or countervailing duty proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.[45] Parties must use the certification formats provided in 19 CFR 351.303(g).[46] Commerce intends to reject factual submissions if the submitting party does not comply with the applicable certification requirements.

Notification to Interested Parties

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Parties wishing to participate in these investigations should ensure that they meet the requirements of 19 CFR 351.103(d) (*e.g.,* by filing the required letter of appearance). Note that Commerce has amended certain of its requirements pertaining to the service of documents in 19 CFR 351.303(f).[47]

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 732(c)(2) and 777(i) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.203(c).

Dated: August 12, 2025.

Christopher Abbott,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

Scope of the Investigations

The scope of these investigations covers certain freight railcar couplers (also known as ''fits'' or ''assemblies'') and parts thereof. Freight rail couplers are composed of two main parts, namely knuckles and coupler bodies but may also include other items (*e.g.,* coupler locks, lock lift assemblies, knuckle pins, knuckle throwers, and rotors). The parts covered by these investigations include: (1) E coupler bodies; (2) E/F coupler bodies; (3) F coupler bodies; (4) E knuckles; (5) F knuckles; as set forth by the Association of American Railroads (AAR). The freight rail coupler parts are included within the scope of the investigations when imported individually.

Subject freight rail couplers and parts are included within the scope whether finished or unfinished, whether imported individually or with other subject or nonsubject parts, whether assembled or unassembled, whether mounted or unmounted, or if joined with nonsubject merchandise, such as other nonsubject parts or a completed railcar. Finishing includes, but is not limited to, arc washing, welding, grinding, shot blasting, heat treatment, machining, and assembly of various parts. When a subject coupler or subject parts are mounted on or to other nonsubject merchandise, such as a railcar, only the coupler or subject parts are covered by the scope.

The finished products covered by the scope of these investigations meet or exceed the AAR specifications of M–211, ''Foundry and Product Approval Requirements for the Manufacture of Couplers, Coupler Yokes, Knuckles, Follower Blocks, and Coupler Parts,'' and/or AAR M–215 ''Coupling Systems,'' or other equivalent domestic or international standards (including any revisions to the standard(s)).

The country of origin for subject couplers and parts thereof, whether fully assembled, unfinished or finished, or attached to a railcar, is the country where the subject coupler parts were cast or forged. Subject merchandise includes coupler parts as defined above that have been further processed or further assembled, including those coupler parts attached to a railcar in third countries. Further processing includes, but is not limited to, arc washing, welding, grinding, shot blasting, heat treatment, painting, coating, priming, machining, and assembly of various parts. The inclusion, attachment, joining, or assembly of nonsubject parts with subject parts or couplers either in the country of manufacture of the in-scope product or in a third country does not remove the subject parts or couplers from the scope.

The couplers that are the subject of these investigations are classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) statistical reporting numbers 8607.30.1010, 8607.30.1050, and 8607.30.1090. Subject merchandise attached to finished railcars may also enter under HTSUS statistical reporting numbers 7326.90.8688, 8606.10.0000, 8606.91.0000, 8606.92.0000, 8606.99.0130, or under subheading 8606.99.0160. Subject merchandise may also be imported under HTSUS statistical reporting number 7325.99.5000. These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes only; the written description of the scope of these investigations is dispositive.

[FR Doc. 2025–15633 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[44] *See* 19 CFR 351.302; *see also, e.g., Time Limits Final Rule.*

[45] *See* section 782(b) of the Act.

[46] *See Certification of Factual Information to Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (*Final Rule*). Additional information regarding the *Final Rule* is available at *https://access.trade.gov/Resources/filing/index.html.*

[47] *See Administrative Protective Order, Service, and Other Procedures in Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings,* 88 FR 67069 (September 29, 2023).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[RTID 0648–XF115]

New England Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The New England Fishery Management Council (Council) is scheduling a public meeting of its Climate and Ecosystem Steering Committee via webinar to consider actions affecting New England fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). Recommendations from this group will be brought to the full Council for formal consideration and action, if appropriate.

DATES: This webinar will be held on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, at 10 a.m. Webinar registration URL information: *https://nefmc-org.zoom.us/meeting/register/4cKdQEaLQdutdtsy2Jqo4Q.*

ADDRESSES:

Council address: New England Fishery Management Council, 50 Water Street, Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cate O'Keefe, Ph.D., Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council; telephone: (978) 465–0492.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Agenda

The Climate and Ecosystem Steering Committee will meet to discuss ongoing work of the process mapping and communications subcommittees and provide direction as needed. They will receive updates on the Council's portfolio of Inflation Reduction Act-funded projects and provide feedback on specific initiatives as requested. The committee will also receive a presentation from NOAA on the most

recent climate forecast for the northeast region. Also, on the agenda is to discuss and provide feedback on ongoing Northeast Fisheries Science Center ecosystem initiatives. Other business will be discussed, if necessary.

Although non-emergency issues not contained on the agenda may come before this Council for discussion, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Council action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, provided the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final action to address the emergency. The public also should be aware that the meeting will be recorded. Consistent with 16 U.S.C. 1852, a copy of the recording is available upon request.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Cate O'Keefe, Ph.D., Executive Director, at (978) 465–0492, at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Rey Israel Marquez,

Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15612 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[RTID 0648–XF078]

Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Meeting of the Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Advisory Panel

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting and webinar/conference call.

SUMMARY: NMFS will hold a 2-day hybrid Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Advisory Panel (AP) meeting in September 2025. The intent of the meeting is to consider options for the conservation and management of HMS. The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The AP meeting and webinar will be held on Wednesday, September 3, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. ET and Thursday, September 4, from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. ET.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the DoubleTree by Hilton Silver Spring Hotel, 8777 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD 20910. The meeting will also be accessible via WebEx conference call and webinar. Conference call and webinar access information are available at: *https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/event/september-2025-hms-advisory-panel-meeting.*

Participants accessing the webinar are strongly encouraged to log/dial in 15 minutes prior to the meeting. NMFS will show the presentations via webinar and allow public comment during identified times on the agenda.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Cooper (*peter.cooper@noaa.gov*) or Anna Quintrell (*anna.quintrell@noaa.gov*) at 301–427–8503.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: HMS fisheries (swordfish, sharks, tunas, and billfish) are managed under the 2006 Consolidated HMS Fishery Management Plan (FMP) and its amendments pursuant to the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*) and consistent with the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act (16 U.S.C. 971 *et seq.*). HMS implementing regulations are at 50 CFR part 635.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires the establishment of APs and requires NMFS to consult with and consider the comments and views of AP members during the preparation and implementation of FMPs or FMP amendments (16 U.S.C. 1854(g)(1)(A)–(B)). NMFS meets with the HMS AP approximately twice each year to consider potential alternatives for the conservation and management of Atlantic swordfish, shark, tunas, and billfish fisheries, consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Some of the discussion topics are:

- Atlantic bluefin tuna fishery update, including 2025 performance, 2026 quota management considerations, and potential rulemakings;
- Executive Orders 14192 and 14276 and request for input on potential deregulatory actions; and
- HMS economic situation update.

We anticipate having other NMFS offices and the U.S. Coast Guard participate to provide updates, if available, on their activities relevant to HMS fisheries. Additional information on the meeting and a copy of the draft agenda will be posted prior to the meeting (see **ADDRESSES**).

All members of the public will have virtual access to the meeting available via webinar and status updates of in-person public access to the meeting will be available on the NMFS website (see **ADDRESSES**). The meeting location is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Peter Cooper at 301–427–8503, at least 7 days prior to the meeting.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Kelly Denit,

Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15603 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Record of Decision for the Environmental Impact Statement for the F–15 Beddown and Infrastructure Upgrades at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: On July 16, 2025, the Department of the Air Force (DAF) signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for the F–15 Beddown and Infrastructure Upgrades at Andersen Air Force Base (AFB), Guam Environmental Impact Statement.

ADDRESSES: Mr. David Martin (AFCEC/CIEE), 2261 Hughes Avenue, STE 155, JBSA Lackland, TX 78236–9853, (210) 395–1656; *david.martin.127@us.af.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DAF has decided to construct new infrastructure including a new aircraft parking apron and associated buildings and utilities on the northwest side of the existing runway at Andersen AFB, Guam. The DAF will not implement or carry forward the beddown of up to 12 Republic of Singapore Air Force (RSAF) F–15 aircraft nor associated aircraft airfield operations, to include temporary support aircraft, and RSAF personnel or their families and no periodic temporary increases in associated support personnel will be required at Andersen AFB.

The DAF decision documented in the ROD was based on matters discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, input from the public and regulatory agencies, and other relevant factors. The Final Environmental Impact Statement was made available to the public on April 25, 2025 through a Notice of Availability in the **Federal**

Register Vol. 90, No. 79, EIS Number 20250046, page 17431, with a 30-day wait period that ended on May 27, 2025.

Authority: This Notice of Availability is published pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*) and the Department of Defense NEPA Implementing Procedures.

Tommy W. Lee,

Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–15658 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3911–44–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DOD–2025–OS–0475]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD (P&R)), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: 60-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,* the OUSD(P&R) announces a proposed public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Transparency, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24, Suite 05F16, Alexandria, VA 22350–1700.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to Office of Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Attn: Office of Legal Policy, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–4000, Terri Saunders, 703–695–3817.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; And OMB Number: Application for Correction of Military Records Under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552; DD Form 149; OMB Control Number 0704–0003.

Needs and Uses: Under Title 10 United States Code § 1552, Active Duty and Reserve Component Service members, Coast Guard, former Service members, their lawful or legal representatives, spouses of former Service members on issues of Survivor Benefit Program (SBP) benefits, and civilian employees with respect to military records other than those related to civilian employment, who believe they have suffered an error or injustice in their military records (hereafter referred to as Respondent), may apply to their respective Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NR) for a correction of their military record. The information collected is needed to provide the BCM/NR the basic data to process and act on the Respondent's request.

The Respondent applies to the respective BCM/NR, which uses the DD Form 149, ''Application for Correction of Military Record under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552,'' as the collection instrument. The form is formatted in both electronic and paper format with text or hand-written fillable entries. The information from the DD Form 149 is used by the respective BCM/NR in processing the Respondent's request pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1552. The DD Form 149 was developed to standardize application to the BCM/NRs. This information is used to identify and secure the appropriate official military and medical records from the records storage facilities. Information on the form is also used to determine status, to allow the Respondent to designate counsel of choice, to identify the issues involved, and to determine if the request was filed within the three-year statute of limitations established by Congress (10 U.S.C. 1552).

The request is initiated by the respondent; therefore, there is no preemptory request or invitation sent to the Respondent associated with the information collection. The completed DD Form 149, collection instrument, is filed either online through email, through a secure portal or submitted via mail by the Respondent. The information collected from the DD Form 149 is used by the respective BCM/NR to determine if an error or injustice has occurred in an individual's military record and, if applicable, the BCM/NR will promulgate a correction based on error, injustice, or clemency.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 29,065.

Number of Respondents: 29,065.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 29,065.

Average Burden per Response: 1 hour.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2025–15634 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001–FR–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DOD–2025–OS–0476]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD (P&R)), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: 60-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,* the OUSD(P&R) announces a proposed public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the

burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Transparency, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24, Suite 05F16, Alexandria, VA 22350–1700.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to Office of Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Attn: Office of Legal Policy, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–4000, Terri Saunders, 703–695–3817.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States; DD Form 293; OMB Control Number 0704–0004.

Needs and Uses: Under Title 10 United States Code § 1553 and DoD Directive 1332.41, ''Boards for the Correction of Military Records and Discharge Review Board (DRBs),'' former service members who received an administrative discharge have the right to appeal the characterization or reason for separation provided they do so within 15 years from the date of separation. The DD Form 293, ''Application for Review of Discharge or Separation from the Armed Forces of the United States,'' is the form that allows former Service members to explain the reasons for the alleged inequity or impropriety, designate counsel of choice, and select the method of hearing desired.

The request is initiated by the respondent; therefore, there is no preemptory request or invitation sent to the Respondent associated with the information collection. The completed DD Form 293 is filed either online through email, through a secure portal, or submitted via mail by the Respondent. The form is formatted in both electronic and paper format with text or hand-written fillable entries. The information collected is needed to provide the DRBs the basic data to process and act on the respondent's request.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 2,418.

Number of Respondents: 4,835.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 4,835.

Average Burden per Response: 30 minutes.

Frequency: On occasion.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2025–15632 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001–FR–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Docket ID: DOD–2025–OS–0477]

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD (P&R)), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: 60-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,* the OUSD(P&R) announces a proposed public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by any of the following methods:

Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Mail: Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Transparency, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Mailbox #24, Suite 05F16, Alexandria, VA 22350–1700.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this **Federal Register** document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the internet at *http://www.regulations.gov* as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to Office of Military Family Readiness Policy, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Suite 3G15, Alexandria, VA 22350, Josie Beets, (571)372–5320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; And OMB Number: Spouse Education and Career Opportunities (SECO) Program; OMB Control Number 0704–0556.

Needs And Uses: The DoD SECO Program is the primary source of education, career and employment counseling for all military spouses who are seeking post-secondary education, training, licenses and credentials needed for portable career employment. The SECO system delivers the resources and tools necessary to assist spouses of service members with career exploration/discovery, career education and training, employment readiness, and career connections at any point within the spouse career lifecycle. It is imperative that the DoD collect data to ensure that the SECO program is meeting its overarching goal of increasing employment opportunities for military spouses. The DoD requires the information in the proposed collection for program planning and management purposes. Collected information will ensure that the SECO program will be able to collect relevant metrics and make determinations of program viability and improvement. Additionally, the data collected is utilized to build a spouse profile that allows information to be saved over time and to prepopulate information

into tools such as resume builders and career and education planning resources.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 12,124.

Number of Respondents: 24,247.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 24,247.

Average Burden per Response: 30 minutes.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register, Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2025–15635 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001–FR–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

[Docket ID: USN–2024–HQ–0019]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: 30-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: The DoD has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.* Find this particular information collection by selecting ''Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments'' or by using the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Reginald Lucas, (571) 372–7574, *whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: Marine Corps Lodging Guest Registration and Feedback; OMB Control Number 0712–0001.

Type of Request: Revision.

Lodging Registration

Number of Respondents: 27,182.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 27,182.

Average Burden per Response: 7 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 3,171.

Customer Feedback

Number of Respondents: 2,797.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 2,797.

Average Burden per Response: 5 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 233.

Total

Annual Responses: 29,979.

Annual Burden Hours: 3,404.

Needs and Uses: The information collection is necessary to keep a record of Marine Corps lodging reservations to ensure orderly room assignment and avoid improper booking; to record registration and payment of accounts; to verify proper usage by eligible patrons; for cash control; to gather occupancy data; to determine occupancy breakdown; to account for rentals and furnishings; and to collect data for customer satisfaction and marketing.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

DoD Clearance Officer: Mr. Reginald Lucas.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2025–15640 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001–FR–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

[Docket ID: USN–2024–HQ–0018]

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of the Navy (DON), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: 30-Day information collection notice.

SUMMARY: The DoD has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.* Find this particular information collection by selecting ''Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments'' or by using the search function.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Reginald Lucas, (571) 372–7574, *whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title; Associated Form; and OMB Number: Non-appropriated Fund Human Resource Management System (NAF HRMS); NAVMC Forms 12000/499, 12000/89, and 12000/89B; OMB Control Number 0712–0007.

Type of Request: Revision.

NAF HRMS Online Application

Number of Respondents: 73,391.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 73,391.

Average Burden Per Response: 30 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 36,696.

NAVMC Form 12000/499

Number of Respondents: 50.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 50.

Average Burden per Response: 15 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 13.

NAVMC 12000/89

Number of Respondents: 45.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 45.

Average Burden Per Response: 10 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 8.

NAVMC 12000/89B

Number of Respondents: 550.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 550.

Average Burden per Response: 10 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 92.

Total

Number of Respondents: 74,036.

Annual Responses: 74,036.

Annual Burden Hours: 36,807.

Needs and Uses: Information collection via the Non-Appropriated Fund Human Resource Management System (NAF HRMS) and associated forms is necessary for Marine Corps Community Service (MCCS) to successfully manage and administer an effective and efficient recruiting and hiring process. MCCS's use of innovative technologies in the Non-Appropriated Fund Human Resource Management System (NAF HRMS) enables MCCS to streamline the employment application process, reduce processing and recruiter response times, and decrease the need for applicant calls and inquiries; therefore, improving the applicant's experience.

Additionally, information collection via NAVMC 12000/499 is necessary to allow MCCS retirees receiving an annuity to request changes to their current NAF Group medical, dental, or life insurance plans; their NAF Group Retirement plan; and/or their beneficiary information. Finally, information is collected via NAVMC 12000/89 and 12000/89B to facilitate annuity requests from eligible retirees and lump sum payment requests from eligible retiree beneficiaries following the death of a retiree, respectively.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; individuals or households.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

DoD Clearance Officer: Mr. Reginald Lucas.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Aaron T. Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2025–15641 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6001–FR–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No.: ED–2025–SCC–0449]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Loan Cancellation in the Federal Perkins Loan Program

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid (FSA), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the Department is proposing a reinstatement without change of a previously approved information collection request (ICR).

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: To access and review all the documents related to the information collection listed in this notice, please use *http://www.regulations.gov* by searching the Docket ID number ED–2025–SCC–0449. Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *http://www.regulations.gov* by selecting the Docket ID number or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. If the *regulations.gov* site is not available to the public for any reason, the Department will temporarily accept comments at *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov.* Please include the docket ID number and the title of the information collection request when requesting documents or submitting comments. Please note that comments submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to Carolyn Rose, U.S. Department of Education, Federal Student Aid, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Carolyn Rose, (202) 453–5967.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. The Department is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: Loan Cancellation in the Federal Perkins Loan Program.

OMB Control Number: 1845–0100.

Type of Review: Reinstatement without change of a previously approved ICR.

Respondents/Affected Public: Private Sector; State, Local, and Tribal Governments; Individuals or Households.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 116,872.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 43,832.

Abstract: This is a request for a reinstatement without change of a previously approved collection for the record keeping requirements contained in 34 CFR 674.53, 674.56, 674.57, 674.58 and 674.59. The information collections in these regulations are necessary to determine Federal Perkins Loan (Perkins Loan) Program borrower's eligibility to receive program benefits and to prevent fraud and abuse of program funds. There has been no change to the regulatory requirements.

Ross Santy,

Chief Data Officer, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development.

[FR Doc. 2025–15678 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board, Savannah River Site

AGENCY: Office of Environmental Management, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces an in-person/livestreamed meeting of the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB), Savannah River Site. The Federal Advisory Committee Act requires that public notice of this meeting be announced in the **Federal Register.**

DATES: Tuesday, September 23, 2025; 9 a.m.–4 p.m. EDT.

ADDRESSES: Advanced Manufacturing Collaborative, 4345 Trolley Line Road, Aiken, South Carolina 29801. This meeting will be held in-person at the Advanced Manufacturing Collaborative and streamed on YouTube, no registration is necessary. The link for the livestream can be found on the following website: *https://www.youtube.com/@SRSCAB/streams.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Tanner, Office of External Affairs, U.S. Department of Energy, Savannah River Operations Office, P.O. Box A, Aiken, SC 29802; Phone: (803) 646–2167; or Email: *james.tanner@srs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Board: The purpose of the Board is to provide advice and recommendations concerning the following EM site-specific issues: clean-up activities and environmental restoration; waste and nuclear materials management and disposition; excess facilities; future land use and long-term stewardship. The Board may also be asked to provide advice and recommendations on other EM program components. The Board also provides an avenue to fulfill public participation requirements outlined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Comprehensive Environmental

Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Federal Facility Agreements, Consent Orders, Consent Decrees and Settlement Agreements.

Tentative Agenda: (agenda topics are subject to change; please contact Juanita Campbell at *juanita.campbell@srs.gov* for the most current agenda)

- Chair Update
- Agency Updates
- Program Presentations to the Board
- Board Business
- Public Comments

Public Participation: The meeting is open to the public and public comment can be given orally or in writing. Fifteen minutes are allocated during the meeting for public comment and those wishing to make oral comment will be given a minimum of two minutes to speak. Written comments received at least two working days prior to the meeting will be provided to the members and included in the meeting minutes. Written comments received within two working days after the meeting will be included in the minutes. For additional information on public comment and to submit written comment, please contact *srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov*. The EM SSAB, Savannah River Site, welcomes the attendance of the public at its meetings and will make every effort to accommodate persons with physical disabilities or special needs. If you require special accommodations due to a disability, please contact *srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov* at least seven days in advance of the meeting.

Meeting conduct: The Designated Federal Officer is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business. Questioning of board members or presenters by the public is not permitted.

Minutes: Minutes will be available at the following website: *srscitizensadvisoryboard@srs.gov*.

Signing Authority: This document of the Department of Energy was signed on August 14, 2025, by David Borak, Committee Management Officer, pursuant to delegated authority from the Secretary of Energy. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by DOE. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned DOE Federal Register Liaison Officer has been authorized to sign and submit the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of the Department of Energy. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register.**

Signed in Washington, DC, on August 14, 2025.

Jennifer Hartzell,

Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, U.S. Department of Energy.

[FR Doc. 2025–15711 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings

Take notice that the Commission has received the following Natural Gas Pipeline Rate and Refund Report filings:

Filings Instituting Proceedings

Docket Numbers: PR25–65–000.
Applicants: Arcadia Gas Storage, LLC.
Description: 284.123 Rate Filing: MBR Authority Info Notice to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5099.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: PR25–66–000.
Applicants: Hill-Lake Gas Storage, LLC.
Description: 284.123 Rate Filing: Informational Filing_Market Power Status_Pine Prairie Expansion to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5177.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: PR25–67–000.
Applicants: Worsham-Steed Gas Storage, LLC.
Description: 284.123 Rate Filing: Informational Filing_Market Power Status_Pine Prairie Expansion to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/13/25.
Accession Number: 20250813–5000.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: RP25–1066–000.
Applicants: Cadeville Gas Storage LLC.
Description: Compliance filing: MBR Authority Info Notice Cadeville to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5102.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 8/25/25.

Docket Numbers: RP25–1067–000.
Applicants: Monroe Gas Storage Company, LLC.
Description: Compliance filing: MBR Authority Info Notice Monroe to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5103.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 8/25/25.

Docket Numbers: RP25–1068–000.
Applicants: Perryville Gas Storage LLC.
Description: Compliance filing: MBR Authority Info Notice Perryville to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5106.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 8/25/25.

Docket Numbers: RP25–1069–000.
Applicants: Pine Prairie Energy Center, LLC.
Description: Compliance filing: MBR Authority Info Notice Pine Prairie to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5151.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 8/25/25.

Docket Numbers: RP25–1070–000.
Applicants: SG Resources Mississippi, L.L.C.
Description: Compliance filing: MBR Authority Info Notice SGS Resources to be effective N/A.
Filed Date: 8/12/25.
Accession Number: 20250812–5153.
Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 8/25/25.

Any person desiring to intervene, to protest, or to answer a complaint in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211, 214, or 206 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214, or 385.206) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system (*https://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/search/fercgensearch.asp*) by querying the docket number.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

The Commission's Office of Public Participation (OPP) supports meaningful public engagement and participation in Commission proceedings. OPP can help members of the public, including landowners, community organization, Tribal members and others, access publicly available information and navigate Commission processes. For public inquiries and assistance with making filings such as interventions, comments, or requests for rehearing, the public is encouraged to contact OPP at (202) 502–6595 or *OPP@ferc.gov.*

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Carlos D. Clay,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15700 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #1

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric corporate filings:

Docket Numbers: EC25–126–000.

Applicants: West Deptford Energy, LLC.

Description: Application for Authorization Under Section 203 of the Federal Power Act of West Deptford Energy, LLC.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5192.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Take notice that the Commission received the following exempt wholesale generator filings:

Docket Numbers: EG25–446–000.

Applicants: Roy Solar, LLC.

Description: Roy Solar, LLC submits Notice of Self-Certification of Exempt Wholesale Generator Status.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5166.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: EG25–447–000.

Applicants: Persica Solar, LLC.

Description: Persica Solar, LLC submits Notice of Self-Certification of Exempt Wholesale Generator Status.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5168.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: EG25–448–000.

Applicants: Cimarron Wind, LLC.

Description: Cimarron Wind, LLC submits Notice of Self-Certification of Exempt Wholesale Generator Status.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5171.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER21–2460–010.

Applicants: New York Independent System Operator, Inc.

Description: Compliance filing: NYISO Compliance Errata re: Order 2222 December 2024 Compliance Filing to be effective 12/31/9998.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5071.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER23–652–002; ER23–2802–002.

Applicants: Oxbow Solar Farm 1, LLC, Happy Solar 1, LLC.

Description: Notice of Non-Material Change in Status of Happy Solar 1, LLC, et al.

Filed Date: 8/11/25.

Accession Number: 20250811–5177.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: ER24–3131–001.

Applicants: Two Hearted Solar, LLC.

Description: Notice of Non-Material Change in Status of Two Hearted Solar, LLC.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5195.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–1461–000.

Applicants: Sol InfraCo MT3, LLC.

Description: Report Filing: Sol InfraCo MT3 Notification of Effective Date to be effective N/A.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5132.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–1837–000; ER25–2676–000; ER25–2675–000.

Applicants: West Boylston Energy Storage I LLC ,OSCII Gildersleeve, LLC, OSCII Gun Hill LLC.

Description: Supplement to 03/31/2025, and 06/27/2025, OSCII Gun Hill LLC et al., tariff filing.

Filed Date: 8/11/25.

Accession Number: 20250811–5178.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–2236–001.

Applicants: Aron Energy Prepay 36 LLC.

Description: Tariff Amendment: Amendment to 2 to be effective 5/16/2025.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5069.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–2238–001.

Applicants: Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Description: Tariff Amendment: TO: Dinuba BESS Abandoned Plant Cost Recovery Response to Deficiency Letter to be effective 7/15/2025.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5064.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3167–000.

Applicants: Dominion Energy Services, Inc.

Description: Request of Virginia Electric and Power Company for Limited Waivers and Request for Shortened Comment Period and Expedited Treatment.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5184.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 8/19/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3168–000.

Applicants: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Description: 205(d) Rate Filing: NSA Service Agreement No. 7722; Project Identifier AG1–066 to be effective 7/16/2025.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5029.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3170–000.

Applicants: NSTAR Electric Company.

Description: 205(d) Rate Filing: NSTAR–HQUS Transfer Agreement (MMWEC Use Rights) to be effective 10/31/2025.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5059.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3171–000.

Applicants: 1000 Mile Solar, LLC.

Description: Initial Rate Filing: Market-Based Rate Application to be effective 10/13/2025.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5073.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3172–000.

Applicants: Genesee Solar Energy, LLC.

Description: 205(d) Rate Filing: Application For Market-Based Rate Authorization to be effective 10/20/2025.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5110.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3173–000.

Applicants: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Description: Notice of Cancellation of Service Agreement No. 1768 of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Filed Date: 8/13/25.

Accession Number: 20250813–5124.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/3/25.

Docket Numbers: ER25–3174–000.

Applicants: NorthWestern Corporation.

Description: NorthWestern Corporation submits Average System Cost Filing for Sales of Electric Power to the Bonneville Power Administration, FY 2026–2028.

Filed Date: 8/12/25.

Accession Number: 20250812–5197.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. ET 9/2/25.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system (*https://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/search/fercgensearch.asp*) by querying the docket number.

Any person desiring to intervene, to protest, or to answer a complaint in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211, 214, or 206 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214, or 385.206) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the

specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings can be found at: *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf.* For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

The Commission's Office of Public Participation (OPP) supports meaningful public engagement and participation in Commission proceedings. OPP can help members of the public, including landowners, community organizations, Tribal members and others, access publicly available information and navigate Commission processes. For public inquiries and assistance with making filings such as interventions, comments, or requests for rehearing, the public is encouraged to contact OPP at (202) 502–6595 or *OPP@ferc.gov.*

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Carlos D. Clay,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15699 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

[Public Notice: EIB–2025–0014]

Application for Final Commitment for a Long-Term Loan or Financial Guarantee in Excess of $100 million: AP300022XX

AGENCY: Export-Import Bank of the United States.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice is to inform the public, in accordance with the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, the Export-Import Bank of the United States (''EXIM'') has received an application for final commitment for a long-term loan or financial guarantee in excess of $100 million. Comments received within the comment period specified below will be presented to the EXIM Board of Directors prior to final action on this Transaction.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before September 12, 2025 to be assured of consideration before final consideration of the transaction by the Board of Directors of EXIM.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted through *Regulations.gov* at *www.regulations.gov.* To submit a comment, enter EIB–2025–0014 under the heading ''Enter Keyword or ID'' and select Search. Follow the instructions provided at the Submit a Comment screen. Please include your name, company name (if any) and EIB–2025–0014on any attached document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Reference: AP300022XX.

Purpose and Use:

Brief description of the purpose of the transaction: To support the export of U.S.-manufactured locomotives to Mexico.

Brief non-proprietary description of the anticipated use of the items being exported: To provide freight rail transport within Mexico and between Mexico and other countries.

To the extent that EXIM is reasonably aware, the item(s) being exported are not expected to produce exports or provide services in competition with the exportation of goods or provision of services by a United States industry.

Parties:

Principal Supplier: Wabtec Corporation.

Obligor: Grupo Mexico Transportes S.A.B. de C.V.

Guarantor(s): GMXT US Inc. and Ferrosur S.A. de C.V.

Description of Items Being Exported: Locomotives.

Information on Decision: Information on the final decision for this transaction will be available in the ''Board Agenda and Meeting Minutes'' on *https://www.exim.gov/news/meeting-minutes.*

Confidential Information: Please note that this notice does not include confidential or proprietary business information; information which, if disclosed, would violate the Trade Secrets Act; or information which would jeopardize jobs in the United States by supplying information that competitors could use to compete with companies in the United States.

Authority: Section 3(c)(10) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (12 U.S.C. 635a(c)(10)).

Deidre Hodge,

Assistant Corporate Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15659 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6690–01–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The public portions of the applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, if any, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank(s) indicated below and at the offices of the Board of Governors. This information may also be obtained on an expedited basis, upon request, by contacting the appropriate Federal Reserve Bank and from the Board's Freedom of Information Office at *https://www.federalreserve.gov/foia/request.htm.* Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Comments received are subject to public disclosure. In general, comments received will be made available without change and will not be modified to remove personal or business information including confidential, contact, or other identifying information. Comments should not include any information such as confidential information that would not be appropriate for public disclosure.

Comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors, Ann E. Misback, Secretary of the Board, 20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20551–0001, not later than September 17, 2025.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago Colette A. Fried, Assistant Vice President, 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, IL 60604, *Colette.a.fried@chi.frb.org:*

1. *BOSP Bancshares, Inc., Sun Prairie, Wisconsin;* to acquire Banner Banks, Birnamwood, Wisconsin.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Michele Taylor Fennell,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 2025–15650 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

[Document Identifier: CMS–10495 and CMS–855S]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) is announcing an opportunity for the public to comment on CMS' intention to collect information from the public. Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), federal agencies are required to publish notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information (including each proposed extension or reinstatement of an existing collection of information) and to allow 60 days for public comment on the proposed action. Interested persons are invited to send comments regarding our burden estimates or any other aspect of this collection of information, including the necessity and utility of the proposed information collection for the proper performance of the agency's functions, the accuracy of the estimated burden, ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology to minimize the information collection burden.

DATES: Comments must be received by October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: When commenting, please reference the document identifier or OMB control number. To be assured consideration, comments and recommendations must be submitted in any one of the following ways:

1. Electronically. You may send your comments electronically to *http://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the instructions for ''Comment or Submission'' or ''More Search Options'' to find the information collection document(s) that are accepting comments.

2. By *regular mail.* You may mail written comments to the following address: CMS, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs, Division of Regulations Development, Attention: Document Identifier/OMB Control Number:____ Room C4–26–05, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21244–1850.

To obtain copies of a supporting statement and any related forms for the proposed collection(s) summarized in this notice, please access the CMS PRA website by copying and pasting the following web address into your web browser: *https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Legislation/PaperworkReductionActof1995/PRA-Listing.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William N. Parham at (410) 786–4669.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Contents

This notice sets out a summary of the use and burden associated with the following information collections. More detailed information can be found in each collection's supporting statement and associated materials (see **ADDRESSES**).

CMS–10495 Data Collection and Submission for Open Payments

CMS–855S Medicare Enrollment Application: Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies (DMEPOS) Suppliers

Under the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501–3520), federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor. The term ''collection of information'' is defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(3) and 5 CFR 1320.3(c) and includes agency requests or requirements that members of the public submit reports, keep records, or provide information to a third party. Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA requires federal agencies to publish a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** concerning each proposed collection of information, including each proposed extension or reinstatement of an existing collection of information, before submitting the collection to OMB for approval. To comply with this requirement, CMS is publishing this notice.

Information Collections

1. *Type of Information Collection Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection; *Title of Information Collection:* Registration, Attestation, Dispute Resolution and Correction, Assumptions Document and Data Retention Requirements for Open Payments; *Use:* The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was enacted on March 23, 2010 (Pub. L. 111–148). This statute amended section 1128 of the Social Security Act (the Act) by adding a new subsection G that requires applicable manufacturers of drugs, devices, biologics, or medical supplies covered under title XVIII of the Act (Medicare) or a State plan under title XIX (Medicaid) or XXI of the Act (the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP) to report annually to the Secretary certain payments or other transfers of value to physicians and teaching hospitals. Section 1128G of the Act also requires applicable manufacturers and applicable group purchasing organizations (GPOs) to report certain information regarding the ownership or investment interests held by physicians or the immediate family members of physicians in such entities, as well as any payments provided to such physicians. The submitted information facilitates various aspects of the program. The information collected through the registration process is used by CMS to validate registration for applicable manufacturers, applicable GPOs, covered recipients, and physician owners or investors that are registering for Open Payments. Details collected during the dispute resolution and correction process allows CMS to notify applicable manufacturers and applicable GPOs that a covered recipient or physician owner or investor is initiating a dispute regarding data submitted about them and allow CMS to relay the nature of the dispute. The assumptions documents submitted by applicable manufacturers or applicable GPOs assist CMS in providing guidance (for example, determining form and nature of payment categories, calculating the value of a payment, determining the date of payment, and reporting the terms of an ownership or investment interest). *Form Number:* CMS–10495 (OMB control number: 0938–1237); *Frequency:* Annually; Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Governments; *Number of Respondents:* 1,788; *Total Annual Responses:* 1,788; *Total Annual Hours:* 1,950,948. For policy questions regarding this collection contact Kathleen Ott at 410–786–4246.

2. *Type of Information Collection Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection; *Title of Information Collection:* Medicare Enrollment Application—Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics and Supplies (DMEPOS) Suppliers; *Use:* The primary function of the Form CMS–855S Medicare enrollment application for suppliers of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) is to gather information from the supplier that tells us who the supplier is, whether the supplier meets certain qualifications to be a Medicare DMEPOS supplier, where the supplier practices or renders services, and other information

necessary to establish correct claims payments. *Form Number:* CMS–855S (OMB control number: 0938–1056); *Frequency:* Yearly; *Affected Public:* Private Sector, Business or other for-profits and Not-for-profit institutions; *Number of Respondents:* 32,790; *Total Annual Responses:* 32,790; *Total Annual Hours:* 67,886. (For policy questions regarding this collection contact Frank Whelan at 410–786–1302.)

William N. Parham, III,

Director, Division of Information Collections and Regulatory Impacts, Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2025–15616 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4120–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

National Institute on Aging; Amended Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a change in the meeting of the Board of Scientific Counselors, NIA, October 28, 2025, 08:00 a.m. to October 29, 2025, 04:30 p.m., National Institutes of Health, Bayview, 251 Bayview Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21224 which was published in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 2025, 90 FR 17939.

FRN was amended to reflect that the meeting changed from 3 days to 2 days. The meeting is closed to the public.

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Bruce A. George,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2025–15606 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

National Institutes of Health

Center For Scientific Review; Notice of Closed Meetings

Pursuant to section 1009 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, notice is hereby given of the following meetings.

The meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with the provisions set forth in sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5 U.S.C., as amended. The grant applications and the discussions could disclose confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material, and personal information concerning individuals associated with the grant applications, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Transition to Independence.

Date: October 8–9, 2025.

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Address: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge II, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Meeting Format: Virtual Meeting.

Contact Person: Delia Tang, MD, Scientific Review Officer, Resources and Training Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute. NIH, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W602 MSC 9750, Bethesda, MD 20892, 240–276–6456, *tangd@mail.nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; PAR Panel: Academic-Industrial Partnerships for Translation of Technologies.

Date: October 9, 2025.

Time: 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Address: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge II, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Meeting Format: Virtual Meeting.

Contact Person: Susan Lynn Spence, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Research Technology and Contract Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, National Cancer Institute, NIH, 9609 Medical Center Drive, Room 7W126, Rockville, MD 20850, *susan.spence@nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: Applied Therapeutics for Cancer Integrated Review Group; Mechanisms of Cancer Therapeutics B Study Section.

Date: October 14–15, 2025.

Time: 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Address: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge II, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Meeting Format: Virtual Meeting.

Contact Person: Maria Dolores Arjona Mayor, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 806D, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–827–8578, *dolores.arjonamayor@nih.gov*.

Name of Committee: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel; Fellowships and Mentored Training: Hepatology, Toxicology, and Xenobiotic Metabolism and Disposition.

Date: October 21–22, 2025.

Time: 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Address: National Institutes of Health, Rockledge II, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892.

Meeting Format: Virtual Meeting.

Contact Person: Charlene J. Repique, Ph.D., Scientific Review Officer, NIDDK, National Institutes of Health, 6707 Democracy Boulevard, Room 7347, Bethesda, MD 20892, 301–451–3638, *charlene.repique@nih.gov*.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: August 13, 2025.

Bruce A. George,

Program Analyst, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 2025–15607 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

[OMB Control Number 1653–0048]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Extension, Without Change, of a Currently Approved Collection: ICE Mutual Agreement Between Government and Employers (IMAGE)

AGENCY: U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) will submit the following Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: All submissions received must include the OMB Control Number 1653–0048 in the body of the correspondence, the agency name, and Docket ID ICEB–2020–0001. All comments received will be posted without change to *http://www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided.

(1) *Online.* Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal website at *http://www.regulations.gov* under e-Docket ID number ICEB–2020–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions related to this collection, call or email Zachary Middleton, WSE Program Section Chief, 314–765–7015, email: *zachary.j.middleton@hsi.dhs.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies

concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate 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;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through 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.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension, Without Change, of a Currently Approved Collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Mutual Agreement Between Government and Employers (IMAGE) Self-Assessment Questionnaire.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form 73–028; U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions. The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Mutual Agreement Between Government and Employers (IMAGE) program is the outreach and education component of the Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) Worksite Enforcement (WSE) program. IMAGE is designed to build cooperative relationships with the private sector to enhance compliance with immigration laws and reduce the number of unauthorized aliens within the American workforce. Under this program ICE will partner with businesses representing a cross-section of industries. A business will initially complete and prepare an IMAGE application so that ICE can properly evaluate the company for inclusion in the IMAGE program. The information provided by the company plays a vital role in determining its suitability for the program. While 8 U.S.C. 1324(a) makes it illegal to knowingly employ a person who is not in the U.S. legally, there is no requirement for any entity in the private sector to participate in the program and the information obtained from the company should also be available to the public.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 90 responses at 90 minutes (1.5 hours) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 135 annual burden hours.

Dated: August 14, 2025.

Scott Elmore,

PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–15701 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111–28–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[Docket No. FWS–HQ–IA–2024–0033; FXIA16710900000–256–FF09A30000]

Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); Twentieth Regular Meeting; Provisional Agenda; Announcement of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: To implement the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES or the Convention), the Parties to the Convention meet periodically to review what species in international trade should be regulated and other aspects of CITES implementation. The twentieth regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP20) is scheduled to take place in Samarkand, Uzbekistan, November 24–December 5, 2025. Currently, the United States is developing its negotiating positions on proposed resolutions, decisions, and amendments to the CITES Appendices (species proposals), as well as other agenda items that have been submitted by other Parties, the permanent CITES committees, and the CITES Secretariat for consideration at CoP20. With this notice, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces the provisional agenda for CoP20, solicits your comments on the items on the provisional agenda, and schedules a public meeting to seek comments on the items included in the provisional agenda.

DATES:

Public meeting: The public meeting will be held on September 10, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. EDT.

Comment submission: In developing the U.S. negotiating positions on species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and other agenda items submitted by other Parties, the permanent CITES committees, and the CITES Secretariat for consideration at CoP20, we will consider written information and comments you submit if we receive them by September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES:

Public meeting: The public meeting will be held in the Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building at 1849 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20240. Directions to the building can obtained by contacting the Division of Management Authority (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). For more information about the meeting, see ''Announcement of Public Meeting'' under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

Comment submission: You may submit comments pertaining to items on the provisional agenda for discussion at CoP20 by one of the following methods:

(1) Electronically: https://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments on FWS–HQ–IA–2024–0033 (the docket number for this notice).

(2) U.S. mail: Submit by U.S. mail to Public Comments Processing; Attn: Docket No. FWS–HQ–IA–2024–0033; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; MS: PRB (JAO/3W); 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041–3803.

We will not accept email or faxes. Comments and materials we receive, as well as supporting documentation, will be available for public inspection on *https://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information pertaining to resolutions, decisions, and other agenda items, contact Naimah Aziz, Head, Division of Management Authority, at 703–358–2028 (telephone); 703–358–2276 (fax); or *managementauthority@fws.gov* (email). For information pertaining to species proposals, contact Thomas E. Leuteritz, Acting Head, Division of Scientific Authority, at 703–358–1708 (telephone); 703–358–2276 (fax); or *scientificauthority@fws.gov* (email). Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services. Individuals outside the United States

should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point of contact in the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, hereinafter referred to as CITES or the Convention, is an international treaty designed to control and regulate international trade in certain animal and plant species that are or may be affected by trade and are now, or potentially may become, threatened with extinction. Species are included in the Appendices to CITES, which are available on the CITES Secretariat's website at *https://www.cites.org* and at 50 CFR 23.91(a) (How do I find out if a species is listed?). The official CITES list includes species of wildlife and plants placed in Appendix I, II, and III in accordance with the provisions of Articles XV and XVI of the Convention. This list is maintained by the CITES Secretariat (Secretariat) based on decisions of the Parties. You can access the official list from the CITES website (see section 23.7) and at 50 CFR 23.7(f).

Currently there are 185 Parties to CITES—184 countries, including the United States, and one regional economic integration organization, the European Union. The Convention calls for regular biennial meetings of the Conference of the Parties unless the Conference decides otherwise. At these meetings, the Parties review the implementation of CITES, make provisions enabling the Secretariat in Switzerland to carry out its functions, consider amendments to the species included in Appendices I and II, consider reports presented by the Secretariat, and make recommendations for the improved effectiveness of CITES. Any country that is a Party to CITES may propose amendments to Appendices I and II, as well as resolutions, decisions, and agenda items for consideration by all the Parties. The Service's regulations governing this public process are found in title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 50 CFR 23.87.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), in part, implements CITES and incorporates its Appendices of CITES-listed species into U.S. law (see, 16 U.S.C. 1532(4), 1537a, 1538(c), 1538(g), 1539(g), 1540(f)), and the Service has promulgated U.S. CITES implementing regulations (see 50 CFR part 23). The Secretary of the Interior is designated the U.S. Management Authority and U.S. Scientific Authority for CITES purposes, and the respective functions of each are carried out by the Service. The ESA prohibits, among other things, any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to engage in any trade in any specimens contrary to the provisions of the Convention, or to possess any specimens traded contrary to the provisions of the Convention. U.S. CITES implementing regulations explain the administration of CITES, the CITES listing process, the effective dates of CITES listings, and where to find official CITES documents and the CITES Appendices, as set forth in 50 CFR 23.7 and 23.84–23.91.

At least 150 days before any meeting of the Conference of Parties to CITES (CoP)is held, any Party may submit a proposed amendment to Appendix I or II (*e.g.,* for a species to be included in, removed from, or transferred between the CITES Appendices (CITES Art. XV(1)(a); 50 CFR 23.87(b)(2)). The Secretariat then makes publicly available and provides all Parties a list of proposed amendments (CITES Art. XV(1)(a), (2)(c); 50 CFR 23.7(f)(5)). Pursuant to 50 CFR 23.7 and 23.86, as we receive information on the upcoming CoP, we notify the public through **Federal Register** notices or on our website. The CoP can adopt amendments to Appendices I and II by a two-thirds majority vote of those Parties in attendance. Appendix-I and -II species listings adopted at the CoP are effective 90 days after the last day of the CoP, unless otherwise specified in the proposal.

This is our third notice in a series of **Federal Register** notices that, together with the announced public meeting, provides the public with an opportunity to participate in the development of U.S. negotiating positions for CoP20. We published our first CoP20-related **Federal Register** notice on March 22, 2024 (89 FR 20489), in which we requested information and recommendations on animal and plant species proposals, and information and recommendations on proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items for the United States to consider submitting for consideration at CoP20, and provided preliminary information on how to request approved observer status for nongovernmental organizations that wish to attend the meeting.

We published our second CoP20-related **Federal Register** notice on December 26, 2024 (89 FR 105074). In that notice, we responded to recommendations received from the public concerning proposed amendments to the CITES Appendices (species proposals) and proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items that the United States might submit for consideration at CoP20. We also invited public comments and information on these potential proposals and working documents and provided information on how U.S. nongovernmental organizations can attend CoP20 as observers.

These two prior CoP20 **Federal Register** notices are in the docket (FWS–HQ–IA–2024–0033) at *https://www.regulations.gov.* A link to these notices, along with information on U.S. preparations for CoP20, can also be found at *https://www.fws.gov/international-affairs/cites/cop20.*

On June 27, 2025, the United States submitted to the CITES Secretariat, for consideration at CoP20, its species proposals, proposed resolutions, proposed decisions, and other agenda items. These documents are listed on the CITES Secretariat's website at *https://cites.org/eng/cop20.*

Announcement of Provisional Agenda for CoP20

The provisional agenda for CoP20 is available on the CITES Secretariat's website at *https://cites.org/eng/cop/20/agenda-documents.* The working documents associated with the items on the provisional agenda, including proposed resolutions, proposed decisions, and discussion documents, can be found at that location. To view the working document associated with a particular agenda item, locate the item on the provisional agenda, and click on the document link in the column titled ''Files.'' The proposals to amend Appendices I and II can be accessed at *https://cites.org/eng/cop/20/amendment-proposals.*

Announcement of Public Meeting

We will hold a public meeting to seek comments on the items included in the provisional agenda for CoP20. The public meeting will be held on the date specified in **DATES**. We will post additional information regarding the public meeting on our website at *https://www.fws.gov/international-affairs/cites/cop20,* including how to register for the meeting, and how to indicate if you intend to provide comments during the meeting.

Public Comments

You must submit your information and comments to us no later than the date specified in **DATES**, above, to ensure that we consider them. We will not consider comments sent by email or fax, or to an address not listed in **ADDRESSES**. Comments submitted electronically using the Federal eRulemaking Portal

must be received by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on the closing date.

Comments and materials received will be posted for public inspection on *https://www.regulations.gov* (see **ADDRESSES**). Our practice is to post all comments, including names and addresses of respondents, and to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review. There may be circumstances in which we would withhold from public review a respondent's name and/or address, as allowable by law. If you wish for us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment, but we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. We will make all comments and materials submitted by organizations or businesses, and by individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety on *https://www.regulations.gov* at Docket No. FWS–HQ–IA–2024–0033.

Future Actions

Through another notice and website posting in advance of CoP20, we will announce the tentative U.S. negotiating positions on species proposals, proposed resolutions, proposed decisions, and agenda items that were submitted by other Parties, the permanent CITES committees, and the CITES Secretariat for consideration at CoP20.

Author

The primary author of this notice is Michelle Turton, CITES Policy Specialist, Division of Management Authority, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Authority

The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Justin J. Shirley,

Principal Deputy Director, Exercising the Delegated Authority of the Director, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–15664 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[N6447; NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–NPS0040857; PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Inventory Completion: The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the University of Kansas has completed an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and associated funerary objects and Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

DATES: Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice may occur on or after September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice to Dr. Thomas Torma, Repatriation Program Manager, The University of Kansas, Office of Audit, Risk, and Compliance, 1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, 351 Strong Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, email *t-torma@ku.edu*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the University of Kansas, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation, can be found in its inventory or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

Abstract of Information Available

Human remains representing, at least, four individuals have been identified from four sites in Platte County, Missouri. The four associated funerary objects include lots of artifacts.

The Aker Site (23PL43) is located in Platte County, Missouri. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes a lot of artifacts. Collections from this site were donated to the University of Kansas by the Aker Family in 1988, 2022, and 2024. Records indicate a Kansas City Hopewell affiliation (1 to 500 CE).

The Humphrey Mound Site (23PL45) is located in Platte County, Missouri. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes a lot of artifacts. Collections from this site were donated to the University of Kansas by the Aker Family in 1988, 2022, and 2024. Records indicate a time period of 900 to 1250 CE based on ceramics analysis.

The Sugar Creek Ossuary Site (23PL58) is located in Platte County, Missouri. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes a lot of artifacts. Collections from this site were donated to the University of Kansas by the Aker Family in 1988 and 2022. Records indicate a Steed-Kisker affiliation (900 to 1250 CE).

The Walker Ridge Site (23PL303) is located in Platte County, Missouri. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes a lot of artifacts. This site was excavated by R.B. Aker in 1929, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1988. Additional collections from this site were donated by the Aker Family in 2022 and 2024. Records indicate a time period of 900 to 1250 CE based on ceramics analysis.

No hazardous substances are known to have been used on these items.

Cultural Affiliation

Based on the information available and the results of consultation, cultural affiliation is reasonably identified by the geographical location or acquisition history of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice.

Determinations

The University of Kansas has determined that:

- The human remains described in this notice represent the physical remains of four individuals of Native American ancestry.
- The four objects described in this notice are reasonably believed to have been placed intentionally with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony.
- There is a connection between the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice and the Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska; Kaw Nation, Oklahoma; and the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma.

Requests for Repatriation

Written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice must be sent to the authorized representative identified in this notice under **ADDRESSES**. Requests for repatriation may be submitted by:

1. Any one or more of the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

2. Any lineal descendant, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice who shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the requestor is a lineal descendant or an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with cultural affiliation.

Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice to a requestor may occur on or after September 17, 2025. If competing requests for repatriation are received, the the University of Kansas must determine the most appropriate requestor prior to repatriation. Requests for joint repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects are considered a single request and not competing requests. The University of Kansas is responsible for sending a copy of this notice to the Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice and any other consulting parties.

Authority: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3003, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 10.10.

Dated: August 6, 2025.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–15670 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[N6449; NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–NPS0040859; PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Inventory Completion: The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the University of Kansas has completed an inventory of human remains and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

DATES: Repatriation of the human remains in this notice may occur on or after September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send written requests for repatriation of the human remains in this notice to Dr. Thomas Torma, Repatriation Program Manager, The University of Kansas, Office of Audit, Risk, and Compliance, 1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, 351 Strong Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, email *t-torma@ku.edu.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the University of Kansas, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation, can be found in its inventory or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

Abstract of Information Available

Human remains representing at least nine individuals have been identified. No associated funerary objects are present. These individuals were excavated from the Woodruff Ossuary Site (14PH4) located in Phillips County, Kansas. This site was excavated in 1946 by Marvin Kivett as part of the River Basin Surveys by the Smithsonian Institute in preparation for the development of Harlan County Reservoir in Nebraska. The donor and exact date of acquisition by the University of Kansas are unknown. Based on records, this site is affiliated with the Keith Phase of the Late Woodland with a single radiocarbon date of 694±240 CE. There is no record of toxic substances having been used to treat these remains.

Cultural Affiliation

Based on the information available and the results of consultation, cultural affiliation is reasonably identified by the geographical location or acquisition history of the human remains described in this notice.

Determinations

The University of Kansas has determined that:

- The human remains described in this notice represent the physical remains of nine individuals of Native American ancestry.
- There is a connection between the human remains described in this notice and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota; Kaw Nation, Oklahoma; and the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma.

Requests for Repatriation

Written requests for repatriation of the human remainsin this notice must be sent to the authorized representative identified in this notice under **ADDRESSES**. Requests for repatriation may be submitted by:

1. Any one or more of the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

2. Any lineal descendant, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice who shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the requestor is a lineal descendant or an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with cultural affiliation.

Repatriation of the human remains described in this notice to a requestor may occur on or after September 17, 2025. If competing requests for repatriation are received, the University of Kansas must determine the most appropriate requestor prior to repatriation. Requests for joint repatriation of the human remains are considered a single request and not competing requests. The University of Kansas is responsible for sending a copy of this notice to the Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

Authority: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3003, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 10.10.

Dated: August 6, 2025.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–15674 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[N6450; NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–NPS0040860; PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Inventory Completion: The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the University of Kansas has completed an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and associated funerary objects and Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

DATES: Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects

in this notice may occur on or after September 17, 2025

ADDRESSES: Send written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice to Dr. Thomas Torma, Repatriation Program Manager, The University of Kansas, Office of Audit, Risk, and Compliance, 1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, 351 Strong Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, email *t-torma@ku.edu.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the University of Kansas, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation, can be found in its inventory or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

Abstract of Information Available

Human remains representing, at least, 21 individuals have been identified from three separate sites in Kansas. The three associated funerary objects include three lots of artifacts.

An unnamed site (14BO20) is located in Bourbon County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object is one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1968 as part of surveys in preparation for the development of Fort Scott Reservoir by the Kansas City District of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The Kesl Site is located in Republic County, Kansas with no known trinomial. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in the 1920s on the property of J. Kesl by Floyd Schultz who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records do not correspond with any other known sites in the area described.

A site in an undescribed location is from Wyandotte County, Kansas. Human remains representing at least 19 individuals have been identified. The site was excavated in May 1973 on the property of Frank Calovich. Writing on the bag containing remains includes the name ''P. Lin,'' who was a graduate student at the University of Kansas at the time of excavation.

In addition, one lot of artifacts associated with human remains that were previously listed in a Notice of Inventory Completion published in the **Federal Register** on September 29, 2023 (88 FR 67351) have been identified. The one lot of associated funerary objects are artifacts. The items, which come from Cochran Mound (23PL86), was initially excavated in 1971 by staff and students of the Kansas Archaeological Field School, directed by Patricia J. O'Brien of Kansas State University (KSU). During their excavation, they noted previous looting of the mound. In 2024, the children of R. B. Aker donated additional items collected by their family to accompany collections which were donated to KU in 1988 and 2022.

There is no record of toxic substances being used to treat any of the items described in this notice.

Cultural Affiliation

Based on the information available and the results of consultation, cultural affiliation is reasonably identified by the geographical location or acquisition history of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice.

Determinations

The University of Kansas has determined that:

- The human remains described in this notice represent the physical remains of at least 21 individuals of Native American ancestry.
- The three objects described in this notice are reasonably believed to have been placed intentionally with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony.
- There is a connection between the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice and the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma.

Requests for Repatriation

Written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice must be sent to the authorized representative identified in this notice under **ADDRESSES**. Requests for repatriation may be submitted by:

1. Any one or more of the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

2. Any lineal descendant, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice who shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the requestor is a lineal descendant or an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with cultural affiliation.

Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice to a requestor may occur on or after September 17, 2025. If competing requests for repatriation are received, the University of Kansas must determine the most appropriate requestor prior to repatriation. Requests for joint repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects are considered a single request and not competing requests. The University of Kansas is responsible for sending a copy of this notice to the Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

Authority: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3003, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 10.10.

Dated: August 6, 2025.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–15672 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[N6448; NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–NPS0040858; PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Inventory Completion: The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the University of Kansas has completed an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and associated funerary objects and Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

DATES: Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice may occur on or after September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice to Dr. Thomas Torma, Repatriation Program Manager, The University of Kansas, Office of Audit, Risk, and Compliance, 1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, 351 Strong Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, email *t-torma@ku.edu.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the University of Kansas, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation,

can be found in its inventory or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

Abstract of Information Available

Human remains representing, at least, 158 individuals have been identified from 11 sites in Kansas and Nebraska. The 10 associated funerary objects include lots of artifacts.

The Laflin Mound Site (14CY23) is located in Clay County, Kansas. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1925 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate a Hopewell affiliation. The funerary objects are associated with human remains listed in a Notice of Inventory Completion published in the **Federal Register** on April 18, 2025 (90 FR 16545).

The Goeckler Mound Site (14CY24) is located in Clay County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1924 and 1925 by Floyd Schultz who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early Ceramic affiliation.

The Robert Younkin Site (14CY26) is located in Clay County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, eight individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1925 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948.

The Timber Creek Site (14CY32) is located in Clay County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, 54 individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1925 and 1926 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Analysis of ceramics indicates a Late Woodland and Central Plains affiliation.

The Dan Younkin Site (14GE2) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, 17 individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1928 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early Ceramic affiliation.

The Neimuller Site (14GE3, also 14GE301) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, 14 individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1931 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early Ceramic affiliation.

The Berry Site (14GE4) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, 24 individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1929 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early and Middle Ceramic affiliation.

The Chamberlain Site (14GE5) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, seven individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1926 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early Ceramic affiliation.

The James Younkin Site (14GE6) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, 22 individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1931 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early Ceramic affiliation.

The Dixon Site (14GE7) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, 10 individuals have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1931 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948. Records indicate an Early Ceramic affiliation.

Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified from a site with an unspecified location. This site is located along the Little Blue River near Angus, Nuckolls County, Nebraska.

No toxic substances are known to have been used in the treatment of these human remains or associated funerary objects.

Cultural Affiliation

Based on the information available and the results of consultation, cultural affiliation is reasonably identified by the geographical location or acquisition history of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice.

Determinations

The University of Kansas has determined that:

- The human remains described in this notice represent the physical remains of at least 158 individuals of Native American ancestry.
- The 10 objects described in this notice are reasonably believed to have been placed intentionally with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony.
- There is a connection between the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice and the Kaw Nation, Oklahoma and the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma.

Requests for Repatriation

Written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice must be sent to the authorized representative identified in this notice under **ADDRESSES**. Requests for repatriation may be submitted by:

1. Any one or more of the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

2. Any lineal descendant, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice who shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the requestor is a lineal descendant or an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with cultural affiliation.

Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice to a requestor may occur on or after September 17, 2025. If competing requests for repatriation are received, the University of Kansas must determine the most appropriate requestor prior to repatriation. Requests for joint repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects are considered a single request and not competing requests. The University of Kansas is responsible for sending a copy of this notice to the Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

Authority: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3003, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 10.10.

Dated: August 6, 2025.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–15673 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[N6451; NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–NPS0040861; PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Inventory Completion: The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the University of Kansas has completed an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the human remains and associated funerary objects and Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

DATES: Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice may occur on or after September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice to Dr. Thomas Torma, Repatriation Program Manager, The University of Kansas, Office of Audit, Risk, and Compliance, 1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, 351 Strong Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, email *t-torma@ku.edu.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the University of Kansas, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation, can be found in its inventory or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

Abstract of Information Available

Human remains representing, at least, two individuals have been identified from two sites in northern Kansas. The two associated funerary objects include lots of artifacts.

The Hartzell Mound Site (14CY31) is located in Clay County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated in 1925 by Floyd Schultz, who donated his collection to the University of Kansas in 1948.

The D.B. Heath Site #9 (14GE106) is located in Geary County, Kansas. Human remains representing, at least, one individual has been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. This site was excavated by Dwight Heath, likely in 1954, and the human remains and associated objects were later donated to the University of Kansas.

No toxic substances are known to have been used in the treatment of these items.

Cultural Affiliation

Based on the information available and the results of consultation, cultural affiliation is reasonably identified by the geographical location or acquisition history of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice.

Determinations

The University of Kansas has determined that:

- The human remains described in this notice represent the physical remains of at least two individuals of Native American ancestry.
- The two objects described in this notice are reasonably believed to have been placed intentionally with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony.
- There is a connection between the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice and the Kaw Nation, Oklahoma; Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma; and The Osage Nation.

Requests for Repatriation

Written requests for repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects in this notice must be sent to the authorized representative identified in this notice under **ADDRESSES**. Requests for repatriation may be submitted by:

1. Any one or more of the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

2. Any lineal descendant, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice who shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the requestor is a lineal descendant or an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with cultural affiliation.

Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects described in this notice to a requestor may occur on or after September 17, 2025. If competing requests for repatriation are received, the University of Kansas must determine the most appropriate requestor prior to repatriation. Requests for joint repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects are considered a single request and not competing requests. The University of Kansas is responsible for sending a copy of this notice to the Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

Authority: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3003, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 10.10.

Dated: August 6, 2025.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–15671 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[N6453; NPS–WASO–NAGPRA–NPS0040862; PPWOCRADN0–PCU00RP14.R50000]

Notice of Inventory Completion: The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the University of Kansas has completed an inventory of associated funerary objects and has determined that there is a cultural affiliation between the associated funerary objects and Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations in this notice.

DATES: Repatriation of the associated funerary objects in this notice may occur on or after September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send written requests for repatriation of the associated funerary objects in this notice to Dr. Thomas Torma, Repatriation Program Manager, The University of Kansas, Office of Audit, Risk, and Compliance, 1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, 351 Strong Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, email *t-torma@ku.edu.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA. The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the University of Kansas, and additional information on the determinations in this notice, including the results of consultation, can be found in its inventory or related records. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

Abstract of Information Available

Objects associated with human remains previously listed in a Notice of Inventory Completion published in the

Federal Register on April 30, 2025 (90 FR 17958) have been identified. The one associated funerary object includes one lot of artifacts. The items come from the Pawnee Indian Village Site, also known as the Kansas Monument Site (14RP1), which was occupied by the Kitkahahki Band of Pawnee from at least 1770 to 1830. Multiple excavations have taken place from 1926 to 2018, the items in this notice were excavated by Carlyle Smith in 1949. In 1971, the human remains associated with these funerary objects were brought to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville by Bill Bass.

To our knowledge, no potentially hazardous substances were used to treat any of these associated funerary objects.

Cultural Affiliation

Based on the information available and the results of consultation, cultural affiliation is reasonably identified by the geographical location or acquisition history of the associated funerary objects described in this notice.

Determinations

The University of Kansas has determined that:

- The one lot of objects described in this notice is reasonably believed to have been placed intentionally with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony.
- There is a connection between associated funerary objects described in this notice and the Kaw Nation, Oklahoma and the Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma.

Requests for Repatriation

Written requests for repatriation of the associated funerary objects in this notice must be sent to the authorized representative identified in this notice under **ADDRESSES**. Requests for repatriation may be submitted by:

1. Any one or more of the Indian Tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice.

2. Any lineal descendant, Indian Tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization not identified in this notice who shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the requestor is a lineal descendant or an Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization with cultural affiliation.

Repatriation of the associated funerary objects described in this notice to a requestor may occur on or after September 17, 2025. If competing requests for repatriation are received, the University of Kansas must determine the most appropriate requestor prior to repatriation. Requests for joint repatriation of the associated funerary objects are considered a single request and not competing requests. The University of Kansas is responsible for sending a copy of this notice to the Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations identified in this notice and any other consulting parties.

Authority: Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3003, and the implementing regulations, 43 CFR 10.10.

Dated: August 6, 2025.

Melanie O'Brien,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. 2025–15669 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—American Massage Therapy Association

Notice is hereby given that, on July 25, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), the American Massage Therapy Association (''AMTA'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the name and principal place of business of the standards development organization and (2) the nature and scope of its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act, the name and principal place of business of the standards development organization is: American Massage Therapy Association, Evanston, IL. The nature and scope of AMTA's standards development activities are: to develop, plan, establish, coordinate, and publish voluntary consensus standards applicable to the field of massage therapy. Specifically, AMTA is engaged in the development of voluntary uniform standards for the safe and competent practice of massage by a professional massage therapist. Through its standards development activities, AMTA seeks to ensure the highest quality of practice in massage therapy. AMTA's standards development activities include participation of, and input from, a broad base of organizations and individuals in the massage therapy profession and other interested parties, including, but not limited to, bodywork professionals, state licensing boards, massage schools, accrediting bodies, and parties with a general interest in issues relating to the profession of massage therapy. AMTA requires that proposed standards be analyzed through an open, balanced, objective and deliberative process. AMTA's standards development activities are ongoing in nature, and AMTA may continue to amend, revise and/or supplement the uniform standards of massage therapy practice from time to time.

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15690 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Dynamic Spectrum Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on July 29, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Dynamic Spectrum Alliance, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, internet Society, Reston, VA; Tarana Wireless, Milpitas, CA; and Policy Impact Partners, Brighton, UNITED KINGDOM, have been added as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Dynamic Spectrum Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On September 1, 2020, Dynamic Spectrum Alliance, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on September 18, 2020 (85 FR 58390).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 16, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal**

Register pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on February 28, 2025 (90 FR 10950).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15691 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Canton Foundation (F/K/A Global Synchronizer Foundation)

Notice is hereby given that, on July 28, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Canton Foundation f/k/a Global Synchronizer Foundation (''Canton Foundation'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Global Synchronizer Foundation has changed its name to: Canton Foundation.

Specifically, Ubyx Inc., Wilmington, DE; Fairmint Inc., Dover, DE; 4M Group LLC, Wyckoff, NJ; 5 North Inc., New York, NY; AngelHack Pte Ltd., Singapore, REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE; BitSafe, North Andover, MA; HSBC, London, UNITED KINGDOM; Kaiko, New York, NY; Lukka, Inc., Naples, FL; TRM Labs, Inc., San Francisco, CA; and SBI Holdings, Inc., Tokyo, JAPAN, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, SBI Digital Asset Holdings Co., Ltd., Tokyo, JAPAN, has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Canton Foundation intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On September 18, 2024, Canton Foundation filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on October 11, 2024 (89 FR 82632).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 19, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 13, 2025 (90 FR 25081).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15667 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—R Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on July 31, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), R Consortium, Inc. (''R Consortium'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Biogen, Cambridge, MA; and American Statistical Association, Alexandria, VA, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and R Consortium intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On September 15, 2015, R Consortium filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on October 2, 2015 (80 FR 59815).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 21, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on March 7, 2025 (90 FR 11551).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15696 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Rust Foundation

Notice is hereby given that, on August 1, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Rust Foundation has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Qube Research & Technologies Limited, London, UNITED KINGDOM; and The Tor Project, Mansfield, MA, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Appflowy PTE. LTD., Singapore, REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE; Spruce Systems, Inc., New York, NY; Techfund Inc., Tokyo, JAPAN; and Turbofish, Inc., Austin, TX, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Rust Foundation intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 14, 2022, Rust Foundation filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on May 13, 2022 (87 FR 29384).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 27, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 20, 2025 (90 FR 26327).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15692 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—MLCommons Association

Notice is hereby given that, on August 5, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the

National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), MLCommons Association (''MLCommons'') filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Vasilios Mavroudis (Individual Member), London, UNITED KINGDOM; Hyeseon Jang (Individual Member), Seoul, REPUBLIC OF KOREA; Carl Ehrett (Individual Member), Clemson, SC; Aman Shukla (Individual Member), Washington, DC; RooGen AI, San Jose, CA; Hiroki Naganuma (Individual Member), Ottawa, CANADA; Amitash Nanda (Individual Member), San Diego, CA; Florian Kofler (Individual Member), Zurich, SWISS CONFEDERATION; University of Florida, Information Technology Research Computing, Gainesville, FL; Aqora, Paris, FRENCH REPUBLIC; Anjali Jain (Individual Member), Bellevue, WA; Zaki Hakim (Individual Member), Toronto, CANADA; Raghav Sharma (Individual Member), Atlanta, GA; Sai Yaaminie Ganda (Individual Member), San Jose, CA; Sahil Verma (Individual Member), Seattle, WA; Kinchit Technologies, Inc., Bangalore, REPUBLIC OF INDIA; Vamshi Ambati (Individual Member), Pleasanton, CA; David Rivkin (Individual Member), Glasgow, UNITED KINGDOM; Gulcin Gedik (Individual Member), Dresden, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY; The Stage AI, Dover, DE; Thrace Systems LLC, San Jose, CA; Blue Fusion, Natick, MA; and Netweb Technologies India Ltd, Faridabad, REPUBLIC OF INDIA have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Moffett AI Technology Shenzhen Co., Ltd., Los Altos, CA has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open and MLCommons intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On September 15, 2020, MLCommons filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on September 29, 2020 (85 FR 61032).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 16, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on June 11, 2025 (90 FR 24670).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15684 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Bytecode Alliance Foundation

Notice is hereby given that, on August 1, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Bytecode Alliance Foundation has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Mimic Networks, Inc., Palo Alto, CA, has been added as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Bytecode Alliance Foundation intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 20, 2022, Bytecode Alliance Foundation filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on May 13, 2022 (87 FR 29379).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 29, 2025. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on July 25, 2025 (90 FR 35313).

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15693 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Mercury Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on July 29, 2025, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Mercury Consortium, Inc. (''Mercury Consortium'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to the venture and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties to the venture are: E.ON Next Energy Limited, Coventry, UNITED KINGDOM; EDF Energy R&D UK Centre, London, UNITED KINGDOM; GivEnergy Software Ltd., Newcastle-under-Lyme, UNITED KINGDOM; Kraken Technologies Limited, London, UNITED KINGDOM; Mixergy, Cassington, UNITED KINGDOM; New York Power Authority, White Plains, NY; Octopus Energy Group, London, UNITED KINGDOM; Utilidata, Providence, RI; gridX GmbH, Aachen, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY; Consolidated Edison Company of New York, New York, NY; OpenADR Alliance Inc., San Ramon, CA; Salt River Project, Tempe, AZ; Southern California Edison, Rosemead, CA; and Essential Energy, Port Macquarie, COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

The general areas of Mercury Consortium's planned activity are to (a) develop use cases, tests certification suites and other deliverables to enable consumer adoption and seamless communication of energy devices in energy markets and grids, (b) develop and oversee certification programs, (c) promote consumer participation in demand flexibility initiatives, (d) represent and advocate for the interests of its members before legislative, regulatory, and other governmental bodies, and (e) undertake such other activities as may from time to time be appropriate to further the purposes and achieve the goals set forth above. Membership in Mercury Consortium remains open and Mercury Consortium intends to file additional written

notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

Suzanne Morris,

Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2025–15695 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP2025–10; Order No. 9084]

Competitive Postal Products

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is recognizing a recently filed Postal Service document with the Commission concerning time-limited changes in rates of general applicability for Competitive products. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Comments are due:* August 29, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at *http://www.prc.gov.* Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Overview
II. Initial Administrative Actions
III. Ordering Paragraphs

I. Introduction and Overview

On August 8, 2025, the Postal Service filed notice with the Commission concerning time-limited changes in rates of general applicability for Competitive products.[1] The Postal Service represents that, as required by 39 CFR 3035.102(b), the Notice includes an explanation and justification for the changes, the effective date, a schedule of the changed rates, and a schedule showing current prices that shall be restored. *See* Notice at 1. The changes are scheduled to take effect on October 5, 2025, and will roll back to current levels on January 18, 2026. *Id.*

Attached to the Notice is Governors' Decision No. 25–5, which states the new prices are in accordance with 39 U.S.C. 3632 and 3633 and 39 CFR 3035.102.[2] The Governors' Decision provides an analysis of the Competitive products' price changes intended to demonstrate that the changes comply with 39 U.S.C. 3633 and 39 CFR part 3035. Governors' Decision No. 25–5 at 1. The attachment to the Governors' Decision sets forth the price changes and includes draft Mail Classification Schedule (MCS) language for Competitive products of general applicability, as well as the MCS sections with the prices that will be restored on January 18, 2026. No price changes are being made to Special Services or International Competitive products. *Id.* at 3.

The Notice also includes an application for non-public treatment of the attributable costs, contribution, and cost coverage data in the unredacted version of the annex to the Governors' Decision, as well as the supporting materials for the data. Notice at 2.

Planned price adjustments. The Governors' Decision includes an overview of the Postal Service's planned price changes, which is summarized in the table below.

TABLE I–1—PROPOSED PRICE CHANGES

Product name	Average price increase (percent)
Domestic competitive products	
Priority mail express	5.6
Retail	5.7
Commercial	4.9
Priority Mail	5.6
Retail	5.8
Commercial	5.2
USPS Ground Advantage	5.2
Retail	5.1
Commercial	5.3
Alaska Limited Overland Routes (LOR)	6.1
Parcel Select	5.6
Destination Entry	5.6

Source: *See* Governors' Decision No. 25–5 at 2.

II. Initial Administrative Actions

The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2025–10 to consider the Postal Service's Notice. Interested persons may express views and offer comments on whether the planned changes are consistent with 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, and 3642, 39 CFR part 3035, and 39 CFR 3040 subparts B and E. Comments are due no later than August 29, 2025. For specific details of the planned price changes, interested persons are encouraged to review the Notice, which is available on the Commission's website at *www.prc.gov.*

Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, Christopher Mohr is appointed to serve as Public Representative to represent the interests of the general public in this docket.

III. Ordering Paragraphs

It is ordered:

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. CP2025–10 to provide interested persons an opportunity to express views and offer comments on whether the planned changes are consistent with 39 U.S.C. 3632, 3633, and 3642, 39 CFR part 3035, and 39 CFR 3040 subparts B and E.

2. Comments are due no later than August 29, 2025.

3. Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505, the Commission appoints Christopher Mohr to serve as an officer of the Commission (Public Representative) to represent the interests of the general public in this docket.

4. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this Order in the **Federal Register**.

By the Commission.

Erica A. Barker,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15631 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. CP2024–369; K2025–25; K2025–393; MC2025–1594 and K2025–1586; MC2025–1601 and K2025–1593; MC2025–1609 and K2025–1601; MC2025–1610 and K2025–1602; MC2025–1611 and K2025–1603; MC2025–1612 and K2025–1604]

New Postal Products

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing for the Commission's consideration concerning a negotiated service agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Comments are due:* August 20, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's

[1] USPS Notice of Time-Limited Changes in Rates of General Applicability for Competitive Products, August 8, 2025 (Notice). Pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3632(b)(2), the Postal Service is obligated to publish the Governors' Decision and record of proceedings in the **Federal Register** at least 30 days before the effective date of the new rates.

[2] Notice, Decision of the Governors of the United States Postal Service on Changes in Rates of General Applicability for Competitive Products (Governors' Decision No. 25–5), at 1 (Governors' Decision No. 25–5).

Filing Online system at *https://www.prc.gov*. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction
II. Public Proceeding(s)
III. Summary Proceeding(s)

I. Introduction

Pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.405, the Commission gives notice that the Postal Service filed request(s) for the Commission to consider matters related to Competitive negotiated service agreement(s). The request(s) may propose the addition of a negotiated service agreement from the Competitive product list or the modification of an existing product currently appearing on the Competitive product list.

The public portions of the Postal Service's request(s) can be accessed via the Commission's website (*http://www.prc.gov*). Non-public portions of the Postal Service's request(s), if any, can be accessed through compliance with the requirements of 39 CFR 3011.301.[1]

Section II identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, if any, that will be reviewed in a public proceeding as defined by 39 CFR 3010.101(p), the title of each such request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. For each such request, the Commission appoints an officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in the proceeding, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505 and 39 CFR 3000.114 (Public Representative). The Public Representative does not represent any individual person, entity or particular point of view, and, when Commission attorneys are appointed, no attorney-client relationship is established. Section II also establishes comment deadline(s) pertaining to each such request.

The Commission invites comments on whether the Postal Service's request(s) identified in Section II, if any, are consistent with the policies of title 39. Applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3632, 39 U.S.C. 3633, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3035, and 39 CFR part 3041. Comment deadline(s) for each such request, if any, appear in Section II.

Section III identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, if any, to add a standardized distinct product to the Competitive product list or to amend a standardized distinct product, the title of each such request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. Standardized distinct products are negotiated service agreements that are variations of one or more Competitive products, and for which financial models, minimum rates, and classification criteria have undergone advance Commission review. *See* 39 CFR 3041.110(n); 39 CFR 3041.205(a). Such requests are reviewed in summary proceedings pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.325(c)(2) and 39 CFR 3041.505(f)(1). Pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.405(c)–(d), the Commission does not appoint a Public Representative or request public comment in proceedings to review such requests.

II. Public Proceeding(s)

1. *Docket No(s).:* CP2024–369; *Filing Title:* USPS Request Concerning Amendment One to Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 109, with Materials Filed Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 CFR 3035.105 and 39 CFR 3041.505; *Public Representative:* Arif Hafiz; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

2. *Docket No(s).:* K2025–25; *Filing Title:* USPS Request Concerning Amendment One to Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 374, with Materials Filed Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 CFR 3035.105 and 39 CFR 3041.505; *Public Representative:* Jennaca Upperman; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

3. *Docket No(s).:* K2025–393; *Filing Title:* USPS Request Concerning Amendment One to Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 715, with Materials Filed Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 CFR 3035.105 and 39 CFR 3041.505; *Public Representative:* Arif Hafiz; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

4. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1594 and K2025–1586; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail Express International, Priority Mail International & First-Class Package International Service Contract 83 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Maxine Bradley; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

5. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1601 and K2025–1593; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail Express International, Priority Mail International & First-Class Package International Service Contract 87 to Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Maxine Bradley; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

6. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1609 and K2025–1601; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 804 to the Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Elsie Lee-Robbins; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

7. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1610 and K2025–1602; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 805 to the Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Elsie Lee-Robbins; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

8. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1611 and K2025–1603; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 806 to the Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Evan Wise; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

9. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1612 and K2025–1604; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 807 to the Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 12, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Kenneth Moeller; *Comments Due:* August 20, 2025.

III. Summary Proceeding(s)

None. See Section II for public proceedings.

[1] *See* Docket No. RM2018–3, Order Adopting Final Rules Relating to Non-Public Information, June 27, 2018, Attachment A at 19–22 (Order No. 4679).

This Notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Erica A. Barker,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15618 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. K2025–53; MC2025–1613 and K2025–1605; MC2025–1614 and K2025–1606]

New Postal Products

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is noticing a recent Postal Service filing for the Commission's consideration concerning a negotiated service agreement. This notice informs the public of the filing, invites public comment, and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: *Comments are due:* August 21, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at *https://www.prc.gov.* Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction
II. Public Proceeding(s)
III. Summary Proceeding(s)

I. Introduction

Pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.405, the Commission gives notice that the Postal Service filed request(s) for the Commission to consider matters related to Competitive negotiated service agreement(s). The request(s) may propose the addition of a negotiated service agreement from the Competitive product list or the modification of an existing product currently appearing on the Competitive product list.

The public portions of the Postal Service's request(s) can be accessed via the Commission's website (*http://www.prc.gov*). Non-public portions of the Postal Service's request(s), if any, can be accessed through compliance with the requirements of 39 CFR 3011.301.[1]

Section II identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, if any, that will be reviewed in a public proceeding as defined by 39 CFR 3010.101(p), the title of each such request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. For each such request, the Commission appoints an officer of the Commission to represent the interests of the general public in the proceeding, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 505 and 39 CFR 3000.114 (Public Representative). The Public Representative does not represent any individual person, entity or particular point of view, and, when Commission attorneys are appointed, no attorney-client relationship is established. Section II also establishes comment deadline(s) pertaining to each such request.

The Commission invites comments on whether the Postal Service's request(s) identified in Section II, if any, are consistent with the policies of title 39. Applicable statutory and regulatory requirements include 39 U.S.C. 3632, 39 U.S.C. 3633, 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR part 3035, and 39 CFR part 3041. Comment deadline(s) for each such request, if any, appear in Section II.

Section III identifies the docket number(s) associated with each Postal Service request, if any, to add a standardized distinct product to the Competitive product list or to amend a standardized distinct product, the title of each such request, the request's acceptance date, and the authority cited by the Postal Service for each request. Standardized distinct products are negotiated service agreements that are variations of one or more Competitive products, and for which financial models, minimum rates, and classification criteria have undergone advance Commission review. *See* 39 CFR 3041.110(n); 39 CFR 3041.205(a). Such requests are reviewed in summary proceedings pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.325(c)(2) and 39 CFR 3041.505(f)(1). Pursuant to 39 CFR 3041.405(c)–(d), the Commission does not appoint a Public Representative or request public comment in proceedings to review such requests.

II. Public Proceeding(s)

1. *Docket No(s).:* K2025–53; *Filing Title:* USPS Request Concerning Amendment One to Priority Mail Express, Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 454, with Materials Filed Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 13, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 CFR 3035.105 and 39 CFR 3041.505; *Public Representative:* Kenneth Moeller; *Comments Due:* August 21, 2025.

2. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1613 and K2025–1605; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 808 to the Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 13, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Elsie Lee-Robbins; *Comments Due:* August 21, 2025.

3. *Docket No(s).:* MC2025–1614 and K2025–1606; *Filing Title:* USPS Request to Add Priority Mail & USPS Ground Advantage Contract 809 to the Competitive Product List and Notice of Filing Materials Under Seal; *Filing Acceptance Date:* August 13, 2025; *Filing Authority:* 39 U.S.C. 3642, 39 CFR 3035.105, and 39 CFR 3041.310; *Public Representative:* Jennaca Upperman; *Comments Due:* August 21, 2025.

III. Summary Proceeding(s)

None. See Section II for public proceedings.

This Notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

Erica A. Barker,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15662 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

[1] *See* Docket No. RM2018–3, Order Adopting Final Rules Relating to Non-Public Information, June 27, 2018, Attachment A at 19–22 (Order No. 4679).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103697; File No. SR–IEX–2025–18]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Investors Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Exchange's Fee Schedule Concerning Transaction Pricing

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) [1] of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act'') [2] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3] notice is hereby given that, on July 31, 2025, the Investors Exchange LLC (''IEX'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78a.

[3] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 19(b)(1) under the Act,[4] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[5] the Exchange is filing with the Commission a proposed rule change to amend the Exchange's fee schedule applicable to Members [6] (the ''Fee Schedule'' [7]) pursuant to IEX Rule 15.110(a) and (c) to modify the required criteria for one of its Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate Tiers for executions priced at or above $1.00 per share. Changes to the Fee Schedule pursuant to this proposal are effective upon filing,[8] and will be operative on August 1, 2025.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's website at *https://www.iexexchange.io/resources/regulation/rule-filings* and at the principal office of the Exchange.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to modify its Fee Schedule, pursuant to IEX Rule 15.110(a) and (c), to modify the required criteria for one of its Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate Tiers for executions priced at or above $1.00 to introduce an alternative means of qualifying for the rebate tier. Notably, IEX is not proposing to change the amounts of any rebates or fees.

Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate Tiers

As reflected in the Transaction Fees section of the Fee Schedule, IEX currently offers Members the following seven Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate tiers:

- *Tier 1:* provides Member the Exchange's base fee of FREE for all displayed liquidity adding executions priced at or above $1.00 per share (''Added Displayed Liquidity'') [9] if the Member adds less than 3,000,000 ADV [10] of displayed liquidity in that month.
- *Tier 2:* provides Member a rebate of $0.0010 per share for all Added Displayed Liquidity if the Member trades at least 5,000,000 non-displayed ADV and less than 10,000,000 non-displayed ADV.
- *Tier 3:* provides Member a rebate of $0.0014 per share for all Added Displayed Liquidity if the Member either: adds at least 3,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 10,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity; or trades at least 10,000,000 non-displayed ADV.
- *Tier 4:* provides Member a rebate of $0.0016 per share for all Added Displayed Liquidity if the Member adds at least 10,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 15,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity.
- *Tier 5:* provides Member a rebate of $0.0018 per share for all Added Displayed Liquidity if the Member adds at least 15,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 20,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity.
- *Tier 6:* provides Member a rebate of $0.0020 per share for all Added Displayed Liquidity if the Member either: adds at least 20,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 30,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity; or trades at least 20,000,000 non-displayed ADV.
- *Tier 7:* provides Member a rebate of $0.0022 per share for all Added Displayed Liquidity if the Member adds at least 30,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity.

IEX is proposing to modify the required criteria for qualifying for Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate Tier 5 (''Tier 5''), so that Members will have two ways in which they could qualify for Tier 5: (1) the current method, in which a Member qualifies for the rebate tier by adding at least 15,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 20,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity; or (2) the proposed new method, in which a Member would qualify for the rebate tier by trading at least 15,000,000 non-displayed ADV, irrespective of its Added Displayed Liquidity. In effect, this proposed additional means of qualifying for Tier 5 aligns Tier 5 with current Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate Tiers 3 and 6; Tier 3 allows Members to qualify for that tier either: (1) by adding at least 3,000,000 and less than 10,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity or (2) by trading at least 10,000,000 non-displayed ADV, irrespective of their Added Displayed Liquidity, and Tier 6 allows Members to qualify for that tier either: (1) by adding at least 20,000,000 and less than 30,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity or (2) by trading at least 20,000,000 non-displayed ADV, irrespective of their Added Displayed Liquidity.

Accordingly, IEX proposes to update its Fee Schedule to make two revisions to reflect the proposed changes to Tier 5. First, the Exchange proposes to amend the Fee Schedule's Base Rates table to update the description and fees associated with Base Fee Code ML (''Add displayed liquidity''). As amended, the Base Rates table will continue to list seven base rates for Fee Code ML, but the description of the base rate paid for a Member that adds at least 15,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 20,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity will state that a Member also can qualify for that base rate by trading at least 15,000,000 non-displayed ADV. Similarly, IEX proposes to update the description of Tier 5 in Footnote 4 to the Transaction Fees section. As proposed, Footnote 4 will be amended to reflect that a Member can qualify for Tier 5 either by adding at least 15,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity and less than 20,000,000 ADV of displayed liquidity, or by trading at least 15,000,000 non-displayed ADV.

IEX notes that this model of offering volume-based rebates is consistent with the rebates offered by competitor exchanges.[11]

2. Statutory Basis

IEX believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the provisions of Section 6(b) [12] of the Act in general, and furthers the objectives of Sections

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[5] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[6] *See* IEX Rule 1.160(s).

[7] *See* Investors Exchange Fee Schedule, available at *https://www.iexexchange.io/resources/trading/fee-schedule.*

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

[9] Nothing in this rule filing affects trades below $1.00 per share (''subdollar trades''). Any subdollar trade that adds displayed liquidity does not impact the rebate tier calculations and receives a rebate of 0.15% of the total dollar value of the execution. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 102086 (January 2, 2025), 90 FR 1586 (January 8, 2025) (SR–IEX–2024–30).

[10] The Fee Schedule defines ''ADV'' as average daily volume calculated as the number of shares added or removed (as applicable) that execute at or above $1.00 per share, combined, per day, calculated on a monthly basis, subject to certain exclusions.

[11] *See, e.g.,* Cboe BZX Inc. Fee Schedule (Effective May 19, 2025), available at *https://www.cboe.com/us/equities/membership/fee_schedule/bzx/;* MEMX Equities Fee Schedule (Effective May 1, 2025), available at *https://info.memxtrading.com/equities-trading-resources/us-equities-fee-schedule/;* Nasdaq Equity VII; New York Stock Exchange Price List 2025 (as of April 1, 2025), available at *https://www.nyse.com/publicdocs/nyse/markets/nyse/NYSE_Price_List.pdf.*

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f.

6(b)(4) [13] of the Act, in particular, in that it is designed to provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among its Members and other persons using its facilities. The Exchange believes that the proposed fee change is reasonable, fair and equitable, and non-discriminatory.

The Exchange operates in a highly competitive market in which market participants can readily direct order flow to competing venues if they deem fee levels at a particular venue to be excessive. IEX has concluded that, in the context of current regulatory requirements governing access fees and rebates, it is able to more effectively compete with other exchanges for order flow by offering Members an additional means of qualifying for higher rebate incentives. Based upon informal discussions with market participants, IEX believes that Members and other market participants may be more willing to send displayed orders to IEX if the proposed fee change is adopted.

Accordingly, IEX has designed the proposed changes to Tier 5 to allow Members an additional way to qualify for that particular incentive rebate tier. As noted in the Purpose section, the proposed changes to Tier 5 are an expansion of the current criteria to qualify for Displayed Liquidity Adding Rebate Tiers 3 and 6, and thus raises no issues already considered by the Commission.

With these proposed changes, IEX's rebates are still designed to attract and incentivize displayed orders as well as order flow seeking to trade with such displayed orders. Moreover, increases in displayed liquidity would contribute to the public price discovery process which would benefit all market participants and protect investors and the public interest.

As discussed above, the Exchange operates in a highly competitive market in which market participants can readily direct order flow to competing venues if they deem fee levels at a particular venue to be excessive. Within that context, the proposed additional criteria for qualifying for Tier 5 is designed to keep IEX's displayed trading prices competitive with those of other exchanges. The proposed additional criteria for qualifying for Tier 5 is comparable to the criteria applied by competing exchanges, and thus IEX does not believe that the proposal raises any new or novel issues not already considered by the Commission in the context of other exchanges' fees.[14]

Finally, to the extent this proposed fee change is successful in incentivizing the entry and execution of displayed orders on IEX, such greater liquidity will benefit all market participants by increasing price discovery and price formation as well as market quality and execution opportunities. And, as discussed above, IEX does not believe that any aspect of this proposal raises new or novel issues not already considered by the Commission.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

IEX does not believe that the proposed rule change will result in any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on intermarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange operates in a highly competitive market in which market participants can readily favor competing venues if fee schedules at other venues are viewed as more favorable. Consequently, the Exchange believes that the degree to which IEX fees could impose any burden on competition is extremely limited and does not believe that such fees would burden competition between Members or competing venues. Moreover, as noted in the Statutory Basis section, the Exchange does not believe that the proposed changes raise any new or novel issues not already considered by the Commission.

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on intramarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act because, while different rebates are assessed on Members, these rebate tiers are not based on the type of Member entering the orders that match, but rather on the Member's own trading activity. Further, the proposed fee changes continue to be intended to encourage market participants to bring increased order flow to the Exchange, which benefits all market participants.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) [15] of the Act.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B) [16] of the Act to determine whether the proposed rule change should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–IEX–2025–18 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–IEX–2025–18. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR–IEX–2025–18 and

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

[14] *See supra* note 11.

[15] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

[16] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[17]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15623 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103700; File No. SR–LTSE–2025–18]

Self-Regulatory Organizations: Long-Term Stock Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend the Liquidity Incentive Program

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 19(b)(1) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on August 11, 2025, Long-Term Stock Exchange, Inc. (''LTSE'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') a proposed rule change to amend the Liquidity Incentive Program (''LTSE LIP'' or ''Program'') which is designed, among other things, to enhance market quality by incentivizing market participants to provide liquidity in LIP Enhanced Securities. The Exchange proposes to implement the changes to the fee schedule pursuant to this proposal on August 11, 2025.

The text of the proposed rule change is available at the Exchange's website at *https://longtermstockexchange.com/,* and at the principal office of the Exchange.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

On July 1, 2025, the Exchange implemented the LTSE LIP to enhance liquidity and improve market quality in LIP Enhanced Securities [3] traded on the Exchange by incentivizing Members to quote at or better than the National Best Bid and Offer (''NBBO'') and provide liquidity in both select securities, the LIP Enhanced Securities and more generally in all other securities traded on LTSE, the LIP Standard Securities.[4] [5]

Currently, the eligibility threshold for Incentive #1 requires a Member to display a quote in a LIP Enhanced Security of a Minimum Quoted Size, for at least 60% of the time at the NBBO of the Regular Market Session [6] in a calendar quarter, in order to share in SIP Quote Revenue,[7] which is distributed proportionally among eligible Members based on quoting activity.

The Exchange now proposes to amend Incentive #1 of the LTSE LIP to reduce the quoting threshold in a LIP Enhanced Security from 60% to 30% of the time at the NBBO of the Regular Market Session for the months of August and September in the current quarter and going forward for qualifying Members. This intraquarter adjustment is designed to address observed challenges with the initial quoting requirement and to encourage greater participation in LIP Enhanced Securities.[8]

This adjustment is designed to account for the fact that the original quoting threshold of 60% will not apply uniformly across the quarter, as the Exchange is proposing to reduce the threshold to 30% for the months of August and September 2025. Therefore, LTSE will share a share of 80% of July's LTSE SIP Quote Revenue for that LIP Enhanced Security, distributed proportionally with firms who quoted at the NBBO at least 60% of the time for the month of July. For the months of August and September 2005, LTSE will share 80% of the combined August and September LTSE SIP Quote Revenue for that LIP Enhanced Security with firms who quoted at the NBBO at least 30% of the time across August and September. By allowing Members to qualify based on a reduced quoting performance in August and September, the Exchange seeks to make this intra-quarter adjustment from 60% to 30% to encourage greater participation in LIP Enhanced Securities as soon as possible and provide the opportunity to share in SIP Quote Revenue, which is distributed proportionally among eligible Members based on quoting activity.'' The Exchange notes that it is not proposing any changes to the SIP Quote Revenue distribution, which will continue to occur at the end of each calendar quarter.

This approach continues to promote consistent quoting behavior while also

[17] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] LIP Enhanced Securities means a list of securities designated as such, that are used for the purposes of qualifying for the incentives within the LIP. The universe of these securities will be determined by the Exchange and published on the Exchange's website. *See* Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

[4] LIP Standard Securities means a security not defined as a ''LIP Enhanced Security'' and traded on LTSE. *See* Definitions Section of the Fee Schedule.

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Release No. 34–103517 (July 22, 2025), 90 FR 35325 (July 25, 2025) (SR–LTSE–2025–16). The Program includes three key incentives: (1) a proportional share of 80% of LTSE's SIP Quote Revenue for LIP Enhanced Securities, distributed among qualifying Members based on quoting activity; (2) reduced taker fees for LIP Enhanced Securities, available to all Members without quoting obligations; and (3) for LIP Standard Securities, a choice between a proportional share of 20% of LTSE's SIP Quote Revenue or a quarterly credit, contingent on meeting specific quoting thresholds.

[6] Regular Market Session or Regular Market Hours means the time between 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time. *See* Exchange Rule 1.160(kk).

[7] The Securities Information Processors (''SIPs''), which include the Unlisted Trading Privileges and Consolidated Tape Association, collect fees from subscribers for trade and quote tape data received from trading centers and reporting facilities, such as the Exchange (collectively, ''SIP Participants''). After deducting the cost of operating each tape, the profits are allocated among the SIP Participants on a quarterly basis, according to a complex set of calculations that consider estimates of anticipated Market Data Revenue (''MDR''), adjustments to comport to actual MDR from previous quarters and a non-linear aggregation of total trading and quoting activity in Tape A, B, and C securities in attributing MDR to each SIP Participant. Based on these calculations, the SIPs provide MDR payments to each SIP Participant during the second month of each quarter for trade and quote data from the previous calendar quarter, which are subject to adjustment through subsequent quarterly payments. These payments can be divided into six pools (*i.e.,* trade and quote activity in Tape A, B, and C securities).

[8] The Exchange notes that no Member qualified for the 60% quoting threshold in July 2025.

reflecting the intra-quarter change. The Exchange believes that the reduction from 60% to 30% provides a fair and reasonable opportunity for Members to participate in the Program and aligns with the Exchange's broader goal of enhancing liquidity and market quality in LIP Enhanced Securities.

The Exchange notes that this proposal is limited in scope and that Incentives #2 and #3 are unchanged and remain in full force and effect as implemented on July 1, 2025.

This modification is intended to enhance market quality by encouraging Members to contribute to displayed liquidity and tighter spreads in LIP Enhanced Securities. By lowering the barrier to entry mid-quarter, the Exchange aims to increase quoting activity during the remainder of the quarter, allowing firms that did not initially meet the 60% threshold to participate meaningfully in the Program.

The Exchange believes this targeted adjustment will improve overall effectiveness of the Program while preserving the integrity and design of Incentives #2 and #3, which continues to operate as originally adopted.

The Exchange is proposing to amend Incentive #1 by reducing the quoting threshold from 60% to 30% thereby allowing more Members to qualify for SIP revenue based on quoting activity at the NBBO in LIP Enhanced Securities. Through the amendments to Incentive #1 of the Program, the Exchange seeks to provide improved liquidity for all market participants through narrower bid-ask spreads and increased depth of liquidity in LIP Enhanced Securities.

(b) Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,[9] in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(4) of the Act,[10] in particular, in that it provides for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees and other charges among all of its Members and issuers and other persons using its facilities; Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,[11] which requires, among other things, that the rules of the Exchange be designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and to protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange also believes that the proposed rule change is reasonable, fair and equitable, and non-discriminatory.

The Exchange believes that the ever-shifting market share among the exchanges from month to month demonstrates that market participants can shift order flow or discontinue or reduce use of certain categories of products, in response to new or different pricing structures being introduced into the market. Accordingly, competitive forces constrain the Exchange's transaction fees and rebates, and market participants can readily trade on competing venues if they deem pricing levels at those other venues to be more favorable.

The Exchange believes that the proposed reduction in the quoting threshold for Incentive #1 of the Program from 60% to 30% for the months of August and September 2025, and on a prospective basis, thereafter, is reasonable and appropriate in light of observed participation levels and market conditions. The reduced threshold is intended to lower barriers to entry and encourage broader participation among Members, particularly those who may have been unable to meet the more stringent 60% threshold in the first month of the quarter.

To further align with this mid-quarter adjustment, the Exchange also proposes to modify the qualification methodology for the third quarter of 2025. For the month of July, LTSE will share 80% of July's LTSE SIP Quote Revenue for that LIP Enhanced Security, distributed proportionally with firms who quoted at the NBBO at least 60% of the time. Then for the months of August and September 2005, LTSE will share 80% of the combined August and September LTSE SIP Quote Revenue for that LIP Enhanced Security with firms who quoted at the NBBO at least 30% of the time across August and September. This approach provides flexibility to Members who may not have qualified under the July threshold but who can meet the revised standard in August and September. The Exchange believes that this change promotes fairness and program integrity while continuing to reward sustained quoting activity that improves market quality.

The Exchange believes these amendments are consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act because they are designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market by incentivizing quoting behavior that supports tighter spreads, deeper displayed liquidity and improved price discovery in LIP Enhanced Securities. The proposed changes also maintain the original goals of the Program–encouraging continuous quoting at the NBBO–while adapting to early experience and Member behavior under the initial threshold.

Importantly, the proposed program is limited in scope to Incentive #1. Incentives #2 and #3 remain unchanged and in full force and effect as implemented on July 1, 2025, preserving the continuity of the Program's broader incentive structure. These components continue to support market quality and competition without modification.

In addition, as discussed above, the Exchange operates in a highly competitive environment, and its transaction pricing, including incentive programs, such as the LTSE LIP, is constrained by competition among exchanges and alternative trading systems. The proposed changes are designed to make the Program more accessible and effective, thereby attracting greater quoting interest and enhancing overall market quality.

The Exchange also believes that the amendments to the Eligibility Requirement, reducing the percentage of time that market participants must quote at the NBBO of the Regular Market Session in a calendar quarter for Incentive #1, and as described more fully below in the Exchange's statement regarding the burden on competition, the Exchange believes that its transaction pricing is subject to significant competitive forces, and that the proposed amendments to the eligibility requirement for Incentive #1 described herein are appropriate to address such forces.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed change will impose any burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. Instead, as discussed above, the proposal is intended to enhance market quality on the Exchange in a large number of securities generally, and in the LIP Enhanced Securities specifically, and to encourage Members to increase their order flow on the Exchange, thereby promoting price discovery and contributing to a deeper and more liquid market to the benefit of all market participants. As a result, the Exchange believes the proposal would enhance its competitiveness as a market that attracts actionable orders, thereby making it a more desirable destination venue for its customers. For these reasons, the Exchange believes that the proposal furthers the Commission's goal in

[9] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[10] 15 U.S.C.78f(b)(4).

[11] 15 U.S.C.78f(b)(5).

efficient pricing of individual stocks for all types of orders, large and small.'' [12]

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange neither solicited nor received comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

This proposed rule change establishes dues, fees or other charges among its members and, as such, may take effect upon filing with the Commission pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act [13] and paragraph (f)(2) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[14] Accordingly, the proposed rule change would take effect upon filing with the Commission.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend the rule change if it appears to the Commission that the action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or would otherwise further the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–LTSE–2025–18 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–LTSE–2025–18. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of LTSE and on its internet website at *https://longtermstockexchange.com/.*

All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–LTSE–2025–18 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[15]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15627 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[12] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808 (June 9, 2005), 70 FR 47396 (June 29, 2005).

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(ii).

[14] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(2).

[15] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103702; File No. 4–698]

Joint Industry Plan; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Amendment to the National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail To Add 24 National Exchange LLC as a Participant

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 11A(a)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 608 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on August 6, 2025, 24 National Exchange LLC (''24X'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') an amendment to the National Market System Plan Governing the Consolidated Audit Trail (''CAT NMS Plan'' or ''Plan'').[3] The amendment adds 24X as a Participant [4] to the CAT NMS Plan. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the amendment from interested persons.

I. Description and Purpose of the Amendment

The amendment to the CAT NMS Plan adds 24X as a Participant.[5] The CAT NMS Plan provides that any Person [6] approved by the Commission as a national securities exchange or national securities association under the Exchange Act may become a Participant by submitting to the Company [7] a completed application in the form provided by the Company.[8] As a condition to admission as a Participant, said Person shall: (i) execute a counterpart of the CAT NMS Plan, at which time Exhibit A shall be amended to reflect the status of said Person as a Participant (including said Person's address for purposes of notices delivered pursuant to the CAT NMS Plan); and (ii) pay a fee to the Company as set forth in the Plan (the ''Participation Fee'').[9] The amendment to the Plan reflecting the admission of a new Participant shall be effective only when: (x) it is approved by the Commission in accordance with Rule 608 or otherwise becomes effective pursuant to Rule 608; and (y) the prospective Participant pays the Participation Fee.[10]

24X has executed a copy of the current CAT NMS Plan, amended to include 24X in the List of Parties (including the address of 24X), paid the

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78k–1(a)(3).

[2] 17 CFR 242.608.

[3] The Commission approved the CAT NMS Plan on November 16, 2016. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 79318, 81 FR 84695 (November 23, 2016) (order approving the CAT NMS Plan).

[4] The Participants to the CAT NMS Plan are: BOX Exchange LLC; Cboe BYX Exchange, Inc.; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.; Cboe C2 Exchange, Inc.; Cboe EDGA Exchange, Inc.; Cboe EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Cboe Exchange, Inc.; Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc.; Investors Exchange LLC; Long-Term Stock Exchange, Inc.; MEMX, LLC; Miami International Securities Exchange LLC; MIAX Emerald, LLC; MIAX PEARL, LLC; MIAX Sapphire, LLC; Nasdaq BX, Inc.; Nasdaq GEMX, LLC; Nasdaq ISE, LLC; Nasdaq MRX, LLC; Nasdaq PHLX LLC; The NASDAQ Stock Market LLC; New York Stock Exchange LLC; NYSE American LLC; NYSE Arca, Inc.; NYSE Texas, Inc.; and NYSE National, Inc.

[5] Defined in Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan as follows: ''Participant'' means each Person identified as such on Exhibit A hereto, and any Person that becomes a Participant as permitted by this Agreement, in such Person's capacity as a Participant in the Company (it being understood that the Participants shall comprise the ''members'' of the Company (as the term ''member'' is defined in Section 18–101(11) of the Delaware Act)).

[6] Defined in Section 1.1 of the CAT NMS Plan as follows: ''Person'' means any individual, partnership, limited liability company, corporation, joint venture, trust, business trust, cooperative or association and any heirs, executors, administrators, legal representatives, successors and assigns of such Person where the context so permits.

[7] The ''Company'' refers to the limited liability company, Consolidated Audit Trail, LLC, which is responsible for conducting the activities of the CAT. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 87149 (September 27, 2019), 84 FR 52905 (October 3, 2019).

[8] *See* Section 3.3 of the CAT NMS Plan. 24X was approved as a national securities exchange on November 27, 2024. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 101777 (November 27, 2024), 89 FR 97092 (December 6, 2024).

[9] *See* Section 3.3 of the CAT NMS Plan.

[10] *Id.*

applicable Participation Fee and provided each current Plan Participant with a copy of the executed and amended CAT NMS Plan.[11]

II. Effectiveness of the Proposed Plan Amendment

The foregoing CAT NMS Plan amendment has become effective pursuant to Rule 608(b)(3)(iii)[12] because it involves solely technical or ministerial matters. At any time within sixty days of the filing of this amendment, the Commission may summarily abrogate the amendment and require that it be refiled pursuant to paragraph (a)(1) of Rule 608,[13] if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors or the maintenance of fair and orderly markets, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanisms of, a national market system or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

III. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the amendment is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number 4–698 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number 4–698. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number 4–698 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[14]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15615 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[11] *See* Letter from David Sassoon, General Senior Counsel, 24X National Exchange LLC, dated August 6, 2025, to Vanessa Countryman, Secretary, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

[12] 17 CFR 242.608(b)(3)(iii).

[13] 17 CFR 242.608(a)(1).

[14] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(85).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103701; File No. SR–CBOE–2025–059]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Its Rules Related to the Submission of Bids and Offers for Certain Complex Strategies for Execution Using Bulk Message Functionality

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on August 12, 2025, Cboe Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''Cboe Options'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

Cboe Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''Cboe Options'') proposes to amend its Rules related to the submission of bids and offers for certain complex strategies for execution using bulk message functionality. The text of the proposed rule change is provided in Exhibit 5.

The text of the proposed rule change is also available on the Exchange's website (*http://www.cboe.com/AboutCBOE/CBOELegalRegulatoryHome.aspx*) and at the Exchange's Office of the Secretary.

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend its Rules regarding the submission of bids and offers for certain complex strategies using bulk message functionality. The primary purpose of bulk message functionality is to encourage market-maker quoting on the Exchange.[3] The Exchange's bulk message functionality permits Market-Makers to submit a single electronic message to the Exchange, in which message the Market-Maker may enter, modify, or cancel up to an Exchange-specified number of bids and offers.[4] Bulk messages are submitted through bulk ports, as set forth in Rule 5.5(c)(3). The System handles a bid or offer submitted in a bulk message in the same manner as it handles a bid or offer submitted in an order message, unless the Rules

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 86374 (July 15, 2019), 84 FR 34963 (July 19, 2019) (SR–CBOE–2019–033). The Exchange notes that a ''bulk message'' is often referred to as a ''quote'' or ''quote message,'' while an ''order'' and ''order message'' refer to an order (even if submitted by a Market-Maker, which would be classified as a quote pursuant to the definition of quote in Rule 1.1). This is relevant for purposes of the reporting exemption for options market-maker quote in the CAT NMS Plan (''CAT''). *See CAT Section 6.4(d)(iii); see also* CAT FAQ K10 (which provides that each options exchange determines which messages submitted by options market-makers are subject to the exemption) and Cboe Options Regulatory Circular 20–044 (July 7, 2020) (which requires Market-Maker bulk message quotes include quote sent time in accordance with the exemption and notes that other messages, such as order and auction response messages, sent by Market-Makers are not subject to the exemption).

[4] *See* Rule 1.1 (definition of bulk message). The proposed rule change amends the definition of bulk message in Rule 1.1 to correct a cross-reference. The proposed rule change amends Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A) to clarify that bulk messages may be submitted by Market-Makers only, which is consistent with the definition of bulk message that states a bulk message must have an M Capacity (which, per the definition of Capacity in Rule 1.1, is the code corresponding to the account of a Market-Maker).

otherwise specify. While the definition in the rules for bulk messages (*i.e.,* quotes) applies to both simple and complex bids and offers, the Exchange currently offers bulk message functionality only for simple bids and offers. However, the Exchange plans to expand the use of this functionality to complex bids and offers for Exchange-designated strategies,[5] and this filing amends certain rules in connection with this planned expansion of functionality.

In 2024, the Exchange amended its Rules to encourage increased, consolidated liquidity in complex strategies on the complex order book (''COB'').[6] Specifically, Rule 5.33(a) permits the Exchange to create new complex strategies to allow for the consolidation of liquidity within a single complex strategy that may otherwise be spread across multiple customer-created complex strategies expressing similar exposure profiles. Additionally Rule 5.33(b)(2)(A) permits complex orders with a Market-Maker capacity (M or N) to enter complex orders to rest in the COB in Exchange-designated complex strategies to support this consolidation of liquidity. The proposed rule change enhances current functionality to further support the consolidation of liquidity within certain complex strategies rather than have liquidity spread across complex strategies with the same or similar exposure risk profiles. Specifically, it will permit Market-Makers to use the same bulk message functionality they generally use to provide liquidity in simple markets to do so in complex markets (rather than only be able to use order message functionality) in the complex strategies designated by the Exchange pursuant to Rule 5.33(b)(2)(A). As noted above, bulk message functionality will permit Market-Makers to submit new or updated bids and offers for multiple complex strategies in a single message. This functionality is consistent with Market-Makers' quoting systems that update quotes in response to market conditions and will permit Market-Makers to update quotes in more complex strategies on a regular basis. Currently, Market-Makers need to submit an individual order for each complex strategy in which they want to submit a bid or offer. The Exchange believes providing Market-Makers with this functionality for Exchange-designated strategies will encourage Market-Makers to add more liquidity into these strategies.[7]

The proposed rule change first adopts Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii) to impose similar requirements on bulk messages comprised of complex bids and offers to the requirements imposed on quote messages comprised of simple bids and offers.[8] Specifically, proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii) provides that bulk messages comprised of complex bids and offers must have a Time-in-Force of Day.[9] This is consistent with the purpose of bulk ports, including for Exchange-designated strategies, which are intended to be used for liquidity provision on the Exchange (particularly Market-Makers).[10] In turn, the Exchange believes it is unnecessary to allow orders entered via bulk ports to be able to last beyond the trading day on which they were entered. This is consistent with why bulk messages were initially limited to a Time-in-Force of Day when Cboe migrated its prior quoting functionality to its new technology in 2019. As noted when the Exchange adopted quote functionality, the Exchange understands it to be common practice in the industry for Market-Makers to enter new quotes at the beginning of a trading day based on then-current market conditions.[11]

Unlike simple bulk messages, the Exchange does not propose to permit complex bulk messages to be designated as Immediate-or-Cancel (''IOC'').[12] The Exchange previously amended Rules 5.5(c) and 5.6(d) to permit appointed Market-Makers to designate bulk messages as IOC, as the Exchange understood that some appointed Market-Makers updated bulk message bids and offers with the specific purpose of removing interest in the simple book.[13] As noted when the Exchange adopted that functionality, in addition to providing liquidity via continuous quotes in Market-Makers' appointed classes, a Market-Maker is also required to maintain active markets in its appointed classes and update quotations in response to changed market conditions in its appointed classes.[14] The Exchange is initially expanding bulk message functionality for complex strategies to encourage the provision of liquidity on the COB for Exchange-designated strategies, including to provide competitive markets to customers for these strategies, and thus initially does not desire to make the IOC designation available to complex bulk messages, the purpose of which is to remove liquidity.[15] As there are no appointments with respect to complex strategies and thus no quoting obligations for Market-Makers with respect to complex strategies, the Exchange does not believe it is necessary at this time to permit IOC complex quotes, given that part of the

[5] Pursuant to Rule 5.33(b)(2)(A), the Exchange may designate complex strategies in which a complex order with Capacity M or N may enter the COB. These designated complex strategies (which the Exchange announces pursuant to Rule 1.5) are the complex strategies in which Market-Makers may submit complex bulk messages.

[6] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 100081 (May 8, 2024), 89 FR 42007 (May 14, 2024) (SR–CBOE–2024–015). The proposed rule change adds to the definition of complex strategy in Rule 5.33(a) that Exchange-designated complex strategies are available for trading during RTH only, as the Exchange does not publicize which strategies will be available until prior to the RTH trading session. If a User wanted to trade in that complex strategy during other trading sessions, it may continue to do so by submitting that complex instrument creation request as it would for any other complex strategy during those trading sessions.

[7] Proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii) states that complex quotes may be submitted on in Exchange-designated complex strategies.

[8] The proposed rule change makes a nonsubstantive change to add Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(i) to contain the current provisions related to simple quotes (including adding introductory language to make clear that provision applies to bulk messages comprised of simple bids and offers changing current subparagraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) to proposed subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c)).

[9] Rule 5.6(d) defines a ''Day'' order as an order or quote that, if not executed, expires at the Regular Trading Hours (''RTH'') market close for all RTH Only orders and expires at the Curb market close for all All Sessions and RTH and Curb orders. The definition already provides that Market-Makers may designate bulk messages as Day. The Exchange proposes to correct a cross-reference in the introductory language in Rule 5.6(d), which currently points to Rule 5.6(j) regarding bulk message Time-in-Force restrictions, but such paragraph does not exist, as those restrictions are in Rule 5.5(c)(3).

[10] The Exchange notes it currently has authority to determine which Times-in-Force are available for complex orders under Rule 5.33(b)(1).

[11] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 86374 (July 15, 2019), 84 FR 34963, 34967 (July 19, 2019) (SR–CBOE–2019–033).

[12] *See* proposed Rule 5.6(d) (definition of IOC).

[13] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92988 (September 15, 2021), 86 FR 52521 (September 21, 2021) (SR–CBOE–2021–053). The Exchange proposes to amend current Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(i) (proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(i)(a)) and the definition of IOC in Rule 5.6(d) to clarify that the IOC designation on simple quotes is permissible only for a Market-Maker with an appointment in a class. As noted above, this is consistent with the rule filing in which that proposed rule change was adopted. The Exchange inadvertently did not make the distinction in the rule text.

[14] *Id.* at 52521.

[15] Permitting only appointed Market-Makers to submit IOC simple quotes is also consistent with current Rule 5.5(c)(3)(B), which requires Market-Makers to designate simple orders submitted through bulk ports as Post Only or Book Only, while all other Users may submit only Post Only orders through bulk ports (and thus may not remove liquidity). As further discussed below, complex orders submitted through bulk ports must be Post Only (as is the case for Users other than appointed Market-Makers for simple orders), and thus the proposed rule change is consistent with the current restrictions on removing liquidity through bulk ports.

Exchange's purpose of providing that functionality for simple quotes to Market-Makers was to assist them with satisfying their quoting obligations.

Similarly, proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii)(b) requires that a bulk message comprised of bids and offers for complex strategies be designated as Post Only.[16] The purpose of a Post Only instruction is to add displayed liquidity to the book. Therefore, restricting complex bulk messages to Post Only is consistent with the purpose of the proposed expansion of bulk message functionality to complex bids and offers. This is consistent with current bulk message functionality for simple bids and offers, which requires bulk messages submitted by non-appointed Market-Makers to be Post Only. Market-Maker appointments, and thus quoting obligations with respect to those appointments, do not apply to complex strategies.[17] Therefore, with respect to complex bulk messages, the concept of appointed Market-Makers is not applicable, and thus all Market-Makers are equivalent to non-appointed Market-Makers with respect to complex bulk messages. One of the primary reasons the Exchange provides appointed Market-Makers with the ability to also designate bulk messages for simple bids and offers as Book Only (which may remove liquidity)[18] is to provide them with additional tools to meet their quoting obligations in a manner they deem appropriate. As noted above, quoting obligations do not apply to complex strategies, so that purpose does not exist with respect to complex bulk messages. As the Exchange's primary purpose of expanding bulk message functionality to complex orders is to enhance liquidity provision within Exchange-designated complex strategies and Market-Makers will not be subject to quoting obligations with respect to these strategies, the Exchange believes limiting complex bulk messages to Post Only is appropriate. The Exchange notes users may continue submit complex orders with the Book Only instruction, or any other instruction the Exchange permits pursuant to Rule 5.33(b), through other ports in the same manner as they do today.

Proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii)(c) permits Market-Makers to apply the same match trade prevention (''MTP'') modifiers to complex bulk messages that are permitted for simple bulk messages. Specifically, Market-Makers may establish a default MTP modifier of MTP Cancel Newest (''MCN''), MTP Cancel Oldest (''MCO''), or MTP Cancel Both (''MCB''),[19] and a default value of attributable or non-attributable, for a bulk port, each of which applies to all bulk messages submitted to the Exchange through that bulk port.[20] Allowing the same three MTP modifiers for complex bulk messages that are available for simple bulk messages will provide Market-Makers with additional control over the circumstances in which their bulk message bids and offers (and resting orders (including bulk message bids and offers)) will interact with each other. The Exchange does not believe there is demand by Market-Makers for the other MTP modifiers for bulk messages. The Exchange notes all Market-Makers may continue to apply all MTP modifiers to complex orders submitted through a bulk port or any other type of port.

As is the case for simple orders, all Users[21] (not just Market-Makers, as is the case for quotes) may submit single complex orders through a bulk port[22] in the same manner as users may currently submit complex orders to the Exchange through any other type of port.[23] Currently, with respect to simple orders submitted through bulk ports, a Market-Maker with an appointment in a class must designate an order for that class as Post Only or Book Only, and non-appointed Market-Makers must designate a bulk message as Post Only (both of which are consistent with the restrictions for simple quotes, as discussed above). The Exchange believes it is appropriate for orders submitted through bulk ports to be subject to the same restrictions on adding and removing liquidity as bulk messages submitted through bulk ports, so that orders submitted through bulk ports do not have an advantage over bulk messages, and vice versa.[24] To that end, the proposed rule change amends current Rule 5.6(c)(3)(B) (proposed Rule 5.6(c)(3)(B)(i)) to provide that a User must designate an order as Day or GTD (the date of which must be for the date on which the order was entered)[25] to be consistent with the requirement that a simple quote must be designated as Day (except for appointed Market-Makers who may also designate a simple quote as IOC). Such a GTD order is practically equivalent to a Day order, as both would be available for execution on that specific date only (and until a specific time with respect to a GTD). Similarly, proposed Rule 5.6(c)(3)(B)(ii) requires a User to designate a complex order submitted through a bulk port as Day or GTD (the date of which must be for the date on which the order was entered). This restriction is consistent with the purpose of bulk ports, which, as discussed above, is to encourage liquidity provision, which generally involves providing bids and offers reflecting then-current market conditions. The Day and GTD (the date

[16] Rule 5.6(c) defines ''Post Only'' as an order the System ranks and executes pursuant to Rule 5.32 (subject to the Price Adjust process), as applicable, except the order or quote may not remove liquidity from the book or route away to another exchange.

[17] *See* Rule 5.33, Interpretation and Policy .01. The Exchange proposes a clarifying change to Rule 5.33, Interpretation and Policy .01 to note that Interpretation and Policy. 02 does include an exception to the statement made in Interpretation and Policy .01 that the Exchange does not take into account a Market-Maker's complex orders entered in its appointed classes when determining whether a Market-Maker meets its quoting obligations pursuant to Rule 5.52. While that is true, pursuant to Rule 5.33, Interpretation and Policy .02, there is one exception to this, which is that the Exchange does consider a Market-Maker's executions in complex strategies within its appointed classes to determine whether the Market-Maker exceeds electronic volume thresholds pursuant to Rule 5.52(d)(1) and (d)(2) (which in turn determines what that Market-Maker's quoting obligations may be). This has no impact on a Market-Maker's quoting obligations and is merely adding clarity to the Rules. Additionally, the Exchange proposes to add the phrase ''and quotes'' to Rule 5.33, Interpretation and Policy .02. This is a nonsubstantive clarification. Given the interpretation and policy relates specific to Market-Makers, and the term quote (with respect to electronic trading) means a firm bid or offer a Market-Maker submits electronically in an order or bulk message (see definition of ''quote'' in Rule 1.1), this Interpretation and Policy already applies to quotes, and the proposed rule change merely provides additional transparency and clarity within the rules. Similarly, the proposed rule change adds a nonsubstantive clarification to the definition of ''complex order'' in Rule 1.1 to reference quotes in addition to orders. Market-Makers may currently submit complex orders, which by definition would be considered quotes.

[18] *See* Rule 5.6(c) (definition of Book Only).

[19] *See* Rule 5.6(c) for definitions of MTP modifiers.

[20] *See* proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii)(c).

[21] The term ''User'' means any Trading Permit Holder (''TPH'') or Sponsored User (see Rule 3.60) authorized to obtain access to the Exchange's trading system. *See* Rule 1.1 (definition of User).

[22] The proposed rule change makes a conforming change to Rule 5.33(b)(4) to provide that Users may submit complex orders through bulk ports, subject to the restrictions set forth in proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3) (as discussed above). Users may continue to submit complex orders through any other port as they do today.

[23] The Exchange proposes to delete the language ''in the same manner as Users may submit orders to the Exchange through any other type of port, including designated with any Order Instruction and any Time-in-Force in Rule 5.30.'' This is not a substantive change, as it is still true. However, the Exchange believes simplifying the provision to solely reference the exceptions to the submission of orders (as is done for quotes (bulk messages) in proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)) simplifies the rule text.

[24] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 86374 (July 15, 2019), 84 FR 34963, 34968 (July 19, 2019) (SR–CBOE–2019–033).

[25] A ''Good-til-Date'' or ''GTD'' order is an order, if after entry into the System is not fully executed, the order (or unexecuted portion) remains available for potential display or execution (with the same timestamp) until a date and time specified by the entering User unless cancelled by that User. *See* Rule 5.6(d) (definition of GTD).

of which must be for the date on which the order was entered) restriction for orders submitted through bulk ports supports that and reflects current industry practice in which liquidity providers submit new bids and offers at the beginning of a trading day (as discussed above).

Additionally, the proposed rule change requires a complex order submitted through a bulk port to be designated as Post Only, as is the case for simple orders submitted by all Users other than appointed Market-Makers.[26] The Exchange believes this will encourage users that may not have quoting systems to provide liquidity to the Exchange. This is consistent with simple orders that users other than appointed Market-Makers may submit through bulk ports (as discussed above, the distinction for appointed Market-Makers is unnecessary for complex bulk messages and orders submitted through bulk ports). Because there are no time-in-force restrictions on orders submitted through bulk ports, users may allow their liquidity to rest on the Exchange for multiple trading days, if users so choose. This will also provide users with additional control over the orders they use to provide liquidity to the Exchange through bulk ports. The Exchange believes it is appropriate for orders submitted through bulk ports to be subject to the same restrictions on adding and removing liquidity as bulk messages submitted through bulk ports, so that orders submitted through bulk ports do not have an advantage over bulk messages, and vice versa. As noted above, users may continue submit complex orders with the Book Only, or any other instruction the Exchange permits pursuant to Rule 5.33(b), through other ports in the same manner as they do today. As noted above, the requirements set forth in proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(B)(ii) impose the same restrictions on adding and removing liquidity using complex orders submitted through bulk ports as complex bulk messages, so that orders submitted through bulk ports do not have an advantage over bulk messages, and vice versa.[27]

Users will also be able to submit auction responses for complex order auctions (such as COAs) in the same manner as they may currently submit auction responses to the Exchange through any other type of port.[28] The proposed rule change merely adds the ability for Users that decide to obtain bulk ports to submit auction responses through that port, rather than maintain a separate port for that purpose. This is consistent with the purpose of bulk ports, as auction responses are a form of liquidity provision given their purpose is to trade against an exposed auction order at potentially improved prices (and auction responses are currently permitted in bulk ports for simple auctions).

Current Rule 5.7(a) provides that a user may only enter one bid and one offer for a series per EFID per bulk port. The proposed rule change similarly provides that Users may only enter one bid and one offer for a complex strategy per EFID per bulk port. The addition of ''complex strategy'' to this rule provision conforms to the changes in this rule filing that permit complex interest to be submitted through bulk ports. The Exchange believes the proposed rule change, as was the case for simple interest submitted through bulk ports, will encourage users that use bulk port functionality to submit bids and offers for a complex strategy to submit their best bids and offers in that strategy and thus provide displayed liquidity to the market and contribute to price discovery. Note firms may have multiple EFIDs and multiple bulk ports and thus will have the ability through separate ports or EFIDs to submit additional bids and offers using bulk messages in the same strategy if they choose.

Generally, the System will handle bulk message bids and offers for complex strategies in the same manner as it handles orders and quotes with the same order instructions and times-in-force that will be applied to bulk messages, including prioritizing, displaying, and executing them pursuant to Rule 5.33. The proposed rule change makes the following changes to Rule 5.33 with respect to complex bulk messages:

- The proposed rule change amends Rule 5.33(b)(1) to add a cross-reference to proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3) regarding the proposed restriction on Time-in-Force applicable to complex bulk messages (which as discussed above may only have a Time-in-Force of Day).
- The proposed rule change amends the definition of a COA-eligible complex order in Rule 5.33(c)(5) to provide that a complex bid or offer submitted in a bulk message is not COA-eligible. This is consistent with the purpose of quote message functionality, which is to provide liquidity to the book (COB in the case of complex quotes).[29] The purpose of complex bulk messages will be to enter the COB to execute against COA-d orders (users may also submit COA responses through bulk ports, as discussed above).
- Similarly, the proposed rule change adds Rule 5.33(g)(7) to provide that a complex bid or offer submitted in a bulk message does not leg into the simple book to execute against simple orders and quotes resting in the simple book.[30] As discussed above, given the purpose of complex bids and offers submitted in bulk messages is to provide displayed liquidity in the COB, such purpose would not be achieved if these bids and offers legged into the simple book for execution. Even though a bid or offer submitted in a complex order may leg into the simple book (if not marked complex only or Post Only), but the same bid or offer in a complex bulk message would not, the Exchange believes this is consistent with all of the proposed complex quote restrictions discussed above, which are to create resting liquidity in the COB and not remove any liquidity. Legging into the simple book is a type of removal, and that would be inconsistent with the proposed rule change that bulk messages must be Post Only. Currently, a Post Only complex order does not leg into the simple book.[31] Additionally, a simple bulk message must be Post Only and thus not may remove liquidity from the simple book. Therefore, not having a complex bid or offer submitted in a bulk message be able to remove liquidity from the simple book is consistent with the restrictions currently applicable to simple bulk messages that non-appointed Market-Makers may submit today, merely extended to complex bulk messages. Market-Makers and other liquidity providers separately may submit simple bids and offers for the purpose of providing liquidity to simple orders resting in the simple book, or submit complex orders through another port type that would have the opportunity to leg into the simple book (depending on prices available on that book).

Finally, the proposed rule change moves the bulk message fat finger check from current Rule 5.34(a)(5) to proposed

[26] *See* proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(B)(ii). The proposed rule change creates subparagraphs (i) and (ii) within Rule 5.5(c)(3)(B) to distinguish between simple and complex orders submitted through a bulk port and adds introductory language to proposed subparagraph (i) to indicate that subparagraph relates to simple orders.

[27] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 86374 (July 15, 2019), 84 FR 34963, 34968 (July 19, 2019) (SR–CBOE–2019–033).

[28] *See* Rule 5.5(c)(3)(C).

[29] The purpose of an auction, such as COA, is to attempt to find liquidity against which the auctioned order may execute upon submission to the Exchange, including at potentially improved prices.

[30] This is consistent with the ''Complex Only'' instruction available to Market-Makers.

[31] *See* Rule 5.33(g)(4).

Rule 5.34(c)(12), as it will apply to bulk messages containing simple or complex bids and offers. The proposed rule change amends the check solely to include reference to the synthetic national best bid or offer (''SNBBO''), which will be the reference point for complex bulk messages (rather than the national best bid or offer which applies to simple bulk messages). It will otherwise apply to complex bulk message bids and offers in the same manner as it applies to simple bulk message bids and offers.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act'') and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to the Exchange and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[32] Specifically, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5) [33] requirements that the rules of an exchange be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. Additionally, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5) [34] requirement that the rules of an exchange not be designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers.

In particular, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change to adopt complex bulk message functionality, as described above, will remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and, in general, protect investors, by encouraging further provision and consolidation of liquidity for complex strategies and increasing execution opportunities for customers. The Exchange began listing Exchange-designated complex strategies in June 2024 [35] to address fragmentation of liquidity across multiple customer-created complex instruments expressing a similar exposure profile. The creation of complex strategies, including commonly traded ones, has allowed for the consolidation of liquidity within a single complex strategy that was otherwise spread across multiple customer-created complex instruments expressing the same or similar exposure profiles to increase execution opportunities at more competitive prices, to the benefit of investors. The Exchange understands from Market-Makers that they would be able to enhance their liquidity provision for these strategies if they could use the same quote functionality (bulk messages) for these strategies as they do for individual series. The proposed rule change accommodates the expansion of bulk message functionality to be used for these Exchange-designated complex strategies, which the Exchange believes will further increase liquidity in these often commonly traded strategies. This may lead to more interest with displayed prices on the COB to indicate to customers the prices at which liquidity providers are willing to trade against their complex strategies, which may lead to more competitive pricing and additional execution opportunities, to the benefit of investors.

As proposed, bulk port functionality for complex bids and offers will be available to all Users (including all Market-Makers with respect to complex bulk messages) in a substantially similar manner it is currently available for simple orders and quotes for all Users other than appointed Market-Makers. As discussed above, Market-Makers have no quoting obligations for complex strategies, and thus it is reasonable to impose the same restrictions on complex bulk messages and complex orders submitted through bulk ports that apply to simple bulk messages and simple orders submitted through bulk ports by all Users other than appointed Market-Makers. Specifically, complex bulk messages and orders must be designated as Post Only, which is consistent with requirements for simple bulk messages and orders submitted through bulk ports for users other than appointed Market-Makers. The Day and Post Only requirements, as well as not permitting complex bulk messages to leg into the simple markets or initiate COAs (which is the case today for Post Only complex orders), are consistent with the ultimate purpose of bulk port functionality, which is to provide consolidated liquidity to the COB. The Exchange notes all Users may continue to submit complex orders for any complex strategy with any Time-in-Force and Order Instruction otherwise permissible under Rule 5.33 through any port as they do today. The proposed rule change is accommodating an expansion of current quoting functionality to Market-Makers to provide them with more tools and flexibility to provide liquidity to the COB within commonly traded complex strategies, which the Exchange believes may further consolidate liquidity for these complex strategies, which may ultimately lead to more competitive pricing for these strategies as well as increased execution opportunities for customers within these strategies. This may result in more efficient execution of complex interest and will provide users with additional flexibility and increased functionality on the Exchange's System, which may benefit all investors.

The proposed rule change to apply the bulk message fat finger check to complex quotes will protect investors and the public interest and maintain fair and orderly markets by mitigating potential risks associated with market participants entering complex quotes at unintended prices, and risks associated with quotes trading at prices that are extreme and potentially erroneous, which may likely have resulted from human or operational error. The fat finger check will apply to complex quotes in the same manner it does to simple quotes, except it will use complex pricing (SNBBO) rather than simple pricing (NBBO).

The proposed rule change to permit Market-Makers to enter complex orders as GTD for the same day will protect investors and the public interest, as a GTD for a specific day is functionally equivalent to a Day Order, so it provides Users with additional flexibility regarding the entry of orders through bulk ports. Users may achieve the same result as a GTD for the same day to be available up to a specific time by submitting an order with a Day instruction and then cancelling it at that time. A GTD order to expire at the close of trading on a specific day achieves the same result as a Day order.

The proposed rule change to clarify that the IOC designation on simple quotes is available only to an appointed Market-Maker will benefit investors by adding transparency and clarity to the Rules. As discussed above, this language was inadvertently omitted when the Exchange previously amended its rules to permit an IOC designation on simple quotes. It is consistent with current Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(ii), which permits appointed Market-Makers to remove liquidity (with a Book Only instruction) while other Market-Makers may only add liquidity (with a Post Only instruction). As discussed above, the Exchange amended its Rules to permit

[32] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[33] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[34] *Id.*

[35] *See* Exchange Notice C2024040200, *available at* Cboe Options Exchange Announces Quoted Spread Book in Designated SPX/SPXW Complex Instruments.

the IOC instruction on simple quotes because it understood that some appointed Market-Makers updated quotes with the specific purpose of removing interest in the simple book.[36] As noted in that rule filing, in addition to providing liquidity via continuous quotes in Market-Makers' appointed classes, a Market-Maker is also required to maintain active markets in its appointed classes and update quotations in response to changed market conditions in its appointed classes.[37] This proposed rule change merely codifies what is permissible today in accordance with the Exchange's previous filing.

The Exchange believes the various nonsubstantive proposed rule changes (Rules 1.1, 5.5(c)(3), 5.6(d) (introductory paragraph and definition of IOC), 5.33(a) (definition of complex strategy), (b)(1), and Interpretations .01 and .02) will protect investors and the public interest, as they add transparency and clarity to the Rules, which may reduce potential confusion for investors. Because they are nonsubstantive clarifications, they have no impact on investors or trading on the Exchange.

The proposed rule change is consistent with the CAT NMS Plan (''CAT Plan''), as complex quotes will be reported to the Consolidated Audit Trail (''CAT'') in the same manner as simple quotes are currently reported to the CAT. As set forth in Section 6.4(d)(iii) of the CAT Plan and Exchange Rule 7.22(a)(3), an Options Market Maker (as defined in the CAT Plan) is not required to report to CAT information regarding quotes and instead must report the quote sent time to the applicable options exchange, which time the exchange will then report to CAT in lieu of reporting by the Options Market Maker. In connection with this provision,[38] the Exchange issued a regulatory circular stating which types of messages submitted to the Exchange from Market-Makers were subject to that exemption.[39] Specifically, bulk messages (*i.e.,* quote messages) (which may only be submitted by Market-Makers as discussed above) must include a quote sent time, and Market-Makers would not be required to send the data regarding bulk messages to CAT, while Market-Makers would be required to send data regarding order messages directly to CAT. Currently, Market-Makers send data regarding complex order messages to CAT in accordance with Exchange Rules and the CAT Plan. The proposed complex bulk message (*i.e.,* quote message) functionality would be subject to the exemption in the same manner as simple quoting functionality currently is. In other words, Market-Makers will need to include a quote sent time on their complex bulk messages and would not be required to send the data regarding those complex bulk messages to CAT, but would need to continue sending data regarding complex order messages directly to CAT. While this may result in complex interest that is currently reported directly by Market-Makers to CAT no longer being reported if Market-Makers instead use complex bulk messages rather than complex order messages to submit interest to the Exchange, it is consistent with the OMM Exemption Approval. Specifically, the Commission stated ''[t]o the extent the options exchanges would report the same data otherwise reported by Options Market Makers in an efficient, accurate and reliable manner, then the ability of the Commission and the SROs to access and use CAT Data should not be adversely affected. Moreover, the potentially lower cost associated with eliminating duplicative reporting and storage of such data represents a possible benefit.'' [40] The Exchange will report the same data with respect to Market-Maker complex bulk messages in the same manner it reports data with respect to Market-Maker simple bulk message, and thus regulators will have access to sufficient information for regulatory purposes. The fact that a bid or offer in a complex bulk message represents strategies of two or more legs rather than a single leg as is the case for a bid or offer in a simple bulk message has no impact on this finding.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on intramarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, because bulk port functionality for complex strategies will be available to all users in the same manner. It will work in the same manner as bulk port functionality currently available for simple interest for all Users, including Market-Makers (other than appointed Market-Makers, which is not applicable in the complex market, as discussed above). Use of bulk port functionality for complex interest is also voluntary, and all Users may continue to submit complex interest through other ports in the same manner they do today. The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on intermarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, because many exchanges offer quoting functionality similar to bulk message functionality, at least one of which makes that quoting functionality available for complex interest.[41]

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange neither solicited nor received written comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not: (i) significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act [42] and subparagraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[43]

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such

[36] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92988 (September 15, 2021), 86 FR 52521 (September 21, 2021) (SR–CBOE–2021–053). The Exchange proposes to amend current Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(i) (proposed Rule 5.5(c)(3)(A)(i)(a)) and the definition of IOC in Rule 5.6(d) to clarify that the IOC designation on simple quotes is permissible only for a Market-Maker with an appointment in a class. As noted above, this is consistent with the rule filing in which that proposed rule change as adopted. The Exchange inadvertently did not make the distinction in the rule text.

[37] *Id.* at 52521.

[38] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 77265 (March 1, 2016), 81 FR 11856 (March 7, 2016) (''OMM Exemption Approval'').

[39] *See* Regulatory Circular 20–044 (July 7, 2020), *available at* RC20–044 Options Market Maker Quote SendTime Requirements for CAT Reporting.

[40] OMM Exemption Approval at 11858.

[41] *See, e.g.,* Miami International Securities Exchange, LLC (''MIAX'') Rule 518, Interpretation and Policy .02 (which permits complex bids and offers to be submitted as ''eQuotes,'' as defined in MIAX Rule 517).

[42] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[43] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6). In addition, Rule 19b–4(f)(6) requires a self-regulatory organization to give the Commission written notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change at least five business days prior to the date of filing of the proposed rule change, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. The Exchange has satisfied this requirement.

action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number SR–CBOE–2025–059 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–CBOE–2025–059. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR–CBOE–2025–059 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[44]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15625 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[44] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103696; File No. SR–CBOE–2025–057]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of a Proposed Rule Change To Amend Certain Lead Market-Maker (''LMM'') Incentive Programs by Increasing or Decreasing Quote Width and Size Requirements, and Increasing or Decreasing Rebate Amounts, as Applicable, and To Amend the Fees Schedule To Include Further Clarifying Information Regarding the Operation of Its LMM Incentive Programs

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on August 7, 2025, Cboe Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''Cboe Options'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

Cboe Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''Cboe Options'') proposes to amend certain Lead Market-Maker (''LMM'') Incentive Programs by increasing or decreasing quote width and size requirements, and increasing or decreasing rebate amounts, as applicable, and to amend the Fees Schedule to include further clarifying information regarding the operation of its LMM Incentive Programs. The text of the proposed rule change is provided in Exhibit 5.

The text of the proposed rule change is also available on the Exchange's website (*https://www.cboe.com/us/options/regulation/rule_filings/*) and at the Exchange's Office of the Secretary.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend its Fees Schedule.[3]

The Exchange proposes to amend its Fees Schedule in connection with certain LMM Incentive Programs. Specifically, the Exchange proposes to amend its Global Trading Hours (''GTH'') Cboe Volatility Index (''VIX'') options and VIX Weekly (''VIXW'') options LMM Incentive Programs, GTH S&P 500 Index (''SPX'') options and SPX Weekly (''SPXW'') options LMM Incentive Programs, GTH Mini-SPX Index (''XSP'') options LMM Incentive Programs, Cboe Mini Bitcoin U.S. ETF Index (''MBTX'') options and MBTX Weekly (''MBTXW'') options LMM Incentive Program, Cboe Bitcoin U.S. ETF Index (''CBTX'') options and CBTX Weekly (''CBTXW'') options LMM Incentive Program, and S&P 500 Equal Weight Index (''SPEQX'') options LMM Incentive Program.

All LMM Incentive Programs provide a rebate to Trading Permit Holders (''TPHs'') with LMM appointments to the respective incentive program that meet certain quoting standards in the applicable series in a month. The Exchange notes that meeting or exceeding the quoting standards (both current and as proposed; described in further detail below) in each of the LMM Incentive Program products to receive the applicable rebate (both currently offered and as proposed; described in further detail below) is optional for an LMM appointed to a program. Particularly, an LMM appointed to an incentive program is eligible to receive the corresponding rebate if it satisfies the applicable quoting standards, which the Exchange believes encourages appointed LMMs to provide liquidity in the applicable class and trading session (*i.e.,* Regular Trading Hours (''RTH'') or GTH). The Exchange may consider other exceptions to the programs' quoting standards based on demonstrated legal

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] The Exchange initially filed the proposed fee changes on August 1, 2025 (SR–CBOE–2025–052). On August 7, 2025, the Exchange withdrew that filing and submitted SR–CBOE–2025–057.

or regulatory requirements or other mitigating circumstances. In calculating whether an LMM appointed to an incentive program meets the applicable program's quoting standards each month, the Exchange excludes from the calculation in that month the business day in which the LMM missed meeting or exceeding the quoting standards in the highest number of the applicable series.

GTH VIX/VIXW LMM Incentive Program

The Exchange proposes to amend the GTH VIX/VIXW LMM Incentive Program. The proposed program provides that, if the appointed LMM provides continuous electronic quotes during GTH (*i.e.,* from 7:15pm CST to 8:25am CST the next day) that meet or exceed the VIXW and VIX basic quoting standards [4] in at least 95% of each of the VIX and VIXW series, 90% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive a rebate for that month in the amount of $25,000 for VIX and $10,000 for VIXW (or pro-rated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month) for that month.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of VIX heightened basic quoting standards (below) under the GTH VIX/VIXW LMM Incentive Program (new proposed widths are denoted with an asterisk).

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Long term	
	Less than 15 days		15 days to 60 days		61 days to 180 days		181 days or Greater	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
VIX Value at Prior Close <18								
$0.00–$1.00	$0.20	30	$0.16	40	$0.20	30	$0.50	5
$1.01–$3.00	0.30	20	0.25	25	0.25	15	0.70	5
$3.01–$5.00	0.40	15	0.30	15	0.40	10	1.00	5
$5.01–$10.00	0.80	10	*0.90	10	2.00	10	2.00	5
$10.01–$30.00	*1.80	5	*1.40	5	*1.80	5	3.00	3
Greater than $30.00	*4.50	3	*4.50	3	*4.50	3	5.00	3
VIX Value at Prior Close from 18–25								
$0.00–$1.00	0.30	15	0.30	30	0.30	15	1.00	5
$1.01–$3.00	0.35	10	0.35	20	0.40	10	1.00	5
$3.01–$5.00	0.50	5	0.50	15	0.60	5	1.30	5
$5.01–$10.00	*1.00	5	*1.00	5	1.50	5	2.20	5
$10.01–$30.00	*2.50	1	*2.50	1	*2.50	1	5.00	1
Greater than $30.00	*5.00	1	*5.00	1	*5.00	1	*8.00	1
VIX Value at Prior Close from >25								
$0.00–$1.00	0.80	10	0.50	10	0.60	10	1.20	5
$1.01–$3.00	1.00	10	0.75	10	1.00	10	1.20	5
$3.01–$5.00	1.20	5	0.90	10	1.20	5	1.80	5
$5.01–$10.00	2.00	5	1.50	5	2.50	5	3.00	3
$10.01–$30.00	*4.00	1	*4.00	1	*4.00	1	*6.00	1
Greater than $30.00	10.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	1

Finally, the Exchange proposes a change to the rebates offered by the GTH VIX/VIXW LMM Incentive Program to an LMM appointed to the program for meeting the heightened quoting standards in a given month. The Exchange proposes to increase the rebate from $25,000 to $30,000 for the GTH VIX LMM Incentive Program, and decrease the rebate from $10,000 to $5,000 for the GTH VIXW LMM Incentive Program.

GTH SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Programs

The Exchange proposes to amend the GTH1 and GTH2 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Programs. Currently, the GTH1 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Program provides that if the appointed LMM in SPX/SPXW provides during continuous electronic quotes during GTH from 7:15PM CST to 2:00AM CST (''GTH1'') that meet or exceed the program's heightened quoting standards [5] in at least 85% of the SPX and SPXW series 90% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive a rebate for that month in the amount of $25,000 (or pro-rated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month). Separately, LMM's may earn an additional $15,000 compensation for satisfying the Mid Term (23 days to 37 days to expiry) quoting requirements.

Similarly, the GTH2 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Program provides that if the appointed LMM in SPX/SPXW provides during continuous electronic quotes during GTH from 2:00AM CST to 8:25AM CST (''GTH2'') that meet or exceed the program's heightened quoting standards [6] in at least 85% of the SPX and SPXW series 90% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive a rebate for that month in the amount of $25,000 (or pro-rated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month). Separately, LMMs may earn an additional $15,000 compensation for satisfying the Mid Term (23 days to 37 days to expiry) quoting requirements

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of SPX/SPXW heightened basic quoting standards (below) under the GTH1 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive

[4] Located in the ''GTH VIX/VIXW LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

[5] Located in the ''GTH1 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

[6] Located in the ''GTH2 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

Program (new proposed widths are denoted with an asterisk).

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Mid-long term		Long term	
	7 days or less		8 days to 22 days		23 days to 37 days		38 to 180 days		181 to 500 days	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
VIX Value at Prior Close <20										
$0.00–$5.00	$0.50	15	$0.40	15	*$0.25	10	$0.60	5	$1.20	5
$5.01–$15.00	0.70	15	0.70	15	*0.40	10	1.50	5	2.50	5
$15.01–$50.00	1.40	10	2.00	15	*1.60	10	2.00	5	5.00	5
$50.01–$100.00	7.00	5	4.00	10	*2.20	5	3.50	5	6.00	5
$100.01–$200.00	18.00	1	6.00	5	3.00	5	5.00	5	8.00	5
Greater than $200.00	24.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	1	12.00	1	50.00	1
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥20 and <30										
$0.00–$5.00	0.70	10	0.80	10	0.60	5	0.75	5	2.00	5
$5.01–$15.00	1.20	10	1.10	10	1.00	5	2.40	5	3.50	5
$15.01–$50.00	*2.75	10	3.50	10	3.00	5	3.50	5	6.00	5
$50.01–$100.00	*10.00	5	*6.00	5	5.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5
$100.01–$200.00	*20.00	1	10.00	1	6.00	1	7.00	5	12.00	5
Greater than $200.00	30.00	1	12.00	1	*12.00	1	20.00	1	60.00	1
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥30										
$0.00–$5.00	*2.00	5	1.20	5	1.00	5	1.00	5	3.00	5
$5.01–$15.00	3.00	5	2.70	5	2.20	5	3.00	5	5.00	5
$15.01–$50.00	5.00	5	5.50	5	4.00	5	4.00	5	8.00	5
$50.01–$100.00	*15.00	5	12.00	5	8.00	5	5.00	3	10.00	1
$100.01–$200.00	20.00	1	15.00	5	10.00	5	15.00	1	18.00	1
Greater than $200.00	30.00	1	30.00	1	20.00	1	30.00	1	70.00	1

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of SPX/SPXW heightened basic quoting standards (below) under the GTH2 SPX/SPXW LMM Incentive Program (new proposed widths are denoted with an asterisk).

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Mid-long term		Long term	
	7 days or less		8 days to 22 days		23 days to 37 days		38 to 180 days		181 to 500 days	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
VIX Value at Prior Close <20										
$0.00–$5.00	$0.35	25	$0.40	15	*$0.25	15	$0.60	5	$1.20	5
$5.01–$15.00	0.80	20	0.60	20	*0.40	15	1.50	10	2.00	5
$15.01–$50.00	1.80	15	2.00	15	*1.20	10	2.00	10	4.00	5
$50.01–$100.00	*6.50	10	*3.00	10	*2.00	5	3.00	10	5.00	5
$100.01–$200.00	15.00	1	5.00	5	3.00	5	4.00	5	6.00	5
Greater than $200.00	20.00	1	8.00	1	8.00	1	12.00	1	50.00	1
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥20 and <30										
$0.00–$5.00	0.60	15	0.80	10	0.40	10	0.75	5	2.00	5
$5.01–$15.00	1.00	15	1.00	15	0.80	10	2.20	5	3.00	5
$15.01–$50.00	2.50	10	3.50	10	3.00	5	3.00	5	5.00	5
$50.01–$100.00	*9.00	10	*6.00	10	5.00	5	3.50	5	7.00	5
$100.01–$200.00	*15.00	1	8.00	5	6.00	1	6.00	5	10.00	5
Greater than $200.00	25.00	1	12.00	1	10.00	1	20.00	1	60.00	1
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥30										
$0.00–$5.00	0.90	10	1.00	10	0.80	5	1.00	5	3.00	5
$5.01–$15.00	2.50	10	2.50	10	2.00	5	3.00	5	4.00	5
$15.01–$50.00	4.00	10	5.00	10	3.50	5	4.00	5	8.00	5
$50.01–$100.00	*10.00	5	10.00	5	8.00	5	4.50	3	10.00	1
$100.01–$200.00	20.00	1	12.00	5	10.00	5	15.00	1	18.00	1
Greater than $200.00	30.00	1	25.00	1	20.00	1	30.00	1	70.00	1

GTH XSP LMM Incentive Programs

The Exchange proposes to amend the GTH1 and GTH2 XSP LMM Incentive Programs. Currently, the GTH1 XSP LMM Incentive Program provides that if the appointed LMM in XSP provides during continuous electronic quotes during GTH1 that meet or exceed the program's heightened quoting standards [7] in at least 85% of each of the XSP series 90% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive a rebate

[7] Located in the ''GTH1 XSP LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

for that month in the amount of $20,000 (or pro-rated amounts if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month) for that month.

The GTH2 XSP LMM Incentive Program provides that if the appointed LMM in XSP provides during continuous electronic quotes during GTH2 that meet or exceed the program's heightened quoting standards [8] in at least 85% of the series 90% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive a payment for that month in the amount of $20,000 (or pro-rated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month) for that month.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of heightened quoting standards for each program. The proposed heightened quoting standards for XSP options during GTH1 are as follows in the table below (new proposed widths are denoted with an asterisk):

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Long term	
	7 days or less		8 days to 60 days		61 days to 270 days		271 to 500 days	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
VIX Value at Prior Close <20								
$0.01–$1.00	$0.08	5	$0.08	5	$0.10	5	$0.15	5
$1.01–$5.00	0.12	5	0.12	5	0.15	5	0.20	5
$5.01–$8.00	0.20	5	0.20	5	0.30	5	0.40	5
$8.01–$12.00	0.40	5	0.50	5	0.80	5	1.00	5
$12.01–$20.00	0.80	5	1.00	5	1.00	5	1.50	5
Greater than $20.00	1.50	5	2.00	5	2.00	5	3.00	5
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥20 and <30								
$0.01–$1.00	0.12	5	0.12	5	0.15	5	0.20	5
$1.01–$5.00	0.15	5	0.15	5	0.20	5	0.30	5
$5.01–$8.00	0.25	5	0.25	5	0.40	5	0.70	5
$8.01–$12.00	0.60	5	0.80	5	1.10	5	1.50	5
$12.01–$20.00	1.00	5	1.30	5	1.80	5	2.20	5
Greater than $20.00	2.00	5	2.40	5	2.80	5	3.60	5
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥30								
$0.01–$1.00	0.15	5	0.16	5	0.20	5	0.30	5
$1.01–$5.00	*0.50	5	*0.50	5	*0.50	5	*0.80	5
$5.01–$8.00	*0.60	5	*0.60	5	*0.70	5	*1.20	5
$8.01–$12.00	*1.00	5	0.90	5	1.20	5	1.50	5
$12.01–$20.00	1.20	5	1.50	5	2.00	5	2.40	5
Greater than $20.00	2.40	5	2.80	5	3.20	5	4.00	5

The proposed heightened quoting standards for XSP options during GTH2 are as follows in the table below (new proposed widths are denoted with an asterisk):

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Long term	
	7 days or less		8 days to 60 days		61 days to 270 days		271 to 500 days	
	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width
VIX Value at Prior Close <20								
$0.01–$1.00	$0.05	5	$0.07	5	$0.08	5	$0.12	5
$1.01–$5.00	0.10	5	0.10	5	0.12	5	0.16	5
$5.01–$8.00	0.16	5	0.16	5	0.20	5	0.40	5
$8.01–$12.00	0.30	5	0.40	5	0.60	5	0.80	5
$12.01–$20.00	0.80	5	0.80	5	0.80	5	1.20	5
Greater than $20.00	2.00	5	2.00	5	2.00	5	3.00	5
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥20 and <30								
$0.01–$1.00	0.10	5	0.10	5	0.12	5	0.20	5
$1.01–$5.00	0.14	5	0.15	5	0.16	5	0.30	5
$5.01–$8.00	0.20	5	0.20	5	0.30	5	0.60	5
$8.01–$12.00	0.50	5	0.70	5	1.00	5	1.30	5
$12.01–$20.00	1.00	5	1.20	5	1.50	5	2.20	5
Greater than $20.00	2.00	5	2.40	5	2.40	5	3.60	5

[8] Located in the ''GTH2 XSP LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Long term	
	7 days or less		8 days to 60 days		61 days to 270 days		271 to 500 days	
	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥30								
$0.01–$1.00	0.15	5	0.16	5	0.20	5	0.30	5
$1.01–$5.00	*0.30	5	*0.30	5	*0.40	5	*0.60	5
$5.01–$8.00	*0.40	5	*0.40	5	*0.60	5	*1.00	5
$8.01–$12.00	0.60	5	0.90	5	1.20	5	1.50	5
$12.01–$20.00	1.20	5	1.50	5	2.00	5	2.40	5
Greater than $20.00	2.40	5	2.80	5	3.20	5	4.00	5

RTH MBTX/MBTW LMM Incentive Program

The Exchange proposes to amend the RTH MBTX/MBTXW LMM Incentive Program (''MBTX LMM Incentive Program''). The MBTX LMM Incentive Program provides that if the appointed LMM provides continuous electronic quotes during RTH that meet or exceed the program's heightened quoting standards [9] in at least 85% of MBTX series 85% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive (i) a payment for that month in the amount of $10,000 (or pro-rated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month) for that month and (ii) a credit of $0.25/contract applied to all MBTX contracts executed in Market-Maker capacity during RTH.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of MBTX heightened quoting standards (below) (new proposed widths and sizes are denoted with an asterisk).

Premium level	6 days or less		7 days to 14 days		15 days to 60 days		61 to 120 days		121 to 270 days	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
$0.00–$1.00	*$0.05	15	*$0.10	15	*$0.10	10	$0.15	5	$0.25	5
$1.01–$3.00	0.20	15	0.20	15	0.20	10	*0.20	5	*0.40	5
$3.01–$5.00	*0.45	15	*0.45	15	*0.45	10	0.40	5	*0.80	5
$5.01–$10.00	*0.60	5	0.60	10	0.60	*15	0.60	5	*1.75	3
$10.01–$20.00	*1.40	1	5.00	1	6.00	*5	*0.90	5	*2.40	3
$20.01–$50.00	8.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	*3	8.00	1	10.00	1
Greater than $50.00	10.00	1	12.00	1	12.00	1	8.00	1	12.00	1

The Exchange also proposes a change to the rebate offered by the MBTX LMM Incentive Program to an LMM appointed to the program for meeting the heightened quoting standards in a given month. The Exchange proposes to decrease the rebate from $10,000 to $5,000; the credit of $0.25/contract applied to all MBTX contracts executed in Market-Maker capacity during RTH remains the same.

RTH CBTX/CBTXW LMM Incentive Program

The Exchange proposes to amend the RTH CBTX/CBTXW LMM Incentive Program (''RTH CBTX LMM Incentive Program''). The CBTX LMM Incentive Program provides that if an LMM appointed to the CBTX LMM Incentive Program provides continuous electronic quotes during RTH that meet or exceed the proposed heightened quoting standards [10] in at least 85% of CBTX series 85% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive (i) a payment for that month in the amount of $10,000 (or pro-rated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month) and (ii) a credit of $0.50/contract applied to all CBTX contracts executed in Market-Maker capacity during RTH.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of CBTX heightened quoting standards (below) (new proposed widths and sizes are denoted with an asterisk).

Premium level	6 days or less		7 days to 14 days		15 days to 60 days		61 to 120 days		121 to 270 days	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
$0.00–$5.00	*$2.00	*1	*$2.00	*1	*$2.40	*1	*$2.50	*1	*$3.00	*1
$5.01–$10.00	*2.50	*1	*2.50	*1	*2.70	*1	*3.00	*1	*5.00	*1
$10.01–$20.00	*4.00	*1	*$4.00	*1	*5.50	*1	*6.00	*1	*8.00	*1
$20.01–$50.00	*5.00	*1	*5.00	*1	*4.50	*1	*7.00	*1	*8.00	*1
$50.01–$100.00	6.00	1	*6.00	*1	*5.50	*1	*8.00	*1	*10.00	*1
$100.01–$200.00	12.00	1	12.00	1	*12.00	1	*12.00	1	*12.00	1
Greater than $200.00	*20.00	1	*20.00	1	*20.00	1	*20.00	1	*20.00	1

RTH SPEQX LMM Incentive Program

The Exchange proposes to amend the SPEQX LMM Incentive Program (''SPEQX LMM Incentive Program''). The SPEQX LMM Incentive Program provides that if an LMM appointed to the SPEQX LMM Incentive Program provides continuous electronic quotes during RTH that meet or exceed the

[9] Located in the ''RTH MBTX/MBTXW LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

[10] Located in the ''RTH CBTX/CBTXW LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

proposed heightened quoting standards [11] in at least 90% of SPEQX series 90% of the time in a given month, the LMM will receive a payment for that month in the amount of $15,000 (or prorated amount if an appointment begins after the first trading day of the month or ends prior to the last trading day of the month) for that month.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a new set of SPEQX heightened quoting standards (below) (new proposed widths and sizes are denoted with an asterisk).

Premium level	Expiring		Near term		Mid term		Long term	
	7 days or less		8 days to 30 days		31 days to 90 days		90 to 270 days	
	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size	Width	Size
VIX Value at Prior Close ≤18								
$0.00–$3.00	*$0.30	*1	*$0.35	*1	*$0.45	*1	*$0.70	*1
$3.01–$8.00	*0.40	*1	*0.60	*1	*0.80	*1	*1.10	*1
$8.01–$15.00	*2.50	*1	*1.70	*1	*2.00	*1	*2.00	*1
$15.01–$25.00	*6.00	*1	*4.00	*1	*4.00	*1	*4.00	*1
$25.01–$35.00	*9.00	1	*8.00	*1	*8.00	*1	*6.00	*1
$35.01–$50.00	*12.50	1	*12.50	1	*12.50	1	*12.50	1
Greater than $50.00	*19.00	1	*19.00	1	*19.00	1	*19.00	1
VIX Value at Prior Close >18 and <25								
$0.00–$3.00	*0.50	*1	*0.65	*1	*0.75	*1	*1.00	*1
$3.01–$8.00	*0.70	*1	*0.90	*1	*1.30	*1	*1.60	*1
$8.01–$15.00	*3.00	*1	2.50	*1	*2.50	*1	*3.00	*1
$15.01–$25.00	*7.00	*1	*6.00	*1	*4.50	*1	*4.50	*1
$25.01–$35.00	10.00	1	10.00	1	*9.00	1	*7.50	1
$35.01–$50.00	*15.00	1	*15.00	1	*15.00	1	*15.00	1
Greater than $50.00	*23.50	1	*23.50	1	*23.50	1	*23.50	1
VIX Value at Prior Close ≥25								
$0.00–$3.00	*0.60	*1	*0.80	*1	*1.00	*1	*1.30	*1
$3.01–$8.00	*1.50	*1	*1.80	*1	*2.30	*1	*2.50	*1
$8.01–$15.00	*4.00	*1	*3.00	*1	*3.00	*1	*4.00	*1
$15.01–$25.00	*8.00	1	*7.00	*1	*6.00	*1	6.00	1
$25.01–$35.00	15.00	1	15.00	1	15.00	1	10.00	1
$35.01–$50.00	20.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	1
Greater than $50.00	25.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	1

Proposed Footnote 53

Finally, the Exchange proposes to add Footnote 53 to the Fees Schedule to provide further clarifying information regarding the operation of its LMM Incentive Programs. Specifically, proposed Footnote 53 provides that, for purposes of Exchange LMM Incentive Programs, all of an LMM's continuous electronic quotes across all Executing Firm IDs (''EFIDs'') will be considered in calculating whether an LMM meets the heightened quoting standards each month to achieve rebate payments, as applicable. Proposed Footnote 53 further provides that, in calculating whether an LMM met the heightened quoting standard each month, the Exchange will make appropriate adjustments to account for trading halts and abbreviated trading sessions, as applicable. The Exchange proposes to append Footnote 53 to all of its LMM Incentive Programs within the Fees Schedule. The proposed changes will not result in any practical changes in calculating whether an LMM met the heightened quoting standards each month to achieve rebate payments under each of the LMM Incentive Programs, but rather are being added to eliminate potential confusion.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act'') and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to the Exchange and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[12] Specifically, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5) [13] requirements that the rules of an exchange be designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating, clearing, settling, processing information with respect to, and facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. Additionally, the Exchange believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5) [14] requirement that the rules of an exchange not be designed to permit unfair discrimination between customers, issuers, brokers, or dealers. The Exchange also believes the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(4) of the Act,[15] which requires that Exchange rules provide for the equitable allocation of reasonable dues, fees, and other charges among its TPHs and other persons using its facilities.

The Exchange believes that it is reasonable to amend the monthly rebate amounts applicable to the GTH VIX/VIXW options LMM Incentive Programs and MBTX options LMM Incentive Program. The Exchange notes that LMMs appointed to the respective

[11] Located in the ''RTH SPEQX LMM Incentive Program'' table in the Fees Schedule.

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[13] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[14] *Id.*

[15] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(4).

programs will continue to receive a monthly rebate. The Exchange believes that the proposed rebate amounts are reasonably designed to continue to incentivize an LMM appointed to the respective program to meet the applicable quoting standards for VIX/VIXW and MBTX options, thereby providing liquid and active markets, which facilitates tighter spreads, increased trading opportunities, and overall enhanced market quality to the benefit of all market participants.

The Exchange further believes that the proposed rule change to amend the rebate amounts received for VIX/VIXW ($30,000 for VIX and $5,000 for VIXW) and MBTX ($5,000) options is reasonable because they are in line with other rebates offered through other LMM Incentive Programs offered by the Exchange. The Exchange believes the amount of the rebate for each LMM Incentive Program remains commensurate with the quoting standards of each of the LMM Incentive Programs, of which some standards are being restructured, as proposed.

Similarly, the Exchange believes that it is reasonable to amend the heightened quoting standards under the GTH VIX, GTH SPX/SPXW, GTH XSP, MBTX, CBTX, and SPEQX LMM Incentive Programs. The proposed quoting standards are overall reasonably designed to continue to encourage LMMs appointed to the incentive programs to provide significant liquidity in these options, which benefits investors overall by providing more trading opportunities, tighter spreads, and added market transparency and price discovery.

The proposed changes adopt generally tighter widths for VIX, SPX/SPXW, MBTX, and SPEQX, and larger quotes sizes for MBTX. The Exchange believes that by adopting heightened quoting standards that provide for tighter width and larger quote size standards, the proposed rule change offers LMMs appointed to the programs a more challenging opportunity, thus further incentive, to strive to meet the heightened quoting standards in order to receive the additional rebate on their VIX, SPX/SPXW, MBTX and SPEQX options orders. As noted above, the proposed quoting standards are overall reasonably designed to continue to encourage LMMs appointed to the incentive programs to provide significant liquidity in these options, which benefits investors overall by providing more trading opportunities, tighter spreads, and added market transparency and price discovery.

The proposed changes also adopt generally wider widths for XSP and CBTX and smaller quotes sizes for CBTX and SPEQX. The Exchange believes that the proposed changes to width and quote sizes for the various programs' heightened quoting standards, while easing the standards and thus potentially making it easier for appointed LMMs to achieve such requirements, continues to incentivize quoting activity in XSP, CBTX, and SPEQX options and may possibly incentive increased quoting activity. Particularly, by increasing certain quote widths and deceasing certain quote sizes, the Exchange believes the proposed changes will encourage appointed LMMs to post more aggressive quotes in XSP, CBTX, and SPEQX options, in order to meet the heightened quoting standards, as amended, and receive the rebates offered under the incentive program, resulting in tighter spreads and increased liquidity to the benefits of investors.

The Exchange also notes that the proposed heightened quoting standards for VIX, SPX/SPXW, XSP, MBTX, CBTX, and SPEQX options do not represent a significant departure from each of the program's current quote width and size standards and remain generally aligned with the current heightened standards in the programs, as the proposed width and quote sizes are only marginally changed in order to incentivize an increase in quoting activity.

The Exchange believes that the proposed changes to the LMM Incentive Programs are equitable and not unfairly discriminatory. Specifically, the changes to the LMM Incentive Program will apply equally to any and all TPHs with LMM appointments to the VIX/VIXW, SPX/SPXW, XSP, CBTX, MBTX, and SPEQX LMM Incentive Programs, as applicable, that seek to meet the programs' quoting standards in order to receive the rebates offered under each respective program. The Exchange additionally notes that, if an LMM appointed to any of the LMM Incentive Programs does not satisfy the corresponding heightened quoting standard for any given month, then it simply will not receive the rebate offered by the respective program for that month.

Regarding each of the LMM Incentive Programs generally, the Exchange believes it is reasonable, equitable and not unfairly discriminatory to continue to offer these financial incentives, including as amended, to LMMs appointed to the programs, because it benefits all market participants trading in the corresponding products during RTH (for MBTX, CBTX, and SPEQX) and GTH (for VIX/VIXW, SPX/SPXW and XSP). These incentive programs encourage the LMMs appointed to such programs to satisfy the applicable quoting standards, which may increase liquidity and provide more trading opportunities and tighter spreads. Indeed, the Exchange notes that these LMMs serve a crucial role in providing quotes and the opportunity for market participants to trade VIX/VIXW, SPX/SPXW, XSP, CBTX, MBTX, and SPEQX options, as applicable, which can lead to increased volume, providing for robust markets. The Exchange ultimately offers the LMM Incentive Programs, as amended, to sufficiently incentivize LMMs appointed to each incentive program to provide key liquidity and active markets in the corresponding program products during the corresponding trading sessions, and believes that these incentive programs, as amended, will continue to encourage increased quoting to add liquidity in each of the corresponding program products, thereby protecting investors and the public interest. The Exchange also notes that an LMM appointed to an incentive program may undertake added costs each month to satisfy that heightened quoting standards (*e.g.,* having to purchase additional logical connectivity).

Finally, the Exchange believes the proposed change to add Footnote 53 will remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, will protect investors and the public interest. The proposed change clarifies certain aspects regarding the operation of the Exchange's LMM Incentive Programs that are in place today. Overall, the changes merely codify these operational aspects and are intended to add clarity to the Fees Schedule, thereby mitigating any potential confusion, to the benefit of investors.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. The Exchange does not believe the proposed rule changes regarding the LMM Incentive Programs will impose any burden on intramarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, because these changes, as well as the to LMM Incentive Programs in general, will apply to all LMMs appointed to the applicable program classes (*i.e.,* VIX/VIXW, SPX/SPXW, XSP, CBTX, MBTX,

and SPEQX) in a uniform manner. To the extent these LMMs appointed to an incentive program receive a benefit that other market participants do not, as stated, these LMMs in their role as Market-Makers on the Exchange have different obligations and are held to different standards. For example, Market-Makers play a crucial role in providing active and liquid markets in their appointed products, thereby providing a robust market which benefits all market participants. Such Market-Makers also have obligations and regulatory requirements that other participants do not have. The Exchange also notes that an LMM appointed to an LMM Incentive Program may undertake added costs each month to satisfy that heightened quoting standards (*e.g.,* having to purchase additional logical connectivity). The Exchange also notes that the LMM Incentive Programs are designed to attract additional order flow to the Exchange, wherein greater liquidity benefits all market participants by providing more trading opportunities, tighter spreads, and added market transparency and price discovery, and signals to other market participants to direct their order flow to those markets, thereby contributing to robust levels of liquidity. As a result, the Exchange believes that the proposed change furthers the Commission's goal in adopting Regulation NMS of fostering competition among orders, which promotes ''more efficient pricing of individual stocks for all types of orders, large and small.'' [16] Additionally, the Exchange does not believe the proposed clarifying rule changes will impose any burden on intramarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, as the changes will not result in any practical changes in calculating whether an LMM met the heightened quoting standards each month to achieve rebate payments under each of the LMM Incentive Programs, but rather are being added to eliminate potential confusion.

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule changes will impose any burden on intermarket competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, as the changes to amend certain LMM Incentive Programs apply only to transactions in products exclusively listed on the Exchange. As noted above, the incentive programs are designed to attract additional order flow to the Exchange, wherein greater liquidity benefits all market participants by providing more trading opportunities, tighter spreads, and added market transparency and price discovery, and signals to other market participants to direct their order flow to those markets, thereby contributing to robust levels of liquidity. To the extent that the proposed changes make Cboe Options a more attractive marketplace for market participants at other exchanges, such market participants are welcome to become Cboe Options market participants.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange neither solicited nor received comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The foregoing rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act [17] and paragraph (f) of Rule 19b–4 [18] thereunder. At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission will institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number SR–CBOE–2025–057 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–CBOE–2025–057. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR–CBOE–2025–057 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[19]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15622 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103693; File No. SR–NYSE–2025–30]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Rule 7.37

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) [1] of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [2] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3] notice is hereby given that on August 6, 2025, New York Stock Exchange LLC (''NYSE'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

[16] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 51808, 70 FR 37495, 37498–99 (June 29, 2005) (S7–10–04) (Final Rule).

[17] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

[18] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f).

[19] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78a.

[3] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.37 to provide for order routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at *www.nyse.com* and at the principal office of the Exchange.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of those statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.37 (Order Execution and Routing) to provide for optional order routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations.

Rule 7.37(c) and the subparagraphs thereunder describe how the Exchange routes orders to Away Markets. The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.37(c)(3), which is currently designated as ''Reserved,'' to provide that orders eligible to route will be routed to all available Away Markets unless the order includes an instruction to bypass Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations.[4] This proposed change would allow eligible orders to be routed to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations, except for those with an instruction to bypass such destinations when routing, thereby facilitating optional routing to additional destinations at member organizations' preference. Proposed Rule 7.37(c)(3) is based on NYSE Arca, Inc. (''NYSE Arca'') Rule 7.37–E(b)(3), NYSE National, Inc. (''NYSE National'') Rule 7.37(b)(3), and NYSE Texas, Inc. (''NYSE Texas'') Rule 7.37(b)(3) without any changes.

The Exchange also proposes to add new subparagraph (1) under Rule 7.37(e), relating to the Exchange's use of data feeds for the handling, execution, and routing of orders, as well as for regulatory compliance.[5] Proposed Rule 7.37(e)(1) would provide that the Exchange receives data feeds directly from broker dealers for purposes of routing interest to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. This proposed change would ensure that Rule 7.37(e) accurately and comprehensively reflects the Exchange's use of data feeds for order handling, execution, and routing (as well as for regulatory compliance) and would promote transparency in the Exchange's rules with respect to routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. Proposed Rule 7.37(e)(1) is based on NYSE Arca Rule 7.37–E(d)(1), NYSE National Rule 7.37(d)(1), and NYSE Texas Rule 7.37(d)(1) without any changes.

Subject to effectiveness of this proposed rule change, the Exchange will implement this change no later than in the fourth quarter of 2025 and announce the implementation date by Trader Update.

2. Statutory Basis

The proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,[6] in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5),[7] in particular, because it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The Exchange believes the proposed change would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and protect investors and the public interest by providing for optional routing functionality to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. Specifically, proposed Rule 7.37(c)(3) would facilitate routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations for eligible orders that do not have an instruction to bypass such destinations. Proposed Rule 7.37(e)(1) would promote clarity and transparency in the Exchange's rules regarding its use of data feeds for order handling, execution, and routing, as well as for regulatory compliance, with respect to routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. The Exchange believes that the proposed change would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and protect investors and the public interest because it would promote additional trading opportunities for member organizations and afford greater flexibility to market participants through optional routing functionality to additional trading venues, thereby encouraging competition between the Exchange and other equity exchanges. The Exchange also believes that the proposed change would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and protect investors and the public interest by aligning the Exchange's rules with those of its affiliated equities exchanges, NYSE Arca, NYSE National, and NYSE Texas.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. As noted above, the Exchange believes that the proposed change could instead encourage competition by making additional optional routing destinations available for orders eligible to be routed away from the Exchanges, as well as by promoting additional trading opportunities for member organizations.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The Exchange has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section

[4] The Exchange also proposes that Rule 7.37(c)(3) would provide that orders eligible to route would not route to all available Away Markets if designated with a routing strategy pursuant to Rule 7.37(c)(9) because such routing strategies may provide for routing to specific destinations only.

[5] The Exchange also proposes a non-substantive, conforming change to renumber current Rule 7.37(e)(1) as Rule 7.37(e)(2).

[6] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[7] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act[8] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder.[9] Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not: (i) significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act[10] and subparagraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[11]

At any time within 60 days of the filing of such proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B)[12] of the Act to determine whether the proposed rule change should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number SR–NYSE–2025–30 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSE–2025–30. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSE–2025–30 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[13]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15619 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[9] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[11] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6). In addition, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) requires a self-regulatory organization to give the Commission written notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change, along with a brief description and text of the proposed rule change, at least five business days prior to the date of filing of the proposed rule change, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. The Exchange has satisfied this requirement.

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

[13] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103698; File No. SR–NYSENAT–2025–17]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE National, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Rule 7.18 and Make Conforming Changes to Rules 1.1 and 7.11

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1)[1] of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[2] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3] notice is hereby given that on August 5, 2025, NYSE National, Inc. (''NYSE National'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.18 (''Halts'') to effectuate amendments to Second Restatement of the CTA Plan and the Restated CQ Plan (together, the ''Amended CTA Plan''). In addition, the Exchange proposes to make conforming changes to Rules 1.1 and 7.11. The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at *www.nyse.com* and at the principal office of the Exchange.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of those statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

NYSE National, Inc. (''NYSE National'' or the ''Exchange'') proposes to amend Rule 7.18 (''Halts'') to effectuate amendments to Second Restatement of the CTA Plan and the Restated CQ Plan (together, the ''Amended CTA Plan'').[4] The proposed changes would amend the rule pertaining to regulatory and operational halts, improve the rule's clarity, and adopt defined terms from the Amended CTA Plan.[5] In addition, the Exchange

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78a.

[3] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[4] On February 3, 2021, the CTA/CQ Plan participants (''Participants'') filed Amendment 36 to the Second Restatement of the CTA Plan and Amendment 27 to the Restated CQ Plan, to revise provisions governing regulatory and operational halts. *See* Letter from Robert Books, Chair, CTA/CQ Operating Committee, to Vanessa Countryman, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, dated February 3, 2021. The SEC approved the amendments on May 28, 2021 (the ''Amended CTA Plan''). *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92070 (May 28, 2021), 86 FR 29849 (June 3, 2021) (SR–CTA/CQ–2021–01). The SEC also approved similar amendments to the Nasdaq UTP Plan. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92071 (May 28, 2021), 86 FR 29846 (June 3, 2021) (S7–24–89) (the ''Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan''). The Amended CTA Plan and the Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan include provisions requiring Participant self-regulatory organizations (''SROs'') to honor a Regulatory Halt declared by the Primary Listing Market. The provisions in the Amended CTA Plan and the Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan include provisions similar to the changes proposed by the Exchange in this filing.

[5] The Exchange notes that this proposed rule change is based on a similar rule change filed by the Nasdaq Stock Market LLC (''Nasdaq'') that was approved by the SEC in 2022. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 95069 (June 8, 2022), 87 FR 36018 (June 14, 2022) (SR–NASDAQ–2022–017).

proposes to make conforming changes to Rules 1.1 and 7.11.

Background

The Exchange has been working with other SROs to establish common criteria and procedures for halting and resuming trading in equity securities in the event of regulatory or operational issues. These common standards are designed to ensure that events that might impact multiple exchanges are handled in a consistent manner that is transparent. The Exchange believes that implementation of these common standards will assist the SROs in maintaining fair and orderly markets. Notwithstanding the development of these common standards, the Exchange will retain discretion in certain instances as to whether and how to handle halts, as is discussed below.

Every U.S.-listed equity security has its primary listing on a specific stock exchange (its ''Primary Listing Market'') [6] that is responsible for a number of regulatory functions. These include confirming that the security continues to meet the exchange's listing standards, monitoring trading in that security, and taking action to halt trading in the security when necessary to protect investors and to ensure and fair and orderly market. While these core responsibilities remain with the Primary Listing Market, trading in the security can occur on multiple exchanges that have unlisted trading privileges for the security or in the over-the-counter market, regulated by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''). The exchanges and FINRA are responsible for monitoring activity on the markets over which they have oversight, but also must abide by the regulatory decisions made by the Primary Listing Market. For example, a venue trading a security pursuant to unlisted trading privileges must halt trading in that security during a Regulatory Halt, which is a defined term under the proposed rules,[7] and may only trade the security once the Primary Listing Market has cleared the security to resume trading.

While the Exchange and the other SROs intend to harmonize certain aspects of their trading halt rules, other elements of the rules will continue to be unique to each market. The Exchange believes that this is appropriate to reflect different products listed or traded on each market.

The Exchange will implement all of the changes proposed herein in conjunction with the Processor and other SROs implementing the necessary rule changes. The Exchange will publish a trader notice at least 30 business days before implementing the proposed changes.

Proposed Exchange Rule Changes

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.18 to add new definitions and proposed categories of regulatory and operational halts that are designed to address the type of market-wide events described in the Amended CTA Plan. Amended Rule 7.18 would also cross-reference the Exchange's current halt authority. The Exchange also proposes to rename Rule 7.18 from ''Halts'' to ''Trading Halts.''

Definitions

Amended Rule 7.18(a) would set forth definitions, many of which cross-reference definitions in the Amended CTA Plan.[8]

First, the Exchange proposes to add the definition of ''*Primary Listing Market*'' [9] to Rule 7.18, which will have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(i)(H). As is currently the case under the Exchange's rules and under the Amended CTA Plan, all Regulatory Halt decisions are made by the market on which the security has its primary listing. This reflects the regulatory responsibility that the Primary Listing Market has for fair and orderly trading in the securities that list on its market and its direct access to its listed companies, which are required to advise it of certain events and maintain lines of communication with the Primary Listing Market. The proposed definition makes clear that if a security is listed on more than one market (a dually-listed security), the Primary Listing Market means the exchange on which the security has been listed the longest. This provision matches language used in the definition of ''Primary Listing Exchange'' in the Limit Up-Limit Down Plan and will avoid conflict in the event of dually-listed securities.

Second, the Exchange proposes to add a definition for the term ''*Extraordinary Market Activity,*'' [10] which would represent a modified version of the term defined in the Amended CTA Plan.[11] Specifically, the Exchange proposes to remove the concept of a ''market-wide basis'' from the Amended CTA Plan's definition of Extraordinary Market Activity for purposes of the Exchange's rules because the term ''Extraordinary Market Activity'' would only be used in the Exchange's rules as a basis for the Exchange to initiate an Operational Halt, which would only occur on the market declaring the halt (*i.e.,* the Exchange). The current rule does not include a definition for Extraordinary Market Activity. The proposed definition for the term is as follows:

''Extraordinary Market Activity'' means a disruption or malfunction of any electronic quotation, communication, reporting, or execution system operated by, or linked to, the Processor or a Trading Center that has a severe and continuing negative impact on quoting, order, or trading activity or on the availability of market information necessary to maintain a fair and orderly market. For purposes of this definition, a severe and continuing negative impact on quoting, order, or trading activity includes (i) a series of quotes, orders, or transactions at prices substantially unrelated to the current market for the security or securities; (ii) duplicative or erroneous quoting, order, trade reporting, or other related message traffic between one or more Trading Centers or their members; or (iii) the unavailability of quoting, order, transaction information, or regulatory messages for a sustained period.

Third, the Exchange proposes to add a set of new definitions that would be

In addition, the Exchange's affiliate exchanges, NYSE American LLC (''NYSE American'') the New York Stock Exchange LLC (''NYSE''), NYSE Arca, Inc. (''NYSE Arca''), and NYSE Texas, Inc. (''NYSE Texas'') have filed similar rule changes. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 102810 (April 10, 2025), 90 FR 16041 (April 16, 2025) (SR–NYSEAMER–2025–19); 103356 (June 30, 2025) (SR–NYSE–2025–21); 103476 (July 16, 2025), 90 FR 34314 (July 21, 2025) (SR–NYSEARCA–2025–50); SR–NYSETEX–2025–23. The Exchange's proposal here provides the Exchange with more limited authority to declare Regulatory Halts than its affiliate exchanges because the Exchange, unlike its affiliates, is not a Primary Listing Market. Given that difference, certain definitions and concepts from the Amended CTA Plan are not included herein. Several exchanges that do not operate Primary Listing Markets have also filed similar rule changes. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 96574 (December 22, 2022), 87 FR 80213 (December 29, 2022) (SR–Phlx–2022–49); 97093 (March 9, 2023), 88 FR 16045 (March 15, 2023) (SR–PEARL–2023–11); and 97824 (June 29, 2023), 88 FR 43159 (July 6, 2023) (SR–MEMX–2023–11).

[6] The Exchange proposes to incorporate into Rule 7.18 the same definition of ''Primary Listing Market'' as appears in Section XI.(a)(i)(H) of the Amended CTA Plan: '''Primary Listing Market' means the national securities exchange on which an Eligible Security is listed. If an Eligible Security is listed on more than one national securities exchange, Primary Listing Market means the exchange on which the security has been listed the longest.''

[7] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(11).

[8] The Exchange notes that these terms are defined identically in the Amended CTA Plan and the Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan, such that there will be uniformity in the meaning of the terms among such plans as well as among the rules of the SROs. The Exchange proposes to adopt in Rule 7.18(a) all of the definitions in the Amended CTA Plan Section XI(a)(i) except for definition of ''Regular Trading Hours'' at Section XI(a)(i)(I), because the Exchange uses different terminology for its trading sessions and those terms are already defined in the Exchange's rules. *See* Rule 7.34(a) defining ''Early Trading Session,'' ''Core Trading Session,'' and ''Late Trading Session.''

[9] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(9).

[10] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(1).

[11] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(i)(H).

specific to events involving the SIP. While the Exchange recognizes that many events involving the SIP would also meet the definition of ''Extraordinary Market Activity'' as defined in the Amended CTA Plan, the Exchange believes that the critical role of the SIPs in market infrastructure weighs in favor having the Exchange's rules specify how such events would be handled. The definitions of ''*SIP Outage,*'' [12] ''*Material SIP Latency,*'' [13] ''*SIP Halt,*'' [14] and ''*SIP Halt Resume Time*'' [15] are intended to provide specificity to address this subset of potential market issues. In addition, the Exchange is proposing to define terms related to SIP governance needed in order to understand these definitions:

- ''*Processor*'' or ''*SIP*'' [16] would have the same meaning as the term ''Processor'' in the Nasdaq UTP Plan or the CTA Plan, as applicable.[17]
- ''*SIP Plan*'' [18] would be defined as ''the national market system plan governing the SIP, as applicable.''
- ''*Operating Committee*'' [19] would be defined as having the same meaning as in the CTA Plan, namely the committee charged with administering the CTA Plan.
- ''*Trading Center*'' [20] would have the same meaning as in Rule 600(b)(95) of Regulation NMS.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a category of Regulatory Halt, called a ''*SIP Halt,*'' [21] that would have the same meaning as that term is defined in the Amended CTA Plan, namely ''a Regulatory Halt to trading in one or more securities that a Primary Listing Market declares in the event of a SIP Outage or Material SIP Latency.'' [22] This new category of Regulatory Halt would address situations where the Primary Listing Market declares a Regulatory Halt in one or more securities as a result of a SIP Outage [23] or a Material SIP Latency.[24]

Fourth, the Exchange proposes to add a definition of ''*Regulatory Halt,*'' [25] which would be a new defined term that incorporates the Exchange's existing regulatory halt authority as well as the proposed new regulatory halt authority. The Exchange proposes that the term would have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan,[26] as follows:

> a halt declared by the Primary Listing Market in trading in one or more securities on all Trading Centers for regulatory purposes, including for the dissemination of material news, news pending, suspensions, or where otherwise necessary to maintain a fair and orderly market. A Regulatory Halt includes a trading pause triggered by Limit Up Limit Down,[27] a halt based on Extraordinary Market Activity as defined in the Amended CTA Plan, a trading halt triggered by a Market-Wide Circuit Breaker,[28] and a SIP Halt.

Fifth, the Exchange proposes to add a definition of ''*Operational Halt,*'' [29] which would be a new definition for the Exchange. The Exchange proposes that this term would have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan, which is: ''a halt in trading in one or more securities only on a Market declared by such Participant and is not a Regulatory Halt.'' [30] An Operational Halt is effective only on the Exchange; other markets are not required to halt trading in the affected securities. In practice, the Exchange has always had the capacity to implement operational halts and local trading suspensions in specified circumstances, but such halts are not currently referred to as ''operational halts'' in the Exchange's rules.[31] The proposed change would provide greater clarity on when an Operational Halt may be implemented and the process for halting and resuming trading in the event of an Operational Halt. An Operational Halt is not a Regulatory Halt.

Regulatory Halts

Proposed Rule 7.18(b) would set forth requirements relating to Regulatory Halts.

Authority To Initiate a Regulatory Halt

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1) would describe the three circumstances in which the Exchange must halt pursuant to a Regulatory Halt: (a) when a UTP Listing Market has declared a Trading Pause pursuant to Rule 7.11 [32] concerning Limit Up-Limit Down; [33] (b) in the event of extraordinary market volatility as set forth in Rule 7.12 [34] concerning Market-Wide Circuit Breakers; and (c) when a UTP Listing Market initiates a Regulatory Halt.

Implementing a UTP Regulatory Halt

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(2) would specify how the Exchange would implement Regulatory Halts declared by other Primary Listing Markets, referred to by the Exchange as a ''UTP Regulatory Halt.'' [35]

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(2)(A) would provide that the Exchange would halt trading in a UTP Security when the UTP Listing Market declares a UTP Regulatory Halt for any such securities. This proposed rule text is based on Section XI(a)(iii) of the Amended CTA Plan, as well as the first sentence of current Rule 7.18(a),[36] which provides

[12] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(14).

[13] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(5).

[14] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(12).

[15] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(13).

[16] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(10).

[17] *See, e.g.,* Amended CTA Plan, Section I(x), which provides: '' 'Processor' means the organization designated as recipient and processor of last sale price information furnished by Participants pursuant to this CTA Plan, as Section V describes.''

[18] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(15).

[19] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(7).

[20] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(16).

[21] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(12).

[22] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(K).

[23] ''SIP Outage'' means ''a situation in which the Processor has ceased, or anticipates being unable, to provide updated and/or accurate quotation or last sale price information in one or more securities for a material period that exceeds the time thresholds for an orderly failover to backup facilities established by mutual agreement among the Processor, the Primary Listing Market for the affected securities, and the Operating Committee unless the Primary Listing Market, in consultation with the Processor and the Operating Committee, determines that resumption of accurate data is expected in the near future.'' *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(M).

[24] ''Material SIP Latency'' means ''a delay of quotation or last sale price information in one or more securities between the time data is received by the Processor and the time the Processor disseminates the data over the high speed line or over the ''high speed line'' under the CQ Plan, which delay the Primary Listing Market determines, in consultation with, and in accordance with, publicly disclosed guidelines established by the Operating Committee, to be (a) material and (b) unlikely to be resolved in the near future.'' *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(E).

[25] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(11).

[26] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(J).

[27] The Exchange proposes to incorporate the Amended CTA Plan's definition of ''Limit Up Limit Down.'' *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(2).

[28] The Exchange proposes to incorporate the Amended CTA Plan's definition of ''Market-Wide Circuit Breaker.'' *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(4).

[29] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(8).

[30] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(G).

[31] *See* Rule 7.13 (Trading Suspensions).

[32] Rule 7.11 is the Exchange's rule governing Limit Up Limit Down.

[33] The Exchange, as a non-Primary Listing Market, does not itself declare Trading Pauses pursuant to the Limit Up-Limit Down Plan, but rather implements such pauses declared by Primary Listing Markets.

[34] Rule 7.12 is the Exchange's rule governing Market-Wide Circuit Breaker.

[35] The term ''UTP Listing Market'' is defined in Rule 1.1(jj) to mean the primary listing market for a UTP Security. The term ''UTP Security'' is defined in Rule 1.1(ii) to mean a security that is listed on a UTP Listing Market and that trades on the Exchange pursuant to unlisted trading privileges. The term ''UTP Regulatory Halt'' is defined in Rule 1.1(kk). The Exchange proposes a non-substantive amendment to this definition to cross-reference the definition of ''Regulatory Halt'' in proposed Rule 7.18 and delete the clause ''that requires all market centers to halt trading in that security'' as duplicative of the proposed new definition of Regulatory Halt, described above.

[36] As discussed below, the Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(a) in its entirety.

in part that if the UTP Listing Market declares a UTP Regulatory Halt, the Exchange will halt trading in that security.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(2)(B) would provide that the start time of a UTP Regulatory Halt is when the UTP Listing Market declares the halt, regardless of whether an issue with communications impacts the dissemination of the notice. This provision is consistent with Section XI(a)(iv)(A) of the Amended CTA Plan, and would provide market participants with certainty on the official start time of the Regulatory Halt. Under the proposed rule, the start time is fixed by the UTP Listing Market; it is not dependent on whether notice is disseminated immediately. This will avoid possible disagreement if the UTP Regulatory Halt time were tied to dissemination or receipt of notification, which may occur at different times. The Exchange recognizes that in situations where communication is interrupted, trades may continue to occur until news of the UTP Regulatory Halt reaches all trading centers. However, a fixed ''official'' Regulatory Halt start time will allow SROs to revisit trades after the fact and determine in a consistent manner whether specific trades should stand.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(2)(C)(i), (ii), and (iii) would set forth rules for trading halts in UTP Exchange Traded Products.[37] This proposed rule text is based on current Rule 7.18(c)(1)(A), (B), and (C) with non-substantive differences to replace the term ''primary listing market'' with the term ''Primary Listing Market'' in proposed Rule 7.18(b)(2)(C)(ii) and (iii)(b). The Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(c) and its sub-paragraphs as duplicative of the proposed rule text.

Resumption of Trading After a Regulatory Halt

The SROs have jointly developed processes to govern the resumption of trading in the event of a Regulatory Halt. While the actual process of re-launching trading will remain unique to each exchange, the proposed rule would harmonize certain common elements of the reopening process that would benefit from consistency across markets. These common elements include the primacy of the Primary Listing Market in resumption decisions, the requirement that the Primary Listing Market make its determination to resume trading in good faith, and certain parts of the complex process for reopening trading after a SIP Halt. With respect to a SIP Halt, common elements of the reopening process include the interaction among SROs (including the Primary Listing Market with the SIP), the requirement that the Primary Listing Market terminate a SIP Halt with a notification that specifies a SIP Halt Resume Time, the minimum quoting times before resumption of trading, the cutoff time after which trading would not resume during Core Trading Hours, and the time when trading may resume if the Primary Listing Market does not open a security within the amount of time specified in its rules after the SIP Halt Resume Time.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3) would provide the process for resuming trading upon the conclusion of a Regulatory Halt. This new rule, which would effectuate Section XI(a)(v) and (vi) of the Amended CTA Plan, is divided into the following two subparagraphs concerning resumption of trading: (A) after a Regulatory Halt other than a SIP Halt; and (B) after a SIP Halt.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(A) would provide that, for a Regulatory Halt other than a SIP Halt, the Exchange may resume trading by starting to accept orders after the Exchange receives notification [38] from the UTP Listing Market that the UTP Regulatory Halt has been terminated, provided that, during Core Trading Hours, the Exchange will not resume trading in any security that is subject to the Limit Up Limit Down Plan until the Exchange receives the first Price Band in that security. This proposed rule text is based on the first sentence of current Rule 7.18(a).[39] The Exchange proposes to delete the first sentence of current Rule 7.18(a) as duplicative of the proposed rule text.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(B) would address resumption of trading after a SIP Halt initiated by a UTP Listing Market. The proposed rule would provide that for UTP Securities affected by a SIP Halt, during Core Trading Hours, the Exchange may resume trading in the affected security after trading in the affected security has resumed on the UTP Listing Market or notice has been received from the UTP Listing Market that such trading may resume. The proposed rule would further provide that during Core Trading Hours, if the UTP Listing Market does not open a security within the amount of time listed by the rules of the UTP Listing Market, the Exchange may resume trading in that security, provided that the Exchange will not resume trading in any security that is subject to the Limit Up-Limit Down Plan until it receives the first Price Band in that security.[40] Outside of Core Trading Hours, the Exchange may resume trading in an affected UTP Security after the SIP Halt Resume Time.

Order Processing During a Regulatory Halt

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(4) would describe how the Exchange would process new and existing orders in a UTP Security during a UTP Regulatory Halt, including a SIP Halt initiated by a UTP Listing Market. Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(4)(A)(i)–(vi) is based on current Rule 7.18(b)(1)–(6) without any differences. The Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(b) and its sub-paragraphs as duplicative of the proposed rule text.

Operational Halts

The Exchange proposes to address Operational Halts in proposed Rule 7.18(c). As noted above, an Operational Halt is non-regulatory in nature and applies only to the exchange that calls the halt. As described above, the Exchange has always had the capacity to implement operational halts and local trading suspensions in specified circumstances, but such halts are not currently referred to as ''operational halts'' in the Exchange's rules.[41] As part of the Exchange's assessment with other SROs of the halting and resumption of trading, the Exchange believes that the markets would benefit from greater clarity regarding when an Operational Halt may be appropriate. In part, the proposed change is designed to cover situations similar to those that might

[37] The term ''UTP Exchange Traded Product'' is defined in Rule 1.1(m) to mean a security that meets the definition of ''derivative securities product'' in Rule 19b–4(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and that trades on the Exchange pursuant to unlisted trading privileges.

[38] The manner and timing of such notice would be determined by the UTP Listing Market.

[39] The Exchange does not propose to include the second sentence of current Rule 7.18(a) in the proposed rule, as that sentence is inconsistent with the first sentence (upon which proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(A) is based), and would permit the Exchange to resume trading in a security affected by a UTP Regulatory Halt other than a SIP Halt before the UTP Listing Market has provided notification that the halt has ended and before the Exchange receives the first LULD Price Bands in that security. The Exchange accordingly proposes to delete the second sentence of current Rule 7.18(a).

[40] The Exchange's proposal to wait for the first Limit Up Limit Down Price Band in the affected UTP Security before resuming trading after a SIP Halt initiated by a UTP Listing Market is consistent with the Exchange's practice for resuming trading in affected UTP Securities after other types of Regulatory Halts. *See* proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(A) and current Rule 7.18(a).

[41] *See* Rule 7.13 (Trading Suspensions). The Exchange also notes that its proposed Rule 7.18(c) regarding Operational Halts is substantially identical to the revised NYSE, NYSE American, NYSE Arca, NYSE Texas, Nasdaq, Phlx, MIAX Pearl, and MEMX rules cited in note 4 above, and is therefore not novel.

constitute a Regulatory Halt but where the impact is limited to a single market. For example, just as a market disruption might trigger a Regulatory Halt for Extraordinary Market Activity (as defined in the Amended CTA Plan) if it affects multiple markets, a disruption at the Exchange, such as a technical issue affecting trading in one or more securities, could impact trading on the Exchange so significantly that an Operational Halt is appropriate in one or more securities. In such an instance, it would be in the public interest to institute an Operational Halt to minimize the impact of a disruption that, if trading were allowed to continue, might negatively affect a greater number of market participants. An Operational Halt does not implicate other trading centers.

Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(1) would specify the Exchange's authority to initiate an Operational Halt, which is discretionary, and provide that the Exchange may declare an Operational Halt for any security trading on the Exchange: if it is experiencing Extraordinary Market Activity on the Exchange (Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(1)(A)) or when otherwise necessary to maintain a fair and orderly market or in the public interest (Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(1)(B)).

Under proposed Rule 7.18(c)(2), the Exchange would notify the Processor if it has concerns about its ability to collect and transmit quotes, orders, or last sale prices, or where it has declared an Operational Halt or suspension of trading in one or more Eligible Securities (as that term is defined in the CTA Plan), pursuant to the procedures adopted by the Operating Committee.

Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(3) would set out rules for order processing during an Operational Halt. In such a case, proposed Rule 7.18(c)(3)(A) would provide that the Exchange would cancel all unexecuted orders resting on the Exchange Book, and proposed Rule 7.18(c)(3)(B) would provide that the Exchange would reject all other incoming order instructions until the Exchange resumes trading. The Exchange currently processes new and existing orders in this manner when it suspends trading. The Exchange proposes to include this processing in Rule 7.18 to specify that this processing would also be applicable to when the Exchange resumes trading following an Operational Halt in an Exchange-listed security.

Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(4) would specify how the Exchange resumes trading after an Operational Halt. Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(4)(A) would provide that the Exchange would resume trading following an Operational Halt when it determines that trading may resume in a fair and orderly manner consistent with the Exchange's rules. Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(4)(B) would address ''Communications,'' and provide that trading in a halted security shall resume at the time specified by the Exchange in a notice. It would further specify that Exchange will notify all other Plan participants and the SIP of such Operational Halt as well as provide notice that an Operational Halt has been lifted using such protocols and other emergency procedures as may be mutually agreed to between the Operating Committee and the Exchange. If the SIP is unable to disseminate notice of an Operational Halt or the Exchange is not open for trading, the Exchange would take reasonable steps to provide notice of an Operational Halt, which shall include both the type and start time of the Operational Halt. Each Plan participant shall continuously monitor communication protocols established by the Operating Committee and the Processor during market hours to disseminate notice of an Operational Halt, and the failure of a participant to do so shall not prevent the Exchange from initiating an Operational Halt.

Conforming Changes to Other Rules

The Exchange also proposes non-substantive amendments of two other rules.

First, as noted above, the Exchange proposes a non-substantive amendment to the definition of ''UTP Regulatory Halt'' in Rule 1.1(kk) to cross-reference the definition of ''Regulatory Halt'' in proposed Rule 7.18 and delete the clauses ''trade, suspension, halt, or pause'' and ''that requires all market centers to halt trading in that security'' as duplicative of the proposed new definition of Regulatory Halt.

Second, the Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.11 (Limit Up-Limit Down Plan and Trading Pauses in Individual Securities Due to Extraordinary Market Volatility). Current Rule 7.11(b)(2) provides that if a primary listing market other than the Exchange issues a Trading Pause, the Exchange will resume trading as provided for in Rule 7.18(a) regarding UTP Regulatory Halts. The Exchange proposes to replace the term ''primary listing market'' with ''UTP Listing Market'' for clarity.

Implementation

The Exchange will implement all of the changes proposed herein in conjunction with the Processors and the other SROs implementing the necessary rule changes and related technology and procedural changes. The Exchange will publish a trader notice at least 30 business days before implementing the proposed changes.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[42] Specifically, the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[43] because it would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, protect investors and the public interest.

As described above, the Exchange and other SROs are seeking to adopt harmonized rules related to halting and resuming trading in U.S.-listed equity securities. The Exchange believes that the proposed rules will provide greater transparency and clarity with respect to the situations in which trading will be halted and the process through which that halt will be implemented and terminated. Particularly, the proposed changes seek to achieve consistent results for participants across U.S. equities exchanges and in the over-the-counter market while maintaining a fair and orderly market, protecting investors, and protecting the public interest. Based on the foregoing, the Exchange believes that the proposed rules are consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[44] because they will foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating and facilitating transactions in securities.

As discussed previously, the Exchange believes that the various provisions of the proposed rules that will apply to all SROs are focused on the type of cross-market event where a consistent approach will assist market participants and reduce confusion during a crisis. Because market participants often trade the same security across multiple venues and trade securities listed on different exchanges as part of a common strategy, the Exchange believes that the proposed rules will lessen the risk that market participants holding a basket of securities will have to deal with divergent outcomes depending on where the securities are listed or traded. Conversely, the proposed rules would still allow individual SROs to react

[42] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[43] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[44] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

differently to events that impact various securities or markets in different ways. This avoids the ''brittle market'' risk where an isolated event at a single market forces all markets trading equities securities to halt or halts trading in all securities where the issue affected only a subset of securities. By addressing both concerns, the Exchange believes that the proposed rules further the Act's goal of maintaining fair and orderly markets.

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule's focus of responsibility on the Primary Listing Market for decisions related to a Regulatory Halt and the resumption of trading is consistent with the Act, which itself imposes obligations on exchanges with respect to issuers that are listed. As is currently the case, the Primary Listing Market would be responsible for the many regulatory functions related to its listings, including the determination of when to declare a Regulatory Halt. While these core responsibilities remain with the Primary Listing Market, trading in the security can occur on multiple exchanges that have unlisted trading privileges for the security or in the over-the-counter market, regulated by FINRA. These other venues are responsible for monitoring activity on their own markets, but also have agreed to honor a Regulatory Halt.

The proposed changes relating to Regulatory Halts would ensure that all SROs handle the situations covered therein in a consistent manner that would prevent conflicting outcomes in cross-market events, and ensure that all Trading Centers recognize a Regulatory Halt declared by the Primary Listing Market. The changes are consistent with and implement the Amended CTA Plan.

The Exchange believes that the other definitions in the proposed rules are also consistent with the Act. The Exchange is adopting a modified form of the term ''Extraordinary Market Activity'' from the Amended CTA Plan, as described above, to further the Act's goal of promoting fair and orderly markets. The Exchange is also proposing to adopt definitions for ''SIP Outage,'' ''Material SIP Latency'' and ''SIP Halt,'' to explicitly address situations that may disrupt the markets, and these definitions are identical to the definitions in the Amended CTA Plan. The proposed rules specify when the Exchange should seek information from the Operating Committee, other SROs, and market participants as well as means for dissemination of important information to the market, consistent with the Amended CTA Plan. The Exchange believes these provisions strike the right balance in outlining a process to address unforeseen events without preventing SROs from taking action needed to protect the market.

The Exchange believes that the proposed rules, which make halts consistent across exchange rules, is consistent with the Act in that it will foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating the equities markets. In particular, the Exchange believes it is important for SROs to coordinate when there is a widespread and significant event, as multiple Trading Centers are affected in such an event. Further, while the Exchange recognizes that the proposed rule will not guarantee a consistent result on every market in all situations, the Exchange does believe that it will assist in that outcome. While the proposed rule relating to Regulatory Halts focuses primarily on the kinds of cross-market events that would likely impact multiple markets, individual SROs will still retain flexibility to deal with unique products or smaller situations confined to a particular market.

Also consistent with the Act, and with the Amended CTA Plan, is the Exchange's proposal in Rule 7.18(c) to address Operational Halts, which are non-regulatory in nature and apply only to the exchange that declares the halt. As noted earlier, the Exchange has always had the capacity to implement operational halts and local trading suspensions, but such halts are not currently referred to as ''operational halts'' in the Exchange's rules.[45] The Exchange also notes that its proposed Rule 7.18(c) regarding Operational Halts is substantially identical to the revised NYSE, NYSE American, NYSE Arca, NYSE Texas, Nasdaq, Phlx, MIAX Pearl, and MEMX rules cited above,[46] and is therefore not novel.

The Exchange believes that the markets would benefit from greater clarity regarding when an Operational Halt may be appropriate. In part, the proposed change is designed to cover situations similar to those that might constitute a Regulatory Halt, but where the impact is limited to a single market. For example, a disruption at the Exchange, such as a technical issue affecting trading in one or more securities, could impact trading on the Exchange so significantly that an Operational Halt is appropriate in one or more securities. In such an instance, it would be in the public interest to institute an Operational Halt to minimize the impact of a disruption that, if trading were allowed to continue, might negatively affect a greater number of market participants. An Operational Halt does not implicate other trading centers.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(8) of the Act[47] in that it does not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act as explained below.

Importantly, the Exchange believes the proposal would not impose a burden on intermarket competition but rather would alleviate any burden on competition because it is the result of a collaborative effort by all SROs to harmonize and improve the process related to the halting and resumption of trading in U.S.-listed equity securities. In this area, the Exchange believes that all SROs should have consistent rules to the extent possible in order to provide additional transparency and certainty to market participants and to avoid inconsistent outcomes that could cause confusion and erode market confidence. The proposed changes would ensure that all SROs handle the situations covered therein in a consistent manner and ensure that all Trading Centers handle a Regulatory Halt consistently. The Exchange understands that all other Primary Listing Markets intend to file proposals that are substantially similar to this proposed rule change.

The Exchange does not believe that its proposals concerning Operational Halts impose and undue burden on competition. Under its existing rules, the Exchange already possesses discretionary authority to impose halts and trading suspensions for various reasons. The proposed rule change clarifies and broadens the circumstances in which the Exchange may impose such Operational Halts, and specifies procedures for both imposing and lifting then. The Exchange does not intend for these proposals to have any competitive impact whatsoever. Indeed, the Exchange expects that other exchanges will adopt similar rules and procedures to govern operational halts, to the extent that they have not done so already.

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change imposes a burden on intramarket competition because the proposed rule would apply to all market participants equally. In addition, information regarding the halting and resumption of trading will be disseminated using several freely-accessible sources to ensure broad

[45] *See* Rule 7.13 (Trading Suspensions).

[46] *See supra* note 5.

[47] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(8).

availability of information in addition to the SIP data and proprietary data feeds offered by the Exchange and other SROs that are available to subscribers. In addition, the proposed rule change includes several provisions related to the declaration and timing of trading halts and the resumption of trading designed to avoid any advantage to those who can react more quickly than other participants. The proposals encourage early and frequent communication among the SROs, SIPs, and market participants to enable the dissemination of timely and accurate information concerning the market to market participants.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The Exchange has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act[48] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder.[49] Because the proposed rule change does not: (i) significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative prior to 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, the proposed rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission will institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number SR–NYSENAT–2025–17 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSENAT–2025–17. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSENAT–2025–17 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[50]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15624 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103699; File No. SR–NYSETEX–2025–23]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Texas, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change To Amend Rule 7.18

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1)[1] of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[2] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3] notice is hereby given that on August 4, 2025, the NYSE Texas, Inc. (''NYSE Texas'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.18 (''Halts'') to effectuate amendments to Second Restatement of the CTA Plan and the Restated CQ Plan (together, the ''Amended CTA Plan''). In addition, the Exchange proposes to make conforming changes to Rules 1.1, 7.11, and 7.35. The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at *www.nyse.com* and at the principal office of the Exchange.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of those statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

NYSE Texas, Inc. (''NYSE Texas'' or the ''Exchange'') proposes to amend Rule 7.18 (''Halts'') to effectuate amendments to Second Restatement of the CTA Plan and the Restated CQ Plan (together, the ''Amended CTA Plan'').[4]

[48] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[49] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[50] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78a.

[3] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[4] On February 3, 2021, the CTA/CQ Plan participants (''Participants'') filed Amendment 36 to the Second Restatement of the CTA Plan and Amendment 27 to the Restated CQ Plan, to revise provisions governing regulatory and operational halts. *See* Letter from Robert Books, Chair, CTA/CQ Operating Committee, to Vanessa Countryman, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, dated February 3, 2021. The SEC approved the amendments on May 28, 2021 (the ''Amended CTA Plan''). *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92070 (May 28, 2021), 86 FR 29849 (June 3, 2021) (SR–CTA/CQ–2021–01). The SEC also approved similar amendments to the Nasdaq UTP Plan. *See*

The proposed changes would amend the rule's categories of regulatory and operational halts, improve the rule's clarity, and adopt defined terms from the Amended CTA Plan.[5] In addition, the Exchange proposes to make conforming changes to Rules 1.1, 7.11, and 7.35.

Background

The Exchange has been working with other SROs to establish common criteria and procedures for halting and resuming trading in equity securities in the event of regulatory or operational issues. These common standards are designed to ensure that events that might impact multiple exchanges are handled in a consistent manner that is transparent. The Exchange believes that implementation of these common standards will assist the SROs in maintaining fair and orderly markets. Notwithstanding the development of these common standards, the Exchange will retain discretion in certain instances as to whether and how to handle halts, as is discussed below.

Every U.S.-listed equity security has its primary listing on a specific stock exchange (its ''Primary Listing Market'') [6] that is responsible for a number of regulatory functions. These include confirming that the security continues to meet the exchange's listing standards, monitoring trading in that security, and taking action to halt trading in the security when necessary to protect investors and to ensure and fair and orderly market. While these core responsibilities remain with the Primary Listing Market, trading in the security can occur on multiple exchanges that have unlisted trading privileges for the security or in the over-the-counter market, regulated by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc. (''FINRA''). The exchanges and FINRA are responsible for monitoring activity on the markets over which they have oversight, but also must abide by the regulatory decisions made by the Primary Listing Market. For example, a venue trading a security pursuant to unlisted trading privileges must halt trading in that security during a Regulatory Halt, which is a defined term under the proposed rules,[7] and may only trade the security once the Primary Listing Market has cleared the security to resume trading.

All SROs have rules that require them to honor a Regulatory Halt. The Exchange, as a Primary Listing Market, also has rules outlining the circumstances in which it will halt trading in its listed securities, including situations in which such halts are for regulatory purposes—and therefore are applicable to all markets trading the security—or for operational purposes, which would not halt trading in other markets.[8] However, the trading halt rules are not consistent across SROs. Consequently, events that might constitute a Regulatory Halt for securities listed on one Primary Listing Market theoretically might not be grounds for a Regulatory Halt in securities listed on another Primary Listing Market. Such inconsistency among exchange rules could lead to confusion in circumstances such as a cross-market event, including, for example, ''Extraordinary Market Activity.'' [9]

While the Exchange's existing rules generally have worked as intended to afford the Exchange authority to initiate a Regulatory Halt in appropriate cases, the Exchange proposes to amend its rules to conform to the Amended CTA Plan.

The complex and interconnected market structure of the United States relies on consolidated market data processed and disseminated by the SIPs. In certain circumstances, the loss of this information or issues with the accuracy or timeliness of the information might cause a Primary Listing Market to determine that a trading halt is appropriate. The Exchange believes that providing further details in its rules will assist market participants in better understanding how various scenarios could be handled.

As noted above, the proposed changes that would be uniformly applied across SROs are those that relate to cross-market events as set forth in the Amended CTA Plan. However, there will still be situations where personnel at the Primary Listing Market will need to determine the impact of the cross-market event on the securities listed on its market and use discretion in deciding whether to halt trading in some or all securities during a cross-market event that affects securities listed on different markets. In making a determination as to whether to declare a Regulatory Halt, the Primary Listing Market will consider the totality of information available concerning the severity of the issue, its likely duration, and its potential impact on Member Firms [10] and other market participants, and it will make a good-faith determination that the criteria for declaring a Regulatory Halt have been satisfied and that a Regulatory Halt is appropriate. Moreover, the Primary Listing Market will consult, if feasible, with the affected Trading Center(s), other Plan Participants, or the Processor, as applicable, regarding the scope of the issue and what steps are being taken to address the issue. Once a Regulatory Halt has been declared, the Primary Listing Market would continue to evaluate the circumstances to determine when trading may resume in accordance with its rules.

While the Exchange and the other SROs intend to harmonize certain aspects of their trading halt rules, other elements of the rules will continue to be unique to each market. The Exchange believes that this is appropriate to reflect different products listed or traded on each market and the unique relationship of the Primary Listing Market to its listed companies. It is anticipated that these unique rules would most likely be invoked in cases where the Primary Listing Market's

Securities Exchange Act Release No. 92071 (May 28, 2021), 86 FR 29846 (June 3, 2021) (S7–24–89) (the ''Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan''). The Amended CTA Plan and the Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan include provisions requiring Participant self-regulatory organizations (''SROs'') to honor a Regulatory Halt declared by the Primary Listing Market. The provisions in the Amended CTA Plan and the Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan include provisions similar to the changes proposed by the Exchange in this filing.

[5] The Exchange notes that this proposed rule change is based on a similar rule change filed by the Nasdaq Stock Market LLC (''Nasdaq'') that was approved by the SEC in 2022. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 95069 (June 8, 2022), 87 FR 36018 (June 14, 2022) (SR–NASDAQ–2022–017). In addition, the Exchange's affiliate exchanges, NYSE American LLC (''NYSE American'') the New York Stock Exchange LLC (''NYSE''), and NYSE Arca, Inc. (''NYSE Arca'') have filed similar rule changes. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 102810 (April 10, 2025), 90 FR 16041 (April 16, 2025) (SR–NYSEAMER–2025–19); 103356 (June 30, 2025) (SR–NYSE–2025–21); 103476 (July 16, 2025), 90 FR 34314 (July 21, 2025) (SR–NYSEARCA–2025–50). Several exchanges that do not operate Primary Listing Markets have also filed similar rule changes. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 96574 (December 22, 2022), 87 FR 80213 (December 29, 2022) (SR–Phlx–2022–49); 97093 (March 9, 2023), 88 FR 16045 (March 15, 2023) (SR–PEARL–2023–11); and 97824 (June 29, 2023), 88 FR 43159 (July 6, 2023) (SR–MEMX–2023–11).

[6] The Exchange proposes to incorporate into Rule 7.18 the same definition of ''Primary Listing Market'' as appears in Section XI(a)(i)(H) of the Amended CTA Plan: '''Primary Listing Market' means the national securities exchange on which an Eligible Security is listed. If an Eligible Security is listed on more than one national securities exchange, Primary Listing Market means the exchange on which the security has been listed the longest.''

[7] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(11).

[8] *See* generally current Rules 7.18 and 7.13.

[9] The proposed definition of Extraordinary Market Activity encompasses a market event that affects multiple markets. *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(i)(A), which defines ''Extraordinary Market Activity.'' Proposed Rule 7.18(a)(1) would incorporate this definition by reference.

[10] ''Member Firm'' means a member as that term is defined in Section 3(a)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act. *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(F) and proposed Rule 7.18(a)(6).

decision on whether to institute a Regulatory Halt turns on specific information related to an individual security or issuer, such as the dissemination of news and the issuer's ability to meet listing standards, rather than broader market issue stemming from Extraordinary Market Activity or the loss of consolidated market data from a SIP.

The Exchange will implement all of the changes proposed herein in conjunction with other SROs implementing the necessary rule changes. The Exchange will publish a trader notice at least 30 business days before implementing the proposed changes.

Proposed Exchange Rule Changes

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.18 to add new definitions and proposed categories of regulatory and operational halts that are designed to address the type of market-wide events described in the Amended CTA Plan. Amended Rule 7.18 would also cross-reference the Exchange's current halt authority. Because current subsections of Rule 7.18 would be renumbered, the Exchange proposes to update a cross reference to Rule 7.18 in Rule 7.35. The Exchange also proposes to rename Rule 7.18 from ''Halts'' to ''Trading Halts.''

Definitions

Amended Rule 7.18(a) would set forth definitions, many of which cross-reference definitions in the Amended CTA Plan.[11] The proposed definitions would apply to both the proposed new halt authority as well as the Exchange's halt authority under its current rules.

First, the Exchange proposes to add the definition of ''*Primary Listing Market*'' [12] to Rule 7.18, which will have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(i)(H). As is currently the case under the Exchange's rules and under the Amended CTA Plan, all Regulatory Halt decisions are made by the market on which the security has its primary listing. This reflects the regulatory responsibility that the Primary Listing Market has for fair and orderly trading in the securities that list on its market and its direct access to its listed companies, which are required to advise it of certain events and maintain lines of communication with the Primary Listing Market. The proposed definition makes clear that if a security is listed on more than one market (a dually-listed security), the Primary Listing Market means the exchange on which the security has been listed the longest. This provision matches language used in the definition of ''Primary Listing Exchange'' in the Limit Up-Limit Down Plan and will avoid conflict in the event of dually-listed securities.

Second, the Exchange proposes to add a definition for the term ''*Extraordinary Market Activity,*'' [13] which would be a new definition for the Exchange. The Exchange proposes that this term would have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan:

> ''Extraordinary Market Activity'' means a disruption or malfunction of any electronic quotation, communication, reporting, or execution system operated by, or linked to, the Processor or a Trading Center or a member of such Trading Center that has a severe and continuing negative impact, on a market-wide basis, on quoting, order, or trading activity or on the availability of market information necessary to maintain a fair and orderly market. For purposes of this definition, a severe and continuing negative impact on quoting, order, or trading activity includes (i) a series of quotes, orders, or transactions at prices substantially unrelated to the current market for the security or securities; (ii) duplicative or erroneous quoting, order, trade reporting, or other related message traffic between one or more Trading Centers or their members; or (iii) the unavailability of quoting, order, transaction information, or regulatory messages for a sustained period.[14]

The Exchange notes that the three scenarios included in the proposed new definition would not be exhaustive. This enables the Primary Listing Market to act in the best interests of the market when confronted with unexpected events. However, the Exchange believes that the three scenarios included in the rule cover many of the events that are most likely to occur.

Third, the Exchange proposes to add a set of new definitions that would be specific to events involving the SIP. While the Exchange recognizes that many events involving the SIP would also meet the definition of ''Extraordinary Market Activity'' as defined in the Amended CTA Plan, the Exchange believes that the critical role of the SIPs in market infrastructure weighs in favor having the Exchange's rules specify how such events would be handled. The definitions of ''*SIP Outage,*'' [15] ''*Material SIP Latency,*'' [16] ''*SIP Halt,*'' [17] and ''*SIP Halt Resume Time*'' [18] are intended to provide specificity to address this subset of potential market issues. In addition, the Exchange is proposing to define terms related to SIP governance needed in order to understand these definitions:

- ''*Processor*'' or ''*SIP*'' [19] would have the same meaning as the term ''Processor'' in the Nasdaq UTP Plan or the CTA Plan, as applicable.[20]
- ''*SIP Plan*'' [21] would be defined as ''the national market system plan governing the SIP, as applicable.''
- ''*Operating Committee*'' [22] would be defined as having the same meaning as in the CTA Plan, namely the committee charged with administering the CTA Plan.
- ''*Trading Center*'' [23] would have the same meaning as in Rule 600(b)(95) of Regulation NMS.

The Exchange proposes to adopt a category of Regulatory Halt, called a ''*SIP Halt,*'' [24] that would have the same meaning as that term is defined in the Amended CTA Plan, namely ''a Regulatory Halt to trading in one or more securities that a Primary Listing Market declares in the event of a SIP Outage or Material SIP Latency.'' [25] This new category of Regulatory Halt would address situations where the Primary Listing Market declares a Regulatory Halt in one or more securities as a result of a SIP Outage [26] or a Material SIP Latency.[27]

---

[11] The Exchange notes that these terms are defined identically in the Amended CTA Plan and the Amended Nasdaq UTP Plan, such that there will be uniformity in the meaning of the terms among such plans as well as among the rules of the SROs. The Exchange proposes to adopt in Rule 7.18(a) all of the definitions in the Amended CTA Plan Section XI(a)(i) except for definition of ''Regular Trading Hours'' at Section XI(a)(i)(I), because the Exchange uses different terminology for its trading sessions and those terms are already defined in the Exchange's rules. *See* Rule 7.34(a) defining ''Early Trading Session,'' ''Core Trading Session,'' and ''Late Trading Session.''

[12] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(9).

[13] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(1).

[14] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(i)(H).

[15] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(14).

[16] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(5).

[17] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(12).

[18] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(13).

[19] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(10).

[20] *See, e.g.,* Amended CTA Plan, Section I(x), which provides: '''Processor' means the organization designated as recipient and processor of last sale price information furnished by Participants pursuant to this CTA Plan, as Section V describes.''

[21] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(15).

[22] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(7).

[23] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(16).

[24] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(12).

[25] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(K).

[26] ''SIP Outage'' means ''a situation in which the Processor has ceased, or anticipates being unable, to provide updated and/or accurate quotation or last sale price information in one or more securities for a material period that exceeds the time thresholds for an orderly failover to backup facilities established by mutual agreement among the Processor, the Primary Listing Market for the affected securities, and the Operating Committee unless the Primary Listing Market, in consultation with the Processor and the Operating Committee, determines that resumption of accurate data is expected in the near future.'' *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(M).

[27] ''Material SIP Latency'' means ''a delay of quotation or last sale price information in one or more securities between the time data is received

Fourth, the Exchange proposes to add a definition of ''*Regulatory Halt,*'' [28] which would be a new defined term that incorporates the Exchange's existing regulatory halt authority as well as the proposed new regulatory halt authority. The Exchange proposes that the term would have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan,[29] as follows:

> a halt declared by the Primary Listing Market in trading in one or more securities on all Trading Centers for regulatory purposes, including for the dissemination of material news, news pending, suspensions, or where otherwise necessary to maintain a fair and orderly market. A Regulatory Halt includes a trading pause triggered by Limit Up Limit Down,[30] a halt based on Extraordinary Market Activity, a trading halt triggered by a Market-Wide Circuit Breaker,[31] and a SIP Halt.

The term ''Regulatory Halt'' would include the various existing reasons for a Regulatory Halt that are currently enumerated in the Exchange's rules and Company Guide, as well as the proposed new categories of Regulatory Halt from the Amended CTA Plan: (1) a SIP Halt (due to a SIP Outage or Material SIP Latency), (2) a halt based on Extraordinary Market Activity, and (3) a halt in the event of a national, regional, or localized disruption that necessitates a Regulatory Halt to maintain a fair and orderly market.

Fifth, the Exchange proposes to add a definition of ''*Operational Halt,*'' [32] which would be a new definition for the Exchange. The Exchange proposes that this term would have the same meaning as in the Amended CTA Plan, which is: ''a halt in trading in one or more securities only on a Market declared by such Participant and is not a Regulatory Halt.'' [33] An Operational Halt is effective only on the Exchange; other markets are not required to halt trading in the affected securities. In practice, the Exchange has always had the capacity to implement operational halts and local trading suspensions in specified circumstances, but such halts are not currently referred to as ''operational halts'' in the Exchange's rules.[34] The proposed change would provide greater clarity on when an Operational Halt may be implemented and the process for halting and resuming trading in the event of an Operational Halt. An Operational Halt is not a Regulatory Halt.

Regulatory Halts

Proposed Rule 7.18(b) would set forth requirements relating to Regulatory Halts.

Authority To Initiate a Regulatory Halt

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1) would describe the Exchange's authority to initiate a Regulatory Halt. In this subsection, the Exchange would identify all of the bases for its Regulatory Halt authority, including cross-referencing to current rules describing existing halt authority and by adding the new Regulatory Halt authority consistent with the Amended CTA Plan.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(A) would describe ''Mandatory Halts,'' where the Exchange must issue a Regulatory Halt. The proposed rule would identify five categories of mandatory Regulatory Halts:

- Pursuant to Rule 7.11 concerning Limit Up Limit Down.[35] (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(A)(i)). This proposed rule would effectuate the definition of Regulatory Halt in proposed Rule 7.18(a)(11), which cross-references Section XI(a)(1)(J) of the Amended CTA Plan.
- Pursuant to Rule 7.12 concerning Market-Wide Circuit Breaker.[36] (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(A)(ii)). This proposed rule would effectuate the definition of Regulatory Halt in proposed Rule 7.18(a)(11), which cross-references Section XI(a)(1)(J) of the Amended CTA Plan.
- For a security for which the Exchange is the Primary Listing Market before the end of the Late Trading Session on the day immediately before the market effective date of a reverse stock split (''Reverse Stock Split Halt''). (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(A)(iii)). This proposed rule is based on current Rule 7.18(e) and would effectuate Section XI(a)(iii)(1) of the Amended CTA Plan, which provides that a Primary Listing Exchange may declare a Regulatory Halt ''as provided for in the rules of the Primary Listing Market.'' The Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(e) as duplicative of the proposed rule text.
- If the Exchange becomes aware that, with respect to Derivative Securities Products listed on the Exchange for which a Net Asset Value (''NAV'') (and in the case of Managed Fund Shares under NYSE Rule 8.600 and Managed Trust Securities under NYSE Rule 8.700, a Disclosed Portfolio) is disseminated, such NAV or Disclosed Portfolio is not being disseminated to all market participants at the same time (''Dissemination Halt''). (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(A)(iv)). This proposed rule is based on current Rule 7.18(d)(2) with non-substantive differences to replace the term ''Exchange Traded Product'' with the term ''Derivative Securities Product,'' and would effectuate Section XI(a)(iii)(1) of the Amended CTA Plan, which provides that a Primary Listing Exchange may declare a Regulatory Halt ''as provided for in the rules of the Primary Listing Market.'' The Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(d)(2) as duplicative of the proposed rule text.
- As provided for elsewhere in the Rules of the Exchange, including but not limited to Rules 5.2, 5.5, 8.100, 8.202, 8.204, 8.400, 8.500, 8.600, 8.601, 8.700, and 8.900 concerning requirements for listing, delisting, and maintaining listings of certain types of securities, and regarding the public dissemination of material information (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(A)(v)). This proposed rule would effectuate Section XI(a)(iii)(1) of the Amended CTA Plan, which provides that a Primary Listing Exchange may declare a Regulatory Halt ''as provided for in the rules of the Primary Listing Market.''

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(B) would describe ''Discretionary Halts,'' where ''the Exchange may declare a Regulatory Halt in trading for any security for which it is the Primary Listing Market.'' The proposed rule would list four bases for the Exchange to declare a discretionary Regulatory Halt:

- For a security that is the subject of an initial pricing on the Exchange and that has not been listed on a national securities exchange immediately prior to initial pricing (an ''Initial Listing Regulatory Halt''). (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(B)(i)). This proposed rule is identical to rules on the Exchange's affiliate exchanges NYSE, NYSE American, and NYSE Arca, and therefore is not novel.[37]
- If the Exchange determines that there is a SIP Outage, Material SIP Latency, or Extraordinary Market Activity. (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(B)(ii)). This proposed rule

by the Processor and the time the Processor disseminates the data over the high speed line or over the ''high speed line'' under the CQ Plan, which delay the Primary Listing Market determines, in consultation with, and in accordance with, publicly disclosed guidelines established by the Operating Committee, to be (a) material and (b) unlikely to be resolved in the near future.'' *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(E).

[28] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(11).

[29] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(J).

[30] The Exchange proposes to incorporate the Amended CTA Plan's definition of ''Limit Up Limit Down.'' *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(2).

[31] The Exchange proposes to incorporate the Amended CTA Plan's definition of ''Market-Wide Circuit Breaker.'' *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(4).

[32] *See* proposed Rule 7.18(a)(8).

[33] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(1)(G).

[34] *See* Rule 7.13 (Trading Suspensions).

[35] Rule 7.11 is the Exchange's rule governing Limit Up Limit Down.

[36] Rule 7.12 is the Exchange's rule governing Market-Wide Circuit Breaker.

[37] *See* current NYSE American Rule 7.18E(e) and current NYSE Rule 123D(d).

would effectuate Section XI(a)(iii)(2) of the Amended CTA Plan, which provides this authority.

• In the event of national, regional, or localized disruption that necessitates a Regulatory Halt to maintain a fair and orderly market. (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(B)(iii)). This proposed rule would effectuate Section XI(a)(iii)(3) of the Amended CTA Plan, which provides this authority.

• As provided for elsewhere in the Rules of the Exchange, including but not limited to Rules 5.2, 5.5, 8.3, 8.12, 8.100, 8.200, 8.202, 8.204, 8.400, 8.500, 8.600, 8.601, 8.700, and 8.900 concerning requirements for listing, delisting, and maintaining listings of certain types of securities, and regarding the public dissemination of material information (Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(1)(B)(iv)). This proposed rule would effectuate Section XI(a)(iii)(1) of the Amended CTA Plan, which provides that a Primary Listing Exchange may declare a Regulatory Halt ''as provided for in the rules of the Primary Listing Market.''

Communications

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(2) would describe communications, consistent with Section XI(a)(viii) of the Amended CTA Plan. The proposed rule would provide that whenever, in the exercise of its regulatory functions, the Exchange as Primary Listing Market for an Eligible Security determines it is appropriate to initiate a Regulatory Halt, it will notify all other Participants and the Processor of such Regulatory Halt as well as provide notice that a Regulatory Halt has been lifted using such protocols and other emergency procedures as may be mutually agreed to between the Operating Committee and the Exchange. The Processor shall disseminate to Participants notice of the Regulatory Halt (as well as notice of the lifting of a Regulatory Halt) through the high speed line or through the ''high speed line'' under the CQ Plan, and any other means the Processor, in its sole discretion, considers appropriate. Each Participant shall be required to continuously monitor these communication protocols established by the Operating Committee and the Processor during market hours, and the failure of a Participant to do so shall not prevent the Exchange from initiating a Regulatory Halt in accordance with the SIP Plan and the procedures specified in these rules.

Initiating a Regulatory Halt

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3) would specify how the Exchange, as a Primary Listing Market, would initiate a Regulatory Halt. The proposed rule is consistent with the procedures for initiating a Regulatory Halt as set forth in the Section XI(a)(iv) of the Amended CTA Plan.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(A) would provide, consistent with Section XI(a)(iv)(A) of the Amended CTA Plan, that the start time of a Regulatory Halt would be when the Primary Listing Market declares the halt, regardless of whether an issue with communications impacts the dissemination of the notice. This proposal would provide market participants with certainty on the official start time of the Regulatory Halt. Under the proposed rule, the start time is fixed by the Primary Listing Market; it is not dependent on whether notice is disseminated immediately. This will avoid possible disagreement if the Regulatory Halt time were tied to dissemination or receipt of notification, which may occur at different times. The Exchange recognizes that in situations where communication is interrupted, trades may continue to occur until news of the Regulatory Halt reaches all trading centers. However, a fixed ''official'' Regulatory Halt start time will allow SROs to revisit trades after the fact and determine in a consistent manner whether specific trades should stand.

Second, proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(B) would provide, consistent with Section XI(a)(iv)(B) of the Amended CTA Plan, that if the SIP is unable to disseminate notice of a Regulatory Halt or the Exchange is not open for trading, the Exchange would take reasonable steps to provide notice of a Regulatory Halt in the manner set forth in the Amended CTA Plan. Currently, after receiving notice from the Primary Listing Market, the SIP disseminates an automated, machine-readable trade halt messages to notify Trading Centers to automatically halt their order matching and order dissemination systems. Many Trading Centers rely solely on such SIP dissemination of a Regulatory Halt. Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(B) would provide that the Exchange would take additional, reasonable steps to notify Trading Centers of a Regulatory Halt. The Amended CTA Plan provides that if the SIP is unable to disseminate notice of a Regulatory Halt, the other available means of dissemination that a Primary Listing Market could use would include:

• Proprietary data feeds that contain the same quote and trade information that the Exchange also sends to the applicable SIP;

• Posting on a publicly available Exchange website; or

• System status messages that are disseminated to market participants who sign up to receive such messages.[38]

These additional sources for notice of a Regulatory Halt would provide redundancy if either the SIP or the Exchange is unable to communicate via the existing automated procedures. Although it may take longer for market participants to react to messages received in less automated formats, the use of multiple forms of dissemination will increase the likelihood that participants receive this important information. It will also assist participants that do not subscribe to the Exchange's proprietary feeds in getting regulatory notices. As noted above, in situations where communication is interrupted, the Exchange and other SROs would retain the ability to break trades that occurred after the start of the Regulatory Halt in appropriate circumstances, thereby lessening the potential impact on participants that were delayed in halting trading.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(C) would provide, consistent with Section XI(a)(iv)(C) of the Amended CTA Plan, that except in exigent circumstances, the Exchange would not declare a Regulatory Halt retroactive to a time earlier than the notice of such halt. Feedback from market participants has been that it is very disruptive to trading when the Primary Listing Market sets the start of a trading halt for a time earlier than the notice of the halt.[39] Therefore, in almost all situations the trading halt will start at the time of the notice or at a point in time thereafter. However, the Exchange would retain the authority to implement a retroactive halt to deal with unexpected and significant situations that represent exigent circumstances. While it is difficult in advance to provide an exhaustive list of when retroactive application of a trading halt would be in the public interest, one situation where a halt was applied retroactively was when the Primary Listing Market erroneously lifted a Regulatory Halt. In that case, the Primary Listing Market instituted a Regulatory Halt retroactively so that it coincided with the time the original halt was lifted in error.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(3)(D) would provide, consistent with Section XI(a)(iii)(B) of the Amended CTA Plan, that in making a determination to declare a Regulatory Halt in trading any

[38] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(iv)(B)(1)–(3).

[39] As noted previously, this is measured as the point in time when the Primary Listing Market declares the halt, regardless of whether there is a delay in dissemination of the notice or in receipt of the notice by participants.

security for which the Exchange is the Primary Listing Market, the Exchange will consider the totality of information available concerning the severity of the issue, its likely duration, and potential impact on Member Firms and other market participants and will make a good-faith determination that the criteria for declaring the Regulatory Halt have been satisfied and that a Regulatory Halt is appropriate. The Exchange will consult, if feasible, with the affected Trading Center(s), other SIP Plan Participants, or the Processor, as applicable, regarding the scope of the issue and what steps are being taken to address the issue. Once a Regulatory Halt has been declared, the Exchange will continue to evaluate the circumstances to determine when trading may resume in accordance with its Rules.

UTP Regulatory Halt

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(4) would specify how the Exchange would respond to Regulatory Halts declared by other Primary Listing Markets, referred to by the Exchange as a ''UTP Regulatory Halt.'' [40]

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(4)(A) would provide that the Exchange would halt trading in a UTP Security when the Primary Listing Market declares a Regulatory Halt for any such securities. This proposed rule text is based on Section XI(a)(iii) of the Amended CTA Plan, as well as the first sentence of current Rule 7.18(a),[41] which provides in part that if the UTP Listing Market declares a UTP Regulatory Halt, the Exchange will halt trading in that security.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(4)(B)(i), (ii), and (iii) would set forth rules for trading halts in UTP Derivative Securities Products.[42] This proposed rule text is based on current Rule 7.18(d)(1)(A), (B), and (C) with non-substantive differences to replace the term ''Exchange Traded Product'' with the term ''Derivative Securities Product,'' replace the term ''Exchange's Normal Trading Hours'' with the term ''Core Trading Session,'' [43] and the term ''primary listing market'' with the term ''Primary Listing Market'' in proposed Rule 7.18(b)(4)(B)(ii) and (iii)(a) and (b). The Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(d)(1) and its sub-paragraphs as duplicative of the proposed rule text.

Resumption of Trading After a Regulatory Halt

The SROs have jointly developed processes to govern the resumption of trading in the event of a Regulatory Halt. While the actual process of re-launching trading will remain unique to each exchange (for example, trading in Exchange-listed securities resumes on the Exchange in most cases pursuant to Rule 7.35), the proposed rule would harmonize certain common elements of the reopening process that would benefit from consistency across markets. These common elements include the primacy of the Primary Listing Market in resumption decisions, the requirement that the Primary Listing Market make its determination to resume trading in good faith, and certain parts of the complex process for reopening trading after a SIP Halt. With respect to a SIP Halt, common elements of the reopening process include the interaction among SROs (including the Primary Listing Market with the SIP), the requirement that the Primary Listing Market terminate a SIP Halt with a notification that specifies a SIP Halt Resume Time, the minimum quoting times before resumption of trading, the cutoff time after which trading would not resume during Core Trading Hours, and the time when trading may resume if the Primary Listing Market does not open a security within the amount of time specified in its rules after the SIP Halt Resume Time.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(5) provides the process for resuming trading upon the conclusion of Regulatory Halts other than SIP Halts. This new rule would effectuate Section XI(a)(v) of the Amended CTA Plan.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(5)(A) would make clear that the Exchange, as the Primary Listing Market, is responsible for declaring a resumption of trading when it makes a good-faith determination that trading may resume in a fair and orderly manner in accordance with its rules.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(5)(B) would provide that the Exchange would resume trading after a Regulatory Halt other than a SIP Halt with a Trading Halt Auction pursuant to Rule 7.35, except in the situations enumerated in sub-paragraphs (i) through (v).

Sub-paragraph (i) would specify that the Exchange would resume trading after a Limit Up Limit Down trading pause as specified in Rule 7.11.

Sub-paragraph (ii) would specify that the Exchange would resume trading after a Market-Wide Circuit Breaker halt as specified in Rule 7.12.

Sub-paragraph (iii) would specify that the Exchange would resume trading after a Reverse Stock Split Halt with a Trading Halt Auction at 9:00 a.m. ET on the effective date of the reverse stock split.

Sub-paragraph (iv) would specify that the Exchange would resume trading after a Dissemination Halt when the NAV or Disclosed Portfolio is available to all market participants.

Sub-paragraph (v) would specify that the Exchange would resume trading after an Initial Listing Regulatory Halt when the security is open for trading.[44]

Sub-paragraph (vi) would provide that the Exchange would resume trading after a UTP Regulatory Halt other than a SIP Halt by starting to accept orders after the Exchange receives notification [45] from the UTP Listing Market that the Regulatory Halt has been terminated, provided that during Core Trading Hours, the Exchange will not resume trading in any security that is subject to the Limit Up Limit Down Plan until the Exchange receives the first Price Band in that security. This proposed rule text is based on the first sentence of current Rule 7.18(a), and the Exchange proposes to delete the first sentence of current Rule 7.18(a) as duplicative of this new rule text.[46] Sub-paragraph (v) would further provide that the Exchange would not conduct a

[40] The term ''UTP Listing Market'' is defined in Rule 1.1(bb) to mean the primary listing market for a UTP Security. The term ''UTP Security'' is defined in Rule 1.1(aa) to mean a security that is listed on a UTP Listing Market and that trades on the Exchange pursuant to unlisted trading privileges. The term ''UTP Regulatory Halt'' is defined in Rule 1.1(cc). The Exchange proposes a non-substantive amendment to this definition to cross-reference the definition of ''Regulatory Halt'' in proposed Rule 7.18 and delete the clause ''that requires all market centers to halt trading in that security'' as duplicative of the proposed new definition of Regulatory Halt, described above.

[41] As discussed below, the Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(a) in its entirety as no longer applicable.

[42] The term ''UTP Derivative Securities Product'' is defined in Rule 1.1(k) to mean a security that meets the definition of ''derivative securities product'' in Rule 19b–4(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and that trades on the Exchange pursuant to unlisted trading privileges.

[43] The term ''Core Trading Hours'' is defined in Rule 1.1(e) to mean the hours of 9:30 a.m. Eastern Time through 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time or such other hours as may be determined by the Exchange from time to time.

[44] This language regarding the termination of an Initial Listing Regulatory Halt when the security is open for trading is identical to the language used in current NYSE American Rule 7.18E(e), and therefore is not novel.

[45] The manner and timing of such notice would be determined by the UTP Listing Market.

[46] The Exchange does not propose to include the second sentence of current Rule 7.18(a) in the proposed rule, as that sentence is inconsistent with the first sentence (upon which proposed Rule 7.18(b)(5)(B)(v) is based), and would permit the Exchange to resume trading in a security affected by a UTP Regulatory Halt other than a SIP Halt before the UTP Listing Market has provided notification that the halt has ended and before the Exchange receives the first LULD Price Bands in that security. The Exchange accordingly proposes to delete the second sentence of current Rule 7.18(a).

Trading Halt Auction to resume trading after a Regulatory Halt in a UTP Security.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6) would address resumption of trading after a SIP Halt. This new rule would effectuate Section XI(a)(vi) of the Amended CTA Plan.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A) would establish rules for the resumption of trading following a SIP Halt initiated by the Exchange. Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(i), which is based on Section XI(a)(vi)(A) of the Amended CTA Plan, would provide that the Exchange would determine when a SIP Halt would end, which would be defined as the ''SIP Halt Resume Time,'' which is also defined in the Proposed Amended CTA Plan.[47] As further proposed, in making this determination, the Exchange would make a good-faith determination and consider the totality of information to determine whether resuming trading would promote a fair and orderly market.

The SROs' experience with such events is that communication among SROs, SIPs, and market participants is the best way to ensure that the Primary Listing Market has access to available information and to coordinate the reopening of trading in an orderly manner. In addition, the SROs anticipate that market participants and other affected entities will have access to information about the issue causing the SIP Halt, the duration of the halt, and the resumption process through updated communications from the SIP processor, Operating Committee, and Primary Listing Market. Accordingly, the proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(i) would further provide that when determining whether to resume trading, the Exchange would include input from the SIP processor, the Operating Committee, or the operator of the system in question (as well as any Trading Center(s) to which such system is linked), regarding operational readiness to resume trading. The rule would further provide that the Exchange would retain discretion to delay the SIP Halt Resume Time if it believes trading would not resume in a fair and orderly manner.

Under proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(ii), the Exchange would terminate a SIP Halt with a notification that specifies the SIP Halt Resume Time. Section XI(a)(vi)(B) of the Amended CTA Plan directs the Primary Listing Market to specify in its rules (a) the minimum notice it will provide of a SIP Halt Resume Time, during which period market participants may enter orders in the affected securities, and (b) the last SIP Halt Resume Time before the end of regular trading hours. In accordance with that direction, Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(ii) would state that the Exchange would provide for a minimum five-minute notice of a SIP Halt Resume Time, which is sufficiently in advance of resumption to permit market participants to prepare their systems for trading.

In addition, proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(ii) would establish that during Core Trading Hours, the last SIP Halt Resume Time would be 15 minutes before the end of Core Trading Hours, *e.g.,* 3:45 p.m. ET. The Exchange believes that a SIP Halt Resume Time after 3:45 p.m. ET would interrupt a fair and orderly closing process. Accordingly, in such case, the Exchange would not run a Closing Auction and would establish Official Closing Prices for securities affected by the SIP Halt pursuant to subparagraphs (2) and (3) of the definition of ''Official Closing Price'' in Rule 1.1(t), which set forth how the Exchange will determine the Official Closing Price if the Exchange is unable to conduct a closing transaction in one or more securities due to a systems or technical issue. In such case, the Exchange would disseminate a SIP Halt Resume Time after Core Trading Hours.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(ii) would further provide the Exchange, as the Primary Listing Market, with discretion to stagger the SIP Halt Resume Times for multiple securities in order to reopen in a fair and orderly manner. For example, this discretion could be used to open trading in a small number of symbols to ensure that systems are operating normally before resuming trading in the remaining symbols.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(A)(iii) would provide that for a SIP Halt initiated by the Exchange, the Exchange would reopen trading with a Trading Halt Auction. Because a SIP Halt is a Regulatory Halt, such Trading Halt Auction would be subject to the extension logic and widened auction collars as described in Rule 7.35(e)(5)–(7).

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(6)(B) would address resumption of trading after a SIP Halt initiated by a UTP Listing Market. The proposed rule would provide that for UTP Securities affected by a SIP Halt, during Core Trading Hours, the Exchange may resume trading in the affected security after trading in the affected security has resumed on the UTP Listing Market or notice has been received from the UTP Listing Market that such trading may resume. The proposed rule would further provide that during Core Trading Hours, if the UTP Listing Market does not open a security within the amount of time listed by the rules of the Primary Listing Market, the Exchange may resume trading in that security, provided that the Exchange will not resume trading in any security that is subject to the Limit Up Limit Down Plan until it receives the first Price Band in that security.[48] Outside of Core Trading Hours, the Exchange may resume trading in an affected UTP Security after the SIP Halt Resume Time.

Order Processing During a Regulatory Halt, Including SIP Halts

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(7) would describe how the Exchange would process new and existing orders during a Regulatory Halt. This proposed rule text is based on current Rule 7.18(b) and (c), with differences described below. The Exchange proposes to delete current Rule 7.18(b) and (c) and their sub-paragraphs as duplicative of the proposed rule text.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(7)(A) would address how the Exchange would process new and existing orders during a Regulatory Halt that will reopen with a Trading Halt Auction. This proposed rule is based on current Rule 7.18(c) with differences to use new terminology relating to Regulatory Halts instead of referring to ''securities listed on the Exchange during a halt, suspension or pause.'' The Exchange also proposes to specify that the order processing described in this rule would only be applicable for Regulatory Halts if the Exchange reopens with a Trading Halt Auction. Proposed Rules 7.18(b)(7)(A)(i)–(vi) are based on current Rule 7.18(c)(1)–(6) without any substantive differences.

Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(7)(B) would address how the Exchange would process new and existing orders in a UTP Security during a UTP Regulatory Halt (including a SIP Halt initiated by a UTP Listing Market). This proposed rule text is based on current Rule 7.18(b) with non-substantive differences to use new terminology. Proposed Rule 7.18(b)(7)(B)(i)–(vi) are based on current Rule 7.18(b)(1)–(6) without any substantive differences.

Operational Halts

The Exchange proposes to address Operational Halts in proposed Rule

[47] *See* Amended CTA Plan, Section XI(a)(i)(L).

[48] The Exchange's proposal to wait for the first Limit Up Limit Down Price Band in the affected UTP Security before resuming trading after a SIP Halt initiated by a UTP Listing Market is consistent with the Exchange's practice for resuming trading in affected UTP Securities after other types of Regulatory Halts. *See* proposed Rule 7.18(b)(5)(B)(vi) and current Rule 7.18(a).

7.18(c). As noted above, an Operational Halt is non-regulatory in nature and applies only to the exchange that calls the halt. As described above, the Exchange has always had the capacity to implement operational halts and local trading suspensions in specified circumstances, but such halts are not currently referred to as ''operational halts'' in the Exchange's rules.[49] As part of the Exchange's assessment with other SROs of the halting and resumption of trading, the Exchange believes that the markets would benefit from greater clarity regarding when an Operational Halt may be appropriate. In part, the proposed change is designed to cover situations similar to those that might constitute a Regulatory Halt but where the impact is limited to a single market. For example, just as a market disruption might trigger a Regulatory Halt for Extraordinary Market Activity (as defined in the Amended CTA Plan) if it affects multiple markets, a disruption at the Exchange, such as a technical issue affecting trading in one or more securities, could impact trading on the Exchange so significantly that an Operational Halt is appropriate in one or more securities. In such an instance, it would be in the public interest to institute an Operational Halt to minimize the impact of a disruption that, if trading were allowed to continue, might negatively affect a greater number of market participants. An Operational Halt does not implicate other trading centers.

Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(1) would specify the Exchange's authority to initiate an Operational Halt, which is discretionary, and provide that the Exchange may declare an Operational Halt for any security trading on the Exchange if it is experiencing Extraordinary Market Activity on the Exchange (Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(1)(A)) or when otherwise necessary to maintain a fair and orderly market or in the public interest (Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(1)(B)).

Under proposed Rule 7.18(c)(2), the Exchange would notify the Processor if it has concerns about its ability to collect and transmit quotes, orders, or last sale prices, or where it has declared an Operational Halt or suspension of trading in one or more Eligible Securities (as that term is defined in the CTA Plan), pursuant to the procedures adopted by the Operating Committee.

Proposed Rule 7.1–8E(c)(3) would set out rules for order processing during an Operational Halt. In such case, proposed Rule 7.18(c)(3)(A) would provide that the Exchange would cancel all unexecuted orders resting on the NYSE Arca Book, including Auction-Only Orders, and proposed Rule 7.18(c)(3)(B) would provide that the Exchange would reject all other incoming order instructions until the Exchange resumes trading. The Exchange currently processes new and existing orders in this manner when it suspends trading.[50] The Exchange proposes to include this processing in Rule 7.18 to specify that this processing would also be applicable to when the Exchange resumes trading following an Operational Halt in an Exchange-listed security.

Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(4) would specify how the Exchange resumes trading after an Operational Halt. Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(4)(A) would provide that the Exchange would resume trading following an Operational Halt when it determines that trading may resume in a fair and orderly manner consistent with the Exchange's rules. Proposed Rule 7.18(c)(4)(B) would address ''Communications,'' and provide that trading in a halted security shall resume at the time specified by the Exchange in a notice. It would further specify that Exchange will notify all other Plan participants and the SIP of such Operational Halt as well as provide notice that an Operational Halt has been lifted using such protocols and other emergency procedures as may be mutually agreed to between the Operating Committee and the Exchange. If the SIP is unable to disseminate notice of an Operational Halt or the Exchange is not open for trading, the Exchange would take reasonable steps to provide notice of an Operational Halt, which shall include both the type and start time of the Operational Halt. Each Plan participant shall continuously monitor communication protocols established by the Operating Committee and the Processor during market hours to disseminate notice of an Operational Halt, and the failure of a participant to do so shall not prevent the Exchange from initiating an Operational Halt.

Conforming Changes to Other Rules

The Exchange also proposes non-substantive amendments of three other rules.

First, as noted above, the Exchange proposes a non-substantive amendment to the definition of ''UTP Regulatory Halt'' in Rule 1.1(cc) to cross-reference the definition of ''Regulatory Halt'' in proposed Rule 7.18 and delete the clauses ''trade, suspension, halt, or pause'' and ''that requires all market centers to halt trading in that security'' as duplicative of the proposed new definition of Regulatory Halt.

Second, the Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.11 (Limit Up-Limit Down Plan and Trading Pauses in Individual Securities Due to Extraordinary Market Volatility). Current Rule 7.11(b)(2) provides that if a primary listing market other than the Exchange issues a Trading Pause, the Exchange will resume trading as provided for in Rule 7.18(a) regarding UTP Regulatory Halts. The Exchange proposes to replace the term ''primary listing market'' with ''UTP Listing Market'' for clarity, and proposes to change the current cross-reference to Rule 7.18(a) to refer instead to amended Rule 7.18(b)(5)(B)(vi), which would encompass the provisions of current Rule 7.18(a).

Third, the Exchange proposes to amend Rules 7.35(e)(3) and (e)(8) to update cross-references from current Rule 7.18(c) to proposed Rule 7.18(b)(7)(A).

Implementation

The Exchange will implement the changes proposed herein in conjunction with the Processors and the other SROs implementing the necessary rule changes and related technology and procedural changes. The Exchange will publish a trader notice at least 30 business days before implementing the proposed changes.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that its proposal is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder that are applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b) of the Act.[51] Specifically, the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act [52] because it would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, protect investors and the public interest.

As described above, the Exchange and other SROs are seeking to adopt harmonized rules related to halting and resuming trading in U.S.-listed equity securities. The Exchange believes that the proposed rules will provide greater transparency and clarity with respect to the situations in which trading will be

[49] *See* Rule 7.13 (Trading Suspensions). The Exchange also notes that its proposed Rule 7.18(c) regarding Operational Halts is substantially identical to the revised NYSE American, NYSE, NYSE Arca, Nasdaq, Phlx, MIAX Pearl, and MEMX rules cited in note 4 above, and is therefore not novel.

[50] *See* current Rule 7.18(c).

[51] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[52] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

halted and the process through which that halt will be implemented and terminated. Particularly, the proposed changes seek to achieve consistent results for participants across U.S. equities exchanges and in the over-the-counter market while maintaining a fair and orderly market, protecting investors, and protecting the public interest. Based on the foregoing, the Exchange believes that the proposed rules are consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act [53] because they will foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating and facilitating transactions in securities.

As discussed previously, the Exchange believes that the various provisions of the proposed rules that will apply to all SROs are focused on the type of cross-market event where a consistent approach will assist market participants and reduce confusion during a crisis. Because market participants often trade the same security across multiple venues and trade securities listed on different exchanges as part of a common strategy, the Exchange believes that the proposed rules will lessen the risk that market participants holding a basket of securities will have to deal with divergent outcomes depending on where the securities are listed or traded. Conversely, the proposed rules would still allow individual SROs to react differently to events that impact various securities or markets in different ways. This avoids the ''brittle market'' risk where an isolated event at a single market forces all markets trading equities securities to halt or halts trading in all securities where the issue affected only a subset of securities. By addressing both concerns, the Exchange believes that the proposed rules further the Act's goal of maintaining fair and orderly markets.

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule's focus of responsibility on the Primary Listing Market for decisions related to a Regulatory Halt and the resumption of trading is consistent with the Act, which itself imposes obligations on exchanges with respect to issuers that are listed. As is currently the case, the Primary Listing Market would be responsible for the many regulatory functions related to its listings, including the determination of when to declare a Regulatory Halt. While these core responsibilities remain with the Primary Listing Market, trading in the security can occur on multiple exchanges that have unlisted trading privileges for the security or in the over-the-counter market, regulated by FINRA. These other venues are responsible for monitoring activity on their own markets, but also have agreed to honor a Regulatory Halt.

The proposed changes relating to Regulatory Halts would ensure that all SROs handle the situations covered therein in a consistent manner that would prevent conflicting outcomes in cross-market events, and ensure that all Trading Centers recognize a Regulatory Halt declared by the Primary Listing Market. The changes are consistent with and implement the Amended CTA Plan. While the proposed rules recognize one Primary Listing Market for each security, the rules do not prevent an issuer from switching its listing to another national securities exchange that would thereafter assume the responsibilities of Primary Listing Market for that security. Similarly, the proposed rules set forth a fair and objective standard to determine which exchange will be the Primary Listing Market in the case of dually-listed securities: the exchange on which the security has been listed the longest.

The Exchange believes that the other definitions in the proposed rules are also consistent with the Act. For example, the proposed rules would define what constitutes Extraordinary Market Activity, consistent with the definition of that term in the Amended CTA Plan, thereby furthering the Act's goal of promoting fair and orderly markets. The Exchange is also proposing to adopt definitions for ''SIP Outage,'' ''Material SIP Latency'' and ''SIP Halt,'' to explicitly address situations that may disrupt the markets, and these definitions are identical to the definitions in the Amended CTA Plan. The proposed rules specify when the Exchange should seek information from the Operating Committee, other SROs, and market participants as well as means for dissemination of important information to the market, consistent with the Amended CTA Plan. The Exchange believes these provisions strike the right balance in outlining a process to address unforeseen events without preventing SROs from taking action needed to protect the market.

The Exchange believes that the proposed rules, which make halts consistent across exchange rules, is consistent with the Act in that it will foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in regulating the equities markets. In particular, the Exchange believes it is important for SROs to coordinate when there is a widespread and significant event, as multiple Trading Centers are affected in such an event. Further, while the Exchange recognizes that the proposed rule will not guarantee a consistent result on every market in all situations, the Exchange does believe that it will assist in that outcome. While the proposed rule relating to Regulatory Halts focuses primarily on the kinds of cross-market events that would likely impact multiple markets, individual SROs will still retain flexibility to deal with unique products or smaller situations confined to a particular market. To that end, the Exchange has retained some existing elements of Rule 7.18 that focus on its unique products and the processes it has developed over time to interact with its issuers.

Also consistent with the Act, and with the Amended CTA Plan, is the Exchange's proposal in Rule 7.18(c) to address Operational Halts, which are non-regulatory in nature and apply only to the exchange that declares the halt. As noted earlier, the Exchange has always had the capacity to implement operational halts and local trading suspensions, but such halts are not currently referred to as ''operational halts'' in the Exchange's rules.[54] The Exchange also notes that its proposed Rule 7.18(c) regarding Operational Halts is substantially identical to the revised NYSE, NYSE American, NYSE Arca, Nasdaq, Phlx, MIAX Pearl, and MEMX rules cited above,[55] and is therefore not novel.

The Exchange believes that the markets would benefit from greater clarity regarding when an Operational Halt may be appropriate. In part, the proposed change is designed to cover situations similar to those that might constitute a Regulatory Halt, but where the impact is limited to a single market. For example, just as a market disruption might trigger a Regulatory Halt for Extraordinary Market Activity if it affects multiple markets, so could a disruption at the Exchange, such as a technical issue affecting trading in one or more securities, impact trading on the Exchange so significantly that an Operational Halt is appropriate in one or more securities. In such an instance, it would be in the public interest to institute an Operational Halt to minimize the impact of a disruption that, if trading were allowed to continue, might negatively affect a greater number of market participants. An Operational Halt does not implicate other trading centers.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange believes the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(8) of the

[53] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[54] *See* Rule 7.13 (Trading Suspensions).

[55] *See supra* note 5.

Act [56] in that it does not impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act as explained below.

Importantly, the Exchange believes the proposal would not impose a burden on intermarket competition but rather would alleviate any burden on competition because it is the result of a collaborative effort by all SROs to harmonize and improve the process related to the halting and resumption of trading in U.S.-listed equity securities. In this area, the Exchange believes that all SROs should have consistent rules to the extent possible in order to provide additional transparency and certainty to market participants and to avoid inconsistent outcomes that could cause confusion and erode market confidence. The proposed changes would ensure that all SROs handle the situations covered therein in a consistent manner and ensure that all Trading Centers handle a Regulatory Halt consistently. The Exchange understands that all other Primary Listing Markets intend to file proposals that are substantially similar to this proposed rule change.

The Exchange does not believe that its proposals concerning Operational Halts impose and undue burden on competition. Under its existing rules, the Exchange already possesses discretionary authority to impose halts and trading suspensions for various reasons. The proposed rule change clarifies and broadens the circumstances in which the Exchange may impose such Operational Halts, and specifies procedures for both imposing and lifting then. The Exchange does not intend for these proposals to have any competitive impact whatsoever. Indeed, the Exchange expects that other exchanges will adopt similar rules and procedures to govern operational halts, to the extent that they have not done so already.

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change imposes a burden on intramarket competition because the proposed rule would apply to all market participants equally. In addition, information regarding the halting and resumption of trading will be disseminated using several freely-accessible sources to ensure broad availability of information in addition to the SIP data and proprietary data feeds offered by the Exchange and other SROs that are available to subscribers.

In addition, the proposed rule change includes several provisions related to the declaration and timing of trading halts and the resumption of trading designed to avoid any advantage to those who can react more quickly than other participants. The proposed rules give the Exchanges the ability to declare the timing of a Regulatory Halt immediately. The SROs retain the discretion to cancel trades that occur after the time of the Regulatory Halt. The proposed rule change also allows for the staggered resumption of trading to assist firms in reentering the market after a SIP Halt affecting multiple securities, in order to reopen in a fair and orderly manner. In addition, the proposed rule change encourages early and frequent communication among the SROs, SIPs, and market participants to enable the dissemination of timely and accurate information concerning the market to market participants.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The Exchange has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act [57] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder.[58] Because the proposed rule change does not: (i) significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative prior to 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, if consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, the proposed rule change has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act and Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) thereunder.

At any time within 60 days of the filing of the proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission will institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov*. Please include file number SR–NYSETEX–2025–23 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSETEX–2025–23. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSETEX–2025–23 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[59]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15626 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

[56] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(8).

[57] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[58] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[59] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103695; File No. SR–CboeBZX–2025–105]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Filing of a Proposed Rule Change To List and Trade Shares of the Invesco Galaxy Solana ETF Under BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4), Commodity-Based Trust Shares

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the ''Act''),[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on July 30, 2025, Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc. (the ''Exchange'' or ''BZX'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been substantially prepared by the Exchange. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc. (''BZX'' or the ''Exchange'') is filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC'') a proposed rule change to list and trade shares of the Invesco Galaxy Solana ETF (the ''Trust''),[3] under BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4), Commodity-Based Trust Shares.

The text of the proposed rule change is also available on the Exchange's website (*http://markets.cboe.com/us/equities/regulation/rule_filings/bzx/*) and at the Exchange's Office of the Secretary.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to list and trade the Shares under BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4),[4] which governs the listing and trading of Commodity-Based Trust Shares on the Exchange.[5] Invesco Capital Management LLC is the sponsor of the Trust (the ''Sponsor''). The Shares will be registered with the Commission under the Securities Act of 1933 (the ''Securities Act'') by means of the Trust's registration statement on Form S–1 (the ''Registration Statement'').[6] According to the Registration Statement, the Trust is neither an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended,[7] nor a commodity pool for purposes of the Commodity Exchange Act (''CEA''), and neither the Trust nor the Sponsor is subject to regulation as a commodity pool operator or a commodity trading adviser in connection with the Shares.

Since 2017, the Commission has approved or disapproved exchange filings to list and trade series of Trust Issued Receipts, including spot-based Commodity-Based Trust Shares, on the basis of whether the listing exchange has in place a comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement with a regulated market of significant size related to the underlying commodity to be held (the ''Winklevoss Test'').[8] The Commission has also consistently recognized that this is not the *exclusive* means by which an ETP listing exchange can meet this statutory obligation.[9] A listing exchange could, alternatively, demonstrate that ''other means to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices will be sufficient'' to justify dispensing with a surveillance-sharing agreement with a regulated market of significant size.[10]

The Commission recently issued orders granting approval for proposals to list bitcoin- and ether-based commodity trust shares and bitcoin-based, ether-based, and a combination of bitcoin- and ether-based trust issued

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] The Trust was formed as a Delaware statutory trust on June 12, 2025, and is operated as a grantor trust for U.S. federal tax purposes. The Trust has no fixed termination date.

[4] The Commission approved BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4) in Securities Exchange Act Release No. 65225 (August 30, 2011), 76 FR 55148 (September 6, 2011) (SR–BATS–2011–018).

[5] Any of the statements or representations regarding the index composition, the description of the portfolio or reference assets, limitations on portfolio holdings or reference assets, dissemination and availability of index, reference asset, and intraday indicative values, or the applicability of Exchange listing rules specified in this filing to list a series of Other Securities (collectively, ''Continued Listing Representations'') shall constitute continued listing requirements for the Shares listed on the Exchange.

[6] *See* the Registration Statement on Form S–1, dated June 25, 2025, submitted by the Sponsor on behalf of the Trust. The descriptions and operation of the Trust and the Shares contained herein are based, in part, on information in the Registration Statement. The Registration Statement is not yet effective, and the Shares will not trade on the Exchange until such time that the Registration Statement is effective.

[7] 15 U.S.C. 80a–1.

[8] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 78262 (July 8, 2016), 81 FR 78262 (July 14. 2016) (the ''Winklevoss Proposal''). The Winklevoss Proposal was the first exchange rule filing proposing to list and trade shares of an ETP that would hold spot bitcoin (a ''Spot Bitcoin ETP''). It was subsequently disapproved by the Commission. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 83723 (July 26, 2018), 83 FR 37579 (August 1, 2018) (the ''Winklevoss Order''); 99306 (January 10, 2024), 89 FR 3008 (January 17, 2024) (Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.; Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Changes, as Modified by Amendments Thereto, To List and Trade Bitcoin-Based Commodity-Based Trust Shares and Trust Units) (the ''Spot Bitcoin ETP Approval Order''); 100224 (May 23, 2024), 89 FR 46937 (May 30, 2024) (Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.; Order Granting Accelerated Approval of Proposed Rule Changes, as Modified by Amendments Thereto, To List and Trade Shares of Ether-Based Exchange-Traded Products) (the ''Spot ETH ETP Approval Order'').

[9] *See* Winklevoss Order, 83 FR at 37580; *see* Spot Bitcoin ETP Approval Order, 89 FR at 3009; *see* Spot ETH ETP Approval Order 89 FR at 46938.

[10] The Exchange notes that that the Winklevoss Test was first applied in 2017 in the Winklevoss Order, which was the first disapproval order related to an exchange proposal to list and trade a Spot Bitcoin ETP. All prior approval orders issued by the Commission approving the listing and trading of series of Trust Issued Receipts included no specific analysis related to a ''regulated market of significant size.'' In the Winklevoss Order and the Commission's prior orders approving the listing and trading of series of Trust Issued Receipts have noted that the spot commodities and currency markets for which it has previously approved spot ETPs are generally unregulated and that the Commission relied on the underlying futures market as the regulated market of significant size that formed the basis for approving the series of Currency and Commodity-Based Trust Shares, including gold, silver, platinum, palladium, copper, and other commodities and currencies. The Commission specifically noted in the Winklevoss Order that the approval order issued related to the first spot gold ETP ''was based on an assumption that the currency market and the spot gold market were largely unregulated.'' *See* Winklevoss Order at 37592. As such, the regulated market of significant size prong of the Winklevoss Test does not require that the spot market be regulated in order for the Commission to approve this proposal, and precedent makes clear that an underlying market for a spot commodity or currency being a regulated market would actually be an exception to the norm. These largely unregulated currency and commodity markets do not provide the same protections as the markets that are subject to the Commission's oversight, but the Commission has consistently looked to surveillance sharing agreements with the underlying futures market in order to determine whether such products were consistent with the Act.

receipts (these funds are substantively identical to the Trust, but hold bitcoin and/or ether, respectively, instead of Solana (also referred to as ''SOL'')) (''Spot Bitcoin ETPs'' and ''Spot ETH ETPs''). In both the Spot Bitcoin ETP Approval Order and Spot ETH ETP Approval Order, the Commission found that sufficient ''other means'' of preventing fraud and manipulation had been demonstrated that justified dispensing with a surveillance-sharing agreement. Specifically, the Commission found that while the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (''CME'') futures markets for both bitcoin and ether were not of ''significant size'' related to their respective spot markets, the Exchange demonstrated that other means could be reasonably expected to assist in surveilling for fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices in the specific context of the proposals.

As further discussed below, both the Exchange and the Sponsor believe that this proposal and the included analysis are sufficient to establish that the proposal is consistent with the Act itself and, additionally, that there are sufficient ''other means'' of preventing fraud and manipulation that warrant dispensing of the surveillance-sharing agreement with a regulated market of significant size, as was done with both Spot Bitcoin ETPs and Spot ETH ETPs, and that this proposal should be approved.

Background

SOL is a digital asset that is created and transmitted through the operations of the peer-to-peer Solana Network, a decentralized network of computers that operates on cryptographic protocols. No single entity is known to own or operate the Solana Network, the infrastructure of which is understood to be collectively maintained by a decentralized user base. The Solana Network allows people to exchange tokens of value, called SOL, which are recorded on a public transaction ledger known as a blockchain. SOL can be used to pay for goods and services, including computational power on the Solana Network, or it can be converted to fiat currencies, such as the U.S. dollar, at rates determined on Digital Asset Trading Platforms or in individual end-user-to-end-user transactions. Furthermore, the Solana Network was designed to allow users to write and implement smart contracts—that is, general-purpose code that executes on every computer in the network and can instruct the transmission of information and value based on a sophisticated set of logical conditions. Using smart contracts, users can create markets, store registries of debts or promises, represent the ownership of property, move funds in accordance with conditional instructions and create digital assets other than SOL on the Solana Network. Smart contract operations are executed on the Solana blockchain in exchange for payment of SOL. Like the Ethereum network, the Solana Network is one of a number of projects intended to expand blockchain use beyond just a peer-to-peer money system.

The Solana protocol introduced the Proof-of-History (''PoH'') timestamping mechanism. PoH automatically orders on-chain transactions by creating a historical record that proves an event has occurred at a specific moment in time. PoH is intended to provide a transaction processing speed and capacity advantage over other blockchain networks like Bitcoin and Ethereum, which rely on sequential production of blocks and can lead to delays caused by validator confirmations.

In addition to the PoH mechanism described above, the Solana Network uses a proof-of-stake consensus mechanism to incentivize SOL holders to validate transactions. Unlike proof-of-work, in which miners expend computational resources to compete to validate transactions and are rewarded coins in proportion to the amount of computational resources expended, in proof-of-stake, validators ''stake'' coins to compete to be randomly selected to validate transactions and are rewarded coins in proportion to the amount of coins staked. Certain malicious activity may result in the forfeiture or ''slashing'' of a portion of the staked coins. Proof-of-stake is viewed as more energy efficient and scalable than proof-of-work and is sometimes referred to as ''virtual mining''.

As noted above, this proposal is to list and trade shares of the Trust that would hold spot Solana and, as described below, cause the Trust to stake a portion of its SOL.

Section 6(b)(5) and the Applicable Standards

The Commission has approved numerous series of Trust Issued Receipts,[11] including Commodity-Based Trust Shares,[12] to be listed on U.S. national securities exchanges. In order for any proposed rule change from an exchange to be approved, the Commission must determine that, among other things, the proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act, specifically including: (i) the requirement that a national securities exchange's rules are designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices; [13] and (ii) the requirement that an exchange proposal be designed, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that this proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act and that this filing sufficiently demonstrates that potential policy concerns under the Act are sufficiently mitigated to the point that they are outweighed by quantifiable investor protection issues that would be resolved by approving this proposal.

More recently, the Commission has applied the Winklevoss Test while also recognizing that the ''regulated market of significant size'' standard is not the only means for satisfying Section 6(b)(5) of the Act, specifically providing that a listing exchange could demonstrate that ''other means to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices'' are sufficient to justify dispensing with the requisite surveillance-sharing agreement.[14] In the Spot Bitcoin ETF Approval Order and Spot ETH ETF Approval Order the Commission determined that the CME bitcoin futures market and CME ETH futures market, respectively, were not of ''significant size'' related to the spot market.[15] Instead, the Commission found that sufficient ''other means'' of preventing

[11] *See* Exchange Rule 14.11(f).

[12] Commodity-Based Trust Shares, as described in Exchange Rule 14.11(e)(4), are a type of Trust Issued Receipt.

[13] Much like bitcoin and ether, the Exchange believes that SOL, and by extension the Shares, are resistant to price manipulation and that ''other means to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices'' exist to justify dispensing with the requisite surveillance sharing agreement. The geographically diverse and continuous nature of SOL trading render it difficult and prohibitively costly to manipulate the price of SOL. The fragmentation across platforms and the capital necessary to maintain a significant presence on each trading platform make manipulation of SOL prices through continuous trading activity challenging. To the extent that there are trading platforms engaged in or allowing wash trading or other activity intended to manipulate the price of SOL on other markets, such pricing does not normally impact prices on other trading platforms because participants will generally ignore markets with quotes that they deem non-executable.

[14] *See* Winklevoss Order at 37580. The Commission has also specifically noted that it ''is not applying a 'cannot be manipulated' standard; instead, the Commission is examining whether the proposal meets the requirements of the Exchange Act and, pursuant to its Rules of Practice, places the burden on the listing exchange to demonstrate the validity of its contentions and to establish that the requirements of the Exchange Act have been met.'' *Id.* at 37582.

[15] Futures contracts on Solana began trading on the CME on March 17, 2025. Because these instruments have only been trading for a short time, it is too early to determine whether their market is of ''significant size'' for purposes of the Winklevoss Test.

fraud and manipulation had been demonstrated that justified dispensing with a surveillance-sharing agreement. The Exchange and Sponsor believe that this proposal provides for other means of preventing fraud and manipulation justify dispensing with a surveillance-sharing agreement.

Over the past several years, U.S. investor exposure to SOL, through over-the-counter funds that invest in SOL (''OTC SOL Funds'') and digital asset trading platforms, has grown into billions of dollars with a fully diluted market cap averaging greater than $90 billion over the last 180 days. The Exchange believes that approving this proposal (and comparable proposals) provides the Commission with the opportunity to allow U.S. investors with access to SOL in a regulated and transparent exchange-traded vehicle that would act to limit risk to U.S. investors by: (i) reducing premium and discount volatility; (ii) reducing management fees through meaningful competition; and (iii) providing an alternative to self-custodying SOL.

The policy concerns that the Exchange Act is designed to address are also otherwise mitigated by the size of the market for the underlying reference asset (averaging greater than $90 billion fully diluted value over the last 180 days). The trading volumes of SOL to USD and SOL to USD-stablecoin pairs trade an average daily volume of approximately $2 billion across six leading cryptocurrency trading platforms by volume—Coinbase, Crypto.com, Kraken, Binance, OKX, and ByBit. The geographically diverse and continuous nature of SOL trading makes it difficult and prohibitively costly to manipulate the price of SOL and, in many instances, the SOL market can be less susceptible to manipulation than the equity, fixed income, and commodity futures markets. There are a number of reasons this is the case, including that there is not inside information about revenue, earnings, corporate activities, or sources of supply; manipulation of the price on any single venue would require manipulation of the global SOL price in order to be effective; a substantial over-the-counter market provides liquidity and shock-absorbing capacity; the SOL market's 24/7/365 nature provides constant arbitrage opportunities across all trading venues; and it is unlikely that any one actor could obtain a dominant market share.

Further, SOL is arguably less susceptible to manipulation than other commodities that underlie ETPs; there may be inside information relating to the supply of the physical commodity such as the discovery of new sources of supply or significant disruptions at mining facilities that supply the commodity that simply are inapplicable as it relates to certain crypto assets, including SOL. Further, the Exchange believes that the fragmentation across SOL trading platforms and increased adoption of SOL, as displayed through increased user engagement and trading volumes, and the Solana Network make manipulation of SOL prices through continuous trading activity unlikely. Moreover, the linkage between the SOL markets and the presence of arbitrageurs in those markets means that the manipulation of the price of SOL price on any single venue would require manipulation of the global SOL price in order to be effective. Arbitrageurs must have funds distributed across multiple SOL trading platforms in order to take advantage of temporary price dislocations, thereby making it unlikely that there will be strong concentration of funds on any particular SOL trading platform. As a result, the potential for manipulation on a particular SOL trading platform would require overcoming the liquidity supply of such arbitrageurs who are effectively eliminating any cross-market pricing differences. For all of these reasons, SOL is not particularly susceptible to manipulation, especially as compared to other approved ETP reference assets.

Invesco Galaxy Solana ETF

CSC Delaware Trust Company is the trustee (''Trustee''). The Trust will engage the Bank of New York Mellon to be the administrator (''Administrator''). The transfer agent (''Transfer Agent'') will facilitate the issuance and redemption of Shares of the Trust and respond to correspondence by Trust shareholders and others relating to its duties, maintain shareholder accounts, and make periodic reports to the Trust. The cash custodian (''Cash Custodian'') will be responsible for the custody of the Trust's cash and cash equivalents.[16] The Sponsor will provide assistance in the marketing of the Shares. A third-party custodian (the ''Custodian''), will be responsible for custody of the Trust's SOL.

According to the Registration Statement, each Share will represent a fractional undivided beneficial interest in and ownership of the Trust. The Trust's assets will only consist of SOL, cash, and cash equivalents.

According to the Registration Statement, the Trust will be neither an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended,[17] nor a commodity pool for purposes of the CEA, and neither the Trust nor the Sponsor is subject to regulation as a commodity pool operator or a commodity trading adviser in connection with the Shares.

The Sponsor may stake, or cause to be staked, all or a portion of the Trust's SOL through one or more trusted staking providers (''Staking Providers''). In consideration for any staking activity in which the Trust may engage, the Trust would receive all or a portion of the staking rewards generated through staking activities, which may be treated as income to the Trust. The Trust will not acquire and will disclaim any incidental right (''IR'') or IR asset received, for example as a result of forks or airdrops, and such assets will not be taken into account for purposes of determining NAV.

Creation and Redemption of Shares

When the Trust creates or redeems its Shares, it will do so in cash or in-kind. In connection with cash creations and cash redemptions, the authorized participants will submit orders to create or redeem Baskets of Shares in exchange for cash. When the Trust creates or redeems its Shares in cash, it will do so in transactions in blocks of Shares that are based on the quantity of SOL attributable to each Share of the Trust (*e.g.,* a Creation Basket) at the Trust's NAV. When the Trust creates or redeems its Shares in kind, it will do so in transfers of SOL in blocks of Shares that are based on the quantity of SOL attributable to the Creation Basket being created or redeemed.

The authorized participants will deliver or cause to be delivered cash or SOL to create Shares and the authorized participant or its designee will receive cash or SOL when redeeming Shares. The Trust will create Shares by receiving SOL or cash from an authorized participant or its designee and will redeem shares by delivering SOL or cash to an authorized participant or its designee.

According to the Registration Statement, on any business day, an authorized participant may place an order to create one or more Creation Baskets. Purchase orders must be placed by the close of Regular Trading Hours on the Exchange or another time determined by the Sponsor. The day on which an order is properly received is considered the purchase order date.

For a cash creation order, the total deposit of cash required is an amount of cash sufficient to purchase such amount

[16] Cash equivalents are short-term instruments with maturities of less than 3 months.

[17] 15 U.S.C. 80a–1.

of SOL, the amount of which is equal to the combined NAV of the number of Shares included in the Creation Baskets being created determined as of 4:00 p.m. ET on the date the order to purchase is properly received. The Administrator determines the required deposit for a given day by multiplying the NAV per share by the number of Shares in each Creation Basket and dividing the product by that day's SOL price as determined by the Benchmark.[18]

For a creation order in kind, the total in-kind transfer of SOL is based on the quantity of SOL attributable to the Creation Baskets applicable to the date the order to purchase is properly received. The Administrator determines the quantity of SOL used to calculate the Creation Basket for a given day by dividing the number of SOL held by the Trust, adjusted for the amount of SOL constituting estimated accrued but unpaid fees and expenses of the Trust as of the opening of business on that business day, by the quotient of the number of Shares outstanding at the opening of business divided by the number of Shares in a Creation Basket.

The procedures by which an authorized participant can redeem one or more Creation Baskets mirror the procedures for the creation of Creation Baskets. For a cash redemption order, an authorized participant will deliver Shares to the Trust and will receive cash for the Shares delivered. For an in-kind redemption order, an authorized participant will deliver Shares to the Trust and the authorized participant will receive SOL for the Shares delivered.

Investment Objective

According to the Registration Statement and as further described below, the Trust's investment objective is to reflect the performance of the spot price of SOL, as measured by the performance of the Lukka Prime Solana Reference Rate (the ''Benchmark''), adjusted for the Trust's expenses and other liabilities. In seeking to achieve its investment objective, the Trust will hold SOL and will value its Shares daily as of 4:00 p.m. ET. The value of SOL held by the Trust is determined based on the fair market value price for SOL, reflecting the execution price of SOL on its principal market as determined each day by Lukka Inc., (the ''Benchmark Provider'').

The Benchmark

As described in the Registration Statement, The Trust will use the Benchmark to calculate the Trust's NAV. The Trust will determine the SOL Benchmark price and value its Shares daily based on the value of SOL as reflected by the Benchmark. the Benchmark Provider seeks to identify a ''principal market'' for SOL each day, by evaluating eligible SOL trading platforms across a variety of different criteria, including the trading platforms' oversight and governance frameworks, microstructure efficiency, trading volume, data transparency and data integrity. As of 2025, the following trading platforms are considered to be eligible trading platforms by the Benchmark Provider: Binance, Bitfinex, Bitflyer, Bitstamp, Bullish, Coinbase, Crypto.com, Gate.io, Gemini, HitBTC, Huobi, itBit, Kraken, KuCoin, LMAX, MEXC Global, OKX and Poloniex (collectively, ''Benchmark Pricing Sources''). The Benchmark Provider reviews trading platforms eligible for inclusion in the Benchmark quarterly. In determining which trading platforms to include Benchmark Pricing Sources, the Benchmark Provider evaluates each trading platform using proprietary ratings criteria.

Net Asset Value

NAV means the total assets of the Trust (which includes all SOL and cash and cash equivalents) less total liabilities of the Trust. The Administrator determines the NAV of the Trust on each day that the Exchange is open for regular trading, as promptly as practical after 4:00 p.m. ET based on the closing value of the Benchmark. The NAV of the Trust is the aggregate value of the Trust's assets less its estimated accrued but unpaid liabilities (which include accrued expenses). In determining the NAV, the Administrator values the SOL held by the Trust based on the closing value of the Benchmark as of 4:00 p.m. ET. The Administrator also determines the NAV per Share. The NAV for the Trust will be calculated by the Administrator once a day and will be disseminated daily to all market participants at the same time.

Availability of Information

In addition to the price transparency of the Benchmark, the Trust will provide information regarding the Trust's SOL holdings as well as additional data regarding the Trust. The website for the Trust, which will be publicly accessible at no charge, will contain the following information: (a) the current NAV per Share daily and the prior business day's NAV per Share and the reported BZX Official Closing Price;[19] (b) the BZX Official Closing Price in relation to the NAV per Share as of the time the NAV is calculated and a calculation of the premium or discount of such price against such NAV per Share; (c) data in chart form displaying the frequency distribution of discounts and premiums of the BZX Official Closing Price against the NAV per Share, within appropriate ranges for each of the four previous calendar quarters (or for the life of the Trust, if shorter); (d) the prospectus; and (e) other applicable quantitative information. The aforementioned information will be published as of the close of business and available on the Sponsor's website at *www.invesco.com/etfs,* or any successor thereto. The NAV for the Trust will be calculated by the Administrator once a day and will be disseminated daily to all market participants at the same time. Quotation and last-sale information regarding the Shares will be disseminated through the facilities of the Consolidated Tape Association (''CTA''). The Trust will also disseminate its holdings on a daily basis on its website.

The Intraday Indicative Value (''IIV'') will be updated during Regular Trading Hours to reflect changes in the value of the Trust's SOL holdings during the trading day. The IIV disseminated during Regular Trading Hours should not be viewed as an actual real-time update of the NAV, which will be calculated only once at the end of each trading day. The IIV may differ from the NAV because NAV is calculated, using the closing value of the Benchmark, once a day at 4:00 p.m. ET, whereas the IIV draws prices from the last trade on each constituent platform in an effort to produce a relevant, real-time price). The Trust will provide an IIV per Share updated every 15 seconds, as calculated by the Exchange or a third-party financial data provider during the Exchange's Regular Trading Hours (9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. ET). The IIV will be widely disseminated on a per Share basis every 15 seconds during the Exchange's Regular Trading Hours through the facilities of the CTA and Consolidated Quotation System (CQS) high speed lines. In addition, the IIV will be available through on-line information services, such as Bloomberg and Reuters.

The price of SOL will be made available by one or more major market data vendors, updated at least every 15 seconds during Regular Trading Hours.

[18] As defined below, the ''Benchmark'' refers to the Lukka Prime Solana Reference Rate.

[19] As defined in Rule 11.23(a)(3), the term ''BZX Official Closing Price'' shall mean the price disseminated to the consolidated tape as the market center closing trade.

As noted above, the Benchmark is calculated every 15 seconds and information about the Benchmark and Benchmark value, including index data and key elements of how the Benchmark is calculated, will be publicly available at *www.bloomberg.com.*

Quotation and last sale information for SOL is widely disseminated through a variety of major market data vendors, including Bloomberg and Reuters. Information relating to trading, including price and volume information, in SOL is available from major market data vendors and from the trading platforms on which SOL are traded. Depth of book information is also available from SOL trading platforms. The normal trading hours for SOL trading platforms are 24 hours per day, 365 days per year.

Information regarding market price and trading volume of the Shares will be continually available on a real-time basis throughout the day on brokers' computer screens and other electronic services. Information regarding the previous day's BZX Official Closing Price and trading volume information for the Shares will be published daily in the financial section of newspapers. Quotation and last-sale information regarding the Shares will be disseminated through the facilities of the CTA.

The Custodian

The Custodian's services (i) allow SOL to be deposited from a public blockchain address to the Trust's SOL account, (ii) allow SOL to be withdrawn from the SOL account to a public blockchain address as instructed by the Trust, and (iii) allow SOL to be staked. The custody agreement requires the Custodian to hold the Trust's SOL in cold storage, unless required to facilitate withdrawals as a temporary measure. The Custodian will use segregated cold storage SOL addresses for the Trust which are separate from the SOL addresses that the Custodian uses for its other customers and which are directly verifiable via the SOL blockchain. The Custodian will safeguard the private keys to the SOL associated with the Trust's SOL account. The Custodian will at all times record and identify in its books and records that such SOL constitutes the property of the Trust. The Custodian will not withdraw the Trust's SOL from the Trust's account with the Custodian, or loan, hypothecate, pledge or otherwise encumber the Trust's SOL, without the Trust's instruction. The Sponsor may appoint an additional or replacement custodian and the Trust may enter into a custodian agreement with such custodian.

Rule 14.11(e)(4)—Commodity-Based Trust Shares

The Shares will be subject to BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4), which sets forth the initial and continued listing criteria applicable to Commodity-Based Trust Shares. The Exchange represents that, for initial and continued listing, the Trust must be in compliance with Rule 10A–3 under the Act. A minimum of 100,000 Shares will be outstanding at the commencement of listing on the Exchange. The Exchange will obtain a representation that the NAV will be calculated daily and that the NAV and information about the assets of the Trust will be made available to all market participants at the same time. The Exchange notes that, as defined in Rule 14.11(e)(4)(C)(i), the Shares will be: (a) issued by a trust that holds (1) a specified commodity [20] deposited with the trust, or (2) a specified commodity and, in addition to such specified commodity, cash; (b) issued by such trust in a specified aggregate minimum number in return for a deposit of a quantity of the underlying commodity and/or cash; and (c) when aggregated in the same specified minimum number, may be redeemed at a holder's request by such trust which will deliver to the redeeming holder the quantity of the underlying commodity and/or cash.

Upon termination of the Trust, the Shares will be removed from listing. The Trustee, CSC Delaware Trust Company, is a trust company having substantial capital and surplus and the experience and facilities for handling corporate trust business, as required under Rule 14.11(e)(4)(E)(iv)(a) and that no change will be made to the trustee without prior notice to and approval of the Exchange. The Exchange also notes that, pursuant to Rule 14.11(e)(4)(F), neither the Exchange nor any agent of the Exchange shall have any liability for damages, claims, losses or expenses caused by any errors, omissions or delays in calculating or disseminating any underlying commodity value, the current value of the underlying commodity required to be deposited to the Trust in connection with issuance of Commodity-Based Trust Shares; resulting from any negligent act or omission by the Exchange, or any agent of the Exchange, or any act, condition or cause beyond the reasonable control of the Exchange, its agent, including, but not limited to, an act of God; fire; flood; extraordinary weather conditions; war; insurrection; riot; strike; accident; action of government; communications or power failure; equipment or software malfunction; or any error, omission or delay in the reports of transactions in an underlying commodity. Finally, as required in Rule 14.11(e)(4)(G), the Exchange notes that any registered market maker (''Market Maker'') in the Shares must file with the Exchange in a manner prescribed by the Exchange and keep current a list identifying all accounts for trading in an underlying commodity, related commodity futures or options on commodity futures, or any other related commodity derivatives, which the registered Market Maker may have or over which it may exercise investment discretion. No registered Market Maker shall trade in an underlying commodity, related commodity futures or options on commodity futures, or any other related commodity derivatives, in an account in which a registered Market Maker, directly or indirectly, controls trading activities, or has a direct interest in the profits or losses thereof, which has not been reported to the Exchange as required by this Rule. In addition to the existing obligations under Exchange rules regarding the production of books and records (see, *e.g.,* Rule 4.2), the registered Market Maker in Commodity-Based Trust Shares shall make available to the Exchange such books, records or other information pertaining to transactions by such entity or registered or non-registered employee affiliated with such entity for its or their own accounts for trading the underlying physical commodity, related commodity futures or options on commodity futures, or any other related commodity derivatives, as may be requested by the Exchange.

The Exchange is able to obtain information regarding trading in the Shares and the underlying SOL or any other SOL derivative through members acting as registered Market Makers, in connection with their proprietary or customer trades.

As a general matter, the Exchange has regulatory jurisdiction over its Members and their associated persons, which include any person or entity controlling a Member. To the extent the Exchange may be found to lack jurisdiction over a subsidiary or affiliate of a Member that does business only in commodities or futures contracts, the Exchange could obtain information regarding the activities of such subsidiary or affiliate through surveillance sharing agreements with regulatory organizations of which such subsidiary or affiliate is a member.

[20] For purposes of Rule 14.11(e)(4), the term commodity takes on the definition of the term as provided in the Commodity Exchange Act.

Trading Halts

With respect to trading halts, the Exchange may consider all relevant factors in exercising its discretion to halt or suspend trading in the Shares. The Exchange will halt trading in the Shares under the conditions specified in BZX Rule 11.18. Trading may be halted because of market conditions or for reasons that, in the view of the Exchange, make trading in the Shares inadvisable. These may include: (1) the extent to which trading is not occurring in the SOL underlying the Shares; or (2) whether other unusual conditions or circumstances detrimental to the maintenance of a fair and orderly market are present. Trading in the Shares also will be subject to Rule 14.11(e)(4)(E)(ii), which sets forth circumstances under which trading in the Shares may be halted.

If the IIV or the value of the Benchmark is not being disseminated as required, the Exchange may halt trading during the day in which the interruption to the dissemination of the IIV or the value of the Benchmark occurs. If the interruption to the dissemination of the IIV or the value of the Benchmark persists past the trading day in which it occurred, the Exchange will halt trading no later than the beginning of the trading day following the interruption.

In addition, if the Exchange becomes aware that the NAV with respect to the Shares is not disseminated to all market participants at the same time, it will halt trading in the Shares until such time as the NAV is available to all market participants.

Trading Rules

The Exchange deems the Shares to be equity securities, thus rendering trading in the Shares subject to the Exchange's existing rules governing the trading of equity securities. BZX will allow trading in the Shares during all trading sessions on the Exchange. The Exchange has appropriate rules to facilitate transactions in the Shares during all trading sessions. As provided in BZX Rule 11.11(a) the minimum price variation for quoting and entry of orders in securities traded on the Exchange is $0.01 where the price is greater than $1.00 per share or $0.0001 where the price is less than $1.00 per share. The Shares of the Trust will conform to the initial and continued listing criteria set forth in BZX Rule 14.11(e)(4).

Surveillance

The Exchange represents that its surveillance procedures are adequate to properly monitor the trading of the Shares on the Exchange during all trading sessions and to deter and detect violations of Exchange rules and the applicable federal securities laws. Trading of the Shares through the Exchange will be subject to the Exchange's surveillance procedures for derivative products, including Commodity-Based Trust Shares. FINRA conducts certain cross-market surveillances on behalf of the Exchange pursuant to a regulatory services agreement. The Exchange is responsible for FINRA's performance under this regulatory services agreement.

The Exchange or FINRA, on behalf of the Exchange, or both, will communicate as needed regarding trading in the Shares or any other SOL derivative with other markets and other entities that are members of the ISG, and the Exchange, or FINRA, on behalf of the Exchange, or both, may obtain trading information regarding trading in the Shares or any other SOL derivative from such markets and other entities.[21] The Exchange may obtain information regarding trading in the Shares or any other SOL derivative via ISG, from other exchanges who are members or affiliates of the ISG, or with which the Exchange has entered into a comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement.

In addition, the Exchange also has a general policy prohibiting the distribution of material, non-public information by its employees.

The Sponsor has represented to the Exchange that it will advise the Exchange of any failure by the Trust or the Shares to comply with the continued listing requirements, and, pursuant to its obligations under Section 19(g)(1) of the Exchange Act, the Exchange will surveil for compliance with the continued listing requirements. If the Trust or the Shares are not in compliance with the applicable listing requirements, the Exchange will commence delisting procedures under Exchange Rule 14.12.

Information Circular

Prior to the commencement of trading, the Exchange will inform its members in an Information Circular of the special characteristics and risks associated with trading the Shares. Specifically, the Information Circular will discuss the following: (i) the procedures for the creation and redemption of Creation Baskets (and that the Shares are not individually redeemable); (ii) BZX Rule 3.7, which imposes suitability obligations on Exchange members with respect to recommending transactions in the Shares to customers; (iii) how information regarding the IIV and the Trust's NAV are disseminated; (iv) the risks involved in trading the Shares outside of Regular Trading Hours[22] when an updated IIV will not be calculated or publicly disseminated; (v) the requirement that members deliver a prospectus to investors purchasing newly issued Shares prior to or concurrently with the confirmation of a transaction; and (vi) trading information. The Information Circular will also reference the fact that there is no regulated source of last sale information regarding SOL, and that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the trading of SOL as a commodity.

In addition, the Information Circular will advise members, prior to the commencement of trading, of the prospectus delivery requirements applicable to the Shares. Members purchasing the Shares for resale to investors will deliver a prospectus to such investors. The Information Circular will also discuss any exemptive, no-action and interpretive relief granted by the Commission from any rules under the Act.

2. Statutory Basis

The Exchange believes that the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act[23] in general and Section 6(b)(5) of the Act[24] in particular in that it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to and perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The Commission has approved numerous series of Trust Issued Receipts,[25] including Commodity-Based Trust Shares,[26] to be listed on U.S. national securities exchanges. In order for any proposed rule change from an exchange to be approved, the Commission must determine that, among other things, the proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act, specifically including: (i) the requirement that a national securities exchange's rules are

[21] For a list of the current members and affiliate members of ISG, *see www.isgportal.com.*

[22] Regular Trading Hours is the time between 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. ET.

[23] 15 U.S.C. 78f.

[24] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[25] *See* Exchange Rule 14.11(f).

[26] Commodity-Based Trust Shares, as described in Exchange Rule 14.11(e)(4), are a type of Trust Issued Receipt.

designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices;[27] and (ii) the requirement that an exchange proposal be designed, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The Exchange believes that this proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act and that this filing sufficiently demonstrates that potential policy concerns under the Act are sufficiently mitigated to the point that they are outweighed by quantifiable investor protection issues that would be resolved by approving this proposal.

More recently, the Commission has applied the Winklevoss Test while also recognizing that the ''regulated market of significant size'' standard is not the only means for satisfying Section 6(b)(5) of the Act. In the specifically providing that a listing exchange could demonstrate that ''other means to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices'' are sufficient to justify dispensing with the requisite surveillance-sharing agreement.[28] In the Spot Bitcoin ETF Approval Order and Spot ETH ETF Approval Order the Commission determined that the CME bitcoin futures market and CME ETH futures market, respectively, were not of ''significant size'' related to the spot market.[29] Instead, the Commission found that sufficient ''other means'' of preventing fraud and manipulation had been demonstrated that justified dispensing with a surveillance-sharing agreement. The Exchange and Sponsor believe that this proposal provides for other means of preventing fraud and manipulation justify dispensing with a surveillance-sharing agreement.

The Exchange believes that the proposal is designed to protect investors and the public interest. Over the past several years, U.S. investor exposure to SOL has grown into the billions of dollars, mostly through transactions in spot SOL on digital asset trading platforms. The Exchange believes that approving this proposal (and comparable proposals) provides the Commission with the opportunity to allow U.S. investors with access to SOL in a regulated and transparent exchange-traded vehicle that would act to limit risk to U.S. investors by: (i) reducing premium and discount volatility; (ii) reducing management fees through meaningful competition; and (iii) providing an alternative to custodying SOL.

The policy concerns that the Exchange Act is designed to address are also otherwise mitigated by the fact that the size of the market for the underlying reference asset (averaging greater than $90 billion fully diluted value over the last 180 days). The geographically diverse and continuous nature of SOL trading makes it difficult and prohibitively costly to manipulate the price of SOL and, in many instances, the SOL market can be less susceptible to manipulation than the equity, fixed income, and commodity futures markets. There are a number of reasons this is the case, including that there is not inside information about revenue, earnings, corporate activities, or sources of supply; manipulation of the price on any single venue would require manipulation of the global SOL price in order to be effective; a substantial over-the-counter market provides liquidity and shock-absorbing capacity; the SOL market's 24/7/365 nature provides constant arbitrage opportunities across all trading venues; and it is unlikely that any one actor could obtain a dominant market share.

Further, SOL is arguably less susceptible to manipulation than other commodities that underlie ETPs; there may be inside information relating to the supply of the physical commodity such as the discovery of new sources of supply or significant disruptions at mining facilities that supply the commodity that simply are inapplicable as it relates to bitcoin. Further, the Exchange believes that the fragmentation across SOL trading platforms, the relatively slow speed of transactions, and the capital necessary to maintain a significant presence on each trading platform make manipulation of SOL prices through continuous trading activity unlikely. Moreover, the linkage between the SOL markets and the presence of arbitrageurs in those markets means that the manipulation of the price of SOL price on any single venue would require manipulation of the global SOL price in order to be effective. Arbitrageurs must have funds distributed across multiple SOL trading platforms in order to take advantage of temporary price dislocations, thereby making it unlikely that there will be strong concentration of funds on any particular SOL trading platform. As a result, the potential for manipulation on a particular SOL trading platform would require overcoming the liquidity supply of such arbitrageurs who are effectively eliminating any cross-market pricing differences. For all of these reasons, SOL is not particularly susceptible to manipulation, especially as compared to other approved ETP reference assets.

Commodity-Based Trust Shares

The Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices in that the Shares will be listed on the Exchange pursuant to the initial and continued listing criteria in Exchange Rule 14.11(e)(4). The Exchange believes that its surveillance procedures are adequate to properly monitor the trading of the Shares on the Exchange during all trading sessions and to deter and detect violations of Exchange rules and the applicable federal securities laws. Trading of the Shares through the Exchange will be subject to the Exchange's surveillance procedures for derivative products, including Commodity-Based Trust Shares. The Sponsor has represented to the Exchange that it will advise the Exchange of any failure by the Trust or the Shares to comply with the continued listing requirements, and, pursuant to its obligations under Section 19(g)(1) of the Exchange Act, the Exchange will surveil for compliance with the continued listing requirements. If the Trust or the Shares are not in compliance with the applicable listing requirements, the Exchange will commence delisting procedures under Exchange Rule 14.12. The Exchange may obtain information regarding trading in the Shares and listed SOL derivatives via the ISG, from other exchanges who are members or affiliates of the ISG, or with which the Exchange has entered into a comprehensive surveillance sharing agreement.

[27] Much like bitcoin and ether, the Exchange believes that SOL is resistant to price manipulation and that ''other means to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices'' exist to justify dispensing with the requisite surveillance sharing agreement. The geographically diverse and continuous nature of SOL trading render it difficult and prohibitively costly to manipulate the price of SOL. The fragmentation across platforms and the capital necessary to maintain a significant presence on each trading platform make manipulation of SOL prices through continuous trading activity challenging. To the extent that there are trading platforms engaged in or allowing wash trading or other activity intended to manipulate the price of SOL on other markets, such pricing does not normally impact prices on other trading platforms because participants will generally ignore markets with quotes that they deem non-executable.

[28] *See* Winklevoss Order at 37580. The Commission has also specifically noted that it ''is not applying a 'cannot be manipulated' standard; instead, the Commission is examining whether the proposal meets the requirements of the Exchange Act and, pursuant to its Rules of Practice, places the burden on the listing exchange to demonstrate the validity of its contentions and to establish that the requirements of the Exchange Act have been met.'' *Id.* at 37582.

[29] Futures contracts on Solana began trading on the CME on March 17, 2025. Because these instruments have only been trading for a short time, it is too early to determine whether their market is of ''significant size'' for purposes of the Winklevoss Test.

Availability of Information

In addition to the price transparency of the Benchmark, the Trust will provide information regarding the Trust's SOL holdings as well as additional data regarding the Trust. The website for the Trust, which will be publicly accessible at no charge, will contain the following information: (a) the current NAV per Share daily and the prior business day's NAV per Share and the reported BZX Official Closing Price; [30] (b) the BZX Official Closing Price in relation to the NAV per Share as of the time the NAV is calculated and a calculation of the premium or discount of such price against such NAV per Share; (c) data in chart form displaying the frequency distribution of discounts and premiums of the BZX Official Closing Price against the NAV per Share, within appropriate ranges for each of the four previous calendar quarters (or for the life of the Trust, if shorter); (d) the prospectus; and (e) other applicable quantitative information. The aforementioned information will be published as of the close of business and available on the Sponsor's website at *www.invesco.com/etfs,* or any successor thereto. The NAV for the Trust will be calculated by the Administrator once a day and will be disseminated daily to all market participants at the same time. Quotation and last-sale information regarding the Shares will be disseminated through the facilities of the CTA. The Trust will also disseminate its holdings on a daily basis on its website.

The IIV will be updated during Regular Trading Hours to reflect changes in the value of the Trust's SOL holdings during the trading day. The IIV may differ from the NAV because NAV is calculated, using the closing value of the Benchmark, once a day at 4:00 p.m. ET whereas the IIV draws prices from the last trade on each constituent platform to produce a relevant, real-time price. The IIV disseminated during Regular Trading Hours should not be viewed as an actual real-time update of the NAV, which will be calculated only once at the end of each trading day. The Trust will provide an IIV per Share updated every 15 seconds, as calculated by the Exchange or a third-party financial data provider during the Exchange's Regular Trading Hours (9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. ET). The IIV will be widely disseminated on a per Share basis every 15 seconds during the Exchange's Regular Trading Hours through the facilities of the CTA and CQS high speed lines. In addition, the IIV will be available through on-line information services such as Bloomberg and Reuters.

The price of SOL will be made available by one or more major market data vendors, updated at least every 15 seconds during Regular Trading Hours.

As noted above, the Benchmark is calculated every 15 seconds and information about the Benchmark and Benchmark value, including index data and key elements of how the Benchmark is calculated, will be publicly available at *www.bloomberg.com.*

Quotation and last sale information for SOL is widely disseminated through a variety of major market data vendors, including Bloomberg and Reuters. Information relating to trading, including price and volume information, in SOL is available from major market data vendors and from the trading platforms on which SOL are traded. Depth of book information is also available from SOL trading platforms. The normal trading hours for SOL trading platforms are 24 hours per day, 365 days per year.

Information regarding market price and trading volume of the Shares will be continually available on a real-time basis throughout the day on brokers' computer screens and other electronic services. Information regarding the previous day's BZX Official Closing Price and trading volume information for the Shares will be published daily in the financial section of newspapers. Quotation and last-sale information regarding the Shares will be disseminated through the facilities of the CTA.

In sum, the Exchange believes that this proposal is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act, that on the whole the manipulation concerns previously articulated by the Commission are sufficiently mitigated to the point that they are outweighed by investor protection issues that would be resolved by approving this proposal.

The Exchange believes that the proposal is, in particular, designed to protect investors and the public interest. The investor protection issues for U.S. investors has grown significantly over the last several years, through premium/discount volatility and management fees for OTC SOL Funds. As discussed throughout, this growth investor protection concerns need to be re-evaluated and rebalanced with the prevention of fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices concerns that previous disapproval orders have relied upon.

For the above reasons, the Exchange believes that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) of the Act.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purpose of the Act. The Exchange notes that the proposed rule change, rather will facilitate the listing and trading of an additional exchange-traded product that will enhance competition among both market participants and listing venues, to the benefit of investors and the marketplace.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

The Exchange neither solicited nor received comments on the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 45 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period up to 90 days (i) as the Commission may designate if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the Exchange consents, the Commission will:

A. by order approve or disapprove such proposed rule change, or

B. institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number SR–CboeBZX–2025–105 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

[30] As defined in Rule 11.23(a)(3), the term ''BZX Official Closing Price'' shall mean the price disseminated to the consolidated tape as the market center closing trade.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–CboeBZX–2025–105. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection. All submissions should refer to file number SR–CboeBZX–2025–105 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[31]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15621 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 21, 2025.

PLACE: The meeting will be held via remote means and at the Commission's headquarters, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549.

STATUS: This meeting will be closed to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the closed meeting. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters also may be present.

In the event that the time, date, or location of this meeting changes, an announcement of the change, along with the new time, date, and/or place of the meeting will be posted on the Commission's website at *https://www.sec.gov.*

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(3), (5), (6), (7), (8), 9(B) and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(3), (a)(5), (a)(6), (a)(7), (a)(8), (a)(9)(ii) and (a)(10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the closed meeting.

The subject matter of the closed meeting will consist of the following topics:

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions;

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings;

Resolution of litigation claims; and

Other matters relating to examinations and enforcement proceedings.

At times, changes in Commission priorities require alterations in the scheduling of meeting agenda items that may consist of adjudicatory, examination, litigation, or regulatory matters.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: For further information, please contact Vanessa A. Countryman from the Office of the Secretary at (202) 551–5400.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552b.

Dated: August 14, 2025.

Vanessa A. Countryman,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15676 Filed 8–14–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–103694; File No. SR–NYSEAMER–2025–49]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE American LLC; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Change To Amend Rule 7.37E

August 13, 2025.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1)[1] of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[2] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[3] notice is hereby given that, on August 6, 2025, NYSE American LLC (''NYSE American'' or the ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.37E to provide for order routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. The proposed rule change is available on the Exchange's website at *www.nyse.com* and at the principal office of the Exchange.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of, and basis for, the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of those statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The Exchange has prepared summaries, set forth in sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant parts of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and the Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.37E (Order Execution and Routing) to provide for optional order routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations.

Rule 7.37E(b) and the subparagraphs thereunder describe how the Exchange routes orders to Away Markets. The Exchange proposes to amend Rule 7.37E(b)(3), which is currently designated as ''Reserved,'' to provide that orders eligible to route will be routed to all available Away Markets unless the order includes an instruction to bypass Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations.[4] This proposed change would allow eligible orders to be routed to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations, except for those with an instruction to bypass such destinations when routing, thereby facilitating optional routing to additional destinations at ETP Holders' preference. Proposed Rule 7.37E(b)(3) is based on NYSE Arca, Inc. (''NYSE Arca'') Rule 7.37–E(b)(3), NYSE National, Inc. (''NYSE National'') Rule 7.37(b)(3), and NYSE Texas, Inc. (''NYSE Texas'') Rule 7.37(b)(3) without any changes.

The Exchange also proposes to add new subparagraph (1) under Rule 7.37E(d), relating to the Exchange's use of data feeds for the handling, execution, and routing of orders, as well

[31] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78a.

[3] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[4] The Exchange also proposes that Rule 7.37E(b)(3) would provide that orders eligible to route would not route to all available Away Markets if designated with a routing strategy pursuant to Rule 7.37(b)(9) because such routing strategies may provide for routing to specific destinations only.

as for regulatory compliance.[5] Proposed Rule 7.37E(d)(1) would provide that the Exchange receives data feeds directly from broker dealers for purposes of routing interest to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. This proposed change would ensure that Rule 7.37E(d) accurately and comprehensively reflects the Exchange's use of data feeds for order handling, execution, and routing (as well as for regulatory compliance) and would promote transparency in the Exchange's rules with respect to routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. Proposed Rule 7.37E(d)(1) is based on NYSE Arca Rule 7.37–E(d)(1), NYSE National Rule 7.37(d)(1), and NYSE Texas Rule 7.37(d)(1) without any changes.

Subject to effectiveness of this proposed rule change, the Exchange will implement this change no later than in the fourth quarter of 2025 and announce the implementation date by Trader Update.

2. Statutory Basis

The proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b) of the Act,[6] in general, and furthers the objectives of Section 6(b)(5),[7] in particular, because it is designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to foster cooperation and coordination with persons engaged in facilitating transactions in securities, to remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.

The Exchange believes the proposed change would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and protect investors and the public interest by providing for optional routing functionality to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. Specifically, proposed Rule 7.37E(b)(3) would facilitate routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations for eligible orders that do not have an instruction to bypass such destinations. Proposed Rule 7.37E(d)(1) would promote clarity and transparency in the Exchange's rules regarding its use of data feeds for order handling, execution, and routing, as well as for regulatory compliance, with respect to routing to Away Markets that are not displaying protected quotations. The Exchange believes that the proposed change would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and protect investors and the public interest because it would promote additional trading opportunities for ETP Holders and afford greater flexibility to market participants through optional routing functionality to additional trading venues, thereby encouraging competition between the Exchange and other equity exchanges. The Exchange also believes that the proposed change would promote just and equitable principles of trade, remove impediments to, and perfect the mechanism of, a free and open market and a national market system, and protect investors and the public interest by aligning the Exchange's rules with those of its affiliated equities exchanges, NYSE Arca, NYSE National, and NYSE Texas.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that the proposed rule change will impose any burden on competition that is not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. As noted above, the Exchange believes that the proposed change could instead encourage competition by making additional optional routing destinations available for orders eligible to be routed away from the Exchanges, as well as by promoting additional trading opportunities for ETP Holders.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the proposed rule change.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The Exchange has filed the proposed rule change pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act[8] and Rule 19b–4(f)(6) thereunder.[9] Because the foregoing proposed rule change does not: (i) significantly affect the protection of investors or the public interest; (ii) impose any significant burden on competition; and (iii) become operative for 30 days from the date on which it was filed, or such shorter time as the Commission may designate, it has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act[10] and subparagraph (f)(6) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder.[11]

At any time within 60 days of the filing of such proposed rule change, the Commission summarily may temporarily suspend such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. If the Commission takes such action, the Commission shall institute proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B)[12] of the Act to determine whether the proposed rule change should be approved or disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning the foregoing, including whether the proposed rule change is consistent with the Act. Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's internet comment form (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include file number SR–NYSEAMER–2025–49 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE, Washington, DC 20549–1090.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSEAMER–2025–49. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's internet website (*https://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the filing will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. Do not include personal identifiable

[5] The Exchange also proposes a non-substantive, conforming change to renumber current Rule 7.37E(d)(1) as Rule 7.37E(d)(2).

[6] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b).

[7] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

[8] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[9] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6).

[10] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A)(iii).

[11] 17 CFR 240.19b–4(f)(6). In addition, Rule 19b–4(f)(6)(iii) requires a self-regulatory organization to give the Commission written notice of its intent to file the proposed rule change, along with a brief description and text of the proposed rule change, at least five business days prior to the date of filing of the proposed rule change, or such shorter time as designated by the Commission. The Exchange has satisfied this requirement.

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2)(B).

information in submissions; you should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. We may redact in part or withhold entirely from publication submitted material that is obscene or subject to copyright protection.

All submissions should refer to file number SR–NYSEAMER–2025–49 and should be submitted on or before September 8, 2025.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[13]

Sherry R. Haywood,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15620 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Release of Waybill Data

The Surface Transportation Board has received a request from Bi-State Development on behalf of St. Louis Regional Freightway, (WB25–48—06/06/25) for permission to use select data from the Board's 2021, 2022, and 2023 masked Carload Waybill Samples for railroad traffic originating, terminating, or passing through the St. Louis Region. A copy of this request may be obtained from the Board's website under docket no. WB25–48.

The waybill sample contains confidential railroad and shipper data; therefore, if any parties object to these requests, they should file their objections with the Director of the Board's Office of Economics within 14 calendar days of the date of this notice. The rules for release of waybill data are codified at 49 CFR 1244.9.

Any inquiries on this request should be directed to *waybill@stb.gov.*

Stefan Rice,

Clearance Clerk.

[FR Doc. 2025–15698 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915–01–P

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 9 a.m. ET on August 21, 2025.

PLACE: Knoxville Office Complex, Knoxville, Tennessee.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Meeting No. 25–03

The TVA Board of Directors will hold a public meeting on August 21 at the Knoxville Office Complex, Tennessee. The meeting will be called to order at 9:00 a.m. ET to consider the agenda items listed below. While the Board currently lacks a quorum, it is anticipated that the Board will take an action in accordance with Section 1.6 of its Bylaws.

On August 20, at the Knoxville Office Complex, the public may comment on any agenda item or subject at a Board-hosted public listening session which begins at 2 p.m. ET and will last until 4 p.m. Preregistration is required to address the Board.

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes of the May 8, 2025 Board Meeting
2. Report of the Audit, Risk, and Cybersecurity Committee
   A. FY26 External Auditor Selection
3. Report of the Finance, Rates, and Portfolio Committee
4. Report of the People and Governance Committee
5. Report of the Operations and Nuclear Oversight Committee
6. Report of the External Stakeholders and Regulation Committee
   A. FACA Charter Renewal
7. Information Items
   A. Increase in Budget for Capital Projects
   B. Committee Assignments
   C. Delegation of Authority
   D. Corporate Goals for FY2026
   E. FY 2026 Expenditures and Related Items
   F. CEO Appointment Terms—Long-Term Incentive Plan Benefit Eligibility
8. Report From President and CEO

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: For more information: Please contact Melissa Greene, TVA Media Relations at (865) 632–6000, Knoxville, Tennessee. Anyone who wishes to comment on any of the agenda in writing may send their comments to: TVA Board of Directors, Board Agenda Comments, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

Dated: August 14, 2025.

Edward C. Meade,

Agency Liaison.

[FR Doc. 2025–15719 Filed 8–14–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 8120–08–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket Number USTR–2025–0018]

2025 Review of Notorious Markets for Counterfeiting and Piracy: Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) requests comments that identify online and physical markets to be considered for inclusion in the 2025 Review of Notorious Markets for Counterfeiting and Piracy (Notorious Markets List). The Notorious Markets List identifies examples of online and physical markets that reportedly engage in or facilitate substantial copyright piracy or trademark counterfeiting. The 'issue focus' for the 2025 Notorious Markets List will examine copyright piracy of sports broadcasts.

DATES:

October 1, 2025, at 11:59 p.m. ET: Deadline for submission of written comments.

October 15, 2025, at 11:59 p.m. ET: Deadline for submission of rebuttal comments and other information USTR should consider during the review.

ADDRESSES: You should submit written comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal: *http://www.regulations.gov* (*Regulations.gov*). Follow the instructions for submitting comments in section III below. For alternatives to online submissions, please contact Claire Avery-Page at *notoriousmarkets@ustr.eop.gov* or 202.395.6862 before transmitting a comment and in advance of the relevant deadline.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Claire Avery-Page, Director for Innovation and Intellectual Property, at *notoriousmarkets@ustr.eop.gov* or 202.395.6862. You can find information about the Special 301 Review, including the Notorious Markets List, at *www.ustr.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The United States is concerned with trademark counterfeiting and copyright piracy on a commercial scale because these illicit activities cause significant financial losses for right holders, legitimate businesses, and governments. In addition, these illicit activities undermine critical U.S. comparative advantages in innovation and creativity to the detriment of American workers,

[13] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12).

and can pose significant risks to consumer health and safety and privacy and security. Conducted under the auspices of the Special 301 program and the authority of the U.S. Trade Representative to address practices that have significant adverse impact on the value of U.S. innovation, the Notorious Markets List identifies examples of online and physical markets that reportedly engage in or facilitate substantial copyright piracy or trademark counterfeiting that infringe on U.S. intellectual property (IP).

Beginning in 2006, USTR identified notorious markets in the annual Special 301 Report. In 2010, USTR announced that it would publish the Notorious Markets List as an Out-of-Cycle Review, separate from the annual Special 301 Report. USTR published the first Notorious Markets List in February 2011. USTR develops the annual Notorious Markets List based upon public comments solicited through the **Federal Register** and in consultation with federal agencies that serve on the Special 301 Subcommittee of the Trade Policy Staff Committee.

The United States encourages owners and operators of markets reportedly involved in piracy or counterfeiting to adopt business models that rely on the licensed distribution of legitimate content and products and to work with right holders and enforcement officials to address infringement. USTR also encourages foreign government authorities to intensify their efforts to investigate reports of piracy and counterfeiting in such markets, and to pursue appropriate enforcement actions. The Notorious Markets List does not purport to reflect findings of legal violations, nor does it reflect the U.S. Government's analysis of the general IP protection and enforcement climate in the country or countries concerned. For an analysis of the IP climate in particular countries, please refer to the annual Special 301 Report, published each spring no later than 30 days after USTR submits the National Trade Estimate to Congress.

II. Public Comments

USTR invites written comments concerning examples of online and physical markets that reportedly engage in and facilitate substantial copyright piracy or trademark counterfeiting that infringe on U.S. IP. USTR also invites written comments for the Notorious Markets List 'issue focus' that highlights an issue related to the facilitation of substantial trademark counterfeiting or copyright piracy. The issue focus for the 2025 Notorious Markets List will examine copyright piracy of sports broadcasts.

To facilitate the review, written comments should be as detailed as possible. Commenters should clearly identify potentially relevant markets and the reasons why the commenter believes a market should be included in the Notorious Markets List. Commenters should include the following information, as applicable.

For online markets that engage in or facilitate substantial counterfeiting:

- The domain name(s) of the market, the name(s) of the owner(s) or operator(s), the geographic area(s) where the market operates, and whether the market is owned, operated, or otherwise affiliated with a government entity.
- An estimate of the number of goods sold or otherwise made available on the market and any other indicia of the market's scale, reach, or relative significance in a given geographic area or with respect to a category of goods.
- An estimate of the number and types of goods sold or otherwise made available on the market that are counterfeit, either in aggregate or in relation to the total number and types of goods sold or otherwise made available on the market; a description of the methodology used to create the estimate and the timeframe the estimate was conducted; and information supporting the claims of counterfeiting.
- An estimate of economic harm to right holders resulting from the counterfeit goods and a description of the methodology used to calculate the harm.
- Whether the number and types of counterfeit goods or the economic harm has increased or decreased from previous years, and an approximate calculation of that increase or decrease for each year.
- Whether the counterfeit goods sold or otherwise made available on the market pose a risk to public health or safety.
- Any known contractual, civil, administrative, or criminal enforcement activity against the market and the outcome of that enforcement activity.
- Any actions taken by right holders, such as discussing concerns with the market, submitting takedown notices or requests to remove counterfeit goods, sending cease and desist letters, or requesting that the market enforce its terms of service or terms of use, and the outcome of these actions.
- Any actions taken by the market owners or operators to remove, limit, or discourage the availability of counterfeit goods, including policies to prevent or remove access to such goods, or to disable seller or user accounts, the effectiveness of market policies and guidelines in addressing counterfeiting, and the level of cooperation with right holders and law enforcement.
- Any other additional information relevant to the review.

For online markets that engage in or facilitate substantial piracy:

- The domain name(s) of the market, the name(s) and location(s) of the hosting provider(s), the name(s) and location(s) of the owner(s) or operator(s), the geographic area(s) where the market operates, and whether the market is owned, operated, or otherwise affiliated with a government entity.
- Revenue sources such as sales, subscriptions, donations, upload incentives, or advertising, the methods by which that revenue is collected, and the entities that help facilitate the market's revenue.
- A description and estimate of economic harm to right holders resulting from piracy on the market and a description of the methodology used to calculate the harm.
- Whether the number of pirated goods or files, or the economic harm, has increased or decreased from previous years, and an approximate calculation of that increase or decrease for each year.
- Any known contractual, civil, administrative, or criminal enforcement activity against the market and the outcome of that enforcement activity.
- Any actions taken by right holders, such as discussing concerns with the market, submitting takedown notices or requests to remove URLs or pirated content, sending cease and desist letters, or requesting that the market enforce its terms of service or terms of use, and the outcome of these actions.
- Any actions taken by the market owners or operators to remove, limit, or discourage the availability of pirated goods or services, including policies to prevent or remove access to such goods or services, or to disable seller or user accounts, the effectiveness of market policies and guidelines in addressing piracy, and the level of cooperation with right holders and law enforcement.
- Any other additional information relevant to the review.

For physical markets that engage in or facilitate substantial counterfeiting or piracy:

- The market's name(s), street address, neighborhood or shopping district, city, and the identity of the principal owner(s) or operator(s).
- Whether the market is owned, operated, or otherwise affiliated with a government entity.
- The types of counterfeit or pirated products or services sold, traded,

distributed, or otherwise made available at the market.

- The volume of counterfeit or pirated goods or services or other indicia of the market's scale, reach, or relative significance in a given geographic area or with respect to a category of goods or services.
- A description and estimate of economic harm to right holders resulting from the piracy or counterfeiting and a description of the methodology used to calculate the harm.
- Whether the volume of counterfeit or pirated goods or estimates of harm has increased or decreased from previous years, and an approximate calculation of that increase or decrease for each year.
- Whether the infringing goods or services sold, traded, distributed, or made available pose a risk to public health or safety.
- Any known contractual, civil, administrative, or criminal enforcement activity against the market and the outcome of that enforcement activity.
- Additional actions taken by right holders, such as discussing concerns with the market, sending cease and desist letters, sending warning letters to landlords or requests to enforce the terms of their leases, and the outcome of these actions.
- Additional actions taken by the market owners or operators to remove, limit, or discourage the availability of counterfeit or pirated goods or services, the effectiveness of market policies and guidelines in addressing counterfeiting and piracy, and the level of cooperation with right holders and law enforcement.
- Any other additional information relevant to the review.

III. Submission Instructions

All submissions must be in English and sent electronically via *Regulations.gov*. To submit comments, locate the docket (folder) by entering the docket number USTR–2025–0018 in the search bar on the *Regulations.gov* homepage and click 'search.' The site will provide a search-results page listing all documents associated with this docket. Locate the reference to this notice by selecting 'notice' under 'document type' on the left side of the search-results page, and click on the link entitled 'Comment'. You should provide comments in an attached document, and name the file according to the following protocol, as appropriate: Commenter Name or Organization_2025 Notorious Markets. Please include the following information in the 'Start typing comment here' field: 2025 Review of Notorious Markets for Counterfeiting and Piracy. USTR prefers submissions in Microsoft Word (.docx) or Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) format. If the submission is in another file format, please indicate the name of the software application in the 'Start typing comment here' field. For further information on using *Regulations.gov*, please contact the *Regulations.gov* Help Desk via the 'Support' button in the upper right corner of any page.

Please do not attach separate cover letters to electronic submissions. Instead, include any information that might appear in a cover letter in the comments themselves. Similarly, to the extent possible, please include any exhibits, annexes, or other attachments in the same file as the comment itself, rather than submitting them as separate files.

Please include the name, email address, and phone number of an individual who USTR can contact if there are issues or questions with the submission. The contact information can be included in the submission or sent to Claire Avery-Page, Director for Innovation and Intellectual Property, at *notoriousmarkets@ustr.eop.gov* or 202.395.6862.

For any comment submitted electronically that contains business confidential information (BCI), the file name of the business confidential version should begin with the characters 'BCI'. Any page containing BCI must be clearly marked 'BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL' on the top of that page and the submission should clearly indicate, via brackets, highlighting, or other means, the specific information that is business confidential. A filer requesting business confidential treatment must certify that the information is business confidential and that they would not customarily release it to the public. Additionally, the submitter should type 'Business Confidential 2025 Review of Notorious Markets for Counterfeiting and Piracy' in the 'comment' field. Filers of comments containing BCI also must submit a public version. Begin the file name of the public version with the character 'P'. USTR will place the non-business confidential version in the docket at *Regulations.gov* and it will be available for public inspection.

As noted, USTR strongly urges submitters to file comments through *Regulations.gov*. You must make any alternative arrangements in advance of the relevant deadline and before transmitting a comment by contacting Claire Avery-Page at *notoriousmarkets@ustr.eop.gov* or 202.395.6862.

USTR will post comments in the docket for public inspection, except properly designated BCI. You can view comments on *Regulations.gov* by entering docket number USTR–2025–0018 in the search field on the home page.

Daniel Lee,

Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Innovation and Intellectual Property, Office of the United States Trade Representative.

[FR Doc. 2025–15675 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3390–F4–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket Number USTR–2025–0015]

Request for Comments and Notice of Public Hearing Concerning China's Compliance With WTO Commitments

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Request for comments and notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is seeking public comments to assist in the preparation of its annual report to Congress on China's compliance with its obligations as a Member of the World Trade Organization (WTO). This notice includes the schedule for the submission of comments for the China report and a public hearing.

DATES:

September 24, 2025, at 11:59 p.m. EDT: Deadline for submission of written comments, requests to testify, and summaries of written testimony.

October 7, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. EDT: USTR will convene a public hearing to receive oral testimony.

ADDRESSES: USTR strongly prefers electronic submissions made through the Federal eRulemaking Portal: *https://www.regulations.gov* (*Regulations.gov*). Follow the instructions for submitting written comments and testimony and requests to testify in sections III and IV below, using Docket Number USTR–2025–0015. For alternatives to on-line submissions, please contact Alex Martin, Deputy Director for China Affairs, in advance of the relevant deadline at *Thomas.A.Martin@ustr.eop.gov* or 202.395.9625.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alex Martin, Deputy Director for China Affairs, at *Thomas.A.Martin@ustr.eop.gov* or (202) 395–9625.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

China became a Member of the WTO on December 11, 2001. In accordance with section 421 of the U.S.-China

Relations Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106–286), USTR is required to submit annually a report to Congress on China's compliance with commitments made in connection with its accession to the WTO, including both multilateral commitments and any bilateral commitments made to the United States. In accordance with section 421, and to assist it in preparing this year's report, USTR is soliciting public comments. You can find last year's report on the USTR website at: *https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/files/reports/2025/2024USTRReportCongressonChinaWTOCompliance.pdf.*

The terms of China's accession to the WTO are contained in the Protocol on the Accession of the People's Republic of China (including its annexes) (Protocol), the Report of the Working Party on the Accession of China (Working Party Report), and the WTO agreements. You can find the Protocol and Working Party Report on the WTO website at *http://docsonline.wto.org* (document symbols: WT/L/432, WT/MIN(01)/3, WT/MIN(01)/3/Add.1, WT/MIN(01)/3/Add.2).

II. Hearing Participation

USTR will convene a public hearing on October 7, 2025, related to China's compliance with its WTO commitments.

To ensure participation, you must submit requests to present oral testimony at the hearing and summaries of written testimony by 11:59 p.m. on September 24, 2025, via *Regulations.gov*, using Docket Number USTR–2025–0015. Instructions for submission are in Sections III and IV below. Remarks at the hearing will be limited to no more than five minutes to allow for possible questions from the TPSC. Because it is a public hearing, testimony should not include any business confidential information (BCI).

Small businesses (generally defined by the Small Business Administration as firms with fewer than 500 employees) or organizations representing small business members that submit comments should self-identify as such, so that we may be aware of issues of particular interest to small businesses.

Written comments and/or oral testimony should address China's compliance with the commitments made in connection with its accession to the WTO, including, but not limited to, commitments in the following areas:

A. Trading rights.

B. Import regulation (*e.g.,* tariffs, tariff-rate quotas, quotas, import licenses).

C. Export regulation.

D. Internal policies affecting trade (*e.g.,* subsidies, standards and technical regulations, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, government procurement, trade-related investment measures, taxes and charges levied on imports and exports).

E. Intellectual property rights (including intellectual property rights enforcement).

F. Services.

G. Rule of law issues (*e.g.,* transparency, judicial review, uniform administration of laws and regulations) and status of legal reform.

H. Other WTO commitments.

In addition, given the United States' view that China should be held accountable as a full participant in, and beneficiary of, the international trading system, USTR requests that interested persons specifically identify unresolved compliance issues that warrant review and evaluation by USTR.

III. Procedures for Written Submissions

To be assured of consideration, submit your written comments, requests to testify, and summaries of written testimony by the September 24, 2025, 11:59 p.m. EDT deadline. All submissions must be in English. USTR strongly encourages submissions via *Regulations.gov*, using Docket Number USTR–2025–0015.

To make a submission via *Regulations.gov*, enter Docket Number USTR–2025–0015 in the 'search for' field on the home page and click 'search.' The site will provide a search results page listing all documents associated with this docket. Find a reference to this notice by selecting 'notice' under 'document type' in the 'refine documents results' section on the left side of the screen and click on the link entitled 'comment.'

Regulations.gov allows users to make submissions by filling in a 'type comment' field, or by attaching a document using the 'upload file' field. USTR prefers that you provide submissions in an attached document and, in such cases, that you write 'see attached' in the 'type comment' field. USTR prefers submissions in Microsoft Word (.doc) or Adobe Acrobat (.pdf). If you use an application other than those two, please indicate the name of the application in the 'type comment' field.

At the beginning of your submission or on the first page (if an attachment), include the following text: (1) 2025 China WTO Compliance Report; (2) your organization's name; and (3) whether the submission is a written comment, request to testify, or summary of written testimony. Submissions should not exceed 30 single-spaced, standard letter-size pages in 12-point type, including attachments. Please do not attach separate cover letters, exhibits, annexes, or other attachments to electronic submissions; rather, include any in the same file as the submission itself, not as separate files. You will receive a tracking number upon completion of the submission procedure at *Regulations.gov*. The tracking number is confirmation that *Regulations.gov* received your submission. Keep the confirmation for your records. USTR is not able to provide technical assistance for *Regulations.gov*.

For further information on using *Regulations.gov*, please consult the resources provided on the website by clicking on 'How to Use *Regulations.gov*' on the bottom of the home page. USTR may not consider submissions that you do not make in accordance with these instructions.

If you are unable to provide submissions as requested, please contact Alex Martin, Deputy Director for China Affairs, in advance of the deadline at *Thomas.A.Martin@ustr.eop.gov* or (202) 395–9625, to arrange for an alternative method of transmission. USTR will not accept hand-delivered submissions.

General information concerning USTR is available at *www.ustr.gov.*

IV. Business Confidential Information (BCI) Submissions

If you ask USTR to treat information you submit as BCI, you must certify that the information is business confidential and you would not customarily release it to the public. For any comments submitted electronically containing BCI, the file name of the business confidential version should begin with the characters 'BCI.' You must clearly mark any page containing BCI with 'BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL' at the top of that page. Filers of submissions containing BCI also must submit a public version of their submission that will be placed in the docket for public inspection. The file name of the public version should begin with the character 'P.'

V. Public Viewing of Review Submissions

USTR will post written submissions in the docket for public inspection, except properly designated BCI. You can view submissions at *Regulations.gov* by entering Docket

Number USTR–2025–0015 in the search field on the home page.

Edward Marcus,

Chair of the Trade Policy Staff Committee, Office of the United States Trade Representative.

[FR Doc. 2025–15655 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3390–F4–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[Docket No.: FAA–2025–0301; Summary Notice No. 2025–46]

Petition for Exemption; Summary of Petition Received; Helicopter Consultants of Maui dba Blue Hawaiian Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice contains a summary of a petition seeking relief from specified requirements of Federal Aviation Regulations. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, the FAA's exemption process. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion nor omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of the petition or its final disposition.

DATES: Comments on this petition must identify the petition docket number and must be received on or before September 8, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Send comments identified by docket number FAA–2025–0301 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.
- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* Take comments to 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.
- *Fax:* Fax comments to Docket Operations at (202) 493–2251.

Privacy: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to better inform its rulemaking process. DOT posts these comments, 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: Sean O'Tormey, Office of Rulemaking, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591, at 202–267–9677.

This notice is published pursuant to 14 CFR 11.85.

Issued in Washington, DC.

Dan A. Ngo,

Manager, Part 11 Petitions Branch, Office of Rulemaking.

Petition for Exemption

Docket No.: FAA–2025–0301.

Petitioner: Helicopter Consultants of Maui dba Blue Hawaiian Helicopters.

Section of 14 CFR Affected: § 136.75(d)(1).

Description of Relief Sought: The petitioner is seeking an exemption from § 136.75(d)(1) to be able to fly below the 1,500-foot minimum altitude above the surface in specific areas on the islands of O'ahu, Maui, Moloka'i and Hawai'i (the Big Island) in the State of Hawaii. Several of these areas include specific Razor Back ridge crossings. Petitioner is seeking this relief from § 136.75(d)(1) because a lower altitude in the listed areas of the islands of the State of Hawai'i combined with the correct equipment and training is a safer altitude to conduct air tours in these areas that will also limit the impact to the public.

[FR Doc. 2025–15648 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA–2025–0138]

Notice of Petition for Waiver of Compliance

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document provides the public notice that Nevada State Railroad Museum, Boulder City, operating as Nevada Southern Railway (NVSV) petitioned FRA for relief from certain regulations concerning stenciling of rail cars.

DATES: FRA must receive comments on the petition by September 17, 2025. FRA will consider comments received after that date to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES:

Comments: Comments related to this docket may be submitted by going to *https://www.regulations.gov* and following the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number. All comments received will be posted without change to *https://www.regulations.gov;* this includes any personal information. Please see the Privacy Act heading in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document for Privacy Act information related to any submitted comments or materials.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for accessing the docket.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Musselman, Railroad Safety Specialist, FRA Motive Power & Equipment Division, telephone: 202–834–5837, email: *patrick.musselman@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under part 211 of title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this document provides the public notice that by letter received June 3, 2025, NVSV petitioned FRA for a special approval pursuant to 49 CFR part 215 (Railroad Freight Car Safety Standards), and a waiver of compliance from certain provisions of the Federal railroad safety regulations contained in part 215. The relevant Docket Number is FRA–2025–0138.

Specifically, NVSV requests a special approval pursuant to § 215.203, *Restricted cars,* in this docket for 3 pieces of equipment, WP 2711, OR&N 3505, UP 25428, that are more than 50 years from the date of original construction. NVSV also seeks relief from § 215.303, *Stenciling of restricted cars.* In support of its request, NVSV explains that the cars are operated in nine-mile roundtrip excursion rides, and the stenciling relief will allow the cars to maintain their historical appearance. NVSV adds that the cars are

not used in freight service nor interchanged and will be operated at a maximum speed of 20 miles per hour.

A copy of the petition, as well as any written communications concerning the petition, is available for review online at *www.regulations.gov.*

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment and a public hearing, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

Communications received by September 17, 2025 will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered if practicable.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of any written communications and comments received into any of FRA's dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the document, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Under 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to inform its processes. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *https://www.transportation.gov/privacy.* See also *https://www.regulations.gov/privacy-notice* for the privacy notice of *regulations.gov.*

Issued in Washington, DC.

John Karl Alexy,

Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety, Chief Safety Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–15611 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA–2025–0137]

Notice of Petition for Waiver of Compliance

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document provides the public notice that the Nevada State Railroad Museum, Boulder City, operating as Nevada Southern Railway (NVSV) petitioned FRA for relief from certain regulations concerning reflectorization on rail equipment.

DATES: FRA must receive comments on the petition by September 17, 2025. FRA will consider comments received after that date to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES:

Comments: Comments related to this docket may be submitted by going to *https://www.regulations.gov* and following the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number. All comments received will be posted without change to *https://www.regulations.gov;* this includes any personal information. Please see the Privacy Act heading in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document for Privacy Act information related to any submitted comments or materials.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for accessing the docket.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick Musselman, Railroad Safety Specialist, FRA Motive Power & Equipment Division, telephone: 202–834–5837, email: *patrick.musselman@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under part 211 of title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this document provides the public notice that by letter received June 3, 2025, NVSV petitioned FRA for a waiver of compliance from certain provisions of the Federal railroad safety regulations contained at 49 CFR part 224 (Reflectorization of Rail Freight Rolling Stock). FRA assigned the petition Docket Number FRA–2025–0137.

Specifically, FRA understands that NVSV seeks relief from the reflectorization requirements for 24 pieces of equipment: 4 locomotives, 17 pieces of rolling stock, and 3 track inspection ''speeders.'' NVSV states that ''adding reflectorization to multiple locomotives and all freight rolling stock would eliminate [their] historical authenticity,'' which is demanded by NVSV's visitors and dictated by its professional standards. Further, compromising the equipment's historical authenticity would eliminate the opportunity for photo shoots including the equipment.

In support of its request, NVSV notes that it operates over only two grade crossings, which are both in low-traffic areas and are equipped with active grade crossing protection and overhead streetlights. NVSV adds that night operations, running between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m., are rare and amount to fewer than 30 trains.

A copy of the petition, as well as any written communications concerning the petition, is available for review online at *www.regulations.gov.*

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment and a public hearing, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

Communications received by September 17, 2025 will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered if practicable.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of any written communications and comments received into any of FRA's dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the document, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Under 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to inform its processes. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *https://www.transportation.gov/privacy.* See also *https://www.regulations.gov/privacy-notice* for the privacy notice of *regulations.gov.*

Issued in Washington, DC.

John Karl Alexy,

Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety, Chief Safety Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–15613 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Railroad Administration

[Docket Number FRA–2025–0160]

Notice of Petition for Waiver of Compliance

AGENCY: Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document provides the public notice that Lake State Railway (LSRC) petitioned FRA for relief from certain regulations concerning injury and illness reporting and recordkeeping.

DATES: FRA must receive comments on the petition by September 17, 2025. FRA will consider comments received after that date to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES:

Comments: Comments related to this docket may be submitted by going to *https://www.regulations.gov* and following the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions must include the agency name and docket number. All comments received will be posted without change to *https://www.regulations.gov;* this includes any personal information. Please see the Privacy Act heading in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document for Privacy Act information related to any submitted comments or materials.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to *https://www.regulations.gov* and follow the online instructions for accessing the docket.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Wissman, Railroad Safety Specialist, FRA Incident Management, Accident Reporting, and Analysis Division, telephone: 610–314–5729, email: *michael.wissman@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under part 211 of title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this document provides the public notice that by letter received June 10, 2025, LSRC petitioned FRA for a waiver of compliance from certain provisions of the Federal railroad safety regulations contained at 49 CFR part 225 (Railroad Accidents/Incidents: Reports Classification, and Investigations). FRA assigned the petition Docket Number FRA–2025–0160.

Specifically, LSRC seeks relief from 49 CFR 225.25(h), *Recordkeeping,* to post its monthly listing of all injuries and occupational illnesses online instead of physically on paper. LSRC explains that ''[t]o expand access to important safety-related information,'' it maintains a ''web portal that allows employees to access and review information from computer terminals'' at company facilities, in employee home terminals, and with personal devices.

In support of its request, LSRC states that electronic postings provide ''an equivalent level of compliance'' to paper postings ''by allowing employees to access and review [the] information at any time and from any establishment, including their home[s].'' LSRC adds that employees are being directed to the electronic posting and trained on the system. Employees may also request a physical copy of the logs from supervisors at any time.

A copy of the petition, as well as any written communications concerning the petition, is available for review online at *www.regulations.gov.*

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data, or comments. FRA does not anticipate scheduling a public hearing in connection with these proceedings since the facts do not appear to warrant a hearing. If any interested party desires an opportunity for oral comment and a public hearing, they should notify FRA, in writing, before the end of the comment period and specify the basis for their request.

Communications received by September 17, 2025 will be considered by FRA before final action is taken. Comments received after that date will be considered if practicable.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of any written communications and comments received into any of FRA's dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the document, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). Under 5 U.S.C. 553(c), DOT solicits comments from the public to inform its processes. DOT posts these comments, without edit, including any personal information the commenter provides, to *www.regulations.gov,* as described in the system of records notice (DOT/ALL–14 FDMS), which can be reviewed at *https://www.transportation.gov/privacy.* See also *https://www.regulations.gov/privacy-notice* for the privacy notice of *regulations.gov*.

Issued in Washington, DC.

John Karl Alexy,

Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety, Chief Safety Officer.

[FR Doc. 2025–15628 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. MARAD–2025–0465]

Request Notice: Use of Foreign-Built Small Passenger Vessel in United States Coastwise Trade, S/V ENDANGERED SPECIES

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Transportation, as represented by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), is authorized to make determinations regarding the coastwise use of foreign built; certain U.S. built; and U.S. and foreign rebuilt vessels that solely carry no more than twelve passengers for hire. MARAD has received such a determination request and is publishing this notice to solicit comments to assist with determining whether the proposed use of the vessel set forth in the request would have an adverse effect on U.S. vessel builders or U.S. coastwise trade businesses that use U.S.-built vessels in those businesses. Information about the requestor's vessel, including a description of the proposed service, is in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below.

DATES: Submit comments on or before September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by DOT Docket Number MARAD–2025–0465 by any one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to *https://www.regulations.gov.* Search MARAD–2025–0465 and follow the instructions for submitting comments.
- *Mail or Hand Delivery:* Docket Management Facility is in the West Building, Ground Floor of the U.S. Department of Transportation. The Docket Management Facility location address is U.S. Department of Transportation, MARAD–2025–0465, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, West Building, Room W12–140, Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except on Federal holidays.

Note: If you mail or hand-deliver your comments, we recommend that you include your name and a mailing address, an email

address, or a telephone number in the body of your document so that we can contact you if we have questions regarding your submission.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and specific docket number. All comments received will be posted without change to the docket at *www.regulations.gov,* including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on submitting comments, or to submit comments that are confidential in nature, see the section entitled Public Participation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Hagerty, U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE, Mail Stop 2, MAR–620, Washington, DC 20590. Telephone: (202) 366–5400. Email: *smallvessels@dot.gov*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 12121(b), the U.S. Coast Guard may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise trade endorsement for eligible, small passenger vessels authorized to carry no more than 12 passengers for hire if MARAD, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, determines the use of the small passenger vessel in the coastwise trade will not adversely affect United States vessel builders or the coastwise trade business of any person that employs vessels built in the United States in that business.[1]

MARAD has received an eligibility determination request. Further details about the requester's vessel and its proposed operations may be found in the determination request posted in the DOT docket as MARAD–2025–0465 at *https://www.regulations.gov.* Interested parties may comment on the undue adverse effect this action may have on U.S. vessel builders or coastwise trade businesses in the U.S. that employ U.S.-built vessels in those businesses. Comments should refer to the vessel name, state the commenter's interest in the request, and demonstrate, with supporting documentation, the undue adverse effect on U.S. vessel builders and coastwise trade businesses.

Public Participation

How do I submit comments?

Please submit comments, including the attachments, following the instructions provided under the above heading entitled **ADDRESSES**. It may take a few hours or even days for comments to be reflected on the docket. Comments must be written in English. Provide concise comments and attach additional documents as necessary. There is no limit on the length of the attachments.

Where do I go to read public comments, and find supporting information?

The docket online is located at *https://www.regulations.gov,* keyword search MARAD–2025–0465 or visit the Docket Management Facility (see **ADDRESSES** for hours of operation). Please periodically check the Docket for new submissions and supporting material.

Will my comments be made available to the public?

Yes. Your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, will be made publicly available.

May I submit comments confidentially?

You may request that MARAD treat your comments as commercially confidential by submitting them to *SmallVessels@dot.gov.* Include in the email subject heading ''Contains Confidential Commercial Information'' or ''Contains CCI'' and state in your submission, with specificity, the basis for any such confidential treatment highlighting the CCI portions. If possible, please provide a summary of your submission that can be made available to the public.

If MARAD receives a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the information, procedures described in the Department's FOIA regulation at 49 CFR 7.29 will be followed. Only information that is ultimately determined to be confidential under those procedures will be exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). For information on DOT's compliance with the Privacy Act, please visit *https://www.transportation.gov/privacy.*

(Authority: 49 CFR 1.93(a), 46 U.S.C. 12121)

By Order of the Maritime Administration.

T. Mitchell Hudson, Jr.,

Secretary, Maritime Administration.

[FR Doc. 2025–15660 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–81–P

[1] The U.S. Coast Guard and MARAD have authority under 46 U.S.C. 12121(b) through the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, respectively.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. DOT–OST–2025–1029]

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology; Request for Information—Research Ideas To Support Nationwide Automated Vehicle (AV) Deployment

AGENCY: Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Request for information (RFI).

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Transportation's (U.S. DOT) Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology (OST–R) is seeking information from the public, industry, infrastructure owner/operators, and other stakeholders to inform coordinated national research supporting Automated Driving Systems (ADS) transportation technology deployment and realizing safe efficient operations on our Nation's roadways. ADS-equipped vehicles have significant potential to transform safety and mobility but in order for national deployment to scale effectively, research questions relating to the challenges and opportunities of ADS, including understanding disengagements, identifying factors that contribute or detract from reliable and consistent operations and interactions, and facilitating interoperable data standardization and real-time analytics, among others, are important to investigate further to support deployment and broad public acceptance.

DATES: Written submissions must be received by October 17, 2025.

Submission Instructions: Responses should be submitted electronically as a Microsoft Word document, preferably not to exceed 15 single-sided pages in length, and no greater than 15 MB in file size. Recommended format for responses includes Times New Roman 12-point font and 1 inch page margins. Responses should be emailed to *AVResearchRFI@dot.gov* (with the Subject Line of ''AV Research RFI Response <Institution Name>''. No Confidential Business Information or Sensitive Security Information should be submitted in response to this RFI.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions about this RFI, please email *AVResearchRFI@dot.gov*. You may also contact Shaz Umer, Director of Strategic Initiatives, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology (202–738–7964) or by email at *shaz.umer@dot.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This RFI seeks information that will assist OST–

R in carrying out its transportation research and development responsibilities under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 65, ''Research Planning''. This RFI is neither a request for proposals nor a notice of funding opportunity.

Respondents are requested to supply the following information at a minimum in their written responses:

A. Name of the responding entity (''respondent'').

B. Respondent's Contact information, including that individual's title, name, address, telephone number and email address.

C. The respondent's input to U.S. DOT AV research planning needs relating to any or all of the questions below.

Specific Information Required

This RFI seeks feedback from industry, technology developers, operators of ADS vehicle fleets, State/local transportation agencies, researchers, and other stakeholders to inform United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) on AV research activities necessary to support nationwide Automated Vehicle (AV) deployment. This RFI centers on the intersection of advanced software, real-time data analytics, and the complex management of roadway operational domains—emphasizing the role transportation system data plays in supporting AV operations at scale. OST–R intends to enhance the current understanding of the technical, data, and resource needs to improve the ability of software-driven AV systems to operate and interact with other road users and infrastructure safely and efficiently at scale on roadways across varied U.S. geographies and operational design domains (ODD). This understanding will help OST–R develop a research agenda to facilitate nationwide AV deployment. This RFI does not cover vehicle safety topics already included within existing vehicle safety regulatory responsibilities under the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) including its recently released AV Framework, and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA).

1. *Data Standards and Integration:* What comprehensive data frameworks could be studied, piloted/demonstrated or otherwise tested that could inform standardization of data on AV interactions and impacts on transportation system operations (*e.g.,* obstructions to traffic, behaviors that are not expected of human-driven vehicles, etc.) and how it is categorized, reported to agencies and the public, and validated for normal and anomalous events based on the factors below?

(a) What new or enhanced statistical methodologies, including but not limited to metrics, confidence intervals, significance thresholds, and negative control events, can be applied to create benchmarks for AV impacts on transportation system performance, and considerations relating to appropriate human driver baseline(s)?

(b) What specific data, and methods to publish that data via open-data portals or protocols (dynamic/real-time and non-real-time), designed to meet the needs of operations, maintenance, research, policy, and the general public across all operating scenarios and environments and interactions with other road users, is needed?

(c) What additional research is needed to improve understanding of operational needs related to automated fleet operations (including both commercial motor vehicles and non-CMV fleets such as ride hailing), *e.g.* transcontinental automated truck trips, including fueling, inspection, emergency maintenance and other services. What interoperable digital data would be valuable in supporting these services for automated fleets?

(d) What are the near-term infrastructure-related data needs for deployment of AVs, including roadway operations, maintenance, and planning? Which data needs require standardized information exchange, and how should this occur?

2. *Edge Case Characteristics Identification:*

(a) What research is needed to understand the data capture and support for longitudinal tracking of AV impacts on transportation system operations across varied roadway environments (including potential longitudinal data for a specific street/road segment vs. segments with similar characteristics)?

3. *Supervision Dynamics and Human Interaction:*

(a) What research is required to establish standardized processes and supporting data with appropriate sampling strategies (*e.g.,* across urban, suburban, and rural ODD) to support long-term transportation planning? What methods can incentivize AV operator transparency while protecting proprietary information?

(b) What research is needed to leverage the Evidence Act's requirements for data integrity, chain of custody, and long-term preservation that may be applicable to datasets that combine AV interactions with transportation system data, to ensure that such data remains reliable, legally admissible, and useful for safety evaluations and policy development? Are existing data-management architectures and technical safeguards sufficient (across in-vehicle systems, edge servers, and central repositories) to guarantee cryptographic integrity, tamper-proof evidence, and write-once/read-many storage techniques, or is additional research necessary?

(c) What research is needed to optimize human-machine interfaces for diverse user groups, including emergency responders, pedestrians, cyclists, other human drivers and passengers, to enhance safety, accessibility, and trust in mixed traffic environments?

4. *Evidence Based Evaluation:*

(a) What research is needed to support safe, transparent, and equitable nationwide evidence-based evaluation of AV operational impacts on the transportation system?

5. *Transparency and Building Public Understanding of Variations in AV Impacts on the Transportation System:*

(a) What data standards, formats, and APIs, need to be researched to integrate needed supporting information on AV impacts on the transportation system (*e.g.,* raw AV operational and post-disengagement data), including temporary road conditions (construction, detours, etc.), into publicly accessible research hubs (including supporting enhancements to DOT-supported hubs such as the ITS Datahub) and to ensure consistent edge-case mapping nationwide?

(b) What statistical methods are suitable to adequately capture emerging anomalous behavior or rare-event factors associated with AV impacts or interactions on the transportation system?

(c) What areas and resolution of nationwide mapping is required or would be used for roadways, intersections, bridges, tunnels, interchanges, right of ways, and/or parking areas, be they public, private, paved, unpaved or otherwise? What data standards, formats and APIs are required for the nationwide mapping? If the road surface is mapped in 3 dimensions, what are the height resolution requirements above a surface reference datum or similar base point? What datum reference would be required? Would your company use the map data if it was at no cost? If there was a charge for the map data, what is the reasonable estimated charge for the map data, and would your company be willing to pay this reasonable estimated charge? How would you propose downloading and subsequently

updating the map data in company servers or in road vehicles?

6. *Evaluation of Consistent and Robust Vehicle Behavior Interactions with Other Road Users and the Transportation System:*

(a) What research is needed to develop new or improved standardized methods to evaluate vehicle behavior consistency (*e.g.,* car following, lane changing, pedestrian/cyclist detection) across diverse environments (*e.g.,* rain, fog, snow, work zones, potholes), interactions (*e.g.,* unpredictable human drivers, emergency vehicles), and situations (*e.g.,* sensor failure, loss of cellular network, mechanical failures) when ADS-equipped vehicles are involved?

Confidential Business Information

Do not submit information disclosure of which is restricted by statute, such as trade secrets and commercial or financial information (hereinafter referred to as Confidential Business Information ''CBI'') in response to this RFI. Responses submitted to OST–R cannot be claimed as CBI. Responses received by OST–R will waive any CBI claims for the information submitted.

(Authority: 49 U.S.C. 102(e)(1).)

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 13, 2025.

Michael A. Halem,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology.

[FR Doc. 2025–15605 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–9X–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Notice of OFAC Sanctions Action

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of one or more persons that have been placed on OFAC's Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List (SDN List) based on OFAC's determination that one or more applicable legal criteria were satisfied. All property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of these persons are blocked, and U.S. persons are generally prohibited from engaging in transactions with them. Additionally, OFAC is publishing the removal of persons currently on OFAC's SDN List based on OFAC's determination that one or more applicable legal criteria were satisfied. All property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of such persons are unblocked, and U.S. persons are permitted to engage in lawful transactions with them. Finally, OFAC is publishing updates to the identifying information of two persons currently included on the SDN List.

DATES: These actions were issued on July 24, 2025. See Supplementary Information for relevant dates.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: OFAC: Associate Director for Global Targeting, 202–622–2420; Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance, 202–622–2490; or *https://ofac.treasury.gov/contact-ofac.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Availability

The SDN List and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions programs are available on OFAC's website: *https://ofac.treasury.gov.*

Notice of OFAC Action

A. On July 24, 2025, OFAC determined that the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of the following persons are blocked under the relevant sanctions authorities listed below.

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P

Individuals

1. JO, Kyong Hun (Hangul: 조경훈) (a.k.a. CHO, Kyo'ng-hun), Korea, North; DOB 19 Jun 1990; POB Pyongyang, North Korea; nationality Korea, North; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: North Korea Sanctions Regulations, sections 510.201 and 510.210; Transactions Prohibited For Persons Owned or Controlled By U.S. Financial Institutions: North Korea Sanctions Regulations section 510.214; Passport 108432959 (Korea, North) issued 19 Oct 2018 expires 19 Oct 2023 (individual) [NPWMD] (Linked To: KOREA SOBAEKSU TRADING CORPORATION).

   Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii) of Executive Order 13382 of June 28, 2005, "Blocking Property of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferators and Their Supporters," 70 FR 38567, 3 CFR, 2005 Comp., p. 170 (July 1, 2005) (E.O. 13382) for having provided, or attempted to provide, financial, material, technological or other support for, or goods or services in support of, KOREA SOBAEKSU TRADING CORPORATION, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13382.

2. KIM, Se Un (Hangul: 김세운) (a.k.a. KIM, Se-u'n), Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam; DOB 25 Mar 1978; POB Nampho, North Korea; nationality Korea, North; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: North Korea Sanctions Regulations, sections 510.201 and 510.210; Transactions Prohibited For Persons Owned or Controlled By U.S. Financial Institutions: North Korea Sanctions Regulations section 510.214; Passport 390120007 (Korea, North) issued 09 Jan 2020 expires 09 Jan 2025 (individual) [NPWMD] (Linked To: KOREA SOBAEKSU TRADING CORPORATION).

   Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii) of E.O. 13382 for having provided, or attempted to provide, financial, material, technological or other support for, or goods or services in support of, KOREA SOBAEKSU TRADING CORPORATION, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13382.

3. MYONG, Chol Min (Hangul: 명철민), Korea, North; DOB 25 Sep 1966; POB Pyongyang, North Korea; nationality Korea, North; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: North Korea Sanctions Regulations, sections 510.201 and 510.210; Transactions Prohibited For Persons Owned or Controlled By U.S. Financial Institutions: North Korea Sanctions Regulations section 510.214; Passport 745338501 (Korea, North) issued 19 Sep 2015 expires 19 Sep 2020 (individual) [DPRK4].

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iv) of Executive Order 13810 of September 20, 2017, "Imposing Additional Sanctions With Respect to North Korea" 82 FR 44705, 3 CFR, 2017 Comp., p. 379 (September 25, 2017) for being a North Korean person, including a North Korean person that has engaged in commercial activity that generates revenue for the Government of North Korea or the Workers' Party of Korea.

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–C

Entity

1. KOREA SOBAEKSU TRADING CORPORATION (a.k.a. KOREA SOBAEKSU UNITED CO.; a.k.a. KOREA SOBAEKSU UNITED CORPORATION; a.k.a. SOBAEKSU UNITED CORP.; a.k.a. SOBAEKU UNITED CORP), Huale St. Aojing Park Building 23, Unit 2 12–01, Zhongshan District, Dalian, Liaoning, China; 5 Center St., Xinxing District, Donggang City, Dandong, Liaoning, China; Secondary sanctions risk: North Korea Sanctions Regulations, sections

510.201 and 510.210; Transactions Prohibited For Persons Owned or Controlled By U.S. Financial Institutions: North Korea Sanctions Regulations section 510.214; Organization Type: Other information technology and computer service activities [NPWMD] (Linked To: MUNITIONS INDUSTRY DEPARTMENT).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iv) of E.O. 13382 for being owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, MUNITIONS INDUSTRY DEPARTMENT, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13382.

B. On July 24, 2025, OFAC has determined that circumstances no longer warrant the inclusion of the following persons on the SDN List, and that their property and interests in property are no longer blocked pursuant to Executive Order 14014 of February 10, 2021, ''Blocking Property With Respect to the Situation in Burma'', 86 FR 9429 (February 12, 2021).

Individuals

1. OO, Aung Hlaing, Burma; DOB 11 Jun 1977; nationality Burma; Gender Male (individual) [BURMA–EO14014].

2. AUNG, Sit Taing (a.k.a. ASUNG, Sit Thaing; a.k.a. AUNG, Sitt Thaing), Burma; DOB 13 Nov 1971; nationality Burma; citizen Burma; Gender Male (individual) [BURMA–EO14014].

3. MIN, Tin Latt, Burma; DOB 15 Jun 1968; nationality Burma; Gender Female; National ID No. 5/MAYANAN012759 (Burma) (individual) [BURMA–EO14014] (Linked To: ZAW, Thein Win).

4. THAUNG, Jonathan Myo Kyaw (a.k.a. TAUNG, Jonathan Kwang; a.k.a. THAUNG, Jonathan Kwang; a.k.a. THAUNG, Jonathan Kyaw; a.k.a. ''MYO, Jonathan''), Burma; DOB 29 Dec 1981; nationality Burma; Gender Male (individual) [BURMA–EO14014] (Linked To: MYANMA ECONOMIC HOLDINGS PUBLIC COMPANY LIMITED).

Entities

1. MYANMAR CHEMICAL AND MACHINERY COMPANY LIMITED (a.k.a. MCM GROUP), No. 566/KA, Yazahtarni Road, Paung Laung 2 Quarter, Pyinmana Township, Naypyitaw, Burma; NO.2, 7 Mile Hill, MG Weik Housing, Mayangone Township, Yangon Region, Burma; Organization Type: Wholesale of other machinery and equipment; Target Type Private Company; Registration Number 100220040 (Burma) issued 10 Feb 2001 [BURMA–EO14014] (Linked To: OO, Aung Hlaing).

2. SUNTAC TECHNOLOGIES COMPANY LIMITED (a.k.a. SUNTAC GROUP; a.k.a. SUNTAC TECHNOLOGIES; a.k.a. SUNTAC TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.), Room 5, 7, 8, Building 5, Building 8, MICT Park, Hlaing Township, Yangon Region, Burma; Bldg 5, Room 5/7/8/12 Myanmar ICP Park, Hlaing Po 1052 Township, Yangon, Burma; Organization Established Date 28 Dec 2000; Organization Type: Mining of hard coal; alt. Organization Type: Mining of lignite; Business Registration Number 181472561 (Burma) [BURMA–EO14014] (Linked To: AUNG, Sit Taing).

3. SUNTAC INTERNATIONAL TRADING COMPANY LIMITED (a.k.a. SUN TAC INTERNATIONAL TRADING CO., LIMITED; a.k.a. SUN TEC INTERNATIONAL TRADING CO., LIMITED; a.k.a. SUNTAC GROUP; a.k.a. SUNTAC GROUP OF COMPANIES; a.k.a. SUNTAC INTERNATIONAL TRADING CO., LIMITED; a.k.a. SUNTEC INTERNATIONAL TRADING CO., LIMITED; a.k.a. ''SUN TEC''; a.k.a. ''SUNTAC''), Thiriyadanar Shopping Complex, No. 177, Zabu Thiri Township, Nay Pyi Taw, Burma; 151 B Thiri Mingalar Lane, Mayangon Township, Yangon, Burma; Organization Established Date 03 Jul 1996; Organization Type: Management consultancy activities [BURMA–EO14014] (Linked To: AUNG, Sit Taing).

4. KT SERVICES & LOGISTICS KTSL COMPANY LIMITED (a.k.a. KT SERVICES & LOGISTICS CO., LTD; a.k.a. KT SERVICES AND LOGISTICS CO., LTD; a.k.a. KT SERVICES AND LOGISTICS COMPANY LIMITED; a.k.a. KT SERVICES AND LOGISTICS KTSL COMPANY LIMITED), Pyay Road, A4/A5 Kamayut Township, Rangoon 11201, Burma; Registration Country Burma; Organization Established Date 18 Feb 2014; Registration Number 108301848 (Burma) [BURMA–EO14014] (Linked To: MYANMA ECONOMIC HOLDINGS PUBLIC COMPANY LIMITED).

C. On July 24, 2025, OFAC has determined that circumstances no longer warrant the inclusion of the following persons on the SDN List and their property and interests in property are no longer blocked pursuant to Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, ''Blocking Property of the Government of North Korea and the Workers' Party of Korea, and Prohibiting Certain Transactions with Respect to North Korea,'' 81 FR 14943, 3 CFR, 2016 Comp., p. 446 (March 18, 2016).

Individual

1. JADHAV, Deepak (a.k.a. JADHAV, Deepak Subhash), 203 Topaz Sai Ram Manor, Apartment Yosufguda, Hyderabad 500045, India; DOB 11 Dec 1976; POB Dombivli Maharashtra, India; nationality India; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: North Korea Sanctions Regulations, sections 510.201 and 510.210; Transactions Prohibited For Persons Owned or Controlled By U.S. Financial Institutions: North Korea Sanctions Regulations section 510.214; Passport U8554908 (India) expires 12 Jan 2031 (individual) [DPRK3] (Linked To: SEK STUDIO).

Entity

1. FUNSAGA PTE LTD., 111 North Bridge Road, #08–18, Peninsula Plaza, 179098, Singapore; Peninsular Plaza, 111 North Bridge Road, #08–11, 179098, Singapore; Secondary sanctions risk: North Korea Sanctions Regulations, sections 510.201 and 510.210; Transactions Prohibited For Persons Owned or Controlled By U.S. Financial Institutions: North Korea Sanctions Regulations section 510.214; Organization Established Date 30 Oct 2018; Identification Number 201836948N (Singapore) [DPRK3] (Linked To: SEK STUDIO).

D. On July 24, 2025, OFAC updated the SDN List entry for the following person, whose property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction continue to be blocked. The listing below reflects the amended entry on the SDN List.

Individual

—From—

1. IZZITION E-TECHNOLOGY CO., LIMITED (Chinese Traditional: 伊奇信電子科技有限公司), Room 1001, Jiahe Building A, Zhong Hang Rd., Huaqiang No11h Subdistrict, Futian District, Shenzhen, China; Flat 1506, 15/F, Lucky Center, No. 165-171 Wan Chai Road, Hong Kong, China; RM 29, 22/F, Yan's Tower, 25-27 Wong Chuk Hang Road, Aberdeen, Hong Kong, China; Secondary sanctions risk: See Section 11 of Executive Order 14024.; Organization Established Date 23 Mar 2006; Commercial Registry Number 1033045 (Hong Kong) [RUSSIA-EO14024].

—To—

1. IZZITION E-TECHNOLOGY CO., LIMITED (Chinese Traditional: 伊奇信電子科技有限公司), Room 1001, Jiahe Building A, Zhong Hang Rd., Huaqiang North Subdistrict, Futian District, Shenzhen, China; Flat 1506, 15/F, Lucky Center, No. 165-171 Wan Chai Road, Hong Kong, China; RM 29, 22/F, Yan's Tower, 25-27 Wong Chuk Hang Road, Aberdeen, Hong Kong, China; Secondary sanctions risk: See Section 11 of Executive Order 14024.; Organization Established Date 23 Mar 2006; Commercial Registry Number 1033045 (Hong Kong) [RUSSIA-EO14024].

Lawrence M. Scheinert,

Acting Deputy Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.

[FR Doc. 2025–15694 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of Foreign Assets Control

Notice of OFAC Sanctions Action

AGENCY: Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of one or more persons that have been placed on OFAC's Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List (SDN List) based on OFAC's determination that one or more applicable legal criteria were satisfied. All property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of these persons are blocked, and U.S. persons are generally prohibited from engaging in transactions with them.

DATES: This action was issued on August 14, 2025. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for relevant dates.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: OFAC: Associate Director for Global Targeting, 202–622–2420; Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance, 202–622–2490 or *https://ofac.treasury.gov/contact-ofac.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Availability

The SDN List and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions programs are available on OFAC's website: *https://ofac.treasury.gov.*

Notice of OFAC Action

On August 14, 2025, OFAC determined that the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of the following persons are blocked under the relevant sanctions authorities listed below.

Individuals

1. KARAVATSKY, Pavel (a.k.a. KARAVATSKII, Pavel Yuryevich (Cyrillic: КАРАВАЦКИЙ, Павел Юрьевич); a.k.a. KARAVATSKIY, Pavel), Russia; DOB 25 Jan 1983; nationality Russia; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Tax ID No. 503508082690 (Russia) (individual) [CYBER4] (Linked To: GARANTEX EUROPE OU).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, ''Blocking the Property of Certain Persons Engaging in Significant Malicious Cyber-Enabled Activities,'' 80 FR 18077, 3 CFR, 2015 Comp., p. 297, as amended by Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, ''Taking Additional Steps to Address the National Emergency With Respect to Significant Malicious Cyber-Enabled Activities,'' 82 FR 1, 3 CFR, 2016 Comp., p. 659, and as further amended by Executive Order 14144 of January 16, 2025, ''Strengthening and Promoting Innovation in the Nation's Cybersecurity,'' 90 FR 6755, and Executive Order 14306 of June 6, 2025, ''Sustaining Select Efforts To Strengthen the Nation's Cybersecurity and Amending Executive Order 13694 and Executive Order 14144,'' 90 FR 24723 (E.O. 13694, as further amended), for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, GARANTEX EUROPE OU, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

2. MENDELEEV, Sergey (Cyrillic: МЕНДЕЛЕЕВ, Сергей), Russia; DOB 02 Nov 1976; nationality Russia; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201 (individual) [CYBER4] (Linked To: GARANTEX EUROPE OU).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled

by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, GARANTEX EUROPE OU, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

3. MIRA SERDA, Aleksandr Khoseluisovich (Cyrillic: МИРА СЕРДА, Александр Хоселуисович) (a.k.a. MIRA SERDA, Alexander Joseluisovich; a.k.a. NTIFO SIAW, Alexander; a.k.a. NTIFO-SIAO, Aleksandr Edvardovich (Cyrillic: НТИФО-СИАО, Александр Эдвардович)), 26–6 Pr. Uria Gagarina, 37, Saint Petersburg 196135, Russia; DOB 31 May 1984; POB Saint Petersburg, Russia; nationality Russia; alt. nationality Ghana; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; National ID No. 4005295732 (Russia); Tax ID No. 781017931306 (Russia) (individual) [CYBER4] (Linked To: GARANTEX EUROPE OU).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, GARANTEX EUROPE OU, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

Entities

1. A7 AGENT LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (a.k.a. OBSHCHESTVO S OGRANICHENNOI OTVETSTVENNOSTYU A7 AGENT; a.k.a. ''A7 AGENT LLC''), Ul. Lesnaya D. 9 Pomeshch. 2/10, Moscow 125196, Russia; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 26 Sep 2024; Organization Type: Other financial service activities, except insurance and pension funding activities, n.e.c.; Tax ID No. 9710138144 (Russia); Registration Number 1247700638570 (Russia) [CYBER4] (Linked To: A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

2. A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (a.k.a. OBSHCHESTVO S OGRANICHENNOI OTVETSTVENNOSTYU A7; a.k.a. ''A7 LLC''; a.k.a. ''OOO A7''), Ul. Lesnaya D. 9 Pomeshch. 2/10, Moscow 125196, Russia; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 02 Sep 2024; Organization Type: Other financial service activities, except insurance and pension funding activities, n.e.c.; Tax ID No. 9710137165 (Russia); Registration Number 1247700586891 (Russia) [CYBER4] (Linked To: GARANTEX EUROPE OU).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(C) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for having materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods and services to or in support of, GARANTEX EUROPE OU, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

3. A71 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (a.k.a. OBSHCHESTVO S OGRANICHENNOI OTVETSTVENNOSTYU A71; a.k.a. ''A71 LLC''), Ul. Lesnaya D. 9 Pomeshch. 2/10, Moscow 125196, Russia; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 26 Sep 2024; Organization Type: Other financial service activities, except insurance and pension funding activities, n.e.c.; Tax ID No. 9710138137 (Russia); Registration Number 1247700638514 (Russia) [CYBER4] (Linked To: A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

4. EXVED, Russia; website *exved.com*; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 07 Dec 2023; Organization Type: Financial and Insurance Activities [CYBER4] (Linked To: MENDELEEV, Sergey).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, MENDELEEV, Sergey, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

5. GARANTEX EUROPE OU (Latin: GARANTEX EUROPE OÜ) (a.k.a. GARANTEX), Harju maakond, Kesklinna linnaosa, J., Poska tn 51a/1–3, Tallinn 10150, Estonia; Harju maakond, Lasnamae linnaosa, Peterburi tee 47, Tallinn 11415, Estonia; Moscow, Russia; St. Petersburg, Russia; 12, Presnenskaya Embankment, Floor 14, Federation East Tower, Moscow City, Moscow, Russia; website *garantex.io*; alt. Website *garantex.org*; Digital Currency Address—XBT 3Lpoy53K625zV eE47ZasiG5jGkAxJ27kh1; Digital Currency Address—ETH 0x7FF9cFad38 77F21d41Da833E2F775dB0569eE3D9; alt. Digital Currency Address—ETH 0x8Dce2aAC0dE82bdCA f6b4373B79f94331b8e4995; alt. Digital Currency Address—ETH 0xf4377 edA661e04B6DDA78969796 Ed31658D602D4; alt. Digital Currency Address—ETH 0xb338962 B92CD818D6aef0A32a9ECD01212a 71f33; alt. Digital Currency Address—ETH 0x57EC89A0C056163A0314 e413320f9B3ABe761259; alt. Digital Currency Address—ETH 0xD8500C631d C32FA18645B7436344a99E4825e10e; alt. Digital Currency Address—ETH 0x7CEd75026204aC29C34bEA98905 D4C949F27361e; Secondary sanctions risk: See Section 11 of Executive Order 14024.; alt. Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 18 Nov 2019; Digital Currency Address—USDT 3E6ZCKRrsdPc35chA9Eftp 1h3DLW18NFNV; Digital Currency Address—TRX TFwjPScaJRCbSWVAyw E1S1WgaUgSnyYUbD; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TJkBr9TZ1x BeJoF7RNWqyEMbYqVJ6fXXHR; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TNDjh6WGLYyWmkh8vfu42bXVHU qFNQ3rDq; Business Registration Number 14850239 (Estonia) issued 18 Nov 2019 [RUSSIA–EO14024] [CYBER4].

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(C) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for having materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods and services to or in support of, cyber-enabled activities originating from, or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States that is reasonably likely to result in, or has materially contributed to, a threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economic health or financial stability of the United States, and that has the purpose of or involves causing a misappropriation of funds or economic resources, intellectual property, proprietary or business confidential information, personal identifiers, or financial information for commercial or competitive advantage or private financial gain.

6. GRINEX (a.k.a. OBSHCHESTVO S OGRANICHENNOI OTVETSTVENN-OSTYU GRINEKS), Moscow, Russia; Microdistrict Dzhal 29, Building 14/1, Room 35, Leninsky District, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 23 Dec 2024; Organization Type: Financial and Insurance Activities; Digital Currency Address—TRX TEcuHDQthTmULe8 fFLUccBPpjfXaTmJuuD; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TL1k1U6 SHohxBqb68kCodxHc9y2LXoDSep; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TNZ xGWCwvsHr6JxQxzoeDXV597Yf7 Zb7nV; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TC8axQvzJEVR3NKN6mZnJtGy 7537GEmh38; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TAYhjpL8pPs8T84 FSM329nffQpc6jD8GBM; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TMuCgBej D5RsNANZdjGtaM3YyKGNgDoy7N; alt. Digital Currency Address—TRX TGckaiamj5NzaYx6Qp6Zu7kahu HArzUo99; Tax ID No. 02312202410120 (Kyrgyzstan); Registration Number 311748 3301 OOO (Kyrgyzstan) [CYBER4] (Linked To: GARANTEX EUROPE OU).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, GARANTEX EUROPE OU, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

7. INDEPENDENT DECENTRALIZED FINANCE SMARTBANK AND ECOSYSTEM (a.k.a. INDEFI SMARTBANK), Russia; website *indefibank.com*; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 2020; Organization Type: Financial and Insurance Activities [CYBER4] (Linked To: MENDELEEV, Sergey).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(D) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for being owned or controlled by, or having acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, MENDELEEV, Sergey, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

8. OLD VECTOR LLC (a.k.a. OBSHCHESTVO S OGRANICHENNOI OTVETSTVENNOSTYU OLD VEKTOR), 172 Zh/M Archa Beshik, Ul. Kyzyl Adyr, Leninsky District, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan; Digital Currency Address—ETH 0x12de548F79 a50D2bd05481C8515C1eF5183666a9; Secondary sanctions risk: Ukraine-/Russia-Related Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR 589.201; Organization Established Date 13 Dec 2024; Organization Type: Non-specialized wholesale trade; Digital Currency Address—TRX TCFD8N3vM5b4Gr5f 1kkajQsodRVNyyAq1d; Tax ID No. 01312202410041 (Kyrgyzstan); Registration Number 311479 3301 OOO (Kyrgyzstan) [CYBER4] (Linked To: A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY).

Designated pursuant to section 1(a)(iii)(C) of E.O. 13694, as further amended, for having materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods and services to or in support of, A7 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to E.O. 13694, as further amended.

Bradley T. Smith,

Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.

[FR Doc. 2025–15668 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AL–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Request for Comment on Innovative Methods To Detect Illicit Activity Involving Digital Assets

AGENCY: Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of the Treasury invites interested members of the public to provide input on the use of innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies to detect and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets. This notice fulfills a requirement of the Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins Act (GENIUS Act) and supports the Administration's policy of supporting the responsible growth and use of digital assets, as outlined in the January 23, 2025, Executive Order 14178 on ''Strengthening American Leadership in Digital Financial Technology.''

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Please submit comments electronically via the Federal eRulemaking Portal: *www.regulations.gov.* Follow the ''Submit a comment'' instructions. If you are reading this document on *federalregister.gov*, you may use the green ''SUBMIT A PUBLIC COMMENT'' button beneath this notice's title to submit a comment to the *regulations.gov* docket.

Do not include any personally identifiable information (such as name, address, or other contact information) or confidential business information that you do not want publicly disclosed. All comments are public records; they are publicly displayed exactly as received, and will not be deleted, modified, or redacted. Comments may be submitted anonymously.

Follow the search instructions on *https://www.regulations.gov* to view public comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Julie Lascar, Director, Office of Strategic Policy, Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes, *innovationdigitalassetsrfc@treasury.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On July 18, 2025, President Trump signed into law the GENIUS Act,[1] which creates a comprehensive regulatory framework for payment stablecoin issuers in the United States. The GENIUS Act prioritizes consumer protection, strengthens the U.S. dollar's reserve currency status, and bolsters U.S. national security. It creates strong reserve requirements, aligns state and federal stablecoin frameworks, and requires clear and conspicuous redemption procedures, among other key provisions. It requires permitted payment stablecoin issuers to be treated as financial institutions for purposes of the Bank Secrecy Act, and as such, ''be subject to all federal laws applicable to financial institutions located in the United States relating to economic sanctions, prevention of money laundering, customer identification, and due diligence.'' [2] The GENIUS Act also directs the Secretary of the Treasury to seek public comment on innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies that regulated financial institutions use, or have the potential to use, to detect illicit activity involving digital assets.[3]

The digital asset industry plays a crucial role in innovation and economic development in the United States, and in our Nation's international leadership. On January 23, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14178, ''Strengthening American Leadership in Digital Financial Technology,'' which aims to support the responsible growth and use of digital assets, blockchain technology, and related technologies.[4] It

[1] Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins (GENIUS) Act, Publi Law 119–27, 139 Stat. 419 (2025).

[2] GENIUS Act, section 4(a)(5) (Treatment Under the Bank Secrecy Act and Sanctions Laws).

[3] GENIUS Act, Public Law 119–27, 139 Stat. 419, at Sec. 9(a).

[4] Exec. Order 14178, 90 FR 8647 (Jan. 31, 2025).

also established the President's Working Group (Working Group) on Digital Asset Markets to strengthen U.S. leadership in digital finance.[5] The Working Group was tasked to prepare a report for the President within 180 days with recommendations for regulatory and legislative proposals that advance policies identified in the order.[6] The Working Group's report, which was published on July 30, 2025, includes recommendations related to countering illicit finance and promoting a transparent and resilient digital asset ecosystem.[7] In addition to recommendations to improve the U.S. anti-money laundering/countering the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) and sanctions frameworks, the report proposes that the U.S. government evaluate and consider issuing guidance on the use of digital identity verification by financial institutions and increase public-private cooperation and information sharing, including through FinCEN's 314(a) and 314(b) programs.

II. Request for Comment Overview

The GENIUS Act directs the Secretary of the Treasury to seek public comment to identify innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies that regulated financial institutions use, or have the potential to use, to detect illicit activity, such as money laundering, involving digital assets.[8] Consistent with the GENIUS Act, following receipt of public comments, the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) will conduct research on the methods, techniques, or strategies identified in comments; submit a report that, *inter alia,* summarizes the research and provides to the chairs and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives legislative and regulatory proposals to allow financial institutions to develop and implement novel methods, techniques, or strategies; and issue guidance or notice and comment rulemaking based, in part, on the research results arising from comments.

The GENIUS Act lists four specific technologies on which Treasury should seek comment: application program interfaces (APIs), artificial intelligence (AI), digital identity verification, and use of blockchain technology and monitoring.[9] Consistent with the GENIUS Act, when conducting research on these and other innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies, Treasury will evaluate and consider: (a) improvements in the ability of financial institutions to detect illicit activity involving digital assets; (b) costs to regulated financial institutions; (c) the amount and sensitivity of information that is collected or reviewed; (d) privacy risk associated with the information that is collected or reviewed; (e) operational challenges and efficiency considerations; (f) cybersecurity risks; (g) and effectiveness of the methods, techniques, or strategies at mitigating illicit finance.[10]

Application Program Interfaces: APIs are a system access point or library function that allow different software applications to communicate and interact with each other, including internal and external applications.[11] This can include various applications used by a financial institution for AML/CFT and sanctions compliance. APIs can be used to share data automatically and facilitate access to transaction information. Once deployed, they can also be used to help enforce strict access controls, monitor transactions and activities, and bolster security and integrity of financial institutions providing digital asset services.

Artificial Intelligence: As used in this notice, the term AI means a ''machine-based system that can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, make predictions, recommendations or decisions influencing real or virtual environments.'' [12] The Trump Administration is prioritizing AI as a cornerstone of innovation, as outlined in the July 23, 2025, ''Winning the Race: America's AI Action Plan.'' [13] At financial institutions, AI is playing an increasing role in AML/CFT and sanctions compliance, offering innovative solutions to help financial institutions analyze significant amounts of data and more effectively identify illicit finance patterns, risks, trends, and typologies.[14]

Digital Identity Verification: Digital identity verification (also known as identity proofing) is the process of establishing and verifying that a person is who they claim to be in a digital context.[15] Treasury is aware of several efforts in the digital asset industry to develop portable digital identity credentials designed to support various elements of AML/CFT and sanctions compliance, maximize user privacy, and reduce compliance burden on financial institutions.[16] These tools can incorporate different pieces of information, such as government-issued identity documents or biometrics, and can vary by operational models, governance, and convenience. Digital identity verification tools can also potentially be used by regulated digital asset intermediaries to support onboarding or by decentralized finance (DeFi) services' smart contracts to automatically check for a credential before executing a user's transaction.

Blockchain Technology and Monitoring: Many digital assets operate on public blockchains, enabling any person with access to the internet to view the pseudonymous transaction on the blockchain's public ledger.[17] Blockchain monitoring refers to the process of observing, tracking, and analyzing public blockchain data. The U.S. government, like many financial institutions offering services in digital assets, leverages public blockchain data and blockchain analytics to trace and attribute illicit activity in digital assets. Financial institutions can also use this data to evaluate high-risk counterparties and activities, analyze transactions across multiple blockchains, trace or monitor transaction activities, and identify patterns that indicate potential illicit transactions.

[5] *Id.* at 8648.

[6] *Id.*

[7] White House, *Strengthening American Leadership in Digital Financial Technology* (July 2025), *https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Digital-Assets-Report-EO14178.pdf.*

[8] The GENIUS Act defines the term ''digital asset'' to mean ''any digital representation of value that is recorded on a cryptographically secured distributed ledger.'' GENIUS Act, section 2(6) (Definitions). The GENIUS Act states that the term ''distributed ledger'' means ''technology in which data is shared across a network that creates a public digital ledger of verified transactions or information among network participants and cryptography is used to link the data to maintain the integrity of the public ledger and execute other functions.'' GENIUS Act, section 2(8).

[9] GENIUS Act, section 9(a) (Anti-Money Laundering Innovation).

[10] GENIUS Act, section 9(b).

[11] *See generally* National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), *Securing Web Transactions TLS Server Certificate Management* (June 2020), *https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.1800-16.pdf,* p. 54.

[12] Exec. Order 14179, 90 FR 8741 (Jan. 31, 2025); 15 U.S.C. 9401(3).

[13] White House, *Winning the Race: America's AI Action Plan* (July 2025), *https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Americas-AI-Action-Plan.pdf.*

[14] For Treasury observations on use of AI, see Treasury, *2024 National Strategy for Combatting Terrorist Financing and Other Illicit Financing* (May 2024), *https://home.treasury.gov/system/files/136/2024-Illicit-Finance-Strategy.pdf,* pp. 36–37, 89.

[15] *See generally* NIST, *Digital Identity Guidelines* (June 2017), *https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-63-3.pdf,* p. 2.

[16] *See generally* White House, *Strengthening American Leadership in Digital Financial Technology* (July 2025), *https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Digital-Assets-Report-EO14178.pdf,* pp. 111–113.

[17] *See generally* Treasury, *Illicit Finance Risk Assessment of Decentralized Finance* (Apr. 2023), *https://home.treasury.gov/system/files/136/DeFi-Risk-Full-Review.pdf,* p. 32.

Innovative tools are critical to advancing AML/CFT and sanctions compliance. Financial institutions can leverage these tools to protect the digital asset ecosystem from misuse by illicit actors like drug traffickers, fraudsters, ransomware attackers, terrorist financiers, Iranian regime-linked sanctions evaders, and Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) cybercriminals. Treasury has been a leader in promoting innovation in this area over the past decade, including by championing the use of regulatory technology (RegTech) solutions to streamline compliance processes, soliciting feedback from industry on novel tools, and providing guidance and resources on new technologies.[18] Treasury is conscious, however, that innovative tools may present new resource burdens for financial institutions upon introduction due to costs to acquire and integrate new tools and to building necessary expertise. Financial institutions may also face difficulties using these tools effectively, especially at early stages of use, due to their novel nature. As such, it will be critical for financial institutions to evaluate these tools and implement them as part of a comprehensive AML/CFT and sanctions compliance program.

IV. Request for Comments

Treasury welcomes input on any matter that commenters believe is relevant to Treasury's efforts to identify and evaluate innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies that regulated financial institutions use to detect and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets. For each method, technique, or strategy discussed in your comment, Treasury welcomes input on the following research factors that will be used to evaluate the methods, techniques, strategies, or tools: (a) improvements in ability of financial institutions to detect illicit activity involving digital assets; (b) costs to regulated financial institutions; (c) the amount and sensitivity of information that is collected or reviewed; (d) privacy risks associated with the information that is collected or reviewed; (e) operational challenges and efficiency considerations; (f) cybersecurity risks; and (g) effectiveness of the methods, techniques, or strategies in mitigating illicit finance.

When responding to one or more of the questions below, please note in your response the number(s) of the questions to which you are responding. When appropriate, your comment should include discussion of regulatory or statutory changes that may be necessary to effectively leverage the discussed methods, techniques, strategies, or tools. In all cases, to the extent possible, please cite any public data related to or that support your responses. If data are available, but non-public, describe such data to the extent possible.

1. In your experience, what illicit finance risks and vulnerabilities pose the greatest risk in the digital asset ecosystem? What key trends in illicit finance risks have financial institutions observed in the digital asset ecosystem?

2. What innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies related to APIs are financial institutions using to detect illicit activity and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets? What are the risks, benefits, challenges, and potential safeguards related to APIs?

(a) What factors do financial institutions consider when deciding whether to employ APIs for AML/CFT and sanctions compliance purposes? For financial institutions that use or plan to use APIs for these purposes, what specific compliance functions do/will APIs support? For financial institutions that decided not to use APIs, please provide additional details on the rationale for that decision.

(b) How are financial institutions using API tools in AML/CFT and sanctions compliance efforts in relation to other tools (*e.g.,* in testing phase while using existing tools, to augment existing tools, or to replace existing tools)? Please explain and, if possible, compare the effectiveness of API tools with other existing or previous tools used for similar purposes.

(c) Are there regulatory, legislative, supervisory, or operational obstacles to using APIs to detect illicit finance and mitigate risks involving digital assets? Please provide any recommendations related to identified obstacles.

(d) What steps, if any, should the U.S. government take to further facilitate effective, risk-based adoption of APIs for detecting illicit finance involving digital assets?

(e) Treasury will evaluate APIs and consider their impact based on the research factors identified in the GENIUS Act.[19] Provide any information pertinent to those factors.

3. What innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies related to AI are financial institutions using to detect illicit activity and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets? What are the risks, benefits, challenges, and potential safeguards related to AI? Please describe the use of AI to conduct analysis of transactional data, including transactions that occur on blockchains, and to identify complex illicit financial networks, as well as key lessons learned from use of AI in this context.

(a) What factors do financial institutions consider when deciding whether to employ AI for AML/CFT and sanctions compliance purposes? For financial institutions that use or plan to use AI for these purposes, what specific compliance functions does/will AI support? For financial institutions that decided not to use AI, please provide additional details on the rationale for that decision.

(b) How are financial institutions using AI tools in AML/CFT and sanctions compliance efforts in relation to other tools (*e.g.,* in testing phase while using existing tools, to augment existing tools, or to replace existing tools)? Please explain and, if possible, compare the effectiveness of AI tools with other previous or existing tools used for similar purposes.

(c) Are there regulatory, legislative, supervisory, or operational obstacles to using AI to detect illicit finance and mitigate risks involving digital assets? Please provide any recommendations related to identified obstacles.

(d) What steps, if any, should the U.S. government take to further facilitate effective, risk-based adoption of AI for detecting illicit finance involving digital assets?

(e) Treasury will evaluate AI and consider its impact based on the research factors identified in the GENIUS Act.[20] Provide any information pertinent to those factors.

4. What innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies related to digital identity verification are financial institutions using to detect illicit activity and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets? What are the risks, benefits, challenges, and potential safeguards related to digital identity verification? Please describe the portable digital identity credentialing

[18] *See e.g.,* Treasury, *2024 National Strategy for Combatting Terrorist Financing and Other Illicit Financing* (May 2024), *https://home.treasury.gov/system/files/136/2024-Illicit-Finance-Strategy.pdf;* Treasury, *Ensuring Responsible Development of Digital Assets; Request for Comment,* 87 FR 57556 (Sept. 20, 2022), *https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/09/20/2022-20279/ensuring-responsible-development-of-digital-assets-request-for-comment;* FinCEN, FIN–2019–G001, *Application of FinCEN's Regulations to Certain Business Models Involving Convertible Virtual Currencies* (May 9, 2019), p. 19, *https://www.fincen.gov/sites/default/files/2019-05/FinCEN%20Guidance%20CVC%20FINAL%20508.pdf;* OFAC, *Sanctions Compliance Guidance for the Virtual Currency Industry* (Oct. 15, 2021), *https://ofac.treasury.gov/media/913571/download?inline.*

[19] GENIUS Act, section 9(b)(2).

[20] GENIUS Act, section 9(b)(2).

tools in use and how such tools are being used.

(a) What factors do financial institutions consider when deciding whether to employ digital identity verification for AML/CFT and sanctions compliance purposes? For financial institutions that use or plan to use digital identity verification for these purposes, what specific compliance functions does it/will it support? For financial institutions that decided not to use digital identity verification, please provide additional details on the rationale for that decision.

(b) How are financial institutions using digital identity verification tools in AML/CFT and sanctions compliance efforts in relation to other tools (*e.g.,* in testing phase while using existing tools, to augment existing tools, or to replace existing tools)? Please explain and, if possible, compare the effectiveness of digital identity tools with other existing or previous tools used for similar purposes.

(c) Are there regulatory, legislative, supervisory, or operational obstacles to using digital identity verification to detect illicit finance and mitigate risks involving digital assets? Please provide any recommendations related to identified obstacles.

(d) What steps, if any, should the U.S. government take to further facilitate effective, risk-based adoption of digital identity verification for detecting illicit finance involving digital assets?

(e) Treasury will evaluate digital identity verification and consider its impact based on the research factors identified in the GENIUS Act.[21] Provide any information pertinent to those factors.

5. What innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies related to blockchain technology and monitoring are financial institutions using to detect illicit activity and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets? What are the risks, benefits, challenges, and potential safeguards related to blockchain technology and monitoring? Please describe how financial institutions are integrating information from blockchain analytics with off-chain data and mention any key challenges associated with using blockchain analytics (*e.g.,* obfuscation tools and methods that can complicate tracing and assessing confidence in attribution or complexities inherent in cluster analysis).

(a) What factors do financial institutions consider when deciding whether to employ blockchain technology and monitoring for AML/CFT and sanctions compliance purposes? For financial institutions that use or plan to use blockchain technology and monitoring for these purposes, what specific compliance functions does it/will it support? For financial institutions that decided not to use blockchain technology and monitoring, please provide additional details on the rationale for that decision.

(b) How are financial institutions using blockchain technology and monitoring tools in AML/CFT and sanctions compliance efforts in relation to other tools (*e.g.,* in testing phase while using existing tools, to augment existing tools, or to replace existing tools)? Please explain and, if possible, compare the effectiveness of blockchain technology and monitoring tools with other existing or previous tools used for similar purposes.

(c) Are there regulatory, legislative, supervisory, or operational obstacles to using blockchain technology and monitoring to detect illicit finance and mitigate risks involving digital assets? Please provide any recommendations related to identified obstacles.

(d) What steps, if any, should the U.S. government take to further facilitate effective, risk-based adoption of blockchain technology and monitoring for detecting illicit finance involving digital assets?

(e) Treasury will evaluate blockchain technology and monitoring and consider their impact based on the research factors identified in the GENIUS Act.[22] Provide any information pertinent to those factors.

6. What innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies related to any other innovative technologies such as cryptographic protocols and other privacy-enhancing tools, cloud-based solutions, on-chain compliance tools, oracles,[23] or new verification tools for smart contracts are financial institutions using to detect illicit activity and mitigate illicit finance risks involving digital assets? What are the risks, benefits, challenges, and potential safeguards related to these other innovative technologies?

(a) What factors do financial institutions consider when deciding whether to employ other innovative technologies for AML/CFT and sanctions compliance purposes? For financial institutions that decided to use or plan to use other innovative technologies for these purposes, what specific compliance functions does it/will it support? For financial institutions that decided not to use other innovative technologies for these purposes, please provide additional details on the rationale for that decision.

(b) How are financial institutions using other innovative technologies in AML/CFT and sanctions compliance efforts in relation to other tools (*e.g.,* in testing phase while using existing tools, to augment existing tools, or to replace existing tools)? Please explain and, if possible, compare the effectiveness of other innovative technologies with other existing or previous tools used for similar purposes.

(c) Are there regulatory, legislative, supervisory, or operational obstacles to using other innovative technologies to detect illicit finance and mitigate risks involving digital assets? Please provide any recommendations related to identified obstacles.

(d) What steps, if any, should the U.S. government take to further facilitate effective, risk-based adoption of other innovative technologies for detecting illicit finance involving digital assets?

(e) Treasury will evaluate other innovative technologies and consider their impact based on the research factors identified in the GENIUS Act.[24] Provide any information pertinent to those factors.

Rachel Miller,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–15697 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AK–P

[21] GENIUS Act, section 9(b)(2).

[22] GENIUS Act, section 9(b)(2).

[23] Oracles connect external data sources to blockchain networks. For further information, see White House, *Strengthening American Leadership in Digital Financial Technology* (July 2025), *https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Digital-Assets-Report-EO14178.pdf,* p. 12.

[24] GENIUS Act, section 9(b)(2).

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

United States Mint

Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting on September 16, 2025

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

Pursuant to United States Code, Title 31, section 5135(b)(8)(C), the United States Mint announces the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee (CCAC) public meeting scheduled for September 16, 2025.

Date: September 16, 2025.

Time: 12:00 p.m. (Noon)–4:00 p.m. (Eastern Time).

Location: Remote via Videoconference.

Subject: Review and discussion of the candidate designs for the Forgotten Heroes of the Holocaust Congressional Gold Medal; and review and discussion

of the candidate designs for the 2026 Comic Art Coin and Medal Program.

Interested members of the public may watch the meeting via live stream on the United States Mint's YouTube Channel at *https://www.youtube.com/user/usmint.* To watch the meeting live, members of the public may click on the ''September 16, 2025'' icons under the Live Tab on the specific day.

The public should call the CCAC HOTLINE at (202) 354–7502 for the latest updates on meeting time and access information.

The CCAC advises the Secretary of the Treasury on any theme or design proposals relating to circulating coinage, bullion coinage, Congressional Gold Medals, and national and other medals; advises the Secretary of the Treasury with regard to the events, persons, or places to be commemorated by the issuance of commemorative coins in each of the five calendar years succeeding the year in which a commemorative coin designation is made; and makes recommendations with respect to the mintage level for any commemorative coin recommended.

For members of the public interested in watching online, this is a reminder that the remote access is for observation purposes only. Members of the public may submit matters for the CCAC's consideration by email to *info@ccac.gov.*

For Accommodation Request: If you require an accommodation to watch the CCAC meeting, please contact the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity by September 11, 2025. You may submit an email request to *Reasonable.Accommodations@usmint.treas.gov* or call 202–354–7260 or 1–888–646–8369 (TTY).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Warren, United States Mint Liaison to the CCAC; 801 9th Street NW; Washington, DC 20220; or call 202–354–7208.

(Authority: 31 U.S.C. 5135(b)(8)(C))

Eric Anderson,

Executive Secretary, United States Mint.

[FR Doc. 2025–15666 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–37–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

[OMB Control No. 2900–0216]

Agency Information Collection Activity Under OMB Review: Application for Accrued Amounts Due a Deceased Beneficiary

AGENCY: Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, this notice announces that the Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, will submit the collection of information abstracted below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The PRA submission describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden, and it includes the actual data collection instrument.

DATES: Comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent by September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: To submit comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection, please type the following link into your browser: *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain,* select ''Currently under Review—Open for Public Comments'', then search the list for the information collection by Title or ''OMB Control No. 2900–0216.''

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: *VA PRA information:* Dorothy Glasgow, 202–461–1084, *VAPRA@va.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: VA Form 21P–601, Application for Accrued Amounts Due a Deceased Beneficiary.

OMB Control Number: 2900–0216 *https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRASearch.*

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The VA Form 21P–601 gathers the information necessary to determine a claimant's entitlement to accrued benefits. Accrued benefits are VA benefits due but unpaid to a beneficiary at death. Benefits are paid to eligible survivors based on the priority described in 38 U.S.C. 5121(a). When no eligible survivors are entitled to accrued benefits based on their relationship to the deceased beneficiary, the person or persons who bore the expenses of the beneficiary's last illness and burial may claim reimbursement for these expenses from accrued amounts. No changes have been made to this form, and the respondent burden has remained the same.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this collection of information was published at 90 FR 25430, June 16, 2025.

Affected Public: Individuals or Households.

Estimated Annual Burden: 2,725 hours.

Estimated Average Burden per Respondent: 30 minutes.

Frequency of Response: One time.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 5,449.

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

Lanea Haynes,

Acting, VA PRA Clearance Officer, (Alt), Office of Enterprise and Integration, Data Governance Analytics, Department of Veterans Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2025–15681 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 90 Monday,
No. 157 August 18, 2025

Part II

Department of Education

34 CFR Part 685
William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program; Proposed Rule

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

34 CFR Part 685

[Docket ID ED–2025–OPE–0016]

RIN 1801–AA28

William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program

AGENCY: Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Secretary proposes to amend the regulations on the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program under 34 CFR 685.219 to exclude employers that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. The proposed regulations would prevent taxpayer-funded PSLF benefits from being improperly provided to individuals who are employed by organizations that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. These proposed changes are intended to improve the administration of the PSLF program and provide protection for taxpayers.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before September 17, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *www.regulations.gov*. The Department will not accept comments submitted by fax or by email or comments submitted after the comment period closes. To ensure that the Department does not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comment only once. Additionally, please include the Docket ID at the top of your comments.

Information on using *Regulations.gov*, including instructions for submitting comments, is available on the site under ''FAQ.'' If you require an accommodation or cannot otherwise submit your comments via *Regulations.gov*, please contact *regulationshelpdesk@gsa.gov* or by phone at 1–866–498–2945. If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability and wish to access telecommunications relay services, please dial 7–1–1.

Privacy Note: The Department's policy is to make all comments received from members of the public available for public viewing in their entirety on the Federal eRulemaking at *www.regulations.gov*. Therefore, commenters should include in their comments only information that they wish to make publicly available. Additionally, commenters should not include in their comments any personally identifiable information (PII) in comments about other individuals. For example, if your comment describes an experience of someone other than yourself, please do not identify that individual or include any personal information that identifies that individual. The Department reserves the right to redact a portion of a comment or the entire comment at any time if any PII about other individuals is included.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tamy Abernathy, Office of Postsecondary Education, 400 Maryland Ave. SW, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 987–0385. Email: *Tamy.Abernathy@ed.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Executive Summary

The Department has a broad interest in ensuring that its programs do not contribute to or help support individuals or organizations that engage in unlawful activity.

To prevent taxpayer-funded PSLF benefits from being improperly provided to individuals who are employed by organizations that are engaged in activities that are unlawful, the Secretary proposes to exclude any organization that engages in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose from being a qualifying employer for the purposes of the PSLF program.

The proposed rule would clarify the definition of a qualifying employer, define activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, address the impact on borrower eligibility, and ensure employers are given notice and the opportunity to respond to an adverse finding.

A brief summary of these proposed regulations is available at *https://www.regulations.gov/document/ED-2025-OPE-0016-0001*.

II. Summary of the Major Provisions of This Regulatory Action

These proposed regulations would:

* Amend § 685.219(b) to modify the existing structure of the subsection into regulatory paragraph structure.

* Amend § 685.219(b) to add definitions for: aiding or abetting, chemical castration or mutilation, child or children, foreign terrorist organizations, illegal discrimination, other Federal Immigration laws, substantial illegal purpose, surgical castration or mutilation, terrorism, trafficking, violating State law, and violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy.

* Amend § 685.219(c) to establish that on or after July 1, 2026, no payment made by a borrower shall be credited as a qualifying payment for PSLF for any month subsequent to a determination that a qualifying employer engages in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

* Amend § 685.219(e) to require the Secretary notify borrowers employed by a qualifying employer of the employer's status if the employer is at risk of becoming or becomes ineligible for the PSLF Program.

* Amend § 685.219(g) to clarify that a borrower may not request reconsideration of a final determination by the Secretary that the employer lost status as a qualifying employer.

* Add § 685.219(h) to establish that the Secretary would determine by the preponderance of the evidence, and after notice and opportunity to respond, that a qualifying employer has engaged on or after July 1, 2026, in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose by considering the materiality of any illegal activities or actions. Also, the Secretary will deem certain actions as conclusive evidence that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

* Add § 685.219(i) to establish that the Secretary will determine that a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose when (1) the Secretary receives an application in which the employer fails to certify that it did not participate in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, or (2) the Secretary otherwise determines that the qualifying employer engaged in such activities under the standard set forth in § 685.219(h).

* Add § 685.219(j) to establish that an employer that loses PSLF eligibility could regain qualifying employer status after (1) 10 years from the date the Secretary determines the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, or (2) after the Secretary approves a corrective action plan.

* Add § 685.219(k) to require that if an employer regains eligibility, the Secretary will update, within 30 days, the qualifying employer list.

Cost and Benefits: As further detailed in the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA), the proposed changes would have meaningful implications for borrowers, taxpayers, and the Department. The regulatory changes outlined in this rule are designed to preserve the integrity of the PSLF program by ensuring that only borrowers employed by organizations engaged in lawful public service remain eligible for forgiveness. By excluding employers that engage in activities with a substantial illegal purpose, the rule aims to better align PSLF eligibility with the program's statutory intent—to

reward public service. Furthermore, it ensures that the Department is not indirectly subsidizing employers who are engaging in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

For borrowers, the proposed rule may alter eligibility for PSLF if they are employed by organizations that no longer qualify under the revised criteria. In cases where an employer is deemed to have engaged in activities that breach federal or state law or established public policy, affected borrowers would no longer receive credit toward loan forgiveness for months worked after the effective date of ineligibility. While this may delay or prevent forgiveness for a subset of borrowers, the overall design of the regulations—including advance notice, transparency around determinations, and employer recertification pathways—helps mitigate unexpected harm. These borrowers would retain the ability to pursue PSLF through eligible employment elsewhere, thereby preserving the program's incentive structure.

For taxpayers, the proposed rule reduces the risk of inappropriate government expenditures by ensuring that loan forgiveness is granted only in circumstances where individuals are engaged in public service. Employers that engage in unlawful activity are not serving the public interest because their actions harm, rather than help, the public good. By limiting PSLF eligibility to borrowers employed by organizations that do not engage in unlawful conduct, the rule reinforces appropriate stewardship of federal funds. While the exact budgetary impact will depend on the number and type of employers determined to fall outside the clarified definition, the proposal is expected to reduce PSLF-related discharges in cases where forgiveness would otherwise have gone to borrowers employed at organizations acting illegally.

For the Department, the rule introduces new administrative responsibilities. These include reviewing court judgments and plea agreements for evidence of employer misconduct, issuing determinations, notifying borrowers of status changes, and overseeing corrective action plans. While these tasks will require the investment of staff time and system resources, the use of existing standards—such as definitions grounded in federal law and doctrines adopted by other agencies—will allow the Department to administer the regulations with efficiency and consistency. The rule also codifies a clear evidentiary framework, such as relying on court judgments or plea agreements, which limits the need for new investigative processes.

Taken together, the Department believes these regulations represent a necessary improvement to PSLF implementation. The costs associated with employer review and administration are modest compared to the significant benefits gained, including increased transparency, program integrity, and taxpayer protection. Most importantly, the rule preserves the fundamental promise of PSLF—to support borrowers who dedicate their careers to serving the public—while guarding against the diversion of federal benefits to organizations engaged in illegal conduct.

III. Invitation To Comment

We invite you to submit comments regarding these proposed regulations. Please clearly identify the specific section or sections of the proposed regulations that each of your comments addresses and arrange your comments in the same order as the proposed regulations. The Department will not accept comments submitted after the comment period closes.

We invite you to assist us in complying with the requirements of Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 and their overall requirement of reducing the regulatory burden that might result from these proposed regulations. Please let us know of ways we could reduce potential costs or increase potential benefits while preserving the effective and efficient administration of the Department's programs and activities.

During and after the comment period, you may inspect public comments about these proposed regulations by accessing *Regulations.gov*.

Assistance to Individuals with Disabilities in Reviewing the Rulemaking Record: On request, we will provide an appropriate accommodation or auxiliary aid to an individual with a disability who needs assistance to review the comments or other documents in the public rulemaking record for these proposed regulations. If you want to schedule an appointment for this type of accommodation or auxiliary aid, please contact the Information Technology Accessibility Program Help Desk at *ITAPSupport@ed.gov* to help facilitate.

Clarity of the Regulations

Executive Order 12866 and the Presidential memorandum ''Plain Language in Government Writing'' [1] require each agency to write regulations that are easy to understand. The Secretary invites comments on how to make the regulation easier to understand, including answers to questions such as the following:

* Are the requirements in the proposed regulations clearly stated?

* Do the proposed regulations contain technical terms or other wording that interferes with their clarity?

* Does the format of the proposed regulations (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing) aid or reduce its clarity?

* Would the proposed regulations be easier to understand if we divided them into additional (but shorter) sections? (A ''section'' is preceded by the symbol ''§'' and a numbered heading; for example, § 668.2 General definitions.)

* Could the description of the proposed regulations in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this preamble be more helpful in making the proposed regulations easier to understand? If so, how?

* What else could we do to make the proposed regulation easier to understand?

To send any comments that concern how the Department could make these proposed regulations easier to understand, see the instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section.

IV. Background

The PSLF program was established by the College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007 (CCRAA), Public Law 110–84, 121 Stat. 84. In particular, the CCRAA amended section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, to allow for cancellation of remaining loan balances for eligible Direct Loan borrowers after they have made 120 monthly payments under a qualifying repayment plan while working at a qualifying public service or nonprofit employer.

Following the enactment of the CCRAA, the Department promulgated PSLF regulations at 34 CFR 685.219, which became effective on July 1, 2009.[2] Since its original promulgation, 34 CFR 685.219 has been amended seven times.[3] Of these amendments, two, promulgated in 2020 and 2022, respectively, have substantively changed the criteria for qualifying employment for the purposes of participation in PSLF—

1. In 2020, the definition of ''public service organization'' was substantively

[1] 63 FR 31885 (June 1, 1998).

[2] *See* 73 FR 63232–01 (Oct. 23, 2008).

[3] *See* 74 FR 56005 (Oct. 29, 2009); 77 FR 76414 (Dec. 28, 2012); 80 FR 67242 (Oct. 30, 2015); 85 FR 49821 (Aug. 14, 2020); 87 FR 66063 (Nov. 1, 2022); 88 FR 43065 (July 6, 2023); 88 FR 43905 (July 10, 2023).

changed to allow employees of organizations engaged in religious activities (regardless of whether the borrower's duties included religious instruction, worship services, or any form of proselytizing) to be eligible for PSLF; and

2. In 2022, the Department changed the term ''public service organization'' to the term ''qualifying employer'' which substantively changed the definition. Subsection (v)(A) of the definition of qualifying employer referenced another term ''non-governmental public service.'' Notably, while previous iterations of 34 CFR 685.219 relied on definitions provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in regard to specific professions that were considered to be a form of public service (or left such terms undefined), the 2022 rule instead defined those terms within the section.

The Department is engaging in this rulemaking because organizations must not engage in substantial illegal activities to be a qualifying employer for purposes of the PSLF Program. Indeed, organizations that have a substantial illegal purpose are acting in contravention with the public good.

Below, we address the Secretary's broad authority to engage in rulemaking on this topic and provide a brief discussion of the relevant statutory authority regarding what organization constitutes a qualifying employer for the purposes of PSLF, the implementation of that authority, and relevant changes to 34 CFR 685.219 since its original promulgation. Additionally, we discuss the illegality doctrine utilized by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) as a basis for the Department to promulgate regulations excluding organizations that have engaged in certain illegal activities from the definition of qualifying employers.

V. Authority for This Regulatory Action

Congress has granted the Secretary broad authority to promulgate regulations to administer the programs administered by the Department of Education and to carry out his or her duties.[4] In order to carry out functions otherwise vested in the Secretary by law or by delegation of authority pursuant to law, and subject to limitations as may be otherwise imposed by law, the Secretary is authorized to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations governing applicable programs administered by and the manner of operation of, the Department.[5] These programs include the financial assistance programs authorized pursuant to title IV of the Higher Education Act authorized by HEA § 455 *et seq.*

Legal Basis for Denying Certain Organizations' Qualifying Employer Status

While HEA § 455(m)(3) contains a definition of the term *public service job* (setting forth categories of employment that provide a public service),[6] it does not define the term *public service.* As a result of this, from the time the Department first promulgated 34 CFR 685.219(a), it has been necessary to expound upon what constitutes *public service*—a term which has the plain meaning of ''any work that serves the public good'' [7]—and the Department has repeatedly promulgated amendments to 34 CFR 685.219 to further define its meaning. The proposed change is a continuation of these efforts, as an organization that engages in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose is not providing a public service because it does not serve the public interest to engage in illegal activities. Therefore, these employers should not be considered a *qualifying employer* for the purpose of PSLF.

The Department has based its approach in this matter, in part, on the so-called ''illegality doctrine'' utilized when determining whether organizations qualify for tax-exempt status under Internal Revenue Code § 501(c)(3) (a requirement for non-governmental organizations to be considered a *qualifying employer* for the purposes of the PSLF program). The Department considered this doctrine because it is a tested approach taken by another executive agency to avoid subsidizing employers engaged in unlawful conduct.[8]

Background of the Illegality Doctrine

The ''illegality doctrine'' imposes an implied requirement that organizations exempt from taxation under § 501(c)(3) must not have a substantial illegal purpose. This doctrine arises from a common-sense principle:

> Loss of government revenues from tax exemption is often justified on the grounds that tax-exempt organizations serve desirable public purposes and lessen the government's costs and burdens. As a corollary to this public benefit principle, tax exemption is not justified when an organization has an illegal purpose because the organization does not serve a public purpose, and the organization increases the government's costs and burdens. The illegality doctrine helps ensure that the government is not subsidizing activity that it aims to prevent.[9]

A recent example of the application of the illegality doctrine, and a review of said application by a Federal court, is found in *Iowaska Church of Healing* v. *Werfel,* 105 F.4th 402 (D.C. Cir. 2024). In this case, the IRS denied an application for 501(c)(3) tax exempt status to an organization whose members' sincerely held religious beliefs involved the consumption of a hallucinogenic drug regulated by the Controlled Substances Act (''CSA''), because it determined that (1) the organization was formed in part for the illegal purpose of distributing a controlled substance; and (2) a substantial part of the organization's activities was in furtherance of that illegal purpose.[10] The D.C. Circuit upheld this decision on the basis that, regardless of the sincerity of its beliefs, until the organization obtained an exemption from the CSA, its primary organizational and operational purpose was facially illegal.[11]

The Department's Proposed Changes to the Definition of Qualifying Employer Aligns With, and Are Justified on the Same Basis as, the IRS's Use of the Illegality Doctrine

Through the Illegality Doctrine, the IRS excludes organizations engaged in illegal purposes or purposes that are against established public policy from tax exemption under § 501(c)(3) on the basis that they do not serve a public purpose. The Department's proposed changes to the definition of *qualifying employer* align directly with this approach by excluding organizations engaged in activities with a *substantially illegal purpose* from being

[4] *See* 20 U.S.C. 1221e–3, *see* also 20 U.S.C. 1082, 3441, 3474, 3471.

[5] 20 U.S.C. 1221e–3.

[6] *See* HEA § 455(m)(3)(B).

[7] PUBLIC SERVICE, Black's Law Dictionary (12th ed. 2024).

[8] 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3) exempts the following from taxation: Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or international amateur sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which insures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection (h)), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.

[9] The Illegality Doctrine and 501(c)(3) Organizations (2025), *https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF12739.*

[10] *See Iowaska Church of Healing,* 105 F.4th 402, 406, 407.

[11] *Id.* at 414.

included in the definition of *qualifying employer,* on the basis that such organizations are engaged in activities that are either explicit violations of State or Federal law or are otherwise in direct contravention of established public policy.

Just as benefit to the public is an underlying justification for tax exemption,[12] the purpose of the PSLF program is to encourage individuals to enter and continue in full-time public service employment.[13] All of the activities included within the definition of *substantial illegal purpose*[14] are either explicit violations of State or Federal law, and as such, are actions which do not serve the public good. Indeed, violations of law may increase government costs and burdens, which has the opposite effect of actions that actually promote the public good. To maintain internal coherence across the statutes at large, we presume that Congress would not have the Department subsidize activity through the PSLF program that Congress also aims to prevent in other statutes. Indeed, Congress appropriates significant public funds to combat illegal behavior, and it would frustrate the purpose of those appropriations if the Department were also subsidizing illegal behavior in the PSLF program with public funds. Therefore, the Department's exclusion of organizations engaging in such activities from the definition of *qualifying employer* is justified on the same basis that the IRS is justified in using the Illegality Doctrine to deny or revoke tax exempt status granted under § 501(c)(3): it would be paradoxical for the Department to allow organizations and borrowers to be employed by organizations that are acting against the public good in order to benefit from a program premised on encouraging individuals to enter and continue in full-time public service employment.[15]

[12] *See* Jean Wright and Jay H. Rotz, *Illegality and Public Policy Considerations, in* IRS Exempt Organizations Continuing Professional Education Technical Instruction Program Textbook, 17th Ed. (IRS Exempt Organizations Technical Division, ed. 1993).

[13] *See* 34 CFR 685.219(a).

[14] *See* ''Substantial Illegal Purpose (§ 685.219(b)(30)) for the list of activities.

[15] *See Church of Scientology of California* v. *Comm'r of Internal Revenue,* 83 T.C. 381, 507 (1984), aff'd sub nom. *Church of Scientology of California* v. *Comm'r,* 823 F.2d 1310 (9th Cir. 1987) (*stating* ''The Government also has an interest in not subsidizing criminal activity. Were we to sustain petitioner's exemption, we would in effect be sanctioning petitioner's right to conspire to thwart the IRS at taxpayer's expense. We think such paradoxes are best left for Gilbert and Sullivan'').

VI. Public Participation

Section 492 of the HEA, 20 U.S.C. 1098a, requires the Secretary to obtain public involvement in the development of proposed regulations affecting programs authorized by the title IV, HEA programs. Prior to developing this NPRM, we significantly engaged with the public to obtain advice and recommendations from individuals and representatives of groups involved in the title IV, HEA programs. This engagement included a 30-day public comment period, two days of public hearings, and three days of negotiated rulemaking.

On April 4, 2025, we published in the **Federal Register** (90 FR 14741) a notice of our intent to hold public hearings and to establish a negotiated rulemaking committee addressing topics such as PSLF, Pay As You Earn (PAYE), Income-Contingent Repayment (ICR), or other topics that would streamline and improve Federal student financial assistance programs and related regulations.

Public Comments and Hearings

We received 7,929 written comments in response to the **Federal Register** notice. Additionally, public hearings were held on April 29 and on May 1, 2025. A total of 137 individuals testified at the hearings. We also received written comments on possible regulatory provisions that were submitted directly to the Department by interested parties and organizations.

You may view the written comments submitted in response to the April 4, 2025, **Federal Register** notice on the Federal eRulemaking Portal at *Regulations.gov*, within docket ID ED–2023–OPE–0151. Instructions for finding comments are also available on the site under ''FAQ.''

Transcripts of the public hearings can be accessed at *https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/higher-education-laws-and-policy/higher-education-policy/negotiated-rulemaking-for-higher-education-2025-2026.*

Negotiated Rulemaking

After obtaining this extensive advice and recommendations from the public, the Secretary, by section 492 of the HEA, 20 U.S.C. 1098a, prepared draft regulations and submitted them to a negotiated rulemaking process. Further information on the negotiated rulemaking process can be found at: *https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/higher-education-laws-and-policy/higher-education-policy/negotiated-rulemaking-for-higher-education-2025-2026.*

On May 12, 2025, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** (90 FR 20142) announcing our intent to establish a committee to prepare these proposed regulations. The notice set forth a schedule for committee meetings and requested nominations for individual negotiators to serve on the negotiated rulemaking committee. In the notice, we also announced the topics that the committee would address.

We chose members of the negotiated rulemaking committee from individuals nominated by groups involved in the title IV, HEA programs. We selected individuals with demonstrated expertise or experience with the PSLF program. The negotiated rulemaking committee included the following members, representing their respective constituencies:

* Civil rights organizations, consumer advocates, and legal assistance organizations that represent students and/or borrowers: Betsy Mayotte, The Institute of Student Loan Advisors, and Abby Shafroth (alternate), Student Loan Borrower Assistance Project.

* State officials, including State higher education executive officers, State authorizing agencies and State attorneys general: Rebecca Stanley, Fifteenth Judicial Circuit Solicitor's Office, and J. Charles Smith III (alternate), Frederick County State's Attorney's Office.

* Student loan borrowers in repayment: Emeka Oguh, PeopleJoy, and Sarah Doran (alternate), St. Vrain Valley Schools.

* U.S. military service members, veterans, or groups representing them: Robert H. Carey, Jr., National Defense Committee, and Faisal Sulman (alternate), Student Veterans of America.

* Public institutions of higher education, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-serving institutions (institutions of higher education eligible to receive Federal assistance under title III, parts A and F, and title V of the HEA): Tracy A. Ireland, The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, and Kaity McNeill (alternate), The University of North Carolina System Office.

* Private nonprofit institutions of higher education including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-serving institutions (institutions of higher education eligible to receive Federal assistance under title III, parts A and F, and title V of the HEA): C. Todd Jones, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio, and

Heather Boutell (alternate), Vanderbilt University.

* Proprietary institutions of higher education: Mary Lyn Hammer, Champion College Solutions, and April Boyd (alternate), The College of Health Care Professionals.

* Financial aid administrators at postsecondary institutions: Alyssa Dobson, Slippery Rock University, and Helen Faith (alternate), University of Virginia.

* Organizations representing taxpayers and the public interest: Thomas John Aiello, National Taxpayers Union, and Laurel Taylor (alternate), Candidly.

* Federal Family Education Loan Lenders and/or Guaranty Agencies: Scott Buchanan, Student Loan Servicing Alliance, and Alex Ricci (alternate), National Council of Higher Education Resources.

The committee discussion was led by Tamy Abernathy of the Department and supported by the Department's Office of General Counsel and Office of Postsecondary Education, with Annmarie Weisman of Federal Student Aid serving as facilitator for the committee.

The negotiated rulemaking committee for these proposed regulations met from June 30 to July 2, 2025. The committee reviewed and discussed draft regulations prepared by the Department, as well as alternative language and suggestions proposed by committee members. The Department provided opportunities for public comment at the end of the first two days of negotiations. Additionally, during each negotiated rulemaking session, non-Federal negotiators obtained feedback from stakeholders that they shared with the negotiating committee.

Under the organizational protocols for negotiated rulemaking, if the committee reaches consensus on the proposed regulations, we agree to publish, without substantive alteration, a defined group of regulations on which the negotiators reached consensus—unless the Secretary reopens the process or provides a written explanation to the participants stating why he or she has decided to depart from the agreement reached during negotiations. In this instance, consensus is considered to be the absence of dissent by any member of the negotiated rulemaking committee (abstaining members are not considered to be dissenting from the proposal).

At the conclusion of the meetings on July 2, 2025, the negotiator representing civil rights organizations dissented from the draft regulations and therefore the committee did not reach consensus. For more information on the proceedings of these meetings please visit: *https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/higher-education-laws-and-policy/higher-education-policy/negotiated-rulemaking-for-higher-education-2025-2026.*

VII. Significant Proposed Regulations

We discuss substantive issues under the sections of the proposed regulations to which they pertain. Generally, we do not address proposed regulatory provisions that are technical or otherwise minor in effect.

Definitions General (§ 685.219(b))

Current Regulations: Section 685.219(b) contains 23 definitions of key terms as they relate to the PSLF program.

Proposed Regulations: We are proposing to restructure subsection (b) of § 685.219 to make each definition its own paragraph. The paragraphs would include the 23 current definitions and add 13 new definitions in these proposed rules.

Reasons: Due to the proposed addition of 13 new definitions the Department believes restructuring subsection (b) in this manner will greatly aid with readability of the regulation. For ease of reference, the definitions in subsection (b) would continue to be listed in alphabetical order.

Aiding or Abetting (§ 685.219(b)(1))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219 would define aiding or abetting and use the same definition that is already in current law under Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

Reasons: The term aiding or abetting can be found in two places in the proposed definition of *substantial illegal purpose* under § 685.219(b)(30): (1) aiding or abetting violations of 8 U.S.C. 1325 or other Federal immigration laws, and (2) engaging in a pattern of aiding and abetting illegal discrimination. Under the proposed rule, a qualifying employer that engages in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose would lose its qualifying employer status if certain conditions were met (*see* discussion of proposed § 685.219(h) and (i)). The principles under 18 U.S.C. 2 state:

> (1) Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal.
>
> (2) Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal.

The Department would adopt the definition of aiding and abetting as defined in Title 18 of the United States Code, a Federal statute. As the Department expressed during negotiated rulemaking, utilizing a pre-existing definition in Federal law would help ensure: (1) the Department's regulations align with other definitions across Federal agencies, (2) the Department is able to make consistent determinations using established criteria regarding the status of a qualifying employer, and (3) the public understands how the Department interprets the phrase.

Chemical Castration or Mutilation (§ 685.219(b)(3))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(b)(3) would define chemical castration or mutilation to mean the use of puberty blockers, including GnRH agonists and other interventions, to delay the onset or progression of normally timed puberty in an individual who does not identify as his or her sex and the use of sex hormones, such as androgen blockers, estrogen, progesterone, or testosterone, to align an individual's physical appearance with an identity that differs from his or her sex.

Reasons: The term chemical castration or mutilation can be found in the proposed definition of substantial illegal purpose under § 685.219(b)(30): engaging in the chemical and surgical castration or mutilation of children in violation of Federal or State law. Under this proposed rule, a qualifying employer that engages in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose may lose its qualifying employer status if certain conditions are met.

The Department searched for the most appropriate definition of chemical castration or mutilation and located Executive Order 14187, Protecting Children From Chemical and Surgical Mutilation,[16] which provides the basis for the proposed definition. E.O. 14187 states:

> . . . *chemical and surgical mutilation* means the use of puberty blockers, including GnRH agonists and other interventions, to delay the onset or progression of normally timed puberty in an individual who does not identify as his or her sex; the use of sex hormones, such as androgen blockers, estrogen, progesterone, or testosterone, to align an individual's physical appearance with an identity that differs from his or her sex; and surgical procedures that attempt to transform an individual's physical

[16] Executive Order 14187—Protecting Children From Chemical and Surgical Mutilation—*https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/03/2025-02194/protecting-children-from-chemical-and-surgical-mutilation.*

appearance to align with an identity that differs from his or her sex or that attempt to alter or remove an individual's sexual organs to minimize or destroy their natural biological functions. This phrase sometimes is referred to as *gender affirming care.*

As the Department expressed during negotiated rulemaking, utilizing a pre-existing definition elsewhere in guidance would help ensure: (1) that the Department's regulations align with other definitions across Federal agencies, (2) that the Department makes consistent determinations using established precedents regarding the status of a qualifying employer, and (3) that the public has clear expectations on how the Department interprets the term.

During negotiated rulemaking, one negotiator expressed concern that the Department staff are not medical professionals and do not have the expertise to define chemical castration or mutilation. The Department clarified that in order for a qualifying employer to lose eligibility under this definition there must be a violation of Federal or State law. In *United States* v. *Skremtti,* Attorney General and Reporter for Tennessee, et al.,[17] the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a Tennessee law restricting certain sex transition treatments for minors. Also, there are 27 States that restrict medical procedures and treatments performed on minors related to assertion that minor's sexual identity differs from their biological sex, either in part of in full.[18]

The Department would not find a violation of the standard (see discussion under § 685.219(h) and (i)) if there is not a Federal or State law that prohibits sex transition treatments for minors in the state where the employer is located.

Child or Children (§ 685.219(b)(4))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: The Department proposes that for the sole and specific purpose of the PSLF Program the term ''child'' or ''children'' means an individual or individuals under 19 years of age.

Reasons: The term child or children can be found in the proposed definition of substantial illegal purpose under § 685.219(b)(30): engaging in the chemical and surgical castration or mutilation of children in violation of Federal or State law. The Department believes that it is necessary to define the term for the purposes of the PSLF program.

The Department searched for the most appropriate definition of child or children and located guidance in Executive Order 14187, Protecting Children From Chemical and Surgical Mutilation, which provides the basis for the proposed definition. Executive Order 14817 states——

''The term ''child'' or ''children'' means an individual or individuals under 19 years of age.''

During rulemaking, a few negotiators raised concerns that the age of majority in many States is 18 years of age. The negotiators believed that the Department's proposed definition could penalize a qualifying employer that performed certain medical procedures that were banned for minors to an individual that a State considered to be a legal adult. To address this concern, the Department clarified that the entire clause under proposed § 685.219(b)(30) must be considered. The illegal activities in which the organization is engaging—specifically the chemical and surgical castration or mutilation of children must be in violation of Federal or State law of the state where the employer is located (*see also* the discussion of proposed § 685.219(b)(4), above, and § 685.219 (b)(31)), below.

Foreign Terrorist Organizations (§ 685.219(b)(10))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Under proposed 685.219(b)(10), the Department would define the term *foreign terrorist organizations* to mean organizations on the list published under paragraph (a)(2)(A)(ii) under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

Reasons: The Department proposes to adopt the definition of foreign terrorist organizations as defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act, a Federal statute. As the Department expressed during negotiated rulemaking, utilizing a pre-existing definition elsewhere in Federal law helps to ensure that the Department's regulations align with other definitions across Federal agencies. As we explained during negotiated rulemaking, as of June 2025, there were over 70 foreign terrorist organizations designated by the United States Department of State.[19]

To help the Department determine whether a qualifying employer or organization is engaging in activities with a substantial illegal purpose—including supporting terrorism, the Department would need a definition for foreign terrorist organizations. The Department believes utilizing an existing definition of foreign terrorist organizations would ensure consistency and clarity for the community. The Department would then be able to determine the nexus between a qualifying employer and whether that qualifying employer met the conditions of engaging in a substantially illegal purpose.

Illegal Discrimination (§ 685.219(b)(12))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Under proposed 685.219(b)(12), the Department would define the term ''illegal discrimination'' to mean a violation of any Federal discrimination law including, but not limited to, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 1981 *et seq.*), Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 *et seq.*).

Reasons: The Department proposes to enumerate a non-exhaustive list of Federal anti-discrimination laws in the definition of illegal discrimination. These Federal laws are some of the chief anti-discrimination laws that we believe capture the intent of the PSLF Executive Order which keeps qualifying employers accountable to not engage in illegal discrimination.

The definition of illegal discrimination is limited to only Federal discrimination laws rather than State discrimination laws. Limiting the scope to only Federal laws will help reduce the burden on the Department when assessing whether a qualifying employer engages in illegal discrimination as there are many State laws addressing discrimination. Furthermore, the Department would leverage its existing relationship with other Federal partners to assist in determining if a qualifying employer engages in illegal discrimination in the context of Federal laws. The Department believes the listed Federal laws in paragraph (b)(12) should cover most of the illegal discrimination employers could be involved in and help ensure that the Department is consistent and uniform in addressing issues of illegal discrimination to a narrow set of Federal laws.

The Department notes that we reserved the Secretary's authority to include other Federal anti-discrimination laws in this definition that are not enumerated by including the phrase ''including but not limited to.'' In crafting the definition of illegal discrimination, we balanced the need to

[17] United States v. Skremtti, Attorney General and Reporter for Tennessee, et al.—*https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/23-477_2cp3.pdf.*

[18] Amy Herron, *These 27 States Have Restricted Gender-Transition Treatments for Minors Since 2021,* N.Y. Times, June 18, 2025 (available at *https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/18/us/politics/states-trans-treatments-scotus.html*).

[19] List of foreign terrorist organizations designated by the State Department: *https://www.state.gov/foreign-terrorist-organizations/.*

outline specific laws to give qualifying employers clear expectations to curb illegal discrimination with the need to also cover other forms of illegal discrimination that are not enumerated that could be a cause of concern in the future.

During negotiated rulemaking sessions, a negotiator acknowledged that, while the Department has expertise in helping ensure that discrimination does not exist in educational settings, it does not have the expertise or authority to enforce other types of discrimination, including employment discrimination law. The negotiator also expressed concern that a ''chilling effect'' could exist in the reporting of discrimination. In turn, the employee would lose PSLF eligibility if the employer was found liable for engaging in illegal discrimination. In response, the Department pointed out the circular nature of the argument if the Department cannot enforce the rules preventing illegal discrimination due to the fear of the ''chilling effect.'' Therefore, we reiterate that we have an interest in helping ensure that PSLF qualifying employers do not engage in illegal discrimination.

Other Federal Immigration Laws (§ 685.219(b)(17))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(b)(17) would define *other Federal Immigration laws* to mean any violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1105 *et seq.*) or any other Federal immigration laws.

Reasons: The term *other Federal immigration laws* can be found in the proposed definition of substantial illegal purpose under § 685.219(b)(30)(i): aiding or abetting violations of 8 U.S.C. 1325 or other Federal immigration laws. The Department believes that it is necessary to define the term for the purpose of determining whether a qualifying employer engaged in activities that would restrict participation in the PSLF program.

U.S. immigration policy is governed largely by the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), which was first codified in 1952 and has been amended significantly several times since. U.S. immigration policy contains two major aspects. One facilitates migration flows of foreign nationals into the United States; another focuses on immigration enforcement and removal. Immigration functions authorized by Congress under the INA and other laws are carried out by several executive branch agencies.[20]

While the INA is the main Federal statute governing U.S. immigration policy, there are other immigration statutes that are not part of the INA. The Department chooses not to limit its authority to review a qualifying employer under the proposed standard (*see* proposed § 685.219(h) and (i)) to the INA. As such we included the phrase ''or any other Federal immigration laws'' as part of the definition.

Qualifying Employer (§ 685.219(b)(27))

Current Regulations: Current § 685.219(b) contains definitions of key terms, including the definition of *qualifying employer.* Under the current regulations, the term *qualifying employer* generally includes Federal, State, local, and Tribal Government agencies; public child or family service agencies; nonprofit organizations that are described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code; and other organizations that provide certain specific public services listed in § 455(m)(3)(B) of the HEA, other than a business organized for profit, a labor union, or a partisan political organization.

Proposed Regulations: The Department proposes modifying the existing definition of *qualifying employer* in § 685.219(b). At the direction of the Secretary and consistent with the guidance in E.O. 14235,[21] the Department would revise the definition of *qualifying employer* to exclude organizations that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

Reasons: The proposed modified definition of *qualifying employer* would align with the policy in E.O. 14235 to protect the integrity of the PSLF program by ensuring that loan cancellation under the program does not subsidize organizations that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

The Department is concerned that the PSLF program has sent tax dollars to employees of organizations that are engaged in activities that are illegal, thereby subsidizing their employment.

The proposed changes to the definition would benefit taxpayers by ending support for organizations that engage in illegal activities such as aiding and abetting illegal immigration, human trafficking, damage to government property, and other actions that threaten our country. The proposed definition would also benefit student loan borrowers by redirecting them to employment with organizations that serve the public good.

During the negotiated rulemaking meetings, the Department proposed a refined definition of *qualifying employer* as a method to protect the objectives and efficacy of the PSLF program. Negotiators and public commenters expressed concerns that such an approach might create a ''chilling effect'' that could discourage borrowers from entering certain career fields in public service. The Department has taken steps to address the issues raised with the draft regulations and believes that the benefits of these proposed regulations outweigh concerns that have been raised. The modified definition would provide notice to borrowers about the qualifying employer requirements when applying for or certifying eligibility under the PSLF program. The modified definition would also provide clarity that an organization that participates in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose is explicitly excluded from the list of qualifying employers for purposes of determining eligibility under the program.

Substantial Illegal Purpose (§ 685.219(b)(30))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(b)(30) would define substantial illegal purpose as:

(1) aiding or abetting violations of 8 U.S.C. 1325 or other Federal immigration laws;

(2) supporting terrorism, including by facilitating funding to, or the operations of, cartels designated as Foreign Terrorist Organizations consistent with 8 U.S.C. 1189, or by engaging in violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy;

(3) engaging in the chemical and surgical castration or mutilation of children in violation of Federal or State law;

(4) engaging in the trafficking of children to states for purposes of emancipation from their lawful parents in violation of Federal or State law,

(5) engaging in a pattern of aiding and abetting illegal discrimination; or

(6) engaging in a pattern of violating State laws as defined in paragraph (34) of this subsection.

Reasons: Illegal activities, including illegal immigration, as well as activities which are against established public policy, are a threat to our national security and to the social and economic

[20] Primer on U.S. Immigration Policy—*https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R45020.*

[21] Restoring Public Service Loan Forgiveness—*https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/03/12/2025-04103/restoring-public-service-loan-forgiveness.*

stability of the United States. The Department has an overriding governmental interest in promoting policies to thwart such unlawful conduct. Further, the President has a constitutional duty of ensuring that laws be faithfully executed. On March 7, 2025, President Trump signed E.O. 14235, directing the Secretary of Education to propose revisions to 34 CFR 685.219 that ensure that loan cancellation under the PSLF Program excludes organizations that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose and identifying certain activities which are illegal or contrary to public policy. The Department has chosen to use its statutory authority to codify the guidance outlining activities that have a substantial illegal purpose in E.O. 14235 in regulation.

Surgical Castration or Mutilation (§ 685.219(b)(31))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(b)(31) would define surgical castration or mutilation as surgical procedures that attempt to transform an individual's physical appearance to align with an identity that differs from his or her biological sex or that attempt to alter or remove an individual's sexual organs to minimize or destroy his or her natural biological functions.

Reasons: The term surgical castration or mutilation can be found in the proposed definition of substantial illegal purpose under § 685.219(b)(30): engaging in the chemical and surgical castration or mutilation of children in violation of Federal or State law. Under this proposed rule a qualifying employer that engages in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose may lose its qualifying employer status if certain conditions are met.

The Department searched for the most appropriate definition of surgical castration or mutilation and located Executive Order 14187, which provides the rationale for the proposed definition. Executive Order 14187 states:

> . . . *chemical and surgical mutilation* means the use of puberty blockers, including GnRH agonists and other interventions, to delay the onset or progression of normally timed puberty in an individual who does not identify as his or her sex; the use of sex hormones, such as androgen blockers, estrogen, progesterone, or testosterone, to align an individual's physical appearance with an identity that differs from his or her sex; and surgical procedures that attempt to transform an individual's physical appearance to align with an identity that differs from his or her sex or that attempt to alter or remove an individual's sexual organs to minimize or destroy their natural biological functions. This phrase sometimes is referred to as *gender affirming care.*

As the Department expressed during negotiated rulemaking, utilizing a pre-existing definition elsewhere in guidance would help ensure: (1) that the Department's regulations align with other definitions across Federal agencies, (2) that the Department is able to make consistent determinations using established precedent regarding the status of a qualifying employer, and (3) that the public is aware how the Department interprets the phrase.

During negotiated rulemaking, one negotiator expressed concern that the Department staff are not medical professionals and do not have the expertise to define surgical castration or mutilation. The Department clarifies that, in order for a qualifying employer to lose eligibility under this definition, there must be a violation of State law. In the *United States* v. *Skremtti,* Attorney General and Reporter for Tennessee, et al.[23] the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a Tennessee law restricting certain sex transition treatments for minors and, as of June, 2025,[24] there are 27 States that restrict certain medical procedures and treatments performed on minors related to assertions that minors' sexual, identity differs from their biological sex.

The Department would not find a violation of the standard (*see* discussion under § 685.219(h) and (i)) if there is not a Federal or State law in the state where the employer is located that prohibits surgical castration or mutilation of minors. In other words, if those types of procedures are legal in the state where the employer resides and the employer participates or supports such activities, there would be no violation.

Terrorism (§ 685.219(b)(32))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed 685.219(b)(32), would adopt the definition of ''terrorism'' used in Title 18, United States Code, Section 2331 (18 U.S.C. 2331).

Reasons: The Department proposes to adopt the definition of terrorism as defined in the criminal code. As we explained during negotiated rulemaking, utilizing a pre-existing definition elsewhere in Federal law would help ensure that the Department's regulations align with other definitions across Federal agencies. To that end, we propose to use the definition of terrorism in 18 U.S.C. 2331. Under Federal law, terrorism includes acts of international and domestic terrorism that involve violated acts or acts dangerous to human life that are illegal and appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce civilians or the Government.

To help the Department determine whether a qualifying employer or organization is engaging in activities with a substantial illegal purpose, including supporting terrorism, the Department requires a definition for terrorism. The Department would then be able to determine the nexus between a qualifying employer and whether that qualifying employer supported terrorism as defined in our regulations.

Trafficking (§ 685.219(b)(33))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(b)(33) would add a new definition for *trafficking,* which is a key term under the broader *substantial illegal purpose* definition.

Reasons: The proposed definition at § 685.219(b)(33) is necessary to bring clarity to the specific activities that constitute having a substantial illegal purpose. Because trafficking is a key term listed under the broader *substantial illegal purpose* definition, the Department must provide a definition for the term. Additionally, proposed § 685.219(b)(33) provides greater specificity for the Secretary, in his or her authority under the HEA, to make the determination if an organization has engaged in illegal activities, for the purposes of determining eligibility under the PSLF program.

The Department researched existing Federal laws and statutes but did not find a statute that matched the context. For example, current regulatory text at 28 CFR 1100.25 provides a definition for ''severe forms of trafficking,'' however the definition was limited to situations of sex trafficking only. In the absence of an appropriate definition under existing law, the Department chose to develop its own proposed definition to better align with the intent of Executive Order 14187 to specifically protect children from illegal transportation across State lines for the purposes of emancipation from their lawful parents or guardian. The Department believes the proposed definition will effectively serve the purpose of preventing organizations

[23] *United States* v. *Skremtti,* Attorney General and Reporter for Tennessee, et al.—*https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/23-477_2cp3.pdf.*

[24] Amy Herron, These 27 States Have Restricted Gender-Transition Treatments for Minors Since 2021, N.Y. Times, June 18, 2025 (available at *https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/18/us/politics/states-trans-treatments-scotus.html*).*https://www.nytimes.com/2024/12/04/us/gender-transition-bans-states.html.*

from engaging in these types of trafficking activities.

Violating State Law (§ 685.219(b)(34))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Under proposed 685.219(b)(34), *violating S State law* would mean a final, non-default judgment by a State court of: (i) trespassing; (ii) disorderly conduct; (iii) public nuisance; (iv) vandalism; or (v) obstruction of highways.

Reasons: The Department believes we must create a definition to establish a clear and consistent framework for evaluating violations of State law. The proposed definition would provide an exhaustive list of State law violations that would amount to activity that has a substantial illegal purpose. Qualifying employers would have the ability to recognize actions or activities that have a substantial illegal purpose and either avoid or resolve them prior to losing eligibility.

The Department originally proposed ''Violating State Tort Law'' as the title for the definition. However, during negotiated rulemaking, negotiators commented that the listed violations were a combination of both civil and criminal offenses; therefore, the Department removed the reference to ''tort''.

Additionally, because of negotiations, the Department proposed to remove the definition of *violating State laws* given we believed it was defined adequately under the definition of substantial illegal purpose. However, a negotiator noted that we inadvertently removed the condition that the State law violation must be confirmed as a final, non-default judgment. The Department reintroduced the language into the proposed definition as we believed it ensured an employer, suspected of having violated State law under this proposed rule, was provided consistency and fairness when deciding to rely upon a decision made by court or tribunal. The Department believes a non-default judgment clarifies this standard by relying upon a court decision made after a full trial or hearing.

Violence for the Purpose of Obstructing or Influencing Federal Government Policy (§ 685.219(b)(35))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(b)(35) would define *violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy,* which is one of the activities explicitly mentioned in the broader *substantial illegal purpose* definition. Section 685.219(b)(35) leverages an existing statutory definition for *crime of violence,* as found under 18 U.S.C. 16.

Reasons: The proposed definition at § 685.219(b)(35) is necessary to bring clarity to the specific activities that constitute having a substantial illegal purpose. Additionally, § 685.219(b)(35) provides greater specificity for the Secretary, in his or her authority under the HEA, to make the determination if an organization has engaged in illegal activities, for the purposes of determining eligibility under the PSLF program. In defining *violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy,* the Department sought an appropriate reference to violence in existing Federal laws. A *crime of violence* within 18 U.S.C. 16, generally involves attempted, threatened, or physical force against a person or property of another. The Department believes this existing reference is appropriate for use in our proposed definition and simplifies the determination process for the Department by leveraging existing law. Borrowers as well as their employers will also benefit from the approach of using existing law as doing so applies consistency, familiarity, and fairness.

Borrower Eligibility (§ 685.219(c))

Current Regulations: Section 685.219(c) provides the borrower eligibility requirements for purposes of PSLF. Specifically, § 685.219(c)(2) outlines the conditions when a borrower would have been considered to have made a qualifying monthly payment under § 685.219(c)(1)(iii).

Proposed Regulations: Under proposed § 685.219(c)(2), the Secretary would add a new condition under paragraph (c)(4) under which a borrower would not have been considered to have made a qualifying payment under paragraph (c)(1).

Under proposed § 685.219(c)(4), effective on or after July 1, 2026, through a standard described in § 685.219(h), no payment would be creditable as a qualifying payment for any month subsequent to a determination that a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

Reasons: Under the PSLF program, borrowers must meet the following criteria: be employed by a qualifying employer such as a Federal, State, local, or Tribal government or qualifying not-for-profit organization; work full-time for that agency or organization; have Direct Loans (or consolidate other Federal student loans into a Direct Loan); repay their loans under a qualifying repayment plan; and make a total of 120 qualifying monthly payments that need not be consecutive.[25] The proposed rules in 685.219(c) are twofold. First, the Department adds an exception clause in paragraph (c)(2) that states a borrower would not be considered to have made a PSLF-qualifying payment during a period or periods subsequent to which the qualifying employer has been determined to have engaged in substantial illegal activity. Second, by adding a new paragraph (c)(4), the Department makes certain the effective date of these regulations that impact a borrower's eligibility. The Department believes that addressing the impact these regulations have on a borrower's eligibility with an effective date of July 1, 2026, only allows for prospective adjudications. By selecting a date that impacts a borrower's eligibility for PSLF, borrowers have clarity as to when their payments would be considered qualifying payments.

Application Process (§ 685.219(e))

Current Regulations: Section 685.219(e) outlines a process for a borrower to apply for loan forgiveness under the PSLF program. Specifically, the process directs that a borrower may request loan forgiveness by filing an application approved by the Secretary, and then directs the Secretary to, among other things, make determinations and notify the borrower of forgiveness if sufficient information is available. If there is insufficient information available, the Secretary may request that the borrower provide additional information in order to make a determination of qualifying employment or eligible payments based on other documentation provided by the borrower. Upon the Secretary's determination that a borrower meets forgiveness eligibility requirements, the Secretary will notify the borrower and forgive the outstanding balance of the eligible loans.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(e)(9) would modify the current process to require the Secretary to notify the borrower when an employer may become an ineligible employer under subsection (h) of this section. Proposed § 685.219(e)(10) would provide that, if the Secretary has determined that the employer is no longer a qualifying employer, the Secretary would notify that borrower of the employer's status.

Reasons: Modifying § 685.219(e) is necessary to conform with the Department's proposed regulatory amendment at subsection (h) within the

[25] *https://studentaid.gov/manage-loans/forgiveness-cancellation/public-service.*

same section. Whereas subsections (h) and (i) provide the standard for determining a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose and the process for making such determinations, subsection (e) clarifies the application process by directing the Secretary to notify borrowers when an employer may become ineligible or is no longer considered a qualifying employer for purposes of the PSLF program as it relates to the proposed standard for determining a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. The proposed borrower notification process provides transparency and insight regarding current or former employers that may become ineligible or are ineligible as a result of the proposed subsection (h). Should a borrower be employed by an affected employer, such notifications may assist a borrower in making informed decisions about their employment should they wish to continue making qualifying PSLF payments while employed at a qualifying employer.

Borrower Reconsideration Process (§ 685.219(g))

Current Regulations: Section 685.219(g) outlines a process for the reconsideration of a student loan borrower's eligibility under the PSLF program. Specifically, current § 685.219(g) outlines the conditions for a borrower to request that the Secretary reconsider whether the borrower's employer or any payment on their qualifying loan meets the requirements for credit toward loan forgiveness under the program.

Proposed Regulations: Proposed § 685.219(g) would modify the current process for requesting reconsideration by adding an additional subparagraph that states a borrower may not request reconsideration when the Secretary's determination was made based upon an organization's ineligibility as a qualifying employer due to engaging in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

Reasons: Modifying § 685.219(g) is necessary to conform with the Department's proposed regulatory amendment at subsection (h) within the same section. Proposed subsection (h) describes the standard the Secretary would use to determine when a qualifying employer has engaged in substantial illegal activities that would impact a borrower's eligibility under the PSLF program. If an organization has been determined to be ineligible as a qualifying employer under the standard at proposed subsection (h), it would follow that there would be no recourse for a borrower as the employer, not the borrower, is the entity that has not met the eligibility requirements for the PSLF program. It is therefore necessary to modify the regulatory text at subsection (g) to align the reconsideration process with the proposed addition at subsection (h).

During negotiated rulemaking, negotiators expressed concerns that borrowers would have no recourse to contest an employer's loss of qualifying status. The Department noted that, under the standard outlined in subsection (h), the employer itself will have the opportunity to respond to the Department's assertation of the employer having engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. Also, the Department added subsection (j) that would prescribe the process for regaining eligibility as a qualifying employer if qualifying status were ultimately revoked by the Department.

Standard for Determining When a Qualifying Employer Has Engaged in Activities That Have a Substantial Illegal Purpose (§ 685.219(h))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: Under § 685.219(h), the Department would create a standard for determining that a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

The Secretary would determine by a preponderance of the evidence, and after notice and opportunity to respond, that a qualifying employer has engaged on or after July 1, 2026, in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose by considering the materiality of any illegal activities or actions (by gauging both frequency or severity) and would not find that the organization has a substantial illegal purpose if it has only engaged in illegal activities. In making such a determination, the Secretary would accept the following as conclusive evidence that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose:

(1) A final judgment by a State or Federal court, whereby the employer is found to have engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose;

(2) A plea of guilty or *nolo contendere,* whereby the employer admits to have engaged in activities that have substantial illegal purpose or pleads *nolo contendere* to allegations that the employer engaged in activities that have substantial illegal purpose; or

(3) A settlement that includes admission by the employer that it engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose as described in subsection (h) of this section.

Finally, nothing in this proposed standard shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to determine an employer has a substantial illegal purpose based upon the employer or its employees exercising their protected First Amendment rights, or any other rights protected under the Constitution.

Reasons: The Secretary seeks to establish a clear and consistent framework for how the Department would determine that a qualified employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. First, the Department would use the preponderance that it receives from sources specified in regulation (*see* discussion under proposed § 685.219(i)). The Department arrived at this standard because the preponderance of the evidence typically means that something is more likely true than not true. On the final day of negotiated rulemaking, the Department offered using a clear and convincing standard to negotiate in good faith due to negotiators' concerns that the preponderance of evidence was not a high enough standard; however, the committee did not reach consensus. With this proposed rule we have returned to the preponderance of evidence standard. The Department believes that the preponderance of evidence is the most appropriate standard of proof because of the severity of the activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. Prior to losing status as a qualified employer, the Department would notify the employer of an initiated action to determine if the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. This is the Department's attempt to outline the benchmarks that will be used in the determination and offer due process to a qualifying employer.

During this time, payments made by employees of the qualifying employer would still be counted towards PSLF. If the employer chooses not to respond, then the Secretary may move forward with revoking qualified employer status, thus subsequent payments made by a borrower would no longer be counted towards PSLF unless certain conditions were met (*see* discussion of proposed subsections (i) and (j)).

If the employer chooses to respond, the Secretary will decide on the qualified employer's status after the response has been submitted and reviewed by Department staff. Based on the response, the Secretary may choose to maintain or revoke the employer's qualifying status.

The activities that have a substantial illegal purpose would occur on or after July 1, 2026. This means that activities that have a substantial illegal purpose that took place and ended prior to July 1, 2026, would not be considered in the Secretary's review under this standard.

During rulemaking, some of the negotiators expressed concern that the Department would use authority under this proposed standard to target qualifying employers that did not align with the current Administration's values. Negotiators expressed concerns because the language provided to negotiators prior to the committee meetings stated: ''The Secretary determines by a preponderance of the evidence, and after notice and opportunity to respond, that a qualifying employer has engaged on or after July 1, 2026, in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.'' In order to allay concerns, the Department added language that the Secretary would also consider the materiality, meaning the significance, of the activities of the qualifying employer by gauging both frequency and the severity of said activities, in deciding whether the activities amount to a substantial illegal purpose. As stated in the text of the regulation, this is because the Department does not intend to penalize a qualifying employer prior to the proposed effective date of the regulations.

The Secretary would presume that the following is conclusive evidence that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, thus revoking qualifying employer status: (1) A final judgment by a State or Federal court, whereby the employer is found to have engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, (2) A plea of guilty or *nolo contendere,* whereby the employer admits they engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose or pleads *nolo contendere* to allegations that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose; or (3) A settlement that includes admission by the employer that it engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. In crafting options for the proposed standard, the Department explored judgments and legal proceedings in a State or Federal court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction. Reliance on judgments and legal proceedings in any tribunal would reduce the burden on the Department since, in this instance, the Department itself would not adjudicate whether the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. Instead, we would rely on processes that took place in court to determine that the employer engaged in illegal activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

During rulemaking, some of the negotiators expressed concern that the Department would use authority under this proposed standard to target free speech. For example, one negotiator stated that, if an employer releases information in support of transgender rights but does not engage in the chemical or surgical castration or mutilation of a child or children in violation of a State or Federal law, that the Department may revoke qualifying employer status. Another negotiator stated that many legal aid organizations with 501(c)(3) status work with undocumented clients and feared losing qualifying employer status due to the Department's determination that they are aiding and abetting violations of Federal immigration laws. Therefore, the Department clarified that nothing in the standard would be construed to authorize the Secretary to determine an employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose based upon the employer or the employees exercising their protected First Amendment rights, or any other rights protected under the Constitution.

Process for Determining When an Employer Engaged in Activities That Have a Substantial Illegal Purpose (§ 685.219(i))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: The Department would create a standard for determining when a qualifying employer is engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. The Department would determine that a qualifying employer violated the standard when the Secretary receives an application in which the employer fails to certify that it did not participate in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose; or would determine that the qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, unless, prior to the issuance of the Secretary's final determination, the Secretary approves a corrective action plan (*see* discussion in § 685.219(j).

Reasons: The Department intends to determine in regulations when a qualifying employer could lose qualifying status for the PSLF program to make clear to borrowers and qualifying employers the effective date of loss of qualifying status for purposes of qualifying employment for PSLF. First, the Department would amend the PSLF Form to allow a qualifying employer to self-certify that it has not engaged in activity that has a substantial illegal purpose. Upon receiving that non-certification, the Secretary would remove the employer from the qualifying employer list, because the employer is affirming that it engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

Second, the Secretary would determine that a qualifying employer engaged in activity that has a substantial illegal purpose, resulting in the eligible employer losing qualifying status. This is because not all signatories will correctly acknowledge on the PSLF form—either through an inadvertent mistake, unknowingly, or knowingly and willfully concealing those facts—whether the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

During negotiated rulemaking, the Department heard a concern that there could be a lapse in qualifying status for an employer that was ultimately found by the Department to have engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose and attempted to regain eligibility status via a corrective action plan. While under proposed § 685.219(j) an employer can submit a corrective action plan to regain qualifying status, the process may take time for approval which would leave employees without access to PSLF for an undefined length of time. Therefore, the Department proposes to add that the employer may maintain qualifying status if, prior to the issuance of the Secretary's final determination, the Secretary approves a corrective action plan. If the corrective action plan is approved prior to the Secretary's final decision of a violation of the standard, there will be no lapses in the qualifying employer's status.

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: The Department also would propose a new paragraph (i)(2). If an employer is operating under a shared identification number or other unique identifier, the Secretary shall consider the organization to be separate if the employer is operating separately and distinctly, for the purposes of determining whether an employer is eligible.

Reasons: During rulemaking, there was a significant discussion regarding shared Federal employer identification numbers (EIN). The EIN is a unique Federal tax identification number issued by the IRS for businesses, tax-exempt organizations, and other entities. The Department requests the EIN on the PSLF form and matches the EIN with the IRS' publicly available listing of tax-exempt organizations and other entities to ensure that the employer is a qualifying employer for PSLF purposes. Negotiators noted that there are examples of entire city governments that

share an EIN. If a qualifying employer is determined by the Secretary to have engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, entire city governments, including police and fire departments, could lose eligibility for PSLF. While the Department believes the Secretary already has the authority to consider agencies as separate under one EIN, we added a provision in the regulations that allow the Secretary to separate employers that are under one EIN, should an agency with a shared EIN lose qualifying employer status. In the regulations, we do not refer directly to the EIN but instead use the phrase ''shared identification number or other unique identifier'' to safeguard against changes or renaming of the EIN to another term in the future.

A qualifying employer could also choose to provide more information about the structure of the organization during the notice and response phase under the standard in subsection (h). The Secretary maintains ultimate authority to make decisions regarding separation of agencies under a single EIN.

Regaining Eligibility as a Qualifying Employer (§ 685.219(j))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: The proposed addition of § 685.219(j) describes a process for an employer who has lost eligibility due to engaging in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, to regain eligibility, and become a qualifying employer again. An employer who has lost eligibility may regain eligibility after:

(1) ten (10) years from the date the Secretary determines the organization engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose if, at, or after that time the organization certifies on a borrower's subsequent application that the organization is no longer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose; or

(2) the Secretary approves a corrective action plan that is signed by the employer that includes: a certification that the employer is no longer engaging in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose; a report describing the employer's compliance controls that are designed to ensure that the employer will not engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose in the future; and any other terms or conditions imposed by the Secretary designed to ensure that employers do not engage in actions or activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

Reasons: During negotiations, several negotiators expressed that an employer that lost its qualifying status under PSLF would have several negative consequences including that it would permanently ban employers from PSLF that may no longer be engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. Negotiators mentioned that borrowers often make major life decisions about employment based on access to PSLF.

As noted above, the initial draft regulations did not contain provisions for employers to regain eligibility as a qualifying employer. In an attempt to negotiate in good-faith to address the concerns mentioned by negotiators and to reach consensus on the draft regulations, the Department offered two changes whereby an employer may regain eligibility ten years from the date of determination, or, if the employer did not want to wait the ten-year period, then the employer would have the ability to submit a corrective action plan and statement to the Department that it is no longer engaged in activity that has a substantial illegal purpose. While there were tentative agreements on these two changes, one negotiator dissented on approving the draft regulations, and the negotiated rulemaking committee failed to reach consensus. Therefore, in proposing these regulations, the Department continues to agree in principle that providing an employer with a process to regain qualifying status is an important component. However, the agreement to allow reinstatement within five years was a major compromise offered by the Department in the negotiated rulemaking to gain support from committee members on other provisions in the draft regulations. In proposing these regulations, the Department believes that a period of 10 years would better ensure that employers do not continue to engage in behavior that has a substantial illegal purpose.

Borrower Notification of Regained Eligibility (§ 685.219(k))

Current Regulations: None.

Proposed Regulations: The proposed addition of § 685.219(k) describes a process under which the Department would notify student loan borrowers if an organization regained eligibility as a qualifying employer, based upon the standards outlined in proposed subsection (j) of the same section, for the purpose of correctly certifying or applying for loan cancellation under the PSLF program.

Reasons: During the negotiated rulemaking session, negotiators raised concerns about the importance of notifying borrowers, who may become eligible to apply or re-eligible after initial certification, when and if their employer regained eligibility as a qualifying employer. Although operational procedures for the Department are not commonly outlined in regulatory text, we agreed with the committee's recommendation to incorporate a general borrower notification requirement into the proposed rules for PSLF to reflect the Department's commitment to increase transparency and efficiency in our administration of the Federal student loan programs.

X. Regulatory Impact Analysis

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563

Under E.O. 12866, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) must determine whether this regulatory action is ''significant'' and, therefore, subject to the requirements of the E.O. and subject to review by OMB. Section 3(f) of E.O. 12866 defines a ''significant regulatory action'' as an action likely to result in a rule that may:

(1) Have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities;

(2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;

(3) Materially alter the budgetary impacts of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or

(4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles stated in the E.O.

The Department estimates the net budgetary impacts to be −$1.537 billion from increased transfers from borrowers who no longer receive PSLF to the Federal Government. Quantified economic impacts include annualized transfers of −$167 million at 3 percent discounting and $173 million at 7 percent discounting, and annual quantified costs related to compliance costs and administrative updates to Government systems. Therefore, based on our estimates, OIRA has determined that this final action is ''economically significant'' under section 3(f)(1) of Executive Order 12866 and subject to OMB review3(f)(1).

We have also reviewed these regulations under Executive Order 13563, which supplements and explicitly reaffirms the principles, structures, and definitions governing regulatory review established in Executive Order 12866. To the extent

permitted by law, Executive Order 13563 requires that an agency:

(1) Propose or adopt regulations only on a reasoned determination that their benefits justify their costs (recognizing that some benefits and costs are difficult to quantify);

(2) Tailor its regulations to impose the least burden on society, consistent with obtaining regulatory objectives and considering, among other things and to the extent practicable, the costs of cumulative regulations;

(3) In choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, select those approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity);

(4) To the extent feasible, specify performance objectives rather than the behavior or manner of compliance a regulated entity must adopt; and

(5) Identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including economic incentives, such as user fees or marketable permits, to encourage the desired behavior, or provide information that enables the public to make choices.

E.O. 13563 also requires an agency ''to use the best available techniques to quantify anticipated present and future benefits and costs as accurately as possible.'' OIRA has emphasized that these techniques may include ''identifying changing future compliance costs that might result from technological innovation or anticipated behavioral changes.''

As required by OMB Circular A–4, we compare the proposed regulations to the current regulations. In this regulatory impact analysis (RIA), we discussed the need for regulatory action, potential costs and benefits, net budget impacts, and the regulatory alternatives we considered.

Elsewhere in this section under the *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995,* we identify and explain burdens specifically associated with information collection requirements.

1. Need for Regulatory Action

The Department has identified a critical and urgent need for comprehensive regulatory reform within the PSLF program. The PSLF program was established to encourage public service careers by offering loan forgiveness to eligible borrowers. Despite the program's intent, the current regulatory framework has exposed the PSLF program to potential misuse, with taxpayer dollars being allocated to borrowers working for organizations that do not align with the program's public service mission.

In response to these challenges, the Department proposed a series of regulatory changes designed to ensure the program's integrity by limiting benefits to borrowers employed by organizations that meet the established public service criteria. The proposed regulations will exercise the Secretary's authority under title IV of the HEA, specifically 20 U.S.C. 1087e(m), 20 U.S.C. 1221e–3, and implemented in 34 CFR 685.219, to refine the requirements for qualifying employers and ensure that PSLF benefits are distributed only to those working for organizations that provide public service, aligned with the goals of the HEA.

Clarifying the Secretary's Broad Authority and Defining Public Service Employment

The Secretary's authority to establish rules and regulations for the administration of the Direct Loan Program, including the PSLF program, is grounded in the HEA, particularly under Section 455(m)(3), which empowers the Secretary to define and regulate the parameters for public service employment under the program. This broad regulatory authority provides the foundation for the proposed rules to refine the criteria governing PSLF eligibility. Specifically, these changes will focus on ensuring that PSLF benefits are directed only to those borrowers who are employed by organizations that serve the public good and uphold public policy, while eliminating the risk of improper payments to those working for organizations engaged in illegal activities. By exercising this authority, the Department aims to protect public funds and guarantee that PSLF benefits fulfill their intended purpose by rewarding individuals dedicated to public service careers.

Exclusion of Employers Engaged in Substantial Illegal Activities

One of the most significant challenges faced by the PSLF program has been the inclusion of employers whose activities are at odds with the program's core mission of supporting public service. To address this, the Department proposes a new regulation to exclude employers that engage in activities with a ''substantial illegal purpose'' from the list of organizations that qualify for PSLF. This exclusion is necessary to protect taxpayers from funding loan forgiveness for individuals employed by organizations that operate in a manner harmful to the public good.

The proposed rules will specifically identify activities that qualify as having a ''substantial illegal purpose,'' including violations of Federal and State laws, involvement in trafficking, terrorism, violence aimed at obstructing Federal policy, and other illegal actions. Organizations engaging in such activities will be disqualified from participating in the PSLF program, and their employees will no longer be eligible to receive qualifying payments that lead to loan forgiveness under PSLF.

The inclusion of this provision in the regulations aligns with the Department's responsibility to administer Federal student aid programs in a manner that is transparent, equitable, and consistent with public policy. By establishing clear criteria for what constitutes a ''substantial illegal purpose,'' the Department will ensure that PSLF benefits are only granted to those working for employers that genuinely contribute to the public good and comply with the law. The proposed definition of ''substantial illegal purpose'' will be codified in 34 CFR 685.219(b)(30), providing clarity for both employers and borrowers.

Addressing Borrower Eligibility and Ensuring Due Process

In implementing the new regulations, the Department is also mindful of the need to protect borrowers from losing eligibility due to their employer's actions. Borrowers working for organizations engaged in activities that disqualify them from PSLF will no longer be able to accrue qualifying monthly payments toward loan forgiveness while remaining at that employer. However, the proposed regulations include safeguards to ensure that borrowers are not unfairly penalized. When an employer is found to have engaged in disqualifying activities, borrowers will be promptly notified. This ensures that their employer's status does not unduly harm borrowers and that they have the opportunity to continue making progress toward loan forgiveness.

To further protect the rights of borrowers, the regulations will provide a process by which employers who are at risk of losing PSLF eligibility due to illegal activities will be notified and allowed to respond. The proposed regulations at 34 CFR 685.219(h) will specify that employers will be afforded a period to respond to the findings before any final determination regarding their eligibility is made. This process aligns with principles of due process and transparency, ensuring that employers have a fair opportunity to

maintain their status and that borrowers are not left uninformed.

Reaffirming Transparency and Employer Accountability

Transparency and accountability are central to these proposed regulatory changes. By providing clear guidelines for employers regarding their obligations under PSLF, the Department will help ensure that both employers and borrowers understand the eligibility criteria. Employers found to be engaged in disqualifying activities will be given a reasonable opportunity to contest the findings and take corrective action if necessary. If an employer loses eligibility, the proposed regulations will establish a process for regaining eligibility after 10 years or after the employer has implemented a corrective action plan. This will be codified in 34 CFR 685.219(j).

The regulations also require that, once an employer regains eligibility, the Secretary shall update the qualifying employer list, which is accessible to borrowers for purposes of certification or application. This helps ensure that borrowers have up-to-date information about which employers are eligible for PSLF, facilitating a more streamlined and transparent process for all stakeholders.

The proposed regulatory changes are designed to protect the integrity of the PSLF program by ensuring that taxpayer funds are used to support borrowers working in public service roles with eligible employers. By excluding employers engaged in illegal activities, defining ''substantial illegal purpose,'' and providing clear guidelines for borrower eligibility and employer accountability, the Department aims to create a more efficient, transparent, and fair PSLF program. These reforms will help reduce administrative burdens on borrowers and institutions, promote fairness, and ensure that PSLF benefits are awarded only to those genuinely dedicated to serving the public good. Through these changes, the Department will fulfill its responsibility to safeguard taxpayer funds while enhancing the effectiveness of the PSLF program in supporting individuals committed to public service careers.

2. Summary

The Department proposes to make several significant changes to PSLF based on discussions during the negotiations.

TABLE 2.1—SUMMARY OF KEY CHANGES IN THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Provision	Regulatory section	Description of proposed provision
Public Service Loan Forgiveness		
Definitions	685.219(b)	Would add definitions of ''aiding or abetting''; ''chemical castration or mutilation''; ''child or children''; ''foreign terrorist organizations''; ''illegal discrimination''; ''other Federal immigration laws''; ''substantial illegal purpose''; ''surgical castration or mutilation''; ''terrorism''; ''trafficking''; ''violating State law''; and ''violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy''. Would revise the definition of ''qualifying employer''.
Borrower Eligibility	685.219(c)	Would exclude from a credit as a qualifying payment any month that a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.
Application Process	685.219(e)	Would create a borrower notification of employers that are at-risk of or have lost PSLF qualifying status.
Borrower reconsideration process	685.219(g)	Would prohibit a borrower from requesting reconsideration if their employer lost eligibility due to engaging in activity that has a substantial illegal purpose.
Standard for determining a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.	685.219(h)	Would create a standard by which the Secretary determines that the qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, including but not limited to reviewing the preponderance of the evidence and basing decisions on materially of the activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. Also, would provide the employer an opportunity to respond except in cases where there was conclusive evidence (see discussion or regulatory language for more information) that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.
Process for determining when an employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.	685.219(i)	Would establish that the Secretary determinates that a qualifying employer engaged in substantial illegal activities when the Secretary receives that self-certified information on the PSLF form or makes his or her own determination, unless a corrective action plan is submitted prior to issuance of the final determination. We would also note the Secretary's authority to separate employers operating under on identification number.
Regaining eligibility	685.219(j)	Would allow a qualifying employer to regain eligibility after 10 years from the date(s) that it engaged in activity that had a substantial illegal purpose or when the Secretary approves a corrective action plan signed by the employer.
Borrower notification	685.219(k)	Would require the Secretary to update the qualifying employer list, which is accessible to borrowers for purposes of certification or application, if an employer regains eligibility.

3. Discussion of Costs and Benefits

The PSLF program is a component of Federal student loan policy, designed to encourage individuals to enter and continue in public service employment by offering cancellation of remaining Direct student loan balances after 120 qualifying monthly payments and 10 years of full-time employment in a public service job. However, over time, the program has faced significant challenges, including confusion about qualifying employers, and the disbursement of benefits to borrowers employed by organizations whose activities do not align with the program's public service objectives. To address these issues, the Department has proposed a series of regulatory changes. These proposed regulations aim to enhance the program's integrity, improve its efficiency, and ensure that taxpayer funds are allocated appropriately. While these changes are

expected to incur certain costs, the long-term benefits are substantial, making the program more effective, transparent, and equitable. Below is an analysis of both the costs and benefits of these proposed regulations.

Costs of the Proposed Regulations:

The Department acknowledges that implementing the proposed regulations will incur costs. These costs primarily fall into three categories: Department administrative costs, compliance costs for employers, and potential disruptions for borrowers. However, these costs must be viewed in the context of the long-term benefits that the regulations will bring.

One of the immediate costs associated with these regulatory changes will be the need for the Department to update its systems, train staff, and implement new compliance and monitoring processes. The Department will need to track and verify employer eligibility more rigorously, and it will also need to enhance communication systems to notify employers and borrowers of any changes to their status in the PSLF program. These changes will require new investments in staffing, technology upgrades, and outreach programs.

Initial estimates suggest that the administrative costs for the Department will range from $1.5 million to $3 million annually during the first two years of implementation. These funds will be used to ensure that the Department can effectively manage the new employer eligibility determination process, update systems, and conduct necessary training for staff and stakeholders. Using information from prior implementation and of income-driven repayment and PSLF program changes, the Department spent an estimated $2.5 million annually for similar updates. Given the complexity of these new regulations, it is reasonable to expect similar administrative expenditures in the short term.

Employers will need to ensure that they meet the new eligibility criteria under the proposed regulations. This will involve reviewing their activities to ensure they are not engaged in any actions that would disqualify them from participating in the PSLF program. For many employers, especially smaller organizations or those with limited resources, this process may necessitate consultations with legal counsel, operational adjustments, and revisions to their hiring practices.

Compliance costs for employers are expected to vary per organization, depending on the organization's size and complexity. Larger organizations, such as hospitals or universities, may incur higher costs as they assess their practices and make any necessary changes to align with the new rules. A 2021 survey by the National Council of Nonprofits found that a significant percentage of nonprofit organizations may face challenges in meeting changing eligibility standards.[26] These costs primarily result from the costs of legal counsel, restructuring efforts, and changes to the organization's documentation processes. At the same time, many organizations are accustomed to attesting to the fact that they are not violating State and Federal law as a condition to participating in other government or nongovernmental programs. As such, in some circumstances, organizations may not need to exert any more than a *de minimis* amount of additional resources in order make attestations under the proposed regulations. Rather, such organizations will rely on the work already done within the organization that supports their ability to attest they are in compliance with Federal and State law for other purposes.

The most significant impacts on borrowers may stem from: (1) potential delays in loan forgiveness processing during the transition to the new regulations that may stem from changes in employer eligibility databases or open employer eligibility reviews; and (2) potential misunderstandings of the new regulations that lead to borrower confusion that delays application of the forgiveness benefit. Borrowers who are employed by organizations disqualified under the new rules may experience a temporary disruption in their progress toward loan forgiveness. These borrowers will need to transition to qualifying employers to continue receiving credit for their payments. Borrowers who misunderstand the new rules may apply for forgiveness without knowing or understanding the implications of the new rule on their former or current employer as they may no longer be a qualifying employer.

The transition and any misunderstanding of the proposed changes to the program may slightly increase the time it takes borrowers to achieve forgiveness; however, long-term processing efficiencies are expected to be gained. Borrowers frequently encountered confusion and delays in PSLF application due to employer eligibility issues. A 2018 Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit found that over 370,000 certified borrowers had still made zero qualifying payments, suggesting misunderstandings about eligibility criteria or documentation.[27] A 2020 joint investigation by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the Student Borrower Protection Center (SBPC) revealed that the PSLF process had rejected employer eligibility more than 50,000 times, even inconsistently for employees at the same institution.[28] GAO further warned that the absence of clear guidance for loan servicers significantly increases the risk of improper denials. While the Department is taking steps to minimize these delays and inform borrowers of these changes to standard marketing and communication channels, borrowers may experience disruptions as the new regulatory framework is implemented.

Benefits of the Proposed Regulations:

Despite the initial costs, the long-term benefits of the proposed regulations far outweigh the short-term expenditures. These benefits are significant and include increased program integrity, improved efficiency, reduced borrower confusion, and long-term savings for taxpayers.

The most significant benefit of the proposed regulations is the improvement in the integrity of the PSLF program. By excluding employers engaged in substantial illegal activities from the program, the Department ensures that taxpayer dollars are only used to support borrowers working for organizations that are not engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. This change will directly address concerns about improper disbursements and misuse of Federal funds. This change also addresses concerns that the Department is indirectly subsidizing illegal activities that the government broadly aims to prevent.

[26] *https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/reports/nonprofit-workforce-shortages-crisis-affects-everyone.*

[27] *https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/694506.pdf.*

[28] *https://protectborrowers.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/ECF-Failures.pdf.*

The proposed regulations will also streamline the PSLF process by providing more explicit eligibility criteria and verification process. This will make it easier for borrowers to track their progress and ensure that they meet the requirements for loan forgiveness. Additionally, employers will benefit from more straightforward guidelines regarding their obligations under the PSLF program.

Recent data from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) found that a significant fraction of borrowers experienced confusion regarding their employer's eligibility for PSLF.[29] With the new rules in place, the Department anticipates reducing borrower confusion through making the process more transparent and efficient, especially over the long term. This will likely result in faster processing of PSLF applications and fewer errors, as both borrowers and institutions will have a clearer understanding of the program's requirements.

By helping ensure that PSLF benefits are directed only to borrowers working for legitimate public service employers, the proposed regulations will help strengthen public service careers. The PSLF program has been a key factor in attracting and retaining individuals in public service, and these changes will make the program more accessible and reliable.

There is significant research, both academic and private sector, which documents that public service employees cited PSLF as a significant factor in their decision to pursue and remain in public service. Recently, a 2025 student by Mission Square Research Institute, found that 56% of public sector employees and 62% of private sector employees may job decisions based on their student loan debt levels.[30] As the program becomes more transparent and efficient, the Department anticipates growth in public service recruitment and retention in the future. One of the most important benefits of the proposed regulations will be the long-term savings for taxpayers. By eliminating improper payments, the Department estimates that these regulations will save taxpayers a significant amount of money over the next ten years. These savings will result from a reduction in wasteful disbursements. The expected reduction in improper payments will ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent more efficiently and effectively.

The proposed regulatory changes for the PSLF program aim to enhance the program's efficiency and integrity. Although there will be initial costs associated with administrative updates and compliance efforts, the long-term benefits far outweigh these expenditures. The regulations will help reduce improper payments, streamline processing times, reduce borrower confusion, and ensure that the program supports individuals employed by organizations that genuinely contribute to the public good. With these changes, the PSLF program will become more transparent, efficient, and practical, fulfilling its original mission of rewarding public service careers while safeguarding taxpayer funds.

4. Net Budget Impact

Table 4.1 provides an estimate of the net Federal budgetary impact of these proposed regulations that are summarized in Table 2.1 of this RIA. This includes both the effects of a modification to existing loan cohorts and costs for loan cohorts from 2026 to 2035. A cohort reflects all loans originated in a given fiscal year. Consistent with the requirements of the Credit Reform Act of 1990, budget cost estimates for the student loan programs reflect the estimated net present value of all future non-administrative Federal costs associated with a cohort of loans. The baseline for estimating the cost of these final regulations is the President's Budget for 2026 (PB2026).

TABLE 4.1—ESTIMATED BUDGET IMPACT OF THE NPRM

[$ in millions]

Section	Description	Modification score (1994–2025)	Outyear score (2026–2035)	Total (1994–2035)
§ 685.219(h)	Amended definition of qualifying employer	−$640	−$897	−$1,537

As noted in the *Need for Regulatory Action* section of this RIA, the proposed regulations define several terms related to qualifying employment for PSLF and amend the definition of a qualified employer to exclude organizations that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose. This is consistent with E.O. 14235, signed March 7, 2025. As proposed in subsection § 685.219(h), the Secretary will determine based on a preponderance of the evidence, and after notice and opportunity to respond, that employers have engaged in activities with a substantial illegal purpose on or after July 1, 2026, by considering the materiality of any illegal activities or actions. The Department will presume that any of the following is conclusive evidence that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose:

1. A final judgment by a State or Federal court, whereby the employer is found to have engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose;

2. A plea of guilty or *nolo contendere,* whereby the employer admits to have engaged in activities that have substantial illegal purpose or pleads *nolo contendere* to allegations that the employer engaged in activities that have substantial illegal purpose; or

3. A settlement that includes admission by the employer that it engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose described in subsection (h) of this section.

Employer qualification will be linked to the EIN used for reporting to the IRS so employees in one area or agency may be affected by the activities of employees in other organizations under the same EIN. For example, the County of Los Angeles has a single EIN covering various departments including the Los Angeles County Public Defender, Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. Government agencies in particular may have many service areas under a single EIN.

The PSLF application data includes variables that distinguish non-profit

[29] Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Staying on Track While Giving Back: The Cost of Student Loan Servicing Breakdowns for People Serving Their Communities (Washington, DC: June 2017).

[30] Liu, Z., Korankye, T. (February 2025). *The Ripple Effect of Student Debt: Shaping Careers, Financial Choices, and Well-Being in Public and Private Sectors.* Mission Square Research Institute.

employers and government employers, as well as the level of government employers. Table 4.2 summarizes the split between borrowers receiving PSLF whose greatest time in qualifying employment was with government or non-profit organizations.

TABLE 4.2—NUMBER OF BORROWERS RECEIVING PSLF AND AVERAGE FORGIVENESS BY EMPLOYMENT SECTOR

Employment sector	Number of borrowers who have received forgiveness	Average forgiveness amount
Government	677,500	$ 73,000
Nonprofit	296,600	82,100
Total	974,100	75,800

Note: The total number of borrowers who have received forgiveness may be less than most recent Department estimates due to timing, data availability, and data cleaning. Borrowers are sorted into the sector with the maximum time working towards forgiveness. The numbers of borrowers and average forgiveness amounts are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Table 4.3 splits the government category into Federal, State, and local levels. We assume that Federal agencies will comply with the law. Therefore, we do not expect a reduction in forgiveness for Federal employees.

TABLE 4.3—NUMBER OF BORROWERS RECEIVING PSLF AND AVERAGE FORGIVENESS BY GOVERNMENT SUBSECTOR

Government subsector	Number of borrowers who have received forgiveness	Average forgiveness amount
Federal Government	97,800	$71,900
Local Government	415,300	71,200
State Government	161,900	78,400
Unknown	2,500	75,000
Total	677,500	73,000

Note: The total number of borrowers who have received forgiveness may be less than most recent Department estimates due to timing, data availability, and data cleaning. Borrowers are sorted into the sector with the maximum time working towards forgiveness. The numbers of borrowers and average forgiveness amounts are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Based on the activities identified in the E.O. 14235 it is likely that organizations in some fields are more likely to be affected than others, either by loss of eligibility, the deterrent effect on their activities, difficulty recruiting employees, or by their employees not being granted PSLF forgiveness and seeking alternate employment. Regardless of the type of employer, service areas that could be most affected by the proposed regulation include, but are not limited to, legal services, governance, social work, healthcare, K–12 education, and higher education.

Existing data on employers of borrowers who received forgiveness does not include a service category and names do not always indicate what an organization does, but the Department analyzed this data to estimate what share of borrowers who have achieved forgiveness fall into certain service areas and their average forgiveness.[31] This was done by matching keywords from various subsectors to employer names. For example, for healthcare, the keywords included ''hospital'', ''health'', ''medical'', and ''clinic''.

A portion of employers cannot be classified because some employer names give no indication to their service area, contain misspellings, or have names that do not contain any of the keywords matched. These EINs are categorized as ''Other''. Approximately 91 percent of borrowers who have received PSLF were categorized into a subsector category, leaving 9 percent in the ''Other'' category. In this analysis, we assume that the distribution of borrowers and subsectors in the future will reflect that of those who have received forgiveness. Table 4.4 summarizes the results by service area.

TABLE 4.4—NUMBER OF BORROWERS RECEIVING PSLF AND AVERAGE FORGIVENESS BY EMPLOYMENT SUBSECTOR

Employment subsector	Number of borrowers who have received forgiveness	Average forgiveness amount
Agriculture	3,300	$ 64,900
Arts	2,900	61,600
Early Childhood	1,400	63,000

[31] Turner, J., Blanchard, K., & Darolia, R. (2025, January). *Where Do Borrowers Who Benefit from Public Service Loan Forgiveness Work?*. NEA. *https://www.nea.org/sites/default/files/2025-03/where-do-borrowers-who-benefit-from-pslf-work.pdf*.

TABLE 4.4—NUMBER OF BORROWERS RECEIVING PSLF AND AVERAGE FORGIVENESS BY EMPLOYMENT SUBSECTOR—Continued

Employment subsector	Number of borrowers who have received forgiveness	Average forgiveness amount
Environmental	2,600	61,100
Fire Rescue	1,200	52,400
Governance	156,200	67,200
Healthcare	158,600	89,200
Higher Education	105,400	84,200
International	1,200	75,500
K12 Education	296,600	72,500
Law Enforcement	20,100	66,500
Legal	13,800	108,500
Military	48,400	70,200
Other	82,900	72,200
Philanthropy	5,300	73,500
Religious	14,000	69,500
Research	1,500	65,300
Social Services	47,500	75,300
Transportation	5,500	61,400
Utilities & Infrastructure	2,500	60,700
Workforce & Labor	3,000	80,200
All Employment Subsectors	974,100	75,800

Note: The total number of borrowers who have received forgiveness may be less than most recent Department estimates due to timing, data availability, and data cleaning. Borrowers are sorted into the sector with the maximum time working towards forgiveness. The numbers of borrowers and average forgiveness amounts are rounded to the nearest hundred.

As we expect most employers to certify that they do not engage in activities with a substantially illegal purpose, the information in Table 4.4 informed our estimates of potential reductions in qualified employers for PSLF but does not directly translate to the percentage of borrowers assigned to achieve forgiveness in our assumptions for the proposed regulation. We also recognize that employers in other employment subsectors could engage in activity that results in a loss of eligibility but estimate that these will be anomalies or very small percentages. Therefore, we have included a percentage for all other categories and some sensitivity runs that are described in the *Methodology for Budget Impact* section of this analysis.

Methodology for Budgetary Impact

The Department estimated the budgetary impact of the proposed provisions in this NPRM through changes to the PSLF assignment within the Department's income-driven repayment (IDR) assumption. PSLF is randomly assigned to borrowers in our IDR model sample based on percentages that vary by the cohort range in which they enter repayment and highest education level as presented in Table 4.5.

TABLE 4.5—CHANGE IN ASSIGNMENT OF PSLF FOR PROPOSED REGULATION

Enter repayment cohort range	Percentage of Borrowers Assigned PSLF		
	2-year	4-year	Graduate
PB2026 Baseline Scenario			
2016 to 2020	10.46	18.05	21.96
2021 and later	14.65	28.88	30.74
Proposed Regulatory Scenario			
2016 to 2020	10.25	17.69	21.52
2021 and later	14.35	28.30	30.13
Alternate Regulatory Scenario			
2016 to 2020	9.83	16.96	20.64
2021 and later	13.77	27.14	28.90

As we expect the proposed regulations to have more of a deterrent effect reducing the likelihood of qualifying employers engaging in illegal activities and borrowers have the option of shifting employers to complete their 120 months of qualifying payments even if on a delayed basis, we do not expect a significant reduction in the percentage of borrowers achieving PSLF forgiveness. We have not increased the effect for future cohorts of loans

because, while potential ineligibility starts with the July 1, 2026, effective date, employers' ability to appeal and get reinstated and employees' ability to shift positions means the pattern is not necessarily a continued increase in ineligibility.

The changes made in Table 4.5 were derived from applying reductions between 0–5 percent to the employment subsectors identified in Table 4.4 as being most likely to be affected by the proposed regulation (legal, healthcare, social work, higher education, K–12 education, and governance). This results in an estimated total reduction of approximately 0–2 percent.

As explained in the *Paperwork Reduction Act* section, the Department believes that there would be less than 10 employers affected annually. Given the uncertainties of employer and employee response noted for the primary estimate, we considered an alternative approach that evaluated the maximum impact consistent with the PRA analysis. Within the universe of borrowers who have received forgiveness, approximately 6 percent were employed for their longest time toward forgiveness in the top 10 EINs by forgiven borrower count, excluding federal employers who are assumed to comply. Therefore, we also ran a high-impact alternative that bumped the reductions up to 6 percent.

The combined effect of the changes to the percentages in Table 4.5 reduces the number of borrowers achieving PSLF in our IDR assumption and results in the cost savings presented in Table 4.6. The Department welcomes comments on the assumptions related to the reduction in future qualified employer eligibility and will consider any substantive comments or information presented in estimating the effects of the proposed rule.

TABLE 4.6—NET BUDGET IMPACT OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO PSLF

$ mns	PSLF primary	PSLF alternate
Modification	−$640	−$1,765
Outlays for Cohorts 2026–2035	−897	−2,520
Total	−1,537	−4,285

Accounting Statement:

As required by OMB Circular A–4, we have prepared an accounting statement showing the classification of the expenditures associated with the provisions of these proposed regulations. Table 4.7 provides our best estimate of the changes in annual monetized transfers that may result from these proposed regulations. Expenditures are classified as transfers from the Federal government to affected student loan borrowers.

TABLE 4.7—ACCOUNTING STATEMENT: CLASSIFICATION OF ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES

[In millions]

Category	Benefits	
Reduction in taxpayer costs supporting loan forgiveness of those at organizations engaging in activities with a substantial illegal purpose.	Not quantified.	
Deterrence of activities with a substantial illegal purpose done by non-profit or governmental organizations.	Not quantified.	
Category	**Costs**	
	3%	7%
Costs of compliance with paperwork requirements	$0	$0.
Costs incurred by organizations to ensure compliance with proposed regulations.	Not quantified	Not quantified.
Administrative costs to Federal government to update systems and contracts to implement the proposed regulations.	$0.3	$0.4.
Category	**Transfers**	
	3%	7%
Increased transfers from borrowers due to reductions in borrowers achieving PSLF forgiveness:	−$167	−$173.

5. Alternatives Considered

The Department considered many alternatives.

Part of the development of these regulations, the Department engaged in a negotiated rulemaking process in which we received comments and proposals from non-Federal negotiators representing numerous impacted constituencies on a variety of issues. The proposals were submitted from the following constituencies: proprietary institutions of higher education, civil rights organizations, consumer advocates, and legal assistance organizations that represent students and/or borrowers, student loan borrowers in repayment, organizations representing taxpayers and the public interest, public institutions of higher education, financial aid administrators, accrediting agencies, and State officials, U.S. Military service members. Information about these proposals is available on our rulemaking website at *https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/higher-education-laws-and-policy/higher-education-policy/negotiated-rulemaking-for-higher-education-2025-2026*.

The Department worked with the negotiators and continued to provide additional proposed regulatory text for consideration. Despite these efforts, the negotiators did not reach consensus on the proposed regulations in this NPRM, the Department was not bound to incorporating any of the negotiators' submitted proposals in the drafting of this NPRM.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary certifies, under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), that this final regulatory action would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of ''small entities.''

These regulations will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities because they are focused on arrangements between the borrower and the Department. They do not affect institutions of higher education in any way, and these entities are typically the focus of the Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis. As noted in the *Paperwork Reduction Act* section, the burden related to the final regulations will be assessed in a separate information collection process and that burden is expected to involve individuals more than institutions of any size.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the Department provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing collections of information in accordance with the *Paperwork Reduction Act* of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This helps ensure that the public understands the Department's collection instructions, respondents can provide the requested data in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the Department can properly assess the impact of collection requirements on respondents.

Section 685.219(i) of these proposed regulatory changes would require an update to the currently approved Public Service Loan Forgiveness Certification and Application, OMB # 1845–0110. The Department would amend the PSLF form to include the ability for a qualifying employer to certify that it has not engaged in activity that has a substantial illegal purpose. We do not believe the proposed changes will significantly change the amount of time currently assessed for the borrower to complete the form. This form update will be completed and made available for comment through a full public clearance package before being made available for use by the effective date of the regulations. The proposed amendments to the regulation may reduce the number of respondents or responses for individuals submitting Employee Certification forms. This is due in part to the reduction in the number of qualifying employers. As mentioned previously, the Department anticipates a 10 percent reduction in the number of individuals submitting Employee Certification Forms because their employer is no longer eligible for participation. Any burden changes will be assessed to OMB # 1845–0110, Application and Employment Certification for Public Service Loan Forgiveness. Section 685.219 (j) of the proposed regulation would allow an employer to re-establish or maintain eligibility for PSLF if the Secretary approves a corrective action plan. The Department believes that annually there would be less than 10 employers responding to the Department's notice of an initiated action and/or seeking approval of a corrective action plan. No additional burden has been assessed based on these proposed rules as the anticipated number of annual respondents falls below the minimum required for OMB approval.

A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless OMB approves the collection under the PRA and the corresponding information collection instrument displays a currently valid OMB control number. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to comply with or is subject to penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information if the collection instrument does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

In the final regulations we will display the control number numbers assigned by OMB to any information collection requirements proposed in this NPRM and adopted in the final regulations.

If you wish to review and comment on the Information Collection Requests, please follow the instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notification. Note: The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in OMB and the Department review all comments posted at *www.regulations.gov*. We consider your comments on these proposed collections of information in—

* Deciding whether the proposed collections are necessary for the proper performance of our functions, including whether the information will have practical use.

* Evaluating the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed collections, including the validity of our methodology and assumptions.

* Enhancing the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information we collect; and

* Minimizing the burden on those who must respond. Consistent with 5 CFR 1320.8(d), the Department is soliciting comments on the information collection through this document. Between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**, OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information contained in these proposed priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria. Therefore, to ensure that OMB gives your comments full consideration, it is important that OMB receives your comments on these Information Collection Requests by September 17, 2025.

Intergovernmental Review

This program is subject to E.O. 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. One of the objectives of the E.O. is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and strengthened Federalism. The E.O. relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

This document provides early notification of our specific plans and actions for this program.

Assessment of Education Impact

In accordance with section 411 of the General Education Provisions Act, 20 U.S.C. 1221e–4, the Secretary requests comments on whether these final regulations would require transmission of information that any other agency or authority of the United States gathers or makes available.

Federalism

E.O. 13132 requires us to provide meaningful and timely input by State and local elected officials in the development of regulatory policies that have Federalism implications. ''Federalism implications'' means substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the National Government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. The proposed regulations do not have Federalism implications.

Accessible Format: On request to the program contact person(s) listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, individuals with disabilities can obtain

this document in an accessible format. The Department will provide the requestor with an accessible format that may include Rich Text Format (RTF) or text format (txt), a thumb drive, an MP3 file, braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc, or other accessible format.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. You may access the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations at *www.govinfo.gov*. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF, you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at *www.federalregister.gov*. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

List of Subjects in 34 CFR Part 685

Administrative practice and procedure, Colleges and universities, Education, Loan programs-education, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Student aid, Vocational education.

Signing Authority

This document of the U.S. Department of Education was signed on August 14, 2025, by Linda McMahon, Secretary of Education. That document with the original signature and date is maintained by the U.S. Department of Education. For administrative purposes only, and in compliance with requirements of the Office of the Federal Register, the undersigned has been authorized to sign the document in electronic format for publication, as an official document of the U.S. Department of Education. This administrative process in no way alters the legal effect of this document upon publication in the **Federal Register**.

Tracey St. Pierre,

Director, Office of the Executive Secretariat, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Education.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Secretary of Education proposes to amend part 685 of title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 685—WILLIAM D. FORD FEDERAL DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM

■ 1. The authority citation for part 685 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1070g, 1087a, *et seq.,* unless otherwise noted.

■ 2. Amend § 685.219 by:
■ a. Adding paragraphs markers to (b);
■ b. Adding new subsections (h),(i), (j) and (k).
■ c. Adding new paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(3), (b)(4),(b)(10),(b)(12), (b)(17), (b)(30), (b)(31), (b)(32), (b)(33), (b)(34), (b)(35), (c)(4), (e)(9),(e)(10), (g)(7); (; and
■ c. Amending paragraphs b (27), (c)(2), and (g).
■ 2. The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 685.219 Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program (PSLF).

(b) * * *

(1) *Aiding or abetting* has the same meaning as defined under 18 U.S.C. 2.

(2) AmeriCorps service means service in a position approved by the Corporation for National and Community Service under section 123 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12573).

(3) *Chemical castration or mutilation* means—

(i) the use of puberty blockers, including GnRH agonists and other interventions, to delay the onset or progression of normally timed puberty in an individual who does not identify as his or her sex; and

(ii) the use of sex hormones, such as androgen blockers, estrogen, progesterone, or testosterone, to align an individual's physical appearance with an identity that differs from his or her sex.

(4) *Child or children* for the sole and specific purpose of this section means an individual or individuals under 19 years of age.

(5) *Civilian service to the military* means providing services to or on behalf of members, veterans, or the families or survivors of deceased members of the U.S. Armed Forces or the National Guard that is provided to a person because of the person's status in one of those groups.

(6) *Early childhood education program* means an early childhood education program as defined in section 103(8) of the Act (20 U.S.C. 1003).

(7) *Eligible Direct Loan* means a Direct Subsidized Loan, a Direct Unsubsidized Loan, a Direct PLUS Loan, or a Direct Consolidation Loan.

(8) *Emergency management* means services that help remediate, lessen, or eliminate the effects or potential effects of emergencies that threaten human life or health, or real property.

(9) *Employee or employed* means an individual—

(i) To whom an organization issues an IRS Form W–2;

(ii) Who receives an IRS Form W–2 from an organization that has contracted with a qualifying employer to provide payroll or similar services for the qualifying employer, and which provides the Form W–2 under that contract;

(iii) who works as a contracted employee for a qualifying employer in a position or providing services which, under applicable state law, cannot be filled or provided by a direct employee of the qualifying employer.

(10) *Foreign Terrorist Organizations* mean organizations on the list published under paragraph (a)(2)(A)(ii) under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

(11) *Full-time* means:

(i) Working in qualifying employment in one or more jobs—

(A) A minimum average of 30 hours per week during the period being certified.

(B) A minimum of 30 hours per week throughout a contractual or employment period of at least 8 months in a 12-month period, such as elementary and secondary school teachers and professors and instructors, in higher education, in which case the borrower is deemed to have worked full time; or

(C) The equivalent of 30 hours per week as determined by multiplying each credit or contact hour taught per week by at least 3.35 in non-tenure track employment at an institution of higher education.

(12) *Illegal discrimination* means a violation of any Federal discrimination law including, but not limited to, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 1981 *et seq.*), Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 *et seq.*).

(13) *Law enforcement* means service that is publicly funded and whose principal activities pertain to crime prevention, control or reduction of crime, or the enforcement of criminal law.

(14) *Military service* means ''active duty'' service or ''full-time National Guard duty'' as defined in section 101(d)(1) and (d)(5) of title 10 in the United States Code and does not include active duty for training or attendance at a service school.

(15) *Non-governmental public service* means services provided by employees of a non-governmental qualified employer where the employer has devoted a majority of its full-time equivalent employees to working in at

least one of the following areas (as defined in this section): emergency management, civilian service to military personnel, military service, public safety, law enforcement, public interest law services, early childhood education, public service for individuals with disabilities or the elderly, public health, public education, public library services, school library, or other school-based services. Service as a member of the U.S. Congress is not qualifying public service employment for purposes of this section.

(16) *Non-tenure track employment* means work performed by adjunct, contingent or part time faculty, teachers, or lecturers who are paid based on the credit hours they teach at institutions of higher education.

(17) *Other Federal Immigration laws* mean any violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1105 *et seq.*) or any other Federal immigration laws.

(18) *Other school-based service* means the provision of services to schools or students in a school or a school-like setting that are not public education services, such as school health services and school nurse services, social work services in schools, and parent counseling and training.

(19) *Peace Corps position* means a full-time assignment under the Peace Corps Act as provided for under 22 U.S.C. 2504.

(20) *Public education service* means the provision of educational enrichment or support to students in a public school or a public school-like setting, including teaching.

(21) *Public health* means those engaged in the following occupations (as those terms are defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics): physicians, nurse practitioners, nurses in a clinical setting, health care practitioners, health care support, counselors, social workers, and other community and social service specialists.

(22) *Public interest law* means legal services that are funded in whole or in part by a local, State, Federal, or Tribal government.

(23) *Public library service* means the operation of public libraries or services that support their operation.

(24) *Public safety service* means services that seek to prevent the need for emergency management services.

(25) *Public service for individuals with disabilities* means services performed for or to assist individuals with disabilities (as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12102)) that is provided to a person because of the person's status as an individual with a disability.

(26) *Public service for the elderly* means services that are provided to individuals who are aged 62 years or older and that are provided to a person because of the person's status as an individual of that age.

(27) *Qualifying employer* means:

(i)

(A) A United States-based Federal, State, local, or Tribal government organization, agency, or entity, including the U.S. Armed Forces or the National Guard;

(B) A public child or family service agency;

(C) An organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code;

(D) A Tribal college or university; or

(E) A nonprofit organization that—

(1) Provides a non-governmental public service as defined in this section, attested to by the employer on a form approved by the Secretary; and

(2) Is not a business organized for profit, a labor union, or a partisan political organization; and

(ii) Does not include organizations that engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, as defined in this section.

(28) *Qualifying repayment plan* means:

(i) An income-driven repayment plan under § 685.209;

(ii) The 10-year standard repayment plan under § 685.208(b) or the consolidation loan standard repayment plan with a 10-year repayment term under § 685.208(c); or

(iii) Except for the alternative repayment plan, any other repayment plan if the monthly payment amount is not less than what would have been paid under the 10-year standard repayment plan under § 685.208(b).

(29) *School library services* mean the operations of school libraries or services that support their operation.

(30) *Substantial illegal purpose* means—

(i) aiding or abetting violations of 8 U.S.C. 1325 or other Federal immigration laws;

(ii) supporting terrorism, including by facilitating funding to, or the operations of, cartels designated as Foreign Terrorist Organizations consistent with 8 U.S.C. 1189, or by engaging in violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy;

(iii) engaging in the chemical and surgical castration or mutilation of children in violation of Federal or State law;

(iv) engaging in the trafficking of children to states for purposes of emancipation from their lawful parents in violation of Federal or State law;

(v) engaging in a pattern of aiding and abetting illegal discrimination; or

(vi) engaging in a pattern of violating State laws as defined in paragraph (34) of this subsection.

(31) *Surgical castration or mutilation* means surgical procedures that attempt to transform an individual's physical appearance to align with an identity that differs from his or her sex or that attempt to alter or remove an individual's sexual organs to minimize or destroy their natural biological functions.

(32) *Terrorism* is defined under the Crimes and Criminal Procedure (18 U.S.C. 2331).

(33) *Trafficking* means transporting a child or children from their State of legal residence to another State without permission or legal consent from the parent or legal guardian for purposes of emancipation from their lawful parents or legal guardian, in violation of applicable law.

(34) *Violating State law* means a final, non-default judgment by a State court of:

(i) trespassing;

(ii) disorderly conduct;

(iii) public nuisance;

(iv) vandalism; or

(v) obstruction of highways.

(35) *Violence for the purpose of obstructing or influencing Federal Government policy* means violating any part of 18 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.* by committing a crime of violence as defined under 18 U.S.C. 16.

(c) *Borrower eligibility.*

* * * * *

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (c)(4) of this section, a borrower will be considered to have made monthly payments under paragraph (c)(1)(iii) of this section by—

* * * * *

(4) Effective on or after July 1, 2026, through a standard as described in subsection (h) of this section, no payment shall be credited as a qualifying payment for any month subsequent to a determination that a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose, as described in this section.

* * * * *

(e) *Application process.*

* * * * *

(9) If the Secretary has notified the borrower's employer that the employer may no longer satisfy the definition of qualifying employer set forth in subsection (b)(28) of this section, pending a determination made under subsection (h) of this section, the

Secretary notifies the borrower of the potential change in the employer's status.

(10) If the Secretary has determined the borrower's employer has ceased to be qualifying employer as a result of a determination made under subsection (h) of this section, the Secretary notifies the borrower of the change in the employer's status.

* * * * *

(g) *Borrower reconsideration process.*

* * * * *

(7) Notwithstanding paragraph (g)(1) of this section, a borrower may not request reconsideration under this subsection (g) based on the Secretary's determination that the organization lost its status as a qualifying employer due to engaging in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose under the standard described in subsection (h) of this section.

(h) *Standard for determining a qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.*

(1) The Secretary determines by a preponderance of the evidence, and after notice and opportunity to respond, that a qualifying employer has engaged on or after July 1, 2026, in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose by considering the materiality of any illegal activities or actions. In making such a determination, the Secretary shall presume that any of the following is conclusive evidence that the employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose:

(i) A final judgment by a State or Federal court, whereby the employer is found to have engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose;

(ii) A plea of guilty or *nolo contendere,* whereby the employer admits to have engaged in activities that have substantial illegal purpose or pleads *nolo contendere* to allegations that the employer engaged in activities that have substantial illegal purpose; or

(iii) A settlement that includes admission by the employer that it engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose described in subsection (h) of this section.

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to determine an employer has a substantial illegal purpose based upon the employer or its employees exercising their First Amendment protected rights, or any other rights protected under the Constitution.

(i) *Process for determining when an employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.*

(1) The Secretary will determine that a qualifying employer violated the standard under subsection (h) of this section when the Secretary:

(i) Receives an application as referenced under subsection (e) of this section in which the employer fails to certify that it did not participate in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose; or

(ii) Determines that the qualifying employer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose under subsection (h) of this section, unless, prior to the issuance of the Secretary's final determination, the Secretary which includes the factors set forth in subsection (j)(2) of this section.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (i)(1), the Secretary shall, in the event an employer is operating under a shared identification number or other unique identifier, consider the organization to be separate if the employer is operating separately and distinctly, for the purposes of determining whether an employer is eligible.

(j) *Regaining eligibility as a qualifying employer.* An organization that loses eligibility for failure to meet the conditions of paragraph (b)(27) of this section may regain eligibility to become a qualifying employer after—

(1) 10 years from the date the Secretary determines the organization engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose in accordance with subsection (h) of this section, if, at or after that time, the organization certifies on a borrower's subsequent application that the organization is no longer engaged in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose as defined in paragraph (b)(30) of this section; or

(2) The Secretary approves a corrective action plan signed by the employer that includes—

(i) a certification by the employer that it is no longer engaging in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose as defined in paragraph (b)(30) of this section;

(ii) a report describing the employer's compliance controls that are designed to ensure that the employer does not continue to engage in activities that have a substantial illegal purpose as defined in paragraph (b)(30) of this section in the future; and

(iii) any other terms or conditions imposed by the Secretary designed to ensure that employers do not engage in actions or activities that have a substantial illegal purpose.

(k) *Borrower notification of regained eligibility.* If an employer regains eligibility under subsection (j) of this section, the Secretary shall update the qualifying employer list, which is accessible to borrowers for purposes of certification or application.

[FR Doc. 2025–15665 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

FEDERAL REGISTER

Vol. 90 Monday,
No. 157 August 18, 2025

Part III

Department of the Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 20

Migratory Bird Hunting; Final 2025–26 Frameworks for Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations; Final Rule

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 20

[Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2024–0127; FXMB1231099BPP0–256–FF09M32000]

RIN 1018–BH65

Migratory Bird Hunting; Final 2025–26 Frameworks for Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or we) is establishing the final frameworks from which States may select season dates, limits, and other options for the 2025–26 migratory game bird hunting season. We annually prescribe limits (which we call frameworks) within which States may select hunting seasons. Frameworks specify the outside dates, season lengths, shooting hours, bag and possession limits, and areas where migratory game bird hunting may occur. These frameworks are necessary to allow State selections of seasons and limits and to allow harvest at levels compatible with migratory game bird population status and habitat conditions. Migratory game bird hunting seasons provide opportunities for recreation and sustenance, and aid Federal, State, and Tribal governments in the management of migratory game birds.

DATES: This rule takes effect on August 18, 2025.

ADDRESSES: States should send their season selections to: Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS: MB, 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041–3803. You may inspect comments received on the migratory bird hunting regulations at *https://www.regulations.gov* at Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2024–0127. You may obtain copies of referenced reports from the street address above, or from the Division of Migratory Bird Management's website at *https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-birds,* or at *https://www.regulations.gov* at Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2024–0127.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerome Ford, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, (703) 358–2606. Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services. Individuals outside the United States should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point-of-contact in the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Process for Establishing Annual Migratory Game Bird Hunting Regulations

The process for promulgating annual regulations for the hunting of migratory game birds involves the publication of a series of proposed and final rulemaking documents. We provided a detailed overview of the current process in the August 3, 2017, **Federal Register** (82 FR 36308). This final rule is the third in a series of proposed and final rules that establish regulations for the 2025–26 migratory game bird hunting season in title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

On January 21, 2025, we published in the **Federal Register** (90 FR 7056) a proposal to amend 50 CFR part 20. The proposal provided a background and overview of the migratory bird hunting regulations process, and addressed the establishment of seasons, limits, and other regulations for hunting migratory game birds under §§ 20.101 through 20.107, 20.109, and 20.110 of subpart K. Major steps in the regulations development process for the 2025–26 hunting season relating to open public meetings and **Federal Register** notifications were illustrated in the diagram at the end of the January 21, 2025, proposed rule.

Further, in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056) we explained that sections of subsequent documents outlining hunting frameworks and guidelines would be organized under numbered headings, which were set forth in that proposed rule. This document refers only to numbered items requiring attention and omits those items not requiring attention. Therefore, the numbered items are discontinuous, and the list appears incomplete.

The January 21, 2025, proposed rule provided detailed information on the proposed 2025–26 regulatory schedule. We provided the meeting dates and locations for the Service's Migratory Bird Regulations Committee (SRC) on our website at *https://www.fws.gov/event/us-fish-and-wildlife-service-migratory-bird-regulations-committee-meeting* and Flyway Council meetings on Flyway calendars posted on our website at *https://www.fws.gov/partner/migratory-bird-program-administrative-flyways.* The SRC conducted an open meeting with the Flyway Council Consultants on May 17, 2024, to discuss preliminary issues for the 2025–26 regulations, and on November 19, 2024, to review information on the current status of migratory game birds and develop recommendations for the 2025–26 regulations for these species.

On April 24, 2025, we published in the **Federal Register** (90 FR 17300) the proposed regulatory frameworks for the 2025–26 migratory game bird hunting season. We have considered all pertinent comments received, which includes comments submitted in response to our January 21, 2025, and April 24, 2025, proposed rulemaking documents and comments from the May and November SRC meetings. This document establishes final regulatory frameworks for the 2025–26 migratory game bird hunting season and includes no substantive changes from the April 24, 2025, proposed rule. We will publish State season selections in the **Federal Register** as amendments to §§ 20.101 through 20.107 and 20.109 of title 50 CFR part 20.

Population Status and Harvest

Each year, we publish reports that provide detailed information on the status and harvest of certain migratory game bird species and details of our adaptive harvest management decision framework assessments. These reports contain descriptions of species population segments referenced in status assessments. These reports are available at the address indicated under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** or from our website at *https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/population-status, https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/migratory-bird-hunting-activity-and-harvest-reports,* and *https://www.fws.gov/project/adaptive-harvest-management.*

We used the following annual reports published in August 2024 in the development of these regulatory frameworks for the migratory bird hunting season. These reports can be found on our website at the above hyperlinks.

- Adaptive Harvest Management, 2025 Hunting Season;
- American Woodcock Population Status, 2024;
- Band-tailed Pigeon Population Status, 2024;
- Migratory Bird Hunting Activity and Harvest During the 2022–23 and 2023–24 Hunting Seasons;
- Mourning Dove Population Status, 2024;
- Status and Harvests of Sandhill Cranes, Mid-continent, Rocky Mountain, Lower Colorado River Valley and Eastern Populations, 2024; and

• Waterfowl Population Status, 2024.

Our long-term objectives continue to include providing opportunities to harvest portions of certain migratory game bird populations and to limit harvests to levels compatible with each population's ability to maintain healthy, viable numbers. Migratory game bird hunting seasons provide opportunities for recreation and sustenance, and aid Federal, State, and Tribal governments in the management of migratory game birds. Having taken into account the zones of temperature and the distribution, abundance, economic value, breeding habits, and times and lines of flight of migratory birds, we conclude that the final hunting seasons provided for herein are compatible with the current status of migratory bird populations and long-term population goals. Additionally, we are obligated to, and do, give serious consideration to all information received during the public comment period.

Summary of Public Comments and Response

The preliminary proposed rulemaking, which appeared in the January 21, 2025, **Federal Register**, opened the public comment period for migratory game bird hunting regulations for the 2025–26 hunting season. We subsequently published in the **Federal Register** the proposed regulatory frameworks (Federal limits) for the 2025–26 migratory game bird hunting season on April 24, 2025, which also included a request for public comments. We indicated in both rulemaking documents that we would summarize the comments received and publish responses to all pertinent written comments when we developed these final frameworks for the 2025–26 season.

We received a total of 56 unique (plus 3 duplicate and 2 unrelated to the proposed rule) written comments from individuals and organizations on the proposed rules, which contained 101 individual substantive comments. We received 16 comments providing general support for all or some of the provisions of this rulemaking. Due to the number of comments, this summary presents major themes (issues) occurring throughout the comments. We grouped and discussed comments of a similar nature under the issue headings identified below. Although we considered several comments to be outside the scope of this rulemaking, we summarize these and respond for completeness unless the comment scope was outside of migratory game bird hunting in the United States. In addition, we considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into the final rule all relevant information obtained through the public comment periods.

Hunting and the Regulation Development Process in General

Issue: Opposed to the killing of migratory game birds, and distrust in the data on which the migratory bird hunting regulations are based and the hunting regulations development process.

Response: As we indicated above under Population Status and Harvest, our long-term objectives continue to include providing opportunities to harvest portions of certain migratory game bird populations and to limit harvests to levels compatible with each population's ability to maintain healthy, viable numbers. Sustaining migratory bird populations and ensuring a variety of sustainable uses, including harvest, is consistent with the guiding principles by which migratory birds are to be managed under the conventions between the United States and several foreign nations for the protection and management of these birds. The conventions form the basis of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA, 16 U.S.C. 703–12). We have taken into account available information and considered the public comments, and we continue to conclude that the hunting seasons provided for herein are compatible with the current status of migratory bird populations and long-term population goals.

The data we use to evaluate migratory game bird status are based on an extensive portfolio of State and Federal cooperative monitoring programs. These monitoring programs involve species-specific surveys based on statistical designs that allow for defensible and unbiased inference to the migratory bird populations of interest. We also consider any other applicable information that may be available from other monitoring programs including climate data and remote sensing data to evaluate habitat conditions. We continuously work with our partners and university academicians to review our monitoring programs and improve survey reliability and efficiency. Most all our monitoring programs have undergone multiple reviews, and we have made changes to our surveys as appropriate to account for new information and developing technologies. Above, under Population Status and Harvest, we have identified reports that provide detailed information on our cooperative monitoring programs and the status and harvest of certain migratory game bird species. As always, we continue to seek new information and improve the reliability and efficiency of our monitoring programs.

Regarding the regulations process, the Flyway Council system of migratory bird management has been a longstanding example of successful State–Federal cooperative management since its establishment in 1952. The Service and States have similar legal mandates for migratory bird conservation. Thus, the Service and States collaborate through the Flyway Council system to most effectively achieve mutual objectives for migratory bird conservation including the development of cooperative migratory bird population and habitat monitoring programs and in regulation development. The regulations development process is open to public observation and review. However, as always, we continue to seek new ways to streamline and improve the process and ensure adequate conservation of migratory birds.

Specifically, the Service's Migratory Bird Regulations Committee (SRC) is responsible for considering recommendations from the Service and Flyway Councils and recommending changes to decision frameworks and Federal limits for migratory game bird hunting. The SRC recommendations are provided to the Service Director and are subsequently considered by the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks acting on behalf of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. Those recommendations are published in the **Federal Register** for public comment. Consistent with Federal regulations at 50 CFR 20.153–20.155, SRC meetings may be attended by any person outside the Department of the Interior. Notices of these meetings are published on the Service's Migratory Bird Program website at least 2 weeks before the meeting. These meetings are open to the public for observation, and the public may submit written comments to the Service's Migratory Bird Program. Minutes of the proceedings are maintained for each meeting of the SRC for which notice is published. A public file is established for each rulemaking containing written comments and other significant written and oral communications which occur after the notice of proposed rulemaking. The public file includes copies of or references to any other significant data or information.

Additionally, notice of each Flyway Council meeting to be attended by any Department of the Interior official is announced on the Service's Migratory Bird Program website at least 2 weeks

before the meeting or as soon as practicable after the Department of the Interior learns of the meeting. The notices state the time, place, and general subject(s) of the meeting.

Federal Limits for Duck Hunting

Issue: Based on personal observations of current duck population and habitat status, the recommended duck hunting season lengths and female mallard restrictions from the adaptive harvest management (AHM) decision frameworks appear too liberal.

Response: In our January 21, 2025, preliminary rule, we state that we will continue to use AHM to make informed and objective decisions about appropriate duck-hunting regulations (90 FR 7056 at 7061). AHM is a tool that permits sound resource decisions in the face of uncertain regulatory impacts and provides a mechanism for reducing that uncertainty over time. We use an AHM decision framework to evaluate four regulatory alternatives, each with a different expected harvest level, and choose the optimal regulation for duck hunting based on the status and demographics of specific populations of ducks, including those of special concern. By annually comparing predicted vs. observed abundance and harvest, we update model weights and parameters and incorporate this new information to improve our understanding of the dynamics of managed populations. The process is optimal in that each year it provides the regulatory choice necessary to maximize management performance. It is also adaptive in that the decision framework evolves to account for new information.

All the AHM decision frameworks used to determine appropriate duck hunting regulations have been peer reviewed, vetted through the Service and Flyway Councils via their collaborative Harvest Management Working Group, and published in the **Federal Register** as proposed and final rulemakings. These rulemakings involved a public comment period (see, for example, the recently adopted AHM decision framework to guide pintail harvest management decisions in our April 24, 2025, proposed rule). We have already addressed any comments we received when these were developed and proposed for use. We continue to review these decision frameworks and look for ways to improve them in collaboration with the Flyway Councils. However, since adoption of each specific decision framework, we have not received any comments that have identified a flaw in the technical underpinnings. The benefit of AHM is that we can continue to make defensible informed and objective decisions in the face of bird demographic uncertainty with a process that enables learning while doing. We have specified our management objectives, predictive models, measures of model weights, model parameter estimates with credibility intervals, and the set of regulatory alternatives for each AHM decision framework.

Female-specific duck bag limits currently only exist for mallards where hunters may generally discern males and females by plumage characteristics during most of the hunting season. Female mallard restrictions have existed in Federal regulations since at least the 1970s (see, for example, the migratory game bird hunting regulations for the 1976–77 hunting season published in the **Federal Register** on September 7, 1976, 41 FR 37582). However, there are no data that indicates the necessity or benefit of these restrictions in increasing survival or reproduction rates at the population level for mallards or in comparison to other duck populations without sex-specific regulations. Though it might seem counterintuitive, research and scientific modeling in development of the pintail harvest strategy show that restricting the harvest of female pintails would not meaningfully affect the subsequent breeding population. Furthermore, an underlying objective of hunting regulations is to minimize their complexity and ensure that hunters can reasonably comply with them. Sex-specific duck bag limits complicate hunting regulations and places a burden on hunters that may have difficulty identifying gender for some species of ducks in certain hunting situations. However, hunters may use voluntary restraint in choosing duck species and genders to harvest within overall duck bag limits.

Clarity of AHM Decision Criteria

Issue: The proposed framework mentions selecting ''the optimal regulation'' based on terms such as ''maximum long-term sustainable harvest'' and ''98 percent of maximum sustainable harvest,'' but it does not provide explicit thresholds, methodologies, or weightings that underlie these AHM decisions.

Response: We understand the concern and will make every effort to better reference the reports for this additional information that is too great in volume to provide in the rulemaking documents. In the proposed and final framework rules, we list the annual reports in the development of these regulatory frameworks for the migratory bird hunting season (see above under Population Status and Harvest). One of the referenced reports is the Adaptive Harvest Management, 2025 Hunting Season (*https://www.fws.gov/media/adaptive-harvest-management-2025-hunting-season*). This report contains a detailed accounting of the objectives, assessments, model weights and parameters, and resultant optimal harvest management policies. These optimal policies are then used with current bird abundance and habitat information to make informed and objective decisions. Review of the supporting AHM report should make clear the current optimal harvest management policies and state of the resource information that we used to arrive at decisions for the season frameworks for the upcoming duck hunting season.

State-Specific Hunting Seasons

Issue: Individual preference for more restrictive season length and bag limit or specific dates for the duck season in a State where they hunt based on local experience and observations.

Response: The Service annually develops migratory game bird hunting regulations by establishing the frameworks, or limits, for season dates, season lengths, shooting hours, bag and possession limits, and areas where migratory game bird hunting may occur. These frameworks are necessary to allow harvest at levels compatible with migratory game bird population status and habitat conditions. After the frameworks are established, States may select migratory game bird hunting seasons within the frameworks. States may always be more conservative in their selections than the frameworks, but never more liberal. The annual process of developing migratory game bird hunting regulations concludes when we establish the State season selections as Federal regulations under 50 CFR part 20, subpart K.

States have their own process for determining their season selections provided to the Service for publication as a Federal regulation and for promulgating their own migratory game bird hunting regulations. States undoubtedly make every effort to consider the timing and distribution of migratory game bird abundance in their State and to consider the varied preferences of their constituents to provide the greatest hunting opportunity and experience. Those wishing to provide input on State-specific migratory game bird management and hunting regulations are encouraged to contact their State wildlife agency to learn more about the opportunities for public input.

Lastly, we note that the Federal limits are based on an assessment of available demographic and habitat data at the migratory game bird population level. The timing of bird migration and distribution across State and local areas can vary widely depending on a number of factors including weather patterns, water distribution, temperature, habitat availability, hunting pressure, and a number of other factors outside of our control. These factors can have a substantial influence on the number of birds that hunters may see during an outing and the quality of the hunting experience.

Youth and Veterans—Active Military Waterfowl Hunting Days

Issue: Women should be allowed to hunt during these special waterfowl hunting days to increase female participation in hunting.

Response: Females are currently allowed to hunt during the special youth and veterans—active military waterfowl hunting days, so long as they meet the other qualifications for group membership and may be a non-hunting participant. The Service established special youth hunting days in 1996 (61 FR 49232 at 49234, September 18, 1996). The stated purpose was to introduce youth to the concepts of ethical utilization and stewardship of waterfowl and other natural resources, encourage youngsters and adults to experience the outdoors together, and contribute toward the long-term conservation of the migratory bird resource (61 FR 30490 at 30491, June 14, 1996). The Service's intent was not to recruit youth hunters, but to provide the best and safest learning environment for our youth who are interested in hunting (61 FR 49232, September 18, 1996; and 63 FR 38707, July 17, 1998).

The John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (Act), signed into law on March 12, 2019 (Pub. L. 116–9), amended the MBTA to codify the Service's existing 2 youth waterfowl hunting days and 2 additional hunting days for veterans and active military personnel. Thus, as directed by Congress in the Act, we have adopted the inclusion of the 2 additional days for veterans and active military personnel into the frameworks since the 2019–20 hunting season. The purpose of the special waterfowl hunting days for veterans and active military personnel is not explicit in the Act but is assumably to honor these individuals rather than recruit a specific group of hunters.

Many States have programs to increase the recruitment, retention, and reactivation (R3) of participants in hunting and shooting sports. States could designate any of their regular duck season days as open to only a certain group of hunters for the benefit of their R3 efforts. However, we note that any hunting days that exclude certain hunters reduces opportunity for those individuals, particularly when the Federal frameworks already allow a general duck season length of 107 days, the maximum allowed by the MBTA for any species.

Economic Analysis for Migratory Game Bird Hunting

Issue: Economics is driving the regulatory decisions rather than biology, the data used (2011 and 2016 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation) are outdated. The many other values (culture and tradition, social, environmental connection, conservation support) of migratory game bird hunting should be addressed.

Response: The Service establishes annual regulations governing migratory game bird hunting based entirely on current biological data, our legal mandate under the MBTA for long-term sustainability, and our objectives for providing hunting opportunities. The annual regulations include open seasons, daily bag and possession limits, shooting hours, areas where hunting may occur, and other restrictions. These annual regulations ensure that harvest occurs at levels compatible with migratory game bird population demographics, including production and survival, which vary in space and time with habitat conditions.

Our long-term objectives continue to include providing opportunities to harvest portions of certain migratory game bird populations and to limit harvests to levels compatible with each population's ability to maintain healthy, viable numbers. The Service's goals and objectives for migratory game bird harvest management are specified in a 2013 supplemental environmental impact statement (78 FR 32686, May 31, 2013) and the March 13, 1987, proposed rule (52 FR 7900). Migratory game bird hunting seasons provide opportunities for recreation and sustenance, and aid Federal, State, and Tribal governments in the management of migratory game birds.

Annually, the Service conducts formal assessments of monitoring data on migratory game bird status and harvest to determine the biologically appropriate hunting regulations for the upcoming hunting season and in consultation with the four Flyway Councils. We publish reports that provide detailed information on the status and harvest of certain migratory game bird species and the AHM assessments that explicitly review the biological data, objectives for harvest management, and the expected harvests and population level impacts under each regulatory alternative we considered. We choose the optimal regulation for duck hunting based on the status and demographics of these birds and objectives for long-term conservation and harvest opportunity.

The resultant economic effects that are generated by migratory bird hunting are substantial, estimated at about $2.7 billion in associated economic activity (see below under Required Determinations, *Regulatory Flexibility Act*), and generate substantial resources for migratory bird management and habitat conservation. However, the economic benefits have no bearing on the selection of appropriate annual hunting regulations. We conduct an economic analysis each year to comply with Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) to ensure that the annual hunting regulations minimize negative economic impacts on small business entities, such as restaurants, grocery stores, lodging, transportation, and sporting goods stores. Opening the migratory game bird hunting season annually generates economic activity for small businesses that would otherwise not be possible.

Regarding the data used in the economic analysis, we used the data most currently available. Due to rising costs, the 2022 Survey focused on high-level, national data only and did not collect detailed migratory bird hunter expenditure data as was done in previous surveys completed about every 5 years (U.S. Department of Interior 2022). Therefore, we used the 2016 Survey's migratory bird hunter expenditure data inflation adjusted to 2024 dollars. We continue to search for consistent, reliable, national expenditure data for migratory bird hunters.

We agree that hunters derive benefits from hunting, including harvesting game birds, being outdoors, and appreciating their environment. We address these benefits within the consumer surplus analysis conducted as part of our economic analysis. We also recognize that all people may derive benefits from abundant, self-sustaining migratory game bird populations and healthy habitats, and that support for conservation depends on hunters and non-hunters alike. The connection between people, abundant game birds, and healthy habitats is the focus of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan. However, it is beyond the scope of

our economic analysis for this rulemaking to evaluate how hunting regulations affect income and support for conservation efforts. Hunting regulations are developed based on objectives for abundant self-sustaining game bird populations and harvest opportunity, and in consideration of hunter preferences based on available human dimensions information.

Two-Tier Hunting Regulations Pilot Study

Issue: Hunters may not be able to comply with bag limits with the relaxation of hunter requirements to identify duck species, and these regulations are not needed as data indicate active hunter numbers are increasing or stable for many migratory game bird species.

Response: In 2020, we authorized a request from the Central Flyway Council for a 4-year pilot study on a two-tier duck hunting regulatory system in South Dakota and Nebraska. The intent of the two-tier regulation study is to evaluate whether regulations that relax the requirement for hunters to identify duck species can improve active duck hunter participation, which is demonstrated to be declining in most States. We anticipate minimal impacts from the pilot study to species of special concern because the two-tier system applies only under the liberal or moderate regulatory alternatives for the general duck season and there is a reduced bag limit for the hunters participating in the tier with relaxed requirements to identify duck species. Also, hunters in South Dakota and Nebraska do not generally harvest many duck species of special concern, and those species have bag limits that are more restrictive than the general duck season bag limit. We will not expand this two-tier regulatory system to other States or migratory game bird species groups until completion of a final report and evaluation of the pilot study, which includes analysis of species of special concern. The pilot study report is due to the Service by September 2025. Any proposed continuation or expansion of the two-tier regulation study will be published in the **Federal Register** to allow for public review and comment.

Zones and Split Season Guidelines for Ducks and Doves

Issue: Zones and split seasons increase hunting exposure days and are not biologically sustainable.

Response: The Service has allowed the use of zones to provide equitable distribution of duck and dove hunting opportunities within a State or region since 1942 at the request of the Flyway Councils. In 1978 and 2011, we prepared environmental assessments on the use of zones to set duck hunting regulations. The Service has been clear that the intent is not to increase total annual harvest in the zoned areas; harvest levels are to be adjusted downward if they exceed traditional levels because of zoning. However, we acknowledge that use of zones and splits may increase migratory game birds to more hunting exposure days, and evaluating harvest and other impacts on migratory game bird demographics may be exceedingly difficult to estimate without a statistical study design.

In 1991, the Service developed guidelines to provide a framework for controlling the proliferation of zones and split seasons in duck and dove hunting. The guidelines identify a limited number of zone and split-season configurations that could be used for duck and dove hunting and restricted the frequency of changes in State selection among these configurations to the beginning of 5-year intervals. The guidelines were established in part to facilitate evaluation of the biological impacts from use of zones and split seasons. Any negative impacts to duck and dove population abundance from use of zones and split seasons as allowed in our guidelines would be accounted for in our annual process to monitor game bird population status and determine appropriate hunting regulations to ensure long-term population conservation and hunting opportunities, for example, the possibility of establishing more frequent restrictive seasons.

In 2011 and 2021, when we last added additional zones and split-seasons configurations at the request of the Flyway Councils, we required States to conduct an evaluation of impacts to hunter dynamics and harvest to evaluate the costs and benefits of additional configurations. We look forward to receiving the evaluation reports by September 2026 from States that selected the new zones and split-seasons configuration that we added in 2020. In the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056), we proposed to adopt the same zones and split-season guidelines and configurations for duck hunting as we used for the 2021–25 seasons with no changes or expansion. We note that long-term trends for applicable ducks and doves have been sustainable.

Basic Hunting Regulations

Issue: Basic hunting regulations are either too liberal (allowing for the use of electronic spinning wing and other motion decoys, baiting and allowance of intentionally flooded standing crops, and captive mallard release) or restrictive (possession limits) and need review considering current agricultural practices, hunting techniques, and technologies.

Response: This rulemaking is specific to annual regulations for migratory game bird hunting, which include open seasons, daily bag and possession limits, shooting hours, areas where hunting may occur, and other restrictions. These annual regulations ensure that harvest occurs at levels compatible with migratory game bird population demographics, including production and survival, which vary in space and time with habitat conditions. We are not proposing any changes to the basic hunting regulations governing the hunting of migratory birds, which generally do not change based on the status of populations and environmental conditions. Basic regulations include hunting methods.

We acknowledge that we have received an increasing number of inquiries about basic hunting methods in light of advancing technologies, for example, legality of air guns, electronic motion decoys, and artificial baits, as well as comments on related issues including wanton waste and termination of possession. We have been working with the Department of Interior's Office of Law Enforcement to consider the timing and scope of this undertaking. Any such rulemaking effort will begin with an advance notice of proposed rulemaking published in the **Federal Register** to solicit public input on the issues.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Issue: NEPA consideration was not adequate, particularly on habitat degradation and broader ecosystem impacts.

Response: As we state below under Required Determinations, the Service has complied with NEPA for this rulemaking via the programmatic document, Second Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Issuance of Annual Regulations Permitting the Sport Hunting of Migratory Birds (2013 SEIS; EIS No. 20130139), filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on May 24, 2013. The 2013 SEIS addresses NEPA compliance by the Service for issuance of the annual framework regulations for hunting of migratory game bird species. We published a notice of availability for the 2013 SEIS in the **Federal Register** on May 31, 2013 (78 FR 32686) and our record of decision on July 26, 2013 (78

FR 45376). We also address NEPA compliance for waterfowl hunting frameworks through the annual preparation of separate environmental assessments that tiers off the 2013 SEIS. The most recent of these documents is the Duck Hunting Regulations for the 2024–25 Season and corresponding 2024 finding of no significant impact, available at *https://www.regulations.gov* at Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2023–0113. We note that 2013 SEIS has an entire section on the affected environment (see chapter 4, pp. 59–152) and environmental consequences (see chapter 6, pp. 171–229) and provides public comments received during the open comment period and the Service response (see chapter 7, pp. 231–244).

Possible New Hunting Regulations Process

Issue: The new process must continue to use migratory game bird monitoring data and evaluation to inform appropriate Federal limits for hunting, be no less responsive to the biological need for regulatory changes, and allow for public comment.

Response: In the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056), we said we may propose a new approach of authorizing annual migratory bird hunting seasons, and that this would be published as a new proposed rule under RIN 1018–BI04 for public review and comment. All comments on that proposed rule will be considered as we continue to develop a new approach to authorizing annual migratory bird hunting seasons.

Bird Population Stressors

Issue: Impacts to migratory game bird populations from stressors, particularly highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) in waterfowl and sea ducks, was not adequately accounted for in the determination of the Federal limits for the hunting of these birds.

Response: HPAI viruses can severely affect domestic animal, wildlife, and sometimes human health. Outbreaks of Eurasian lineage HPAI viruses have been impacting domestic poultry and wild bird populations in Europe and Asia since August 2020. Introduction of the Eurasian lineage HPAI to North America occurred in late 2021, and at least two additional virus introductions have occurred since then. HPAI cases have now been confirmed in both domestic and wild birds in numerous locations throughout Canada and the United States. The strain of HPAI now present in North America has caused extensive morbidity and mortality events in a range of wild bird species, like that seen in Europe and Asia.

We are working with partners to monitor HPAI and other mortality events of migratory birds, and we anticipate that our current monitoring programs will detect any significant changes to migratory game bird populations. The Service currently chairs the Interagency Steering Committee for Avian Influenza Surveillance in Wild Migratory Birds, which has increased avian influenza surveillance of wild birds across the country. We are coordinating with our partners to ensure effective surveillance through early detection, rapid communications, quick and accurate laboratory diagnoses, and timely relay of diagnostic findings. Also, we are working with our partners to implement prevention and management actions where necessary.

Migratory bird population abundance, survival probabilities, and productivity are influenced by a wide array of biotic and abiotic factors and can vary in space and time. The core of migratory game bird hunting regulations process is an annual cycle of bird population monitoring and subsequent regulation development in cooperation with the States through the Flyway Council system. This annual regulatory cycle begins with the collection of current biological information and subsequent Flyway Council consultation to share, review, and evaluate migratory game bird population status, trends, allowable harvest, and expected harvest from considered alternative regulations. The information considered indirectly includes effects from various stressors in determining appropriate Federal limits for migratory game bird hunting regulations. Each year we apply the most current information on game bird demographics and habitat conditions, which incorporate effects from stressors, to our decision frameworks to help inform decisions on appropriate Federal limits for annual migratory game bird hunting. The annual nature of the migratory game bird hunting regulations process helps ensure that harvest occurs at levels compatible with migratory game bird population demographics. Bird population monitoring, assessment, and consultation with the Flyway Councils ensures that, regardless of the drivers of population status, *i.e.*, stressors, we have considered available information to establish defensible and transparent decisions on annual hunting regulations to achieve State and Federal mandates to conserve migratory birds and meet objectives for hunting opportunity where possible.

Investments in conservation of quality habitats can help offset negative impacts to migratory bird stressors. For example, the Federal Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718–718j, 48 Stat. 452) requires all waterfowl hunters 16 years old or older to buy an annual duck stamp. Funds generated from duck stamp sales are used to protect waterfowl and wetland habitat. Over 1.5 million stamps are sold each year, and, as of 2021, Federal duck stamps have generated more than $1.1 billion for the conservation of more than 6 million acres of waterfowl habitat in the United States. In addition to waterfowl, numerous other birds, mammals, fish, reptiles, and amphibians benefit from habitat protected by the duck stamp revenues, including an estimated one-third of the nation's endangered and threatened species. The healthy wetlands protected by duck stamp funding sequester carbon and contribute to addressing the impacts of climate change, including absorbing flood waters and storm surge. These wetlands purify water supplies and provide economic support to local communities as they attract outdoor recreationists from many different backgrounds. Also, most States have similar Duck Stamp programs that hunters and non-hunters alike support. These are examples of some of the many programs where hunters and other conservationists contribute toward habitat conservation and quality to help offset losses from other stressors.

Interim Pintail Harvest Strategy

Issue: Concern about increasing the daily bag limit from one to three pintails in the face of long-term and recent declines in pintail abundance, lack of a restriction on female pintails within the overall bag limit, and waiting until three seasons with a three-pintail daily bag limit have occurred before evaluation to determine sustainability. One commenter requested an evaluation to see if increasing the pintail bag limit is associated with an increase in mallard abundance.

Response: For several reasons, pintail harvest management has been cautious for the last two decades. There is evidence that the continental carrying capacity for pintails declined by about 50 percent in the early 1980s. Pintail abundance has hovered near historical lows in the last decade.

The previous pintail harvest management decision framework was first used in 2010, but the underlying population model parameters had not been updated. Annual monitoring programs allowed for the incorporation of an additional 10 years of data, including observed harvest rates resulting from seasons with a two-bird daily bag limit (the maximum allowed).

The new interim strategy uses a state-of-the-art integrated population model that links regulations to an expected fall flight, harvest rate, and the resulting effects on population status. An important change is that the model of predicted harvest includes an estimate of fall population size. This has an important effect on the decision framework because the expected harvest decreases with the decreasing fall pintail population size. The status of the pintail population has not changed since the 1990s, and species-specific bag limits are still required because the bag limits for the general duck season may be too great for this population. However, incorporation of new data and updated modeling techniques showed that more harvest opportunity was available than previously realized.

When the 2010 decision framework for pintail harvest management was negotiated, several Flyway Councils expressed concern that allowing a three-bird bag limit option would raise the frequency of closed seasons to intolerable levels. Many of these same concerns remain today, even with the updated population and harvest models. Since 1988, a liberal three-bird season for pintail has only occurred once (in 1997), thus the estimate of the effect of a three-bird bag on harvest is uncertain. Harvest rates from a three-bird bag limit may not be significantly higher than from a two-bird bag. A power analysis suggests that three additional years of experience with a three-bird bag would be needed to clearly discern the difference between the effect of two-bird and three-bird regulations on the harvest in the Pacific Flyway and at the continental level, with longer periods needed to discern the same difference in the other three flyways.

For these reasons, the revised decision framework for pintail harvest management is intended to be implemented on an interim basis. The interim phase will last until three hunting seasons have occurred with a three-pintail bag limit to provide enough data for evaluation and possible revision of the decision framework. Three seasons with a 3-bird pintail bag limit could happen in as few as three years, but it could take longer, depending on pintail status and prescriptions from the decision framework. The Service and Flyway Councils will continue to review and carefully consider the status of pintails annually and could be more restrictive than the decision framework if determined to be necessary. However, a formal analysis of the expected harvest and population level impacts from a three-pintail bag limit will not have much statistical power for an assessment with less than 3 years of data and results may be inconclusive.

Regarding the necessity for female pintail restrictions, see above under our response to *Federal Limits for Duck Hunting.* In summary, research and scientific modeling of the recently developed pintail harvest strategy show that restricting the harvest of female pintails would not meaningfully affect the subsequent breeding population. Also, gender-specific pintail bag limits complicate hunting regulations and place a burden on hunters that may have difficulty identifying gender for some species of ducks in certain hunting situations. However, hunters may use voluntary restraint in harvesting females within the overall pintail bag limit if they choose.

Regarding an association between pintail and mallard abundance, we have data on mallard and pintail abundance since 1955 from our Waterfowl Breeding Population and Habitat Survey. There is no apparent association in the data between pintail and mallard abundance. Mallard and pintail abundance decreased for three decades beginning in about 1960. The decrease in abundance is expected to be associated with decreased wetlands and nesting habitat conditions. Mallard abundance recovered to historic levels in the 1990s and 2000s with increasing wetlands and nesting habitat conditions. These are expected patterns associated with wet and dry cycles on the prairies. However, pintail abundance, unlike mallards, did not recover despite the general improvement in habitat conditions. The continental carrying capacity for pintails declined by about 50 percent in the early 1980s and pintail abundance since then has hovered near the same level. Despite mallard abundance changes, including substantial increases to historic levels and recent declines in the last 5 to 10 years, pintail abundance continues to hover around levels reflective of the apparent carrying capacity changes observed in the early 1980s.

Better Identify Species Designations

Issue: Some game bird species designations lack clarity, and a consolidated list that defines such terms may improve understanding of the frameworks, scientific evaluation, and regulation compliance and enforcement.

Response: Migratory game birds are defined in regulations at 50 CFR 20.11 as those species included in the terms of the conventions between the United States and any foreign country for the protection of migratory birds and belonging to five families of birds and for which open seasons are authorized in 50 CFR part 20. Open hunting seasons may include certain designated members of the avian families Anatidae (ducks, geese, and swans), Columbidae (doves and pigeons), Gruidae (cranes), Rallidae (rails, coots, and gallinules), and Scolopacidae (shorebirds including woodcock and snipe). The Service maintains a list at 50 CFR 10.13 of all species considered migratory birds and protected under the MBTA. We regularly review and update this list (see 88 FR 49310, July 31, 2023, for the most recent update). Based on the game bird families identified in 50 CFR 20.11 and associated species at 50 CFR 10.13, there are 185 migratory game bird species that may be subject to open hunting seasons, but not all these species have open hunting seasons.

The 2024–25 final frameworks rule (89 FR 68500, August 26, 2024) established in 50 CFR 20 open hunting seasons in at least some part of the United States for 93 game bird species on the list at 50 CFR 10.13. Some potential game bird species have no open season anywhere within the United States for reasons related to conservation concerns, uncommon status in the United States, or lack of customary and traditional hunting seasons. There are no customary and traditional hunting seasons for ground-dwelling doves in the conterminous United States and most of the species groups within the shorebird family Scolopacidae. Specifically, there are no seasons for about 60 species of curlews, dowitchers, dunlins, godwits, greenshank, knots, phalaropes, redshanks, ruff, sanderlings, sandpipers, stints, surfbirds, tattlers, turnstones, whimbrels, willets, and yellowlegs; only woodcock and snipe have open hunting seasons.

Of the 93 game bird species with open seasons in the United States, 60 are common and 56 occur regularly in the contiguous United States. The 60 common game bird species in the United States are managed as species, subspecies, and population segments where appropriate. We define population segments used in our status reports and assessments to make harvest management decisions (*e.g.,* eastern, mid-continent, and western mallard population segments), and these definitions are generally based on geographic areas with differing demographic parameters important for consideration in assessments.

All migratory game bird hunting regulations are specific to species or species groups and geographic areas, with the exception of the dusky Canada goose subspecies, which occurs

primarily in west central Oregon and Washington and a special State permit with goose identification training is required to hunt. The collective terms ''dark'' and ''light'' geese are defined in the frameworks and Federal regulations published each year under Definitions. Dark geese means Canada geese, cackling geese, white-fronted geese, brant (except in Alaska, California, Oregon, Washington, and the Atlantic Flyway), and all other goose species except light geese. Light geese means snow (including blue) geese and Ross's geese. Species groups (*i.e.,* swans, white-fronted geese, ducks, teal, scoters, eiders, mergansers, coots, snipe, gallinules, woodcock, and doves) that are not generally defined in hunting regulations include all migratory game bird species on the 10.13 list that may be included in these groups.

We agree that migratory game bird species designations lack clarity in rulemaking for annual hunting regulations, and a consolidated list that defines such terms may improve understanding of the frameworks and regulations. We will add this additional clarifying text to the preamble of subsequent cycle rulemaking for migratory game bird hunting seasons.

Review of Flyway Council Recommendations

We received recommendations from all four Flyway Councils at the May and November 2024 SRC meetings; all recommendations are from the November meeting unless otherwise noted. Some recommendations supported continuation of last year's frameworks. Due to the comprehensive nature of the annual review of the frameworks performed by the Councils, support for continuation of last year's frameworks is assumed for items for which no recommendations were received. Council recommendations for changes in the frameworks are summarized below. We have included only the numbered items pertaining to issues for which we received recommendations. Consequently, the issues do not follow in successive numerical order.

1. Ducks

A. General Harvest Strategy

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended adoption of the liberal regulatory alternative for their respective flyways.

Response: As we stated in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056), we intend to continue use of adaptive harvest management (AHM) to help determine appropriate duck-hunting regulations for the 2025–26 season. AHM is a tool that permits sound resource decisions in the face of uncertain regulatory impacts and provides a mechanism for reducing that uncertainty over time. We use an AHM protocol (decision framework) to evaluate four regulatory alternatives, each with a different expected harvest level, and choose the optimal regulation for duck hunting for the Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyways based on the status and demographics of mallards and in the Atlantic Flyway based on the status and demographics of four duck species (green-winged teal, common goldeneye, ring-necked duck, and wood duck; hereafter, eastern ducks). (See below, and the earlier referenced report ''Adaptive Harvest Management, 2025 Hunting Season'' for more details). We have specific AHM protocols that guide appropriate bag limits and season lengths for species of special concern, including black ducks, scaup, pintails, and eastern mallards. These protocols have species-specific regulatory alternatives.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we will continue to use independent optimizations to determine the appropriate regulatory alternative for mallards in the Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyways and for four duck species in the Atlantic Flyway. This means that we will develop regulations for mid-continent mallards, western mallards, and eastern ducks independently based on the breeding ducks that contribute primarily to each Flyway. We detailed implementation of AHM protocols for mid-continent and western mallards in the July 24, 2008, **Federal Register** (73 FR 43290), and for eastern ducks in the September 21, 2018, **Federal Register** (83 FR 47868). We refer readers to the AHM report referenced above under Population and Harvest Status for details of our AHM decision framework assessments in support of decisions for the 2025–26 duck hunting season.

Atlantic Flyway

For the Atlantic Flyway, we set duck-hunting regulations based on the status and demographics of eastern ducks in eastern Canada and the Atlantic Flyway States. For purposes of the assessment, eastern ducks are those breeding in eastern Canada and Maine (Federal Waterfowl Breeding Population and Habitat Survey (WBPHS) fixed-wing surveys in the eastern survey area (*i.e.,* subareas 51–53, 56, and 62–70), and helicopter plot surveys in subareas 51–52, 63–64, 66–68, and 70–72), and in Atlantic Flyway States from New Hampshire south to Virginia (Atlantic Flyway Breeding Waterfowl Survey, AFBWS). Abundance estimates for green-winged teal, ring-necked ducks, and goldeneyes are derived annually by integrating fixed-wing and helicopter survey data from eastern Canada and Maine (WBPHS subareas 51–53, 56, and 62–72). Counts of green-winged teal, ring-necked ducks, and goldeneyes in the AFBWS are negligible and therefore excluded from population estimates for those species. Abundance estimates for wood ducks in the Atlantic Flyway (Maine south to Florida) are estimated by integrating data from the AFBWS and the North American Breeding Bird Survey. Counts of wood ducks from the WBPHS are negligible and therefore excluded from population estimates.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for eastern ducks using: (1) A management objective of 98 percent of maximum long-term sustainable harvest; (2) the 2025–26 regulatory alternatives; and (3) current stock-specific population models and associated weights. Based on the liberal regulatory alternative selected for the 2024–25 duck hunting season and the 2024 survey estimates of 0.87 million wood ducks, 0.47 million American green-winged teal, 0.73 million ring-necked ducks, and 1.20 million goldeneyes in the WBPHS eastern survey area and AFBWS, the optimal regulation for the Atlantic Flyway is the liberal alternative. Therefore, we concur with the recommendation of the Atlantic Flyway Council regarding selection of the liberal regulatory alternative as described in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule for the 2025–26 season.

Mississippi and Central Flyways

For the Mississippi and Central Flyways, we set duck-hunting regulations based on the status and demographics of mid-continent mallards and habitat conditions (pond numbers in Prairie Canada and the United States). For purposes of the assessment, mid-continent mallards are those breeding in central North America (WBPHS subareas 13–18, 20–50, and 75–77) and in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin (State surveys).

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for mid-continent mallards using: (1) A management objective of maximum long-term sustainable harvest; (2) the 2025–26 regulatory alternatives; and (3) the current population model. Based on a liberal regulatory alternative selected for the 2024–25 hunting season and the 2024 survey estimates of 6.61 million

mid-continent mallards and 5.16 million total ponds observed in Prairie Canada and the United States, the optimal choice for the 2025–26 hunting season in the Mississippi and Central Flyways is the liberal regulatory alternative. Therefore, we concur with the recommendations of the Mississippi and Central Flyway Councils regarding selection of the liberal regulatory alternative as described in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule for the 2025–26 season.

Pacific Flyway

For the Pacific Flyway, we set duck-hunting regulations based on the status and demographics of western mallards. For purposes of the assessment, western mallards consist of two population segments and are those breeding in Alaska and Yukon Territory (WBPHS subareas 1–12) and those breeding in the southern Pacific Flyway including California, Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia (State and Provincial surveys) combined.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for western mallards using: (1) A management objective of maximum long-term sustainable harvest; (2) the 2025–26 regulatory alternatives; and (3) the current population model. Based on a liberal regulatory alternative selected for the 2024–25 hunting season and 2024 survey estimates of 0.94 million western mallards observed in Alaska (0.51 million) and the southern Pacific Flyway (0.43 million), the optimal regulation for the Pacific Flyway is the liberal regulatory alternative. Therefore, we concur with the recommendation of the Pacific Flyway Council regarding selection of the liberal regulatory alternative as described in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule for the 2025–26 season.

B. Regulatory Alternatives

Council Recommendations: At the May 2024 SRC meeting, the Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended that AHM regulatory alternatives for duck hunting during the 2025–26 season remain the same as those used in the previous season.

Response: Consistent with Flyway Council recommendations, the AHM regulatory alternatives proposed for the Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyways in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056) will be used for the 2025–26 duck hunting season (see accompanying table at the end of that document for specific information). The AHM regulatory alternatives consist only of the maximum season lengths, framework dates, and bag limits for total ducks and mallards. For those species with specific harvest strategies (pintails, black ducks, scaup, and eastern mallards), each with their own set of regulatory alternatives, the species-specific strategies and regulatory alternatives will be used for the 2025–26 hunting season.

C. Zones and Split Seasons

Zones and split seasons are special regulations designed to distribute hunting opportunities and harvests according to temporal, geographic, and demographic variability in waterfowl and other migratory game bird populations. The Service has allowed the use of zones to provide equitable distribution of duck hunting opportunities within a State or region. The intent is not to increase total annual waterfowl harvest in the zoned areas; harvest levels are to be adjusted downward if they exceeded traditional levels as a result of zoning. In 1991, the Service developed guidelines to provide a framework for controlling the proliferation of zones and split seasons in duck hunting. Substantial concern remains about the unknown consequences of zones and split seasons on duck populations and harvest redistribution among States and flyways, potential reduced effectiveness of regulations (season length and bag limit) to reduce duck harvest if needed, and the administrative burden. The guidelines identified a limited number of zone and split-season configurations that could be used for duck hunting and restricted the frequency of changes in State selection among these configurations to the beginning of 5-year intervals.

The next opportunity for States to select zones and split-season configurations for duck hunting is in 2025 for the fixed period of the 2026–2030 seasons. In the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056), we proposed to adopt the same zones and split-season guidelines and configurations for duck hunting as we used for the 2021–25 seasons. We discussed and presented guidelines and configurations for duck zones and split seasons during the 2021–25 seasons in our August 21, 2020, final rule (85 FR 51854 at 51857–51858). For those States wishing to change zone and split-season configurations in time for the 2026–2030 seasons, we would need to receive configuration selections and zone descriptions by August 31, 2025.

We also note that when we adopted guidelines for duck zones and split seasons during the 2021–25 seasons, we offered a new configuration (two zones with up to three season segments in each) at the request of the four Flyway Councils. We expressed our sensitivity to the States' desires for flexibility in addressing human dimensions concerns of the hunting public (*i.e.,* foster hunter recruitment, retention, and satisfaction) despite our continued concerns about the proliferation of zones, impacts to harvest, regulation complexity, and administrative burden. Similarly, we revised the zones-splits guidelines for the 2011–2015 period to allow two new options (four zones with a continuous season, and three zones with up to two season segments in each) at the request of the four Flyway Councils (77 FR 23094 at 23100–23101, April 17, 2012). Because the two zones and three season segments configuration are new, we stated in 2020 (85 FR 51854 at 51857–51858, August 21, 2020) that States that select this configuration must conduct an evaluation of impacts to hunter dynamics (*e.g.,* hunter numbers, satisfaction) and harvest during the fixed 5-year period it is implemented (*e.g.,* 2021–25 period). Five States selected the new configuration for the 2021–25 period in two Flyways: Atlantic (Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia) and Mississippi (Louisiana). These States must provide an evaluation through the 2025–26 season regardless of actual implementation by September 2026.

Council recommendations: The Central Flyway Council recommended two additional zone and split-season configurations including: four zones with two season segments, and three zones with three season segments.

Response: We do not currently support the Central Flyway Council's recommendation for additional duck zone and split season configurations. The expansion of zone-split configurations has been a recurring issue for decades. Because of the unknown effects of increasing configurations on duck populations, we have supported a limited, but sufficient, number of options so that States may configure their seasons to provide hunting opportunities for their constituents. In 2011 and 2021, when we last added additional zones and split-seasons configurations at the request of the Flyway Councils, we required States to conduct an evaluation of impacts to hunter dynamics and harvest so that we could evaluate the costs and benefits of additional configurations. We look forward to receiving the evaluation reports by September 2026 from States that selected the new zones and split-seasons configuration that we added in 2020. Further, this issue may better be

addressed through the work of the AHM Task Force that was recently convened to consider the future of waterfowl harvest management. We are open to discussion about how hunting regulations address hunter satisfaction and hunter R3 (recruitment, retention, and reactivation) objectives. We also need more information about the objectives and measures of success from human dimension and biological perspectives. The SRC supports continued discussion between Service staff and the Flyway Councils and their technical committee on this issue. Therefore, in this rule, we are adopting the zones and split-season guidelines and configurations for duck hunting that we previously used and proposed in the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056).

D. Special Seasons/Species Management

i. Early Teal Seasons

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyway Councils recommended a 9-day special early teal season (6-teal daily bag limit) or bonus daily bag limit of two blue-winged teal in the respective States.

Response: The Service concurs with the recommendations. Based on the 2024 survey estimate of 4.6 million blue-winged teal and our special teal season guidelines, 9-day special early teal seasons or bonus daily bag limits of two blue-winged teal are appropriate in the respective States of the Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyways.

Special early teal seasons have been allowed in parts of the Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyways since 1965. In considering the Councils' recent recommendations for special early teal seasons, we recognized that our special early teal season guidelines were developed over multiple **Federal Register** publications, including August 28, 2014 (79 FR 51402 at 51403); April 30, 2014 (79 FR 24512 at 24518–24519); August 23, 2013 (78 FR 52658 at 52659–52660); August 25, 2009 (74 FR 43008 at 43009); August 27, 2003 (68 FR 51658 at 51658); August 21, 2001 (66 FR 44010 at 44010–44011); and August 21, 1992 (57 FR 38202 at 38204), and were not described completely in one publication. Thus, we are providing our special early teal season guidelines here completely for ease of reference.

The Service's special early teal season guidelines allow special early teal seasons in certain States within the Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyways when the spring blue-winged teal population estimate from the WBPHS traditional survey area (*i.e.,* subareas 1–18, 20–50, and 75–77) is at least 3.3 million birds. States authorized in the Atlantic Flyway include Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. States authorized in the Mississippi Flyway include Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. States authorized in the Central Flyway include Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and parts of Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

The special early teal season lengths are 9 days if the blue-winged teal population estimate is between 3.3 and 4.7 million birds and 16 days if the estimate is greater than 4.7 million birds. Season days must occur in September prior to the regular duck season. The daily bag limit is six teal in the aggregate. Shooting hours are one-half hour before sunrise to sunset, except in the States of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, and Wisconsin, where the hours are from sunrise to sunset.

Blue-winged teal production States in the Mississippi Flyway (Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin) and Central Flyway (Montana (part), North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming (part)), in lieu of selecting special early teal seasons, may include additional daily bag and possession limits of two and six blue-winged teal, respectively, during the first part of the regular duck season equivalent in length to the special early teal season. These extra blue-winged teal limits are in addition (bonus) to the regular duck season daily bag and possession limits.

When the blue-winged teal population estimate is less than 3.3 million birds, all available applicable data will be considered and more restrictive limits or a closed season may be prescribed as determined to be appropriate for special early teal seasons.

ii. Early Teal-Wood Duck Seasons

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic and Mississippi Flyway Councils recommended in Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee, in lieu of a special early teal season, a 5-consecutive-day teal-wood duck season in September. The daily bag limit may not exceed six teal and wood ducks in the aggregate, of which no more than two may be wood ducks.

Response: The Service concurs with the recommendations. Based on the 2024 survey estimate of 4.6 million blue-winged teal and our special teal-wood duck season guidelines, a 5-consecutive-day teal–wood duck season in September is appropriate with no additional teal only days during special early teal-wood duck seasons. The daily bag limit may not exceed six teal and wood ducks in the aggregate, of which no more than two may be wood ducks.

Special early wood duck or teal–wood duck seasons have been allowed in Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee since 1981. In considering the Councils' recent recommendations for special early teal–wood duck seasons, we recognized that our special early teal–wood duck season guidelines were developed over multiple **Federal Register** publications, including August 28, 2014 (79 FR 51402 at 51403–51404); August 21, 2001 (66 FR 44010 at 44011); August 21, 1991 (56 FR 41608 at 41608); August 9, 1988 (53 FR 29897 at 29899); and July 29, 1981 (46 FR 38868 at 38868), and were not described completely in one publication. Thus, we are providing our special early teal–wood duck season guidelines here completely for ease of reference.

The Service's early teal–wood duck season guidelines allow special early teal–wood duck seasons in Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee when the spring blue-winged teal population estimate from the WBPHS traditional survey area is at least 3.3 million birds. The season lengths are 5 days. Season days must occur in September prior to the regular duck season. The daily bag limit may not exceed six teal and wood ducks in the aggregate, of which no more than two may be wood ducks. A special early teal–wood duck season is not allowed in Florida, Kentucky, or Tennessee if that State offers a special early teal season.

Four additional teal-only days may be added to the special early teal-wood duck seasons when the blue-winged teal population estimate is greater than 4.7 million birds. The additional teal-only days must be in September, contiguous with the special early teal–wood duck seasons, and before the regular duck seasons. The daily bag limit during the teal-only days is six teal in the aggregate.

When the blue-winged teal population estimate is less than 3.3 million birds, all available applicable data will be considered and more restrictive limits or a closed season may be prescribed as determined to be appropriate for special early teal-wood duck seasons.

iii. Black Ducks

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic and Mississippi Flyway Councils recommended adoption of the moderate regulatory alternative for their respective flyways. The flyway-specific regulations consist of a daily bag limit of two black ducks and a season length of 60 days.

Response: The Service, Atlantic and Mississippi Flyway Councils, and Canada adopted an international AHM protocol for black ducks in 2012 (77 FR 49868, August 17, 2012) whereby we set black duck hunting regulations for the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyways (and Canada) based on the status and demographics of these birds.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for black ducks using: (1) a management objective of 98 percent of maximum long-term sustainable harvest; (2) the black duck regulatory alternatives; and (3) the current population model. Based on the moderate regulatory alternative selected for the 2024–25 hunting season and the 2024 survey estimate of 0.86 million black ducks, the optimal regulation for the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyways is the moderate alternative. Therefore, we concur with the recommendations of the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyway Councils.

iv. Canvasbacks

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended adoption of the liberal regulatory alternative for their respective flyways. The flyway-specific regulations consist of a daily bag limit of two canvasbacks and a season length of 60 days in the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyways, 74 days in the Central Flyway, and 107 days in the Pacific Flyway.

Response: As we discussed in the March 28, 2016, **Federal Register** (81 FR 17302), the canvasback harvest strategy that we relied on until 2015 was not viable under our new regulatory process because it required biological information that was not yet available at the time a decision on season structure needed to be made. We do not yet have a new harvest strategy to propose for use in guiding canvasback harvest management in the future. However, we have worked with technical staff from the four Flyway Councils to develop a decision framework (hereafter, decision support tool) that relies on the best biological information available to develop recommendations for annual canvasback harvest regulations. The decision support tool uses available information (1994–2014) on canvasback breeding population size in Alaska and north-central North America (WBPHS traditional survey area), growth rate, survival, and harvest, and a population model to evaluate alternative harvest regulations based on a management objective of maximum long-term sustainable harvest. The decision support tool calls for a closed season when the population is below 460,000, a 1-bird daily bag limit when the population is between 460,000 and 480,000, and a 2-bird daily bag limit when the population is greater than 480,000. Based on the 2024 survey estimate of 566,000 canvasbacks, we concur with the recommendations of the four Flyway Councils regarding selection of the liberal regulatory alternative for the 2025–26 season.

v. Pintails

Over the past 5 years, scientists from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the Service, in consultation with the Flyway Councils, have collaborated on the development of a revised decision framework for pintail harvest management. The Flyway Councils and Service undertook the revision process due to several concerns about the current strategy (adopted in 2010; see 75 FR 44856 at 44860, July 29, 2010). Concerns included public desires for inclusion of a more liberal regulatory alternative (3-pintail daily bag limit), reliance on outdated modeling techniques and data, and communication challenges associated with the regulatory schedule. To address these concerns, the Service convened the national Pintail Working Group (PWG) composed of two representatives from each Flyway, the four Service Flyway Representatives, and technical experts from the Service and USGS.

The PWG evaluated pintail population and harvest dynamics, built new models using updated data and modern estimation methods, and developed and evaluated many alternative harvest strategies. An important change is that the model of predicted harvest includes an estimate of fall population size. This has an important effect on the harvest strategy because the expected harvest decreases with decreasing fall pintail population size. The strategy recognizes that there is sustainable harvest under conditions that were not previously thought sustainable (*i.e.,* expected increase in frequency of regulatory alternatives with liberal pintail daily bag limits, including the possibility for three pintails).

In January 2024, after extensive consultation, the PWG proposed an interim harvest strategy to inform harvest management decisions for pintails and to learn about the effects of a 3-bird daily bag limit (new alternative) on management objectives. The interim strategy is available for review in the PWG report entitled, ''Proposed Interim Northern Pintail Harvest Strategy'' dated February 9, 2024. The interim strategy is intended to be implemented until three hunting seasons with a 3-bird daily bag limit have been realized (*i.e.,* trial phase over three or more hunting seasons) with an additional allowance for 2 years for data collection and analysis, review of performance, and evaluation of updated alternative strategies. Evaluation results will be provided to the Flyway technical committees for consideration in the development of a proposed operational harvest strategy, which may or may not include an option for a 3-bird daily bag limit.

We greatly appreciate the time and attention over the last 5 years that the PWG has devoted to review and consideration of the current pintail harvest strategy, technical updates, and the various alternatives for implementing a derived pintail harvest strategy. The revised interim strategy addresses stakeholder concerns with the current strategy and includes important technical updates with implications for our harvest management policy. In compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's Information Quality Act (section 515 of Pub. L. 106–554) guidelines (67 FR 8452, Feb. 22, 2022) and Service policy, a scientific peer review of the interim harvest strategy model was completed in early May 2024; during that review, no technical issues or concerns were identified, and reviewer comments have been addressed. In the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056), we proposed to adopt the interim harvest strategy for pintail harvest management as described by the PWG in their ''Proposed Interim Northern Pintail Harvest Strategy'' report, beginning with the 2025–26 hunting seasons. In this document, we are adopting the interim harvest strategy for pintail harvest management as described above.

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended adoption of the liberal regulatory alternative with a 3-pintail daily bag limit for their respective flyways. The flyway-specific regulations consist of a season length of 60 days in the Atlantic and Mississippi Flyways, 74 days in the Central Flyway, and 107 days in the Pacific Flyway.

Response: The Service and the four Flyway Councils adopted an AHM protocol for pintails in this document

whereby we set pintail hunting regulations in all four flyways based on the status and demographics of these birds.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for pintails using: (1) a management objective of maximum long-term sustainable harvest, including a constraint to provide an open hunting season when the observed breeding population is above 1.2 million birds; (2) the pintail regulatory alternatives; and (3) the current population model. Based on the 2024 survey estimates of 1.97 million pintails at a mean latitude of 57.02 degrees (WBPHS traditional survey area), the optimal regulation for all four flyways is the liberal alternative with a 3-pintail daily bag limit. Therefore, we concur with the recommendations of the four Flyway Councils for the 2025–26 season.

vi. Scaup

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended adoption of the restrictive regulatory alternative for their respective flyways. The flyway-specific regulations consist of a 60-day season with a 1-bird daily bag limit during 40 consecutive days and a 2-bird daily bag limit during 20 consecutive days in the Atlantic Flyway; a 60-day season with a 2-bird daily bag limit during 45 consecutive days and a 1-bird daily bag limit during 15 consecutive days in the Mississippi Flyway; a 1-bird daily bag limit for 74 days in the Central Flyway (which may have separate segments of 39 days and 35 days); and an 86-day season with a 2-bird daily bag limit in the Pacific Flyway.

Service Response: The Service and four Flyway Councils adopted an AHM protocol for scaup in 2008 (73 FR 43290, July 24, 2008, and 73 FR 51124, August 29, 2008), whereby we set scaup hunting regulations in all four flyways based on the status and demographics of these birds.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for scaup using: (1) a management objective of 95 percent of maximum sustainable harvest; (2) the scaup regulatory alternatives; and (3) the current population model. Based on a restrictive regulatory alternative for the 2024–25 season, and the 2024 survey estimate of 4.07 million scaup (WBPHS traditional survey area), the optimal regulation for all four flyways is the restrictive alternative. Therefore, we concur with the recommendations of the four Flyway Councils regarding selection of the restrictive alternative for the 2025–26 season.

ix. Eastern Mallards

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic Flyway Council recommended adoption of the liberal regulatory alternative for their flyway. The Atlantic Flyway regulation consists of a daily bag limit of four mallards, no more than two of which may be hens, and a season length of 60 days.

Response: The Service and Atlantic Flyway Council adopted an AHM protocol for eastern mallards in 2023 (88 FR 6054, January 30, 2023) whereby we set mallard hunting regulations in the Atlantic Flyway based on the status and demographics of these birds.

For the 2025–26 hunting season, we evaluated alternative harvest regulations for eastern mallards using: (1) a management objective of 98 percent of maximum sustainable harvest; (2) the eastern mallard regulatory alternatives; and (3) the current population model. Based on a liberal regulatory alternative for the 2024–25 season, and the 2024 survey estimate of 1.17 million eastern mallards (WBPHS eastern survey area and AFBWS), the optimal regulation for the Atlantic Flyway is the liberal alternative. Therefore, we concur with the recommendation of the Atlantic Flyway Council regarding selection of the liberal alternative for the 2025–26 season.

4. Canada and Cackling Geese

B. Regular Seasons

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic Flyway Council recommended the restrictive regulatory alternative as defined in the Council's harvest strategy for Atlantic Population (AP) Canada geese (30-day season with a daily bag limit of one goose) in the AP zones of the Atlantic Flyway. The Pacific Flyway Council recommended several changes to the Canada and cackling goose season framework in the Pacific Flyway. Specifically:

1. Change the framework ending date in Oregon's Northwest Permit Zone and Washington's Area 2 Inland and Area 2 Coastal (Southwest Permit Zone) from March 10 to February 15;

2. Reduce the season length in Oregon's Northwest Permit Zone and Washington's Area 2 Inland and Area 2 Coastal (Southwest Permit Zone) from 107 days to 74 days;

3. Reduce the daily bag limit in Oregon's Northwest Permit Zone and Washington's Area 2 Inland and Area 2 Coastal (Southwest Permit Zone) from three to two Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate;

4. Reduce the daily bag limit in Washington's Areas 1 and 3 from four to three Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate; and

5. Reduce the daily bag limit in Alaska's Units 9, 17, and 18 from four to three Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate.

Response: We agree with the Atlantic Flyway Council's recommendation to implement the restrictive regulatory alternative as described in the Council's harvest strategy for AP Canada geese for the 2025–26 hunting season. The AP Canada goose is one of three populations of Canada geese managed in the Atlantic Flyway and has a long history of intensive management due to its importance to subsistence and sport hunters in Canada and the United States. In 2021, the Council adopted a harvest strategy to prescribe appropriate hunting regulations for AP Canada geese commensurate with the status of this population. The Council's AP Canada goose harvest strategy established three metrics for informing annual recommendations: (1) population model predicted abundance of breeding pairs in the subsequent year; (2) long-term trend in productivity; and (3) long-term trend in total population abundance. The harvest strategy recommends the moderate regulatory alternative when the predicted abundance is between 125,000 and 160,000 pairs. The 2024 breeding population estimate for AP Canada geese is 89,000 pairs, which is a 23 percent decrease from 2023. The estimated number of breeding pairs has decreased by 5 percent per year over the last 10 years. The 2024 total abundance estimate is 606,672 birds, which is slightly less than the 2023 estimate of 611,590 birds. The estimated 2024 productivity is 0.89 which is the second lowest estimate recorded since 1997. Using the most current breeding population and habitat data, the predicted 2025 breeding population estimates is 133,500 pairs. The predicted abundance is consistent with the moderate regulatory alternative, but the long-term trends in productivity and total abundance indicate the restrictive regulatory alternative is appropriate.

We also agree with the Pacific Flyway Council's recommended changes to the season frameworks for Canada and cackling geese in the Pacific Flyway. Seven subspecies of white-cheeked geese winter in the Pacific Flyway and are managed as separate populations. All populations of white-cheeked geese with open hunting seasons in the Pacific Flyway are at or above the Council's population objectives except for minima cackling geese. The most recent 3-year (2022–2024) average fall projected

population estimate for minima cackling geese is 175,055 birds and is 30 percent below the Council's population objective midpoint of 250,000 (range is ± 10 percent, 225,000–275,000). Furthermore, the declining trend in abundance from the three recent abundance estimates (238,093, 160,630, and 126,443 birds) indicates the current population size may be well below the 3-year average.

There is substantial mixing of white-cheeked geese populations during winter in the Pacific Flyway. Restrictions in the Canada and cackling goose season frameworks (specifically daily bag limits, season lengths, and season dates) in the Pacific Flyway for Oregon's Northwest Permit Zone and Washington's Southwest Permit Zone (permit zones), Washington's Areas 1 and 3, and Alaska's Units 9, 17, and 18 are intended to reduce harvest for minima cackling geese and, to some extent, Taverner's cackling geese. The Pacific Flyway Council's management plan for minima cackling geese specifies that when the population index is below 225,000 birds, actions should be taken to increase abundance to the objective level. The index fell below this threshold level in 2021, and consequently the daily bag limit was reduced from four to three geese in the permit zones of Oregon and Washington based on the Pacific Flyway Council's recommendation at that time. However, the abundance index for minima cackling geese has continued to decline and is now at the lowest level since 1994, the year harvest was reopened after a decade of closure. The Council's plan does not prescribe specific actions to reduce harvest in response to population indices below 225,000 birds. However, the Pacific Flyway Council has estimated that the recommended restrictions should reduce harvest by at least 33 percent in the permit zones of Oregon and Washington where most (80 percent) of the minima cackling goose harvest occurs, and by 10 percent in other primary areas in Washington and Alaska, where minima cackling goose harvest occurs. Therefore, the recommended restrictions will allow the minima cackling goose population size to increase over time.

5. White-Fronted Geese

Council Recommendations: The Pacific Flyway Council recommended allowing a 3-segment season for Oregon's Mid-Columbia Goose Zone in the season framework for white-fronted geese in the Pacific Flyway.

Response: We agree with the Pacific Flyway Council's recommendation. Current frameworks allow a 3-segment split for the snow goose, Canada and cackling goose, and greater white-fronted goose seasons in the Pacific Flyway; however, for Canada geese and white-fronted geese, this arrangement requires Pacific Flyway Council and Service approval and a 3-year evaluation by each participating State. The approval of 3-segments for the white-fronted goose season in Oregon's Mid-Columbia Goose Zone will allow this season to be concurrent with the already approved 3-segment seasons for Canada and cackling geese and snow geese in this zone, which will help reduce regulation complexity and simultaneously maintain maximum flexibility in the use of season segments to address issues associated with white goose abundance over objectives. Harvest data suggest white-fronted geese rarely encounter hunters in Oregon's Mid-Columbia Goose Zone, and the change is not expected to influence harvest levels. The current 3-year average predicted fall population estimate (2022–24) for the Pacific population of greater white-fronted geese is 510,884, which is substantially above the Pacific Flyway's population objective of 300,000. Any possible additional harvest of greater white-fronted geese from this regulatory change will be negligible for the Pacific Flyway.

6. Brant

Council Recommendations: The Pacific Flyway Council recommended that the Service revise their Pacific brant harvest strategy based on the Council's revised harvest strategy for use beginning with the 2025–2026 hunting season. The Council also recommended that the brant season framework for Alaska, California, Oregon, and Washington be determined annually based on the Council's Pacific brant harvest strategy and pending current results from the Fall Brant Survey at Izembek Lagoon, Alaska (FBS) in about February prior to the hunting season. If results of the FBS are not available, the most recent FBS should be used.

Response: We agree with the Pacific Flyway Council's recommendations. The Service adopted the Pacific Flyway Council's brant harvest strategy in August 2020 because the Council's harvest strategy used to determine the Pacific brant season frameworks does not fit well within the timing of our regulatory process for proposed frameworks (see 85 FR 51854 at 51860, August 21, 2020).

The Service developed a more statistically rigorous survey to index abundance of Pacific brant than is currently used. The current survey is a ground and aerial count of brant during winter in accessible primary wintering areas from Alaska to Mexico. The count is interpreted as the absolute minimum population size. The new survey is a population estimate based on an aerial photographic survey in the fall at Izembek Lagoon, Alaska, where it is thought that nearly the entire population is concentrated during southward migration. The survey now includes a sampling and inference design, replicate surveys, a measure of uncertainty, and a greater proportion of the population of Pacific brant (about two times the previous survey). The Service and Pacific Flyway Council have agreed to discontinue the winter brant survey in favor of the more reliable FBS. Thus, the current harvest strategy for Pacific brant will no longer be functional without adjustment to the new abundance survey.

The Pacific Flyway Council revised their brant harvest strategy for the new abundance survey in August 2024. The revised harvest strategy maintains the current season closure level when the abundance estimate is less than 102,000 brant, and adjusts the population objective and levels for restrictive, moderate, and liberal season frameworks upward by a factor of two based on the ratio of abundance from winter counts to fall estimates for the 5 years that the surveys overlapped (*i.e.,* the period from 2017 through 2023). Accordingly, the Service is replacing the Council's harvest strategy we adopted in 2020 with the Council's revised harvest strategy, which is described below.

In developing the annual hunting season frameworks for Pacific brant, the Pacific Flyway Council and the Service use the average of the three most recent abundance estimates (index) from the FBS in about February to determine the upcoming season lengths and daily bag limits. Information on abundance of Pacific brant from the FBS is available in about February each year, which is after the date that proposed frameworks are formulated in the regulatory process. However, the data are typically available by the expected publication of final frameworks. When we acquire the survey data annually, we determine the appropriate frameworks for the upcoming Pacific brant season according to the harvest strategy in the Pacific Flyway Council's management plan for Pacific brant, as described below, and publish the results in the final frameworks rule.

- If the FBS index is <102,000 brant, then the brant season is closed, and the season may not reopen until the index exceeds 112,000 brant.

• If the FBS index is between 102,000 and 243,000 brant, then the season length and daily bag limit in Alaska is 51 days and 2 brant, and in California, Oregon, and Washington is 16 days and 2 brant.

• If the FBS index is between 243,001 and 293,000 brant, then the season length and daily bag limit in Alaska is 107 days and 2 brant, and in California, Oregon, and Washington is 27 days and 2 brant.

• If the FBS index is greater than 293,000 brant, then the season length and daily bag limit in Alaska is 107 days and 4 brant, and in California, Oregon, and Washington is 37 days and 2 brant.

Under all of the above open-season alternatives, the framework outside season dates in Alaska are September 1 through January 26, in California and Oregon are the Saturday closest to September 24 through December 15, and in Washington are the Saturday closest to September 24 through the last Sunday in January.

We note that the threshold (≥112,000 brant) to resume an open season following season closure is purposefully 10,000 brant higher than the threshold (≥102,000 brant) to maintain an open season. This adds additional conservatism into the strategy and provides more confidence that the population has recovered before open seasons resume. It also helps avoid a situation where the season toggles between open and closed among successive hunting seasons.

The recent 3-year average (2022–2024) FBS count of Pacific brant was 211,823. Based on the harvest strategy, the appropriate season length and daily bag limit framework for Pacific brant in the 2025–26 season is a 51-day season with a 2-bird daily bag limit in Alaska, and a 16-day season with a 2-bird daily bag limit in California, Oregon, and Washington.

9. Sandhill Cranes

Council Recommendations: The Central and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended that allowable harvest of the Rocky Mountain Population (RMP) of sandhill cranes be determined annually based on the formula described in the Pacific and Central Flyway Councils' management plan for RMP cranes when the current fall abundance and recruitment data become available in about January prior to the hunting season.

Response: We agree with the Central and Pacific Flyway Councils' recommendations. The Service adopted the Central and Pacific Flyway Councils' RMP sandhill crane harvest strategy in March 2016 because the harvest strategy used to calculate the allowable harvest of RMP cranes does not fit well within our current regulatory process for proposed frameworks (see 81 FR 17302 at 17307, March 28, 2016). In developing the annual proposed frameworks for RMP cranes, the Flyway Councils and the Service use the fall abundance and recruitment surveys of RMP cranes to determine annual allowable harvest. Results of the fall abundance and recruitment surveys of RMP cranes are available in about January each year, which is after the date that proposed frameworks are formulated in the regulatory process. However, the data are typically available by the expected publication of final frameworks. When we acquire the survey data annually in about January, we determine the appropriate allowable harvest for the upcoming RMP crane season according to the harvest strategy in the Central and Pacific Flyway Councils' management plan for RMP cranes and publish the results in the final frameworks rule.

The 2024 fall RMP crane abundance estimate was 24,909 cranes, resulting in a 3-year (2022–2024) average of 23,603 cranes, which is similar to the previous 3-year average of 23,287 cranes. The RMP crane recruitment estimate was 9.34 percent young in the fall population, resulting in a 3-year (2022–2024) average of 10.66 percent, which is similar to the previous 3-year average of 10.47 percent. Using the current harvest strategy and the above most recent 3-year average abundance and recruitment estimates, the allowable harvest for the 2025–26 season is 3,232 cranes, which is similar to the previous season allowable harvest of 3,006 cranes.

16. Doves

Similar to duck hunting (see above under 1. Ducks), the Service has allowed the use of zones to provide equitable distribution of dove hunting opportunities within a State or region. The intent is not to increase total annual dove harvest in the zoned areas; harvest levels are to be adjusted downward if they exceed traditional levels as a result of zoning. In 2006, the Service developed guidelines to provide a framework for controlling the proliferation of zones and split seasons in dove hunting (see 71 FR 51406 at 51408, August 29, 2006). Substantial concern remains about the unknown consequences of zones and split seasons on dove populations and harvest redistribution among States and flyways, potential reduced effectiveness of regulations (season length and bag limit) to reduce dove harvest if needed, and the administrative burden of implementing zones and splits. The guidelines identified a limited number of zone and split-season configurations that could be used for dove hunting and restricted the frequency of changes in State selection among these configurations to the beginning of a 5-year interval.

The next opportunity for States to select zones and split-season configurations for dove hunting is in 2025 for the fixed period of the 2026–2030 seasons. In the January 21, 2025, proposed rule (90 FR 7056), we proposed to adopt the same zones and split-season guidelines and configurations for dove hunting that we used for the 2021–25 seasons. We discussed and presented guidelines and configurations for dove zones and split seasons during the 2021–25 seasons in the August 21, 2020, final rule (85 FR 51854 at 51865–51866). In this document, we are adopting the zones and split-season guidelines and configurations for dove hunting as described above. For those States wishing to change zone and split-season configurations in time for the 2026–2030 seasons, we must receive configuration selections and zone descriptions by August 31, 2025.

Council Recommendations: The Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific Flyway Councils recommended adoption of the standard regulatory alternative as prescribed in the national mourning dove harvest strategy for their respective Mourning Dove Management Units. The standard regulatory alternative consists of a 90-day season and 15-bird daily bag limit for States within the Eastern and Central Management Units, and a 60-day season and 15-bird daily bag limit for States in the Western Management Unit (WMU). Also, the Pacific Flyway Council recommended allowing up to 15 white-winged doves in the 15-dove aggregate daily bag limit for the dove season in Arizona and California.

Response: Based on the harvest strategies and current population status, we agree with the recommended selection of the standard season frameworks for doves in the Eastern, Central, and Western Management Units for the 2025–26 season. We also agree with the Pacific Flyway Council's recommendation, which effectively removes the dove season restriction of 10 white-winged doves within the 15-dove aggregate daily bag limit in Arizona and California. This change simplifies the dove season regulations in Arizona and California and is consistent with the dove season frameworks for all other States in the WMU.

The Pacific Flyway Council adopted a revised management plan for western white-winged doves in August 2024. The Council's plan includes a harvest strategy and establishes a harvest management objective to maintain hunting regulations that meet overall objectives of the plan and are consistent with the National Mourning Dove Harvest Strategy. This is because the dove season includes white-winged and mourning doves in an aggregate daily bag limit. The Council's white-winged dove harvest strategy is based on an assessment of the white-winged dove harvest potential and long-term trend in their abundance provided by the North American Breeding Bird Survey (BBS). The BBS indicates white-winged dove abundance in the WMU is stable over the long term (1968–2022) at about 68 white-winged doves per route in the WMU. Based on current data from the BBS, the Council's white-winged dove harvest strategy prescribes the standard regulatory alternative, which allows an aggregate daily bag limit of 15 doves with no species-specific restrictions in the WMU.

Within the WMU, white-winged doves are most abundant in Arizona. The Arizona spring call count survey indicates white-winged doves have increased in abundance considerably during the recent 10 years. White-winged doves generally begin southward migration from Arizona and California during the 15-day dove season allowed in early September and are south of Arizona and California prior to the late dove season starting as early as November 1. Because of the timing of white-winged dove southward migration, the additional harvest of white-winged doves from this bag limit change is expected to be negligible for white-winged dove harvest in the WMU. There is no expected increase in the harvest of mourning doves, but harvest could be reduced by any buffering effect by increased white-winged dove harvest in the aggregate daily bag limit of doves.

17. Alaska

Council Recommendations: The Pacific Flyway Council recommended several changes to the season frameworks for Alaska. Specifically, the Council recommended closing the hunting season for emperor geese in addition to the recommendations already discussed above under 1. Ducks, 4. Canada and Cackling Geese, and 6. Brant.

Response: We agree with the Pacific Flyway Council's recommendation to close the emperor goose season in Alaska. The Pacific Flyway Council's harvest strategy in their management plan for the emperor goose uses the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Coastal Zone Survey to assess emperor goose population abundance in the spring and prescribe harvest management regulations relative to the Council's population objective and abundance threshold levels. The Council's harvest strategy provides that the emperor goose season will be open with an allowable harvest of 1,000 birds if the Coastal Zone survey abundance index from the previous year is greater than 28,000 birds, open with an allowable harvest of 500 birds if the index is between 23,000 and 28,000 birds and closed if the index is below 23,000 birds. The most recent (2024) Coastal Zone survey abundance index for emperor geese is 18,788 birds, which is 45 percent below the Council's population objective of 34,000 birds and below the abundance level necessary to prescribe an open hunting season for emperor geese.

See above under 1. Ducks, 4. Canada and Cackling Geese, and 6. Brant, for the Service's response to the other Pacific Flyway Council's recommendations for changes to the season frameworks for Alaska.

Required Determinations

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Consideration

The programmatic document, Second Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement: Issuance of Annual Regulations Permitting the Sport Hunting of Migratory Birds (EIS No. 20130139), filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on May 24, 2013, addresses NEPA compliance by the Service for issuance of the annual framework regulations for hunting of migratory game bird species. We published a notice of availability in the **Federal Register** on May 31, 2013 (78 FR 32686), and our record of decision on July 26, 2013 (78 FR 45376). We also address NEPA compliance for waterfowl hunting frameworks through the annual preparation of separate environmental assessments, the most recent being the Duck Hunting Regulations for the 2024–25 Season and its corresponding 2024 finding of no significant impact.

Endangered Species Act Consideration

Before issuance of the 2025–26 migratory game bird hunting regulations, we will comply with provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA; 16 U.S.C. 1531–1543), to ensure that hunting is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species designated as endangered or threatened or adversely modify or destroy its critical habitat and is consistent with conservation programs for those species. Consultations under section 7 of the ESA may cause us to change proposals in future supplemental proposed rulemaking documents.

Regulatory Planning and Review—E.O.s 12866, 13563, and 14192

E.O. 12866, as reaffirmed by E.O. 13563, provides that the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will review all significant rules. This action is a ''significant regulatory action,'' as defined under section 3(f)(1) of E.O. 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993).

An economic analysis was prepared for the 2025–26 migratory bird hunting season. This analysis was based on data from the 2011 and the 2016 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation (National Survey), the most recent years for which data are available. See discussion under Required Determinations, *Regulatory Flexibility Act,* below. This analysis estimated consumer surplus for four alternatives for hunting regulations. As defined by OMB in Circular A–4, consumers' surplus is the difference between what a consumer pays for a unit of a good or service and the maximum amount the consumer would be willing to pay for that unit. The duck hunting regulatory alternatives are (1) not opening a hunting season; (2) issuing restrictive regulations that allow fewer days than the 2024–25 season; (3) issuing moderate regulations that allow more days than in Alternative 2 but fewer days than the 2024–25 season, and (4) issuing liberal regulations that allow days similar to the 2024–25 season. The estimated consumer surplus associated with liberal regulations issued for the 2024–25 season across all flyways was $624 million to $816 million (2024$). We also chose Alternative 4 (liberal regulations) for the 2009–10 through 2023–24 seasons. The 2025–26 analysis is part of the record for this rulemaking action and is available at *https://www.regulations.gov* at Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2024–0127.

This rule is not an E.O. 14192 regulatory action because this rulemaking is related to routine hunting and fishing regulatory actions that establish annual harvest limits.

Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)

The annual migratory bird hunting regulations have a significant economic impact on substantial numbers of small entities, such as restaurants, grocery

stores, lodging, transportation, and sporting goods stores under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). A final regulatory flexibility analysis was prepared to analyze the economic impacts of the annual hunting regulations on small business entities. This analysis is updated annually. The primary source of information about hunter expenditures for migratory game bird hunting is the National Survey, which is generally conducted at 5-year intervals. The 2022 National Survey did not collect migratory bird expenditure data, so the 2025–26 migratory bird hunting season analysis is based on the 2022 National Survey's prorated total hunting estimate, 2011 and 2016 National Surveys' migratory bird data, and the U.S. Department of Commerce's County Business Patterns, from which it is estimated that migratory bird hunters will spend approximately $2.5 billion (2024$) at small businesses during the 2025–26 migratory bird hunting season. In summary, this final rule will have a significant beneficial economic impact on small entities. Without these annual regulations, States cannot establish migratory bird hunting seasons. A wide range of businesses and individuals benefit economically from the establishment of the annual migratory bird hunting regulations. The final regulatory flexibility analysis can be found in the economic analysis of the migratory game bird hunting regulations for the 2025–26 season. Copies of the economic analysis are available upon request from the person listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** or from *https://www.regulations.gov* at Docket No. FWS–HQ–MB–2024–0127.

Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to subtitle E of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (also known as the Congressional Review Act or CRA, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), OIRA found this action meets the definition at 5 U.S.C. 804(2) because it is likely to result in an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more. However, because this final rule establishes a regulatory program for activity related to hunting and because hunting seasons are time sensitive, we establish the effective date of this final rule using the exemption in the CRA at 5 U.S.C. 808(1).

Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.)

This final rule does not contain any new collection of information that requires approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). OMB has previously approved the information collection requirements associated with migratory bird surveys and the procedures for establishing annual migratory bird hunting seasons under the following OMB control numbers:

- 1018–0019, ''North American Woodcock Singing Ground Survey'' (expires 02/28/2027).
- 1018–0023, ''Migratory Bird Surveys, 50 CFR 20.20'' (expires 05/31/2026). Includes Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program, Migratory Bird Hunter Surveys, Sandhill Crane Survey, and Parts Collection Survey.
- 1018–0171, ''Establishment of Annual Migratory Bird Hunting Seasons, 50 CFR part 20'' (expires 10/30/2027).

You may view the information collection request(s) at *https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.* An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.)

We have determined and certify, in compliance with the requirements of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*) that this final rulemaking does not include any Federal mandate that may 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 1 year and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments.

Civil Justice Reform—E.O. 12988

The Department, in promulgating this final rule, has determined that this rule will not unduly burden the judicial system and that it meets the requirements of sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of E.O. 12988.

Takings Implication Assessment—E.O. 12630

In accordance with E.O. 12630, this final rule, authorized by the MBTA, does not have significant takings implications and does not affect any constitutionally protected property rights. This final rule would not result in the physical occupancy of property, the physical invasion of property, or the regulatory taking of any property. In fact, this final rule would allow hunters to exercise otherwise unavailable privileges and, therefore, reduces restrictions on the use of private and public property.

Energy Effects—E.O. 13211

E.O. 13211 requires agencies to prepare statements of energy effects when undertaking certain actions. While this final rule is a significant regulatory action under E.O. 12866, it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy and has not been designated by OIRA as a significant energy action. Therefore, no statement of energy effects is required.

Government-to-Government Relationship With Tribes

In accordance with the President's memorandum of April 29, 1994, ''Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments'' (59 FR 22951), E.O. 13175, and 512 DM 2, we have evaluated possible effects on federally recognized Indian Tribes with respect to impacts to Tribes' treaty rights to hunt waterfowl. We have determined that there are de minimis effects on Indian Tribes for that aspect of their treaty rights. Through the process to establish annual hunting regulations, we regularly coordinated with Tribes on concerns related to this final rulemaking action. Tribes have the opportunity to attend spring and fall flyway meetings, provide comments on **Federal Register** publications concerning migratory bird hunting, and, whenever needed, we hold informal consultations with Tribes regarding trust resources, trust assets, health, and safety. Also, while streamlining the migratory bird hunting regulation process, four informational webinars were held to present the new process to Tribes, giving Tribes the opportunity to provide input and to ask questions about the Tribal migratory bird hunting regulations. This final rule would 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.

This final rule is general in nature and does not directly affect any specific Tribal lands, treaty rights, or Tribal trust resources. In addition, this final rule does not interfere with the ability of Tribes to manage themselves or their funds or to regulate migratory bird activities on Tribal lands. Therefore, we conclude that this final rule does not have ''Tribal implications'' under section 1(a) of E.O. 13175 with respect to waterfowl treaty rights. Thus, formal government-to-government consultation is not required by E.O. 13175 and related policies of the Department of the

Interior. We will continue to collaborate with Tribes on concerns related to migratory bird hunting regulations.

Federalism Effects—E.O. 13132

Due to the migratory nature of certain species of birds, the Federal Government has been given responsibility over these species by the MBTA. We annually prescribe frameworks from which the States make selections regarding the hunting of migratory birds, and we employ guidelines to establish special regulations on Federal Indian reservations and ceded lands. This process preserves the ability of the States and Tribes to determine which seasons meet their individual needs.

Any State or Tribe may be more restrictive in its regulations than the Federal frameworks at any time. The frameworks are developed in a cooperative process with the States and the Flyway Councils. This process allows States to participate in the development of frameworks from which they will make selections, thereby having an influence on their own regulations. This final rule would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with E.O. 13132, these regulations do not have federalism implications and do not warrant the preparation of a federalism summary impact statement.

Regulations Promulgation

The rulemaking process for migratory game bird hunting, by its nature, operates under a time constraint as seasons must be established each year or hunting seasons remain closed. However, we have provided the public with extensive opportunity for public input and involvement in compliance with Administrative Procedure Act requirements. Thus, when the preliminary proposed rulemaking was published, we established what we concluded were the longest periods possible for public comment and the most opportunities for public involvement. We also provided notification of our participation in multiple Flyway Council meetings, opportunities for additional public review and comment on all Flyway Council proposals for regulatory change, and opportunities for additional public review during the SRC meeting. Therefore, sufficient public notice and opportunity for involvement have been given to affected persons regarding the migratory bird hunting frameworks for the 2025–26 hunting season. Further, after establishment of the final frameworks, States need sufficient time to conduct their own public processes to select season dates and limits, to communicate those selections to us, and to establish and publicize the necessary regulations and procedures to implement their decisions. Thus, if there were a delay in the effective date of these regulations after this final rulemaking, States might not be able to meet their own administrative needs and requirements.

For the reasons cited above, we find that ''good cause'' exists, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) of the Administrative Procedure Act, and these frameworks will take effect immediately upon publication.

Therefore, under authority of the MBTA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703–711), we prescribe final frameworks setting forth the species to be hunted, the daily bag and possession limits, the shooting hours, the season lengths, the earliest opening and latest closing season dates, and hunting areas, from which State conservation agency officials will select hunting season dates and other options. Upon receipt of season selections from these officials, we will publish a final rulemaking amending 50 CFR part 20 to reflect seasons, limits, and shooting hours for the United States for the 2025–26 seasons.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 20

Exports, Hunting, Imports, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation, Wildlife.

Authority

The rules that eventually will be promulgated for the 2025–26 hunting season are authorized under 16 U.S.C. 703–712 and 742 a–j.

Final Regulatory Frameworks for 2025–26 Hunting Seasons on Certain Migratory Game Birds

Pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and delegated authorities, the Department of the Interior is establishing the following frameworks for outside dates, season lengths, shooting hours, bag and possession limits, and areas within which States may select seasons for hunting migratory game birds between the dates of September 1, 2025, and March 10, 2026. These frameworks are summarized below.

General

Outside Dates: Outside dates are the earliest and latest dates within which States may establish hunting seasons. All outside dates specified below are inclusive.

Season Lengths: Season lengths are the maximum number of days hunting may occur within the outside dates for hunting seasons. Days are consecutive and concurrent for all species included in each season framework unless otherwise specified.

Season Segments: Season segments are the maximum number of consecutive-day segments into which the season lengths may be divided. The sum of the hunting days for all season segments may not exceed the season lengths allowed.

Zones: Unless otherwise specified, States may select hunting seasons by zones. Zones for duck seasons (and associated youth and veterans—active military waterfowl hunting days, gallinule seasons, and snipe seasons) and dove seasons may be selected only in years we declare such changes may be made (*i.e.,* open seasons for zones and splits) and according to federally established guidelines for duck and dove zones and split seasons.

Area, Zone, and Unit Descriptions: Areas open to hunting must be described, delineated, and designated as such in each State's hunting regulations, and, except for early teal seasons, these areas must also be published in the **Federal Register** as a Federal migratory bird hunting frameworks final rule. Geographic descriptions related to regulations are contained in a later portion of this document.

Shooting and Hawking (taking by falconry) Hours: Unless otherwise specified, from one-half hour before sunrise to sunset daily.

Possession Limits: Unless otherwise specified, possession limits are three times the daily bag limits.

Permits: For some species of migratory birds, the Service authorizes the use of permits to regulate harvest or monitor their take by hunters, or both. In such cases, the Service determines the amount of harvest that may be taken during hunting seasons during its formal regulations-setting process, and the States then issue permits to hunters at levels predicted to result in the amount of take authorized by the Service. Thus, although issued by States, the permits will not be valid unless the Service approved such take in its regulations.

These federally authorized, State-issued permits are issued to individuals, and only the individual whose name and address appears on the permit at the time of issuance is authorized to take migratory birds at levels specified in the permit, in accordance with provisions of

both Federal and State regulations governing the hunting season. The permit must be carried by the permittee when exercising its provisions and must be presented to any law enforcement officer upon request. The permit is not transferrable or assignable to another individual, and may not be sold, bartered, traded, or otherwise provided to another person. If the permit is altered or defaced in any way, the permit becomes invalid.

Flyways and Management Units

We generally set migratory bird hunting frameworks for the conterminous United States by Flyway or Management Unit/Region. Frameworks for Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are contained in separate sections near the end of the frameworks portion of this document. The States included in the Flyways and Management Units/Regions are described below.

Waterfowl Flyways

Atlantic Flyway: Includes Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Mississippi Flyway: Includes Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

Central Flyway: Includes Colorado (east of the Continental Divide), Kansas, Montana (Counties of Blaine, Carbon, Fergus, Judith Basin, Stillwater, Sweetgrass, Wheatland, and all counties east thereof), Nebraska, New Mexico (east of the Continental Divide except the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation), North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming (east of the Continental Divide).

Pacific Flyway: Includes Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and those portions of Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, and Wyoming not included in the Central Flyway.

Mallard Management Units

High Plains Management Unit: Roughly defined as that portion of the Central Flyway that lies west of the 100th meridian. See Area, Unit, and Zone Descriptions, *Ducks (Including Mergansers) and Coots,* below, for specific boundaries in each State.

Columbia Basin Management Unit: In Washington, all areas east of the Pacific Crest Trail and east of the Big White Salmon River in Klickitat County; and in Oregon, the counties of Gilliam, Morrow, and Umatilla.

Mourning Dove Management Units

Eastern Management Unit: All States east of the Mississippi River, and Louisiana.

Central Management Unit: Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

Western Management Unit: Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

Woodcock Management Regions

Eastern Management Region: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Central Management Region: Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Definitions

For the purpose of the hunting season frameworks listed below, the collective terms ''dark'' and ''light'' geese include the following species:

Dark geese: Canada geese, cackling geese, white-fronted geese, brant (except in Alaska, California, Oregon, Washington, and the Atlantic Flyway), and all other goose species except light geese.

Light geese: Snow (including blue) geese and Ross's geese.

Migratory Game Bird Seasons in the Atlantic Flyway

In the Atlantic Flyway States of Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania, if Sunday hunting of migratory birds is prohibited statewide by State law or regulation, all Sundays are closed to the take of all migratory game birds. For these States where Sunday hunting is prohibited statewide by State law or regulation, the State may extend their hunting season length beyond the framework season length for any migratory game bird by one day for each Sunday included in the State's regular hunting season. Total season days must be within the season framework outside dates; season days must be consecutive except as provided in framework split-season provisions; and total season length (including extended falconry and other special seasons) must not exceed 107 days.

Season Frameworks

Special Youth and Veterans—Active Military Personnel Waterfowl Hunting Days

Outside Dates and Season Lengths: States may select 2 days per duck-hunting zone, designated as ''Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days,'' and 2 days per duck-hunting zone, designated as ''Veterans and Active Military Personnel Waterfowl Hunting Days,'' in addition to their regular duck seasons. The days may be held concurrently or may be nonconsecutive. The Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days must be held outside any regular duck season on weekends, holidays, or other non-school days when youth hunters have the maximum opportunity to participate. Both sets of days may be held up to 14 days before or after any regular duck-season frameworks or within any split of a regular duck season, or within any other open season on migratory birds.

Daily Bag Limits: The daily bag limits may include ducks, geese, swans, mergansers, coots, and gallinules. Bag limits are the same as those allowed in the regular season except in States that implement a hybrid season for scaup (*i.e.,* different bag limits during different portions of the season), in which case the bag limit will be 2 scaup per day. Flyway species and area restrictions remain in effect.

Participation Restrictions for Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days: States may use their established definition of age for youth hunters. However, youth hunters must be under the age of 18. In addition, an adult at least 18 years of age must accompany the youth hunter into the field. This adult may not duck hunt but may participate in other seasons that are open on the special youth day. Swans may be taken only by participants possessing applicable swan permits.

Participation Restrictions for Veterans and Active Military Personnel Waterfowl Hunting Days: Veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code) and members of the Armed Forces on active duty, including members of the National Guard and Reserves on active duty (other than for training), may participate. Swans may be taken only by participants possessing applicable swan permits.

Special Early Teal Seasons

Areas:

Atlantic Flyway: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

Mississippi Flyway: Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa,

Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

Central Flyway: Colorado (part), Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico (part), Oklahoma, and Texas.

Outside Dates: September 1–30.

Season Lengths: 9 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 6 teal.

Shooting Hours: One-half hour before sunrise to sunset, except in the States of Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, and Wisconsin, where the hours are from sunrise to sunset.

Special Early Teal-Wood Duck Seasons

Areas: Florida, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Seasons: In lieu of a special early teal season, a 5-consecutive-day teal-wood duck season may be selected in September. The daily bag limit may not exceed 6 teal and wood ducks in the aggregate, of which no more than 2 may be wood ducks.

Duck, Merganser, Coot, and Goose Seasons

Atlantic Flyway

Duck, Merganser, and Coot Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 60 days. The daily bag limit is 6 ducks, including no more than 4 mallards (no more than 2 of which may be female), 2 black ducks, 3 pintails, 1 mottled duck, 1 fulvous whistling duck, 3 wood ducks, 2 redheads, 2 canvasbacks, and 4 sea ducks (including no more than 3 scoters, 3 long-tailed ducks, or 3 eiders and no more than 1 female eider). The season for scaup may be split into 2 segments, with one segment consisting of 40 consecutive days with a 1-scaup daily bag limit, and the second segment consisting of 20 consecutive days with a 2-scaup daily bag limit. The daily bag limit of mergansers is 5. In States that include mergansers in the duck bag limit, the daily limit is the same as the duck bag limit. The daily bag limit of coots is 15.

Closed Seasons: There is no open season on the harlequin duck.

Zones and Split Seasons: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and West Virginia may split their seasons into 3 segments. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Vermont may select seasons in each of 3 zones; Pennsylvania may select seasons in each of 4 zones; New York may select seasons in each of 5 zones; and all these States may split their season in each zone into 2 segments. Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia may select seasons in each of 2 zones, and all of these States may split their season in each zone into 3 segments. Connecticut, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia must conduct an evaluation of the impacts of zones and splits on hunter dynamics (*e.g.,* hunter numbers, satisfaction) and harvest during the 2021–25 seasons.

Other Provisions: The seasons, limits, and shooting hours should be the same between New York's Lake Champlain Zone and Vermont's Lake Champlain Zone, and between Vermont's Connecticut River Zone and New Hampshire's Inland Zone.

A craft under power may be used to shoot and retrieve dead or crippled birds in the Special Sea Duck Area in the Atlantic Flyway. The Special Sea Duck Area includes all coastal waters and all waters of rivers and streams seaward from the first upstream bridge in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York; in New Jersey, all coastal waters seaward from the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (COLREGS) Demarcation Lines shown on National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Nautical Charts and further described in 33 CFR 80.165, 80.501, 80.502, and 80.503; in any waters of the Atlantic Ocean and in any tidal waters of any bay that are separated by at least 1 mile of open water from any shore, island, and emergent vegetation in South Carolina and Georgia; and in any waters of the Atlantic Ocean and in any tidal waters of any bay that are separated by at least 800 yards of open water from any shore, island, and emergent vegetation in Delaware and North Carolina. In Virginia, the Special Sea Duck Area includes all ocean waters of Virginia, the tidal waters of Northampton and Accomack Counties up to the first highway bridge, and the Chesapeake Bay and each of its tributaries up to the first highway bridge; Back Bay and its tributaries are not included. In Maryland, the Special Sea Duck Area includes portions of the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The Special Sea Duck Area in each State must be described, delineated, and designated as such in each State's hunting regulations.

Special Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Outside Dates and Season Lengths: 15 days during September 1–15 in the Eastern Unit of Maryland; 30 days during September 1–30 in Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, New Jersey, Long Island Zone of New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and South Carolina; and 25 days during September 1–25 in the remainder of the Atlantic Flyway.

Daily Bag Limits: 15 geese in the aggregate.

Shooting Hours: One-half hour before sunrise to sunset, except that during any special early Canada and cackling goose season, shooting hours may extend to one-half hour after sunset if all other waterfowl seasons are closed in the specific applicable area.

Dark Goose Seasons

Outside Dates, Season Lengths, and Daily Bag Limits: Regulations are State and zone specific as provided below.

Area	Outside dates	Season length	Daily bag limit	Season segments
Connecticut:				
Atlantic Population (AP) Zone	Oct 10–Feb 5	30	1	2
AP Zone Late Season Area (Special season)	Dec 15–Feb 15	54	5	1
North Atlantic Population (NAP) Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
NAP Late Season Area (Special season)	Jan 15–Feb 15	28	5	1
Resident Population (RP) Zone	Oct 1–Feb 15	80	5	3
Delaware	Nov 15–Feb 5	30	1	2
Florida	Oct 1–Mar 10	80	5	3
Georgia	Oct 1–Mar 10	80	5	3
Maine:				
North NAP High Harvest Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
South NAP High Harvest Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2

Area	Outside dates	Season length	Daily bag limit	Season segments
Coastal NAP Low Harvest Zone	Oct 1–Feb 15	70	3	2
Maryland:				
AP Zone	Nov 15–Feb 5	30	1	2
RP Zone	Nov 15–Mar 10	80	5	3
Massachusetts:				
AP Zone	Oct 10–Feb 5	30	1	2
AP Zone Late Season Area (Special season)	Dec 15–Feb 15	54	5	1
NAP Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
NAP Late Season Area (Special season)	Jan 15–Feb 15	28	5	1
New Hampshire	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
New Jersey:				
AP Zone	Fourth Saturday in Oct (25)–Feb 5	30	1	2
NAP Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
Special Late Season Area (Special season)	Jan 15–Feb 15	28	5	1
New York:				
AP Zone	Fourth Saturday in Oct (25)–Feb 5	30	1	2
AP (Lake Champlain) Zone	Oct 10–Feb 5	30	1	2
NAP High Harvest Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
NAP Low Harvest Zone	Oct 1–Feb 15	70	3	2
Western Long Island RP Zone	Saturday nearest Sep 24 (27)–last day of Feb (28).	107	8	3
Remainder of RP Zone	Fourth Saturday in Oct (25)–last day of Feb (28).	80	5	3
AP (Lake Champlain) Zone Late Season (Special season).	Dec 1–Feb 15	77	5	1
North Carolina:				
Northeast Zone	Saturday prior to Dec 25 (20)–Jan 31	30	1	1
RP Zone	Oct 1–Mar 10	80	5	3
Pennsylvania:				
AP Zone	Fourth Saturday in Oct (25)–Feb 5	30	1	2
RP Zone	Fourth Saturday in Oct (25)–Mar 10	80	5	3
Rhode Island:				
Statewide	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
Late Season Area (Special season)	Jan 15–Feb 15	32	5	2
South Carolina	Oct 1–Mar 10	80	5	3
Vermont:				
Connecticut River Zone	Oct 1–Jan 31	60	2	2
Interior Zone	Oct 10–Feb 5	30	1	2
Lake Champlain Zone	Oct 10–Feb 5	30	1	2
Interior, and Lake Champlain Zones Late Season (Special Season).	Dec 1–Feb 15	77	5	1
Virginia:				
AP Zone	Nov 15–Feb 5	30	1	2
RP Zone	Nov 15–Mar 10	80	5	3
West Virginia	Oct 1–Mar 10	80	5	3

Light Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: October 1–March 10.

Season Lengths: 107 days. Seasons may be split into 3 segments.

Daily Bag limits: 25 light geese. There is no possession limit.

Brant Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths: 30 days. Seasons may be split into 2 segments.

Daily Bag Limits: 1 brant.

Mississippi Flyway

Duck, Merganser, and Coot Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 60 days. The daily bag limit is 6 ducks, including no more than 4 mallards (no more than 2 of which may be females), 1 mottled duck, 2 black ducks, 3 pintails, 3 wood ducks, 2 canvasbacks, and 2 redheads. In Louisiana (the only high-harvest State in the Mississippi Flyway for mottled ducks), the daily bag limit for mottled ducks is zero for the first 15 days. The season for scaup may be split into 2 segments, with one segment consisting of 45 days with a 2-scaup daily bag limit, and the second segment consisting of 15 days with a 1-scaup daily bag limit. The daily bag limit of mergansers is 5, only 2 of which may be hooded mergansers. In States that include mergansers in the duck bag limit, the daily limit is the same as the duck bag limit, only 2 of which may be hooded mergansers. The daily bag limit of coots is 15.

Zones and Split Seasons: Alabama, Arkansas, and Mississippi may split their seasons into 3 segments. Kentucky and Tennessee may select seasons in each of 2 zones; Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin may select seasons in each of 3 zones; and all these States may split their season in each zone into 2 segments. Illinois may select seasons in each of 4 zones. Louisiana may select seasons in each of 2 zones and may split their season in each zone into 3 segments. Louisiana must conduct an evaluation of the impacts of zones and splits on hunter dynamics (*e.g.,* hunter numbers, satisfaction) and harvest during the 2021–25 seasons.

Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–February 15.

Season Lengths: 107 days, which may be split into 4 segments.

Daily Bag Limits: 5 geese in the aggregate.

Shooting Hours: One-half hour before sunrise to sunset, except that during September 1–15 shooting hours may extend to one-half hour after sunset for Canada and cackling geese if all other waterfowl and crane seasons are closed in the specific applicable area.

White-Fronted Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–February 15.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 74 days with a daily bag limit of 3 geese, 88 days with a daily bag limit of 2 geese, or 107 days with a daily bag limit of 1 goose. Seasons may be split into 4 segments.

Brant Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–February 15.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 70 days with a daily bag limit of 2 brant or 107 days with a daily bag limit of 1 brant. Seasons may be split into 4 segments.

Other Provisions: In lieu of a separate brant season, brant may be included in the season for Canada and cackling geese with a daily bag limit of 5 geese in the aggregate.

Dark Goose Seasons

Areas: Alabama, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin in lieu of separate seasons for Canada and cackling geese, white-fronted geese, and brant.

Outside Dates: September 1–February 15.

Season Lengths: 107 days, which may be split into 4 segments.

Daily Bag Limits: 5 geese in the aggregate.

Light Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–February 15.

Season Lengths: 107 days, which may be split into 4 segments.

Daily Bag and Possession Limits: The daily bag limit is 20 geese. There is no possession limit for light geese.

Central Flyway

Ducks, Merganser, and Coot Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths and Duck Daily Bag Limits: 74 days, except in the High Plains Mallard Management Unit where the season length is 97 days and the last 23 days must be consecutive and may start no earlier than the Saturday nearest December 10 (December 13). The daily bag limit is 6 ducks and mergansers in the aggregate, including no more than 5 mallards (no more than 2 of which may be females), 2 redheads, 3 wood ducks, 3 pintails, 1 scaup, and 2 canvasbacks. In Texas, the daily bag limit on mottled ducks is 1, except that no mottled ducks may be taken during the first 5 days of the season. In addition to the daily limits listed above, the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, in lieu of selecting an experimental September teal season, may include an additional daily bag and possession limit of 2 and 6 blue-winged teal, respectively, during the first 9 days of the regular duck season in each respective duck hunting zone. These extra limits are in addition to the regular duck bag and possession limits.

Coot Daily Bag Limits: 15 coots.

Zones and Split Seasons: Colorado, Kansas (Low Plains portion), Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma (Low Plains portion), South Dakota (Low Plains portion), Texas (Low Plains portion), and Wyoming may select hunting seasons by zones.

North Dakota may split their season into 3 segments. Montana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas may select seasons in each of 2 zones; Colorado, Kansas, South Dakota, and Wyoming may select seasons in each of 3 zones; and all these States may split their season in each zone into 2 segments. Nebraska may select seasons in each of 4 zones.

Special Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Outside Dates and Seasons Lengths: In Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas, 30 days between September 1–30; in Colorado, New Mexico, Montana, and Wyoming, Canada and cackling goose seasons of not more than 15 days between September 1–15; and in North Dakota, 22 days between September 1–22.

Daily Bag Limits: 5 geese in the aggregate in Colorado, New Mexico, Montana, Wyoming, and Texas; 8 geese in the aggregate in Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma; and 15 geese in the aggregate in North Dakota and South Dakota.

Shooting Hours: One-half hour before sunrise to sunset, except that during September 1–15 shooting hours may extend to one-half hour after sunset if all other waterfowl and crane seasons are closed in the specific applicable area.

Canada Goose, Cackling Goose, and Brant Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–the Sunday nearest February 15 (February 15).

Seasons and Daily Bag Limits: In Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and the Eastern Goose Zone of Texas, 107 days with a daily bag limit of 8 geese; in Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, and Wyoming, 107 days with a daily bag limit of 5 geese; and in Texas (Western Goose Zone), 95 days with a daily bag limit of 5 geese.

Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 3 segments. Three-segment seasons require Central Flyway Council and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval, and a 3-year evaluation by each participating State.

White-Fronted Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–the Sunday nearest February 15 (February 15).

Season Length and Daily Bag Limits:

East-tier States (Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas except for the Western Goose Zone): Either 74 days with a daily bag limit of 3 geese, or 88 days with a daily bag limit of 2 geese, or 107 days with a daily bag limit of 1 goose.

West-tier States (Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, and the Western Goose Zone of Texas): 107 days, except 95 days in the Western Goose Zone of Texas. The daily bag limit is 5 dark geese in the aggregate.

Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 3 segments. Three-segment seasons require Central Flyway Council and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval, and a 3-year evaluation by each participating State.

Light Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–March 10.

Season Lengths: 107 days. Seasons may be split into 3 segments.

Daily Bag and Possession Limits: The daily bag limit is 50 with no possession limit.

Other Provisions: In the Rainwater Basin Light Goose Area (East and West) of Nebraska, temporal and spatial restrictions that are consistent with the late-winter snow goose hunting strategy cooperatively developed by the Central Flyway Council and the Service are required.

Pacific Flyway

Duck, Merganser, Coot, and Gallinule Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 107 days. The daily bag limit is 7 ducks and mergansers in the aggregate, including no more than 2 female mallards, 3 pintails, 2 canvasbacks, 2 scaup, and 2 redheads. For scaup, the season length is 86 days, which may be split according to applicable zones and split duck hunting configurations approved for each State. The daily bag limit of coots and gallinules is 25 in the aggregate.

Zones and Split Seasons: Montana and New Mexico may split their seasons into 3 segments. Arizona, Colorado, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming may select seasons in each of 2 zones; Nevada may select seasons in each of 3 zones; California may select seasons in each of 5 zones; and all these States may split their season in each zone into 2 segments. Idaho may select seasons in each of 4 zones.

Other Provisions: The seasons, limits, and shooting hours should be the same between the Colorado River Zone of California and the South Zone of Arizona.

Goose Seasons

Special Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–20.

Season Lengths: 15 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 5 geese in the aggregate, except in Pacific County, Washington, where the daily bag limit is 15 geese in the aggregate.

Canada Goose, Cackling Goose, and Brant Seasons

Outside Dates: Except as subsequently provided, Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–February 15.

Season Lengths: Except as subsequently provided, 107 days.

Daily Bag Limits: Except as subsequently provided, in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the daily bag limit is 5 Canada and cackling geese and brant in the aggregate. In Oregon and Washington, the daily bag limit is 4 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate. In California, the daily bag limit is 10 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate.

Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 3 segments. Three-segment seasons require Pacific Flyway Council and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval and a 3-year evaluation by each participating State.

Other provisions:

California: In the Balance of State Zone, outside dates are Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27) and March 10. The season may be split into 3 segments. In the Balance of State Zone, North Coast Special Management Area, hunting days that occur after January 31 should be concurrent with Oregon's South Coast Zone.

Oregon: In the Northwest Permit Zone, the season length is 74 days. The daily bag limit is 2 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate. The season may be split into 3 segments. In the South Coast Zone, outside dates are the Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27) and March 10. The daily bag limit is 6 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate. The season may be split into 3 segments. Hunting days that occur after January 31 should be concurrent with California's Balance of State Zone, North Coast Special Management Area.

Washington: In Areas 2 Inland and 2 Coastal (Southwest Permit Zone), the season length is 74 days. The daily bag limit is 2 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate. In Areas 1 and 3, the daily bag limit is 3 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate. The season may be split into 3 segments. In Area 4, the season may be split into 3 segments.

Permit Zones: In Oregon and Washington permit zones, the hunting season is closed on dusky Canada geese. A dusky Canada goose is any dark-breasted Canada goose (Munsell 10 YR color value 5 or less) with a bill length between 40 and 50 millimeters. Hunting is by State-issued permit only. Shooting hours for geese may begin no earlier than sunrise. Regular Canada and cackling goose seasons in the permit zones of Oregon and Washington remain subject to the Memorandum of Understanding entered into with the Service regarding monitoring the impacts of take during the regular Canada and cackling goose season on the dusky Canada goose population.

Brant Seasons

Areas: California, Oregon, and Washington.

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 19 days and 2 brant.

Zones: Washington and California may select seasons in each of 2 zones.

Other Provisions: In Oregon and California, the brant season must end no later than December 15.

White-Fronted Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–March 10.

Season Lengths: 107 days.

Daily Bag Limits: Except as subsequently provided, 10 geese.

Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 3 segments. Three-segment seasons require Pacific Flyway Council and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval and a 3-year evaluation by each participating State.

Other Provisions:

California: In the Balance of State Zone, Sacramento Valley Special Management Area, the season must end on or before December 28, and the daily bag limit is 3 white-fronted geese. In the Balance of State Zone, North Coast Special Management Area, hunting days that occur after January 31 should be concurrent with Oregon's South Coast Zone. In the Northeastern Zone, the season may be split into 3 segments.

Oregon: In the Eastern Zone, for Lake County only, the daily bag limit is 1 white-fronted goose. In the Mid-Columbia Zone, Northwest Permit Zone, and South Coast Zone, the seasons may be split into 3 segments. In Oregon's South Coast Zone, hunting days that occur after January 31 should be concurrent with California's Balance of State Zone, North Coast Special Management Area.

Washington: In Areas 2 Inland and 2 Coastal (Southwest Permit Zone) and Area 4, seasons may be split into 3 segments.

Light Goose Seasons

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–March 10.

Season Lengths: 107 days. Seasons may be split into 3 segments.

Daily Bag Limits: 20 geese, except in Washington where the daily bag limit for light geese is 10 on or before the last Sunday in January (January 25).

Swan Seasons

Pacific Flyway

Areas: Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Utah.

Outside Dates: Saturday nearest September 24 (September 27)–January 31.

Season Lengths: 107 days. Seasons may be split into 2 segments.

Permits: Hunting is by State-issued permit only. The total number of permits issued may not exceed 50 in Idaho, 500 in Montana, 750 in Nevada, and 2,750 in Utah. Permits will authorize the take of no more than 1 swan per permit. Only 1 permit may be issued per hunter in Idaho, Montana, and Utah; 2 permits may be issued per hunter in Nevada.

Quotas: The swan season in the respective State must end upon attainment of the following reported harvest of trumpeter swans: 20 in Utah and 10 in Nevada. There is no quota in Idaho and Montana.

Monitoring: Each State must evaluate hunter participation, species-specific swan harvest, and hunter compliance in providing either species-determinant parts (at least the intact head) or bill measurements (bill length from tip to posterior edge of the nares opening, and presence or absence of yellow lore spots on the bill in front of the eyes) of harvested swans for species identification. Each State should use appropriate measures to maximize hunter compliance with the State's program for swan harvest reporting. Each State must achieve a hunter compliance of at least 80 percent in providing species-determinant parts or bill measurements of harvested swans for species identification, or subsequent permits will be reduced by 10 percent in the respective State. Each State must provide to the Service by June 30 following the swan season a report detailing hunter participation, species-specific swan harvest, and hunter compliance in reporting harvest. In Idaho and Montana, all hunters that harvest a swan must complete and submit a reporting card (bill card) with the bill measurement and color information from the harvested swan within 72 hours of harvest for species determination. In Utah and Nevada, all hunters that harvest a swan must have the swan or species-determinant parts examined by a State or Federal biologist within 72 hours of harvest for species determination.

Other Provisions: In Utah, the season is subject to the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement entered into with the Service in January 2019 regarding harvest monitoring, season closure procedures, and education requirements to minimize take of trumpeter swans during the swan season.

Atlantic and Central Flyways

Areas: Delaware, North Carolina, and Virginia in the Atlantic Flyway and North Dakota, South Dakota east of the Missouri River, and part of Montana in the Central Flyway.

Outside Dates: October 1–January 31 in the Atlantic Flyway and the Saturday nearest October 1 (October 4)–January 31 in the Central Flyway.

Season Lengths: 90 days in the Atlantic Flyway and 107 days in the Central Flyway.

Permits: Hunting is by permit only. Permits will be issued by the States. No more than 5,600 permits may be issued in the Atlantic Flyway including 272 in Delaware; 4,853 in North Carolina; and 475 in Virginia. No more than 4,000 permits may be issued in the Central Flyway including 500 in Montana; 2,200 in North Dakota; and 1,300 in South Dakota. Permits will authorize the take of no more than 1 swan per permit. A second permit may be issued to hunters from unissued permits remaining after the first drawing. Unissued permits may be reallocated to States within a flyway.

Monitoring: Each State must evaluate hunter participation, species-specific swan harvest, and hunter compliance in providing measurements of harvested swans for species identification. Each State should use appropriate measures to maximize hunter compliance with the State's program for swan harvest reporting. Each State must achieve a hunter compliance of at least 80 percent in providing species-determinant measurements of harvested swans for species identification. Each State must provide to the Service by June 30 following the swan season a report detailing hunter participation, species-specific swan harvest, and hunter compliance in reporting harvest.

Other Provisions: In lieu of a general swan hunting season, States may select a season only for tundra swans. States selecting a season only for tundra swans must obtain harvest and hunter participation data.

Sandhill Crane Seasons

Mississippi Flyway

Areas: Alabama, Kentucky, Minnesota, and Tennessee.

Outside Dates: September 1–February 28 in Minnesota, and September 1–January 31 in Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Season Lengths: 37 days in the designated portion of Minnesota's Northwest Goose Zone, and 60 days in Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Daily Bag and Possession Limits: The daily bag limit is 2 cranes in Minnesota and Kentucky, and 3 cranes in Alabama and Tennessee. In Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee, the seasonal bag limit is 3 cranes.

Permits: Hunting is by State-issued permit only.

Other Provisions: The number of permits, open areas, season dates, protection plans for other species, and other provisions of seasons must be consistent with Council management plans and approved by the Mississippi Flyway Council.

Central Flyway

Areas: Colorado, Kansas, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

Outside Dates: September 1–February 28.

Season Lengths: 37 days in Texas (Zone C), 58 days in Colorado, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, and 93 days in New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Daily Bag Limits: 3 cranes, except 2 cranes in North Dakota (Area 2) and Texas (Zone C).

Permits: Hunting is by permit only. Permits will be issued by the States.

Central and Pacific Flyways

Areas: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within the range of the Rocky Mountain Population (RMP) of sandhill cranes.

Outside Dates: September 1–January 31.

Season Lengths: 60 days. The season may be split into 3 segments.

Daily Bag and Possession limits: The daily bag limit is 3 cranes, and the possession limit is 9 cranes per season.

Permits: Hunting is by State-issued permit only.

Other Provisions: Numbers of permits, open areas, season dates, protection plans for other species, and other provisions of seasons must be consistent with Councils' management plan and approved by the Central and Pacific Flyway Councils, with the following exceptions:

1. In Utah, 100 percent of the harvest will be assigned to the RMP crane quota;

2. In Arizona, monitoring the species composition of the harvest must be conducted at 3-year intervals unless 100 percent of the harvest will be assigned to the RMP crane quota;

3. In Idaho, 100 percent of the harvest will be assigned to the RMP crane quota; and

4. In the Estancia Valley hunt area of New Mexico, harvest and species composition must be monitored; greater sandhill cranes in the harvest will be assigned to the RMP crane quota.

Gallinule Seasons

Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyways

Outside Dates: September 1–January 31.

Season Lengths: 70 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 15 gallinules.

Zones and Split Seasons: Seasons may be selected by zones established for duck hunting. The season in each zone may be split into 2 segments.

Pacific Flyway

States in the Pacific Flyway may select their hunting seasons between the outside dates for the season on ducks, mergansers, and coots; therefore, Pacific Flyway frameworks for gallinules are included with the duck, merganser, and coot frameworks.

Rail Seasons

Areas: Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyways and the Pacific Flyway portions of Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Outside Dates: September 1–January 31.

Season Lengths: 70 days. Seasons may be split into 2 segments.

Daily Bag Limits

Clapper and King Rails: In Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Rhode Island, 10 rails in the aggregate. In Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, 15 rails in the aggregate.

Sora and Virginia Rails: 25 rails in the aggregate.

Snipe Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–February 28, except in Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia, where the season must end no later than January 31.

Season Lengths: 107 days.

Daily Bag limits: 8 snipe.

Zones and Split Seasons: Seasons may be selected by zones established for duck seasons. The season in each zone may be split into 2 segments.

American Woodcock Seasons

Areas: Eastern and Central Management Regions.

Outside Dates: September 13–January 31.

Season Lengths: Except as subsequently provided, 45 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 3 woodcock.

Zones and Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 2 segments. New Jersey may select seasons in each of 2 zones. The season in each zone may not exceed 36 days.

Band-Tailed Pigeon Seasons

California, Oregon, Washington, and Nevada

Outside Dates: September 15–January 1.

Seasons Lengths: 9 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 2 pigeons.

Zones: California may select seasons in each of 2 zones. The season in each zone may not exceed 9 days. The season in the North Zone must close by October 3.

Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah

Outside Dates: September 1–November 30.

Season Lengths: 14 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 2 pigeons.

Zones: New Mexico may select seasons in each of 2 zones. The season in each zone may not exceed 14 days. The season in the South Zone may not open until October 1.

Dove Seasons

Eastern Management Unit

Outside Dates: September 1–January 31.

Season Lengths: 90 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 15 mourning and white-winged doves in the aggregate.

Zones and Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 3 segments; Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi may select seasons in each of 2 zones and may split their season in each zone into 3 segments.

Central Management Unit

Outside Dates: September 1–January 15.

Season Lengths: 90 days.

All States Except Texas

Daily Bag Limits: 15 mourning and white-winged doves in the aggregate.

Zones and Split Seasons: Seasons may be split into 3 segments; New Mexico may select seasons in each of 2 zones and may split their season in each zone into 3 segments.

Texas

Daily Bag Limits: 15 mourning, white-winged, and white-tipped doves in the aggregate, of which no more than 2 may be white-tipped doves.

Zones and Split Seasons: Texas may select hunting seasons for each of 3 zones subject to the following conditions:

1. The season may be split into 2 segments, except in that portion of Texas in which the special white-winged dove season is allowed, where a limited take of mourning and white-tipped doves may also occur during that special season (see Special White-winged Dove Area in Texas, below).

2. A season may be selected for the North and Central Zones between September 1 and January 25; and for the South Zone between September 14 and January 25.

Special White-winged Dove Season in Texas

In addition, Texas may select a hunting season of not more than 6 days, which may be split into 3 segments, for the Special White-winged Dove Area between September 1 and 19. The daily bag limit may not exceed 15 white-winged, mourning, and white-tipped doves in the aggregate, of which no more than 2 may be mourning doves and no more than 2 may be white-tipped doves. Shooting hours are from noon to sunset.

Western Management Unit

Outside Dates: September 1–January 15.

Season Lengths: 60 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 15 mourning and white-winged doves in the aggregate.

Zones and Split Seasons: Idaho, Nevada, Utah, and Washington may split their seasons into 2 segments. Oregon may select hunting seasons in each of 2 zones and may split their season in each zone into 2 segments. Arizona and California may split their seasons between 2 periods, September 1–15 and November 1–January 15.

Alaska

Duck, Goose, Sandhill Crane, and Snipe Seasons

Outside Dates: Except as subsequently provided, September 1–January 26.

Season Lengths: Except as subsequently provided, 107 days for ducks, geese, sandhill cranes, and snipe. The season length for brant is 51 days.

Zones and Split Seasons: A season may be established in each of 5 zones. The season in the Southeast Zone may be split into 2 segments.

Closed Seasons: The hunting season is closed on the emperor goose, spectacled eider, and Steller's eider.

Daily Bag and Possession Limits and Special Conditions

Ducks: The basic daily bag limit is 7 ducks. The basic daily bag limit in the North Zone is 10 ducks, and in the Gulf Coast Zone is 8 ducks. The basic daily bag limits may include 2 canvasbacks and may not include sea ducks.

In addition to the basic daily bag limits, the sea duck daily bag limit is 10, including 6 each of either harlequin or long-tailed ducks. Sea ducks include scoters, common and king eiders, harlequin ducks, long-tailed ducks, and common, hooded, and red-breasted mergansers.

Light Geese: The daily bag limit is 6 geese.

Canada and Cackling Geese: The daily bag limit is 4 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate with the following exceptions, and subject to the following conditions:

1. In Game Management Units (Units) 5 and 6, in the Gulf Coast Zone, outside dates are September 28–December 16.

2. On Middleton Island in Unit 6, in the Gulf Coast Zone, all hunting is by permit only. Each hunter is required to complete a mandatory Canada and cackling goose identification class prior to being issued a permit. Hunters must check in and check out when hunting. The daily bag and possession limits are 1 goose. The season will close if incidental harvest includes 5 dusky Canada geese. A dusky Canada goose is any dark-breasted Canada goose (Munsell 10 YR color value 5 or less) with a bill length between 40 and 50 millimeters.

3. In Unit 10, in the Pribilof and Aleutian Islands Zone, the daily bag limit is 6 geese in the aggregate.

4. In Unit 9, in the Gulf Coast Zone, and Units 17 and 18, in the Northern Zone, the daily bag limit is 3 Canada and cackling geese in the aggregate.

White-fronted Geese: The daily bag limit is 4 geese with the following exceptions:

1. In Unit 9, in the Gulf Coast Zone, Unit 10, in the Pribilof and Aleutian Islands Zone, and Unit 17, in the North Zone, the daily bag limit is 6 geese.

2. In Unit 18, in the North Zone, the daily bag limit is 10 geese.

Brant: The daily bag limit is 2 brant.

Snipe: The daily bag limit is 8 snipe.

Sandhill Cranes: The daily bag limit is 2 cranes in the Southeast, Gulf Coast, Kodiak, and Pribilof and Aleutian Islands Zones, and Unit 17 in the North Zone. In the remainder of the North Zone (outside Unit 17), the daily bag limit is 3 cranes.

Tundra Swan Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–October 31.

Season Lengths: 61 days.

Daily Bag and Possession Limits and Special Conditions: All hunting is by permit only according to the following conditions.

1. In Unit 17, in the North Zone, 200 permits may be issued; 3 tundra swans may be authorized per permit, and 1 permit may be issued per hunter per season.

2. In Unit 18, in the North Zone, 500 permits may be issued; 3 tundra swans may be authorized per permit, and 1 permit may be issued per hunter per season.

3. In Unit 22, in the North Zone, 300 permits may be issued; 3 tundra swans may be authorized per permit, and 1 permit may be issued per hunter per season.

4. In Unit 23, in the North Zone, 300 permits may be issued; 3 tundra swans may be authorized per permit, and 1 permit may be issued per hunter per season.

Hawaii

Mourning Dove Seasons

Outside Dates: October 1–January 31.

Season Lengths and Daily Bag Limits: 65 days with a daily bag limit of 15 doves or 75 days with a daily bag of 12 doves.

Note: Mourning doves may be taken in Hawaii in accordance with shooting hours and other regulations set by the State of Hawaii, and subject to the applicable provisions of 50 CFR part 20.

Puerto Rico

Dove and Pigeon Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–January 15.

Season Lengths: 60 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 30 Zenaida, mourning, and white-winged doves in the aggregate, of which 10 may be Zenaida doves and 3 may be mourning doves, and 5 scaly-naped pigeons.

Closed Seasons: There is no open season on the white-crowned pigeon and the plain pigeon, which are protected by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Closed Areas: There is no open season on doves or pigeons in the following areas: Municipality of Culebra, Desecheo Island, Mona Island, El Verde Closure Area, and Cidra Municipality and adjacent areas.

Duck, Coot, Gallinule, and Snipe Seasons

Outside Dates: October 1–January 31.

Season Lengths: 55 days. The season may be split into 2 segments.

Daily Bag Limits: 6 ducks, 6 common gallinules, and 8 snipe.

Closed Seasons: There is no open season on the ruddy duck, white-cheeked pintail, West Indian whistling duck, fulvous whistling duck, and masked duck, which are protected by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. There is no open season on the purple gallinule, American coot, and Caribbean coot.

Closed Areas: There is no open season on ducks, gallinules, and snipe in the Municipality of Culebra and on Desecheo Island.

Virgin Islands

Dove and Pigeon Seasons

Outside Dates: September 1–January 15.

Season Lengths: 60 days.

Daily Bag and Possession Limits: 10 Zenaida doves.

Closed Seasons: There is no open season for ground-doves, quail-doves, and pigeons.

Closed Areas: There is no open season for migratory game birds on Ruth Cay (just south of St. Croix).

Local Names for Certain Birds: Zenaida dove, also known as mountain dove; bridled quail-dove, also known as Barbary dove or partridge; common ground-dove, also known as stone dove, tobacco dove, rola, or tortolita; scaly-naped pigeon, also known as red-necked or scaled pigeon.

Duck Seasons

Outside Dates: December 1–January 31.

Season Lengths: 55 days.

Daily Bag Limits: 6 ducks.

Closed Seasons: There is no open season on the ruddy duck, white-cheeked pintail, West Indian whistling-duck, fulvous whistling-duck, and masked duck.

Special Falconry Regulations

In accordance with 50 CFR 21.82, falconry is a permitted means of taking migratory game birds in any State except for Hawaii. States may select an extended season for taking migratory game birds in accordance with the following:

Outside Dates: September 1–March 10.

Season Lengths: For all hunting methods combined, the combined length of the extended season, regular season, and any special or experimental seasons must not exceed 107 days for any species or group of species in a geographical area. Each extended season may be split into 3 segments.

Daily Bag Limits: Falconry daily bag limits for all permitted migratory game birds must not exceed 3 birds in the aggregate during extended falconry seasons, any special or experimental seasons, and regular hunting seasons in each State, including those that do not select an extended falconry season.

Note: General hunting regulations, including seasons and hunting hours, apply to falconry. Regular season bag limits do not apply to falconry. The falconry bag limit is not in addition to shooting limits.

Area, Unit, and Zone Descriptions

Ducks (Including Mergansers) and Coots

Atlantic Flyway

Connecticut

North Zone: That portion of the State north of I–95.

South Zone: Remainder of the State.

Maine

North Zone: That portion north of the line extending east along Maine State Highway 110 from the New Hampshire-

Maine State line to the intersection of Maine State Highway 11 in Newfield; then north and east along Route 11 to the intersection of U.S. Route 202 in Auburn; then north and east on Route 202 to the intersection of I–95 in Augusta; then north and east along I–95 to Route 15 in Bangor; then east along Route 15 to Route 9; then east along Route 9 to Stony Brook in Baileyville; then east along Stony Brook to the U.S. border.

Coastal Zone: That portion south of a line extending east from the Maine-New Brunswick border in Calais at the Route 1 Bridge; then south along Route 1 to the Maine-New Hampshire border in Kittery.

South Zone: Remainder of the State.

Maryland

Western Zone: Allegany, Carroll, Garrett, Frederick, and Washington Counties; and those portions of Baltimore, Howard, Prince George's, and Montgomery Counties west of a line beginning at I–83 at the Pennsylvania State line, following I–83 south to the intersection of I–83 and I–695 (Outer Loop), south following I–695 (Outer Loop) to its intersection with I–95, south following I–95 to its intersection with I–495 (Outer Loop), and following I–495 (Outer Loop) to the Virginia shore of the Potomac River.

Eastern Zone: That portion of the State not included in the Western Zone.

Special Teal Season Area: Calvert, Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Harford, Kent, Queen Anne's, St. Mary's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties; that part of Anne Arundel County east of Interstate 895, Interstate 97, and Route 3; that part of Prince George's County east of Route 3 and Route 301; and that part of Charles County east of Route 301 to the Virginia State Line.

Massachusetts

Western Zone: That portion of the State west of a line extending south from the Vermont State line on I–91 to MA 9, west on MA 9 to MA 10, south on MA 10 to U.S. 202, south on U.S. 202 to the Connecticut State line.

Central Zone: That portion of the State east of the Berkshire Zone and west of a line extending south from the New Hampshire State line on I–95 to U.S. 1, south on U.S. 1 to I–93, south on I–93 to MA 3, south on MA 3 to U.S. 6, west on U.S. 6 to MA 28, west on MA 28 to I–195, west to the Rhode Island State line; except the waters, and the lands 150 yards inland from the high-water mark, of the Assonet River upstream to the MA 24 bridge, and the Taunton River upstream to the Center Street-Elm Street bridge shall be in the Coastal Zone.

Coastal Zone: That portion of Massachusetts east and south of the Central Zone.

New Hampshire

Northern Zone: That portion of the State east and north of the Inland Zone beginning at the junction of Route 10 and Route 25–A in Orford, east on Route 25–A to Route 25 in Wentworth, southeast on Route 25 to Exit 26 of Route I–93 in Plymouth, south on Route I–93 to Route 3 at Exit 24 of Route I–93 in Ashland, northeast on Route 3 to Route 113 in Holderness, north on Route 113 to Route 113–A in Sandwich, north on Route 113–A to Route 113 in Tamworth, east on Route 113 to Route 16 in Chocorua, north on Route 16 to Route 302 in Conway, east on Route 302 to the Maine-New Hampshire border.

Inland Zone: That portion of the State south and west of the Northern Zone, west of the Coastal Zone, and includes the area of Vermont and New Hampshire as described for hunting reciprocity. A person holding a New Hampshire hunting license that allows the taking of migratory waterfowl or a person holding a Vermont resident hunting license that allows the taking of migratory waterfowl may take migratory waterfowl and coots from the following designated area of the Inland Zone: the State of Vermont east of Route I–91 at the Massachusetts border, north on Route I–91 to Route 2, north on Route 2 to Route 102, north on Route 102 to Route 253, and north on Route 253 to the border with Canada and the area of New Hampshire west of Route 63 at the Massachusetts border, north on Route 63 to Route 12, north on Route 12 to Route 12–A, north on Route 12–A to Route 10, north on Route 10 to Route 135, north on Route 135 to Route 3, north on Route 3 to the intersection with the Connecticut River.

Coastal Zone: That portion of the State east of a line beginning at the Maine-New Hampshire border in Rollinsford, then extending to Route 4 west to the city of Dover, south to the intersection of Route 108, south along Route 108 through Madbury, Durham, and Newmarket to the junction of Route 85 in Newfields, south to Route 101 in Exeter, east to Interstate 95 (New Hampshire Turnpike) in Hampton, and south to the Massachusetts border.

New Jersey

Coastal Zone: That portion of the State seaward of a line beginning at the New York State line in Raritan Bay and extending west along the New York State line to NJ 440 at Perth Amboy; west on NJ 440 to the Garden State Parkway; south on the Garden State Parkway to NJ 109; south on NJ 109 to Cape May County Route 633 (Lafayette Street); south on Lafayette Street to Jackson Street; south on Jackson Street to the shoreline at Cape May; west along the shoreline of Cape May beach to COLREGS Demarcation Line 80.503 at Cape May Point; south along COLREGS Demarcation Line 80.503 to the Delaware State line in Delaware Bay.

North Zone: That portion of the State west of the Coastal Zone and north of a line extending west from the Garden State Parkway on NJ 70 to the New Jersey Turnpike, north on the turnpike to U.S. 206, north on U.S. 206 to U.S. 1 at Trenton, west on U.S. 1 to the Pennsylvania State line in the Delaware River.

South Zone: That portion of the State not within the North Zone or the Coastal Zone.

New York

Lake Champlain Zone: That area east and north of a continuous line extending along U.S. 11 from the New York-Canada International boundary south to NY 9B, south along NY 9B to U.S. 9, south along U.S. 9 to NY 22 south of Keesville; south along NY 22 to the west shore of South Bay, along and around the shoreline of South Bay to NY 22 on the east shore of South Bay; southeast along NY 22 to U.S. 4, northeast along U.S. 4 to the Vermont State line.

Long Island Zone: That area consisting of Nassau County, Suffolk County, that area of Westchester County southeast of I–95, and their tidal waters.

Western Zone: That area west of a line extending from Lake Ontario east along the north shore of the Salmon River to I–81, and south along I–81 to the Pennsylvania State line.

Northeastern Zone: That area north of a continuous line extending from Lake Ontario east along the north shore of the Salmon River to I–81, south along I–81 to NY 31, east along NY 31 to NY 13, north along NY 13 to NY 49, east along NY 49 to NY 365, east along NY 365 to NY 28, east along NY 28 to NY 29, east along NY 29 to NY 22, north along NY 22 to Washington County Route 153, east along CR 153 to the New York–Vermont boundary, exclusive of the Lake Champlain Zone.

Southeastern Zone: The remaining portion of New York.

North Carolina

Coastal Zone: All counties and portions of counties east of I–95.

Inland Zone: All counties and portions of counties west of I–95.

Pennsylvania

Lake Erie Zone: The Lake Erie waters of Pennsylvania and a shoreline margin along Lake Erie from New York on the east to Ohio on the west extending 150 yards inland but including all of Presque Isle Peninsula.

Northwest Zone: The area bounded on the north by the Lake Erie Zone and including all of Erie and Crawford Counties and those portions of Mercer and Venango Counties north of I–80.

North Zone: That portion of the State east of the Northwest Zone and north of a line extending east on I–80 to U.S. 220, Route 220 to I–180, I–180 to I–80, and I–80 to the Delaware River.

South Zone: The remaining portion of Pennsylvania.

Vermont

Lake Champlain Zone: The U.S. portion of Lake Champlain and that area north and west of the line extending from the New York border along U.S. 4 to VT 22A at Fair Haven; VT 22A to U.S. 7 at Vergennes; U.S. 7 to VT 78 at Swanton; VT 78 to VT 36; VT 36 to Maquam Bay on Lake Champlain; along and around the shoreline of Maquam Bay and Hog Island to VT 78 at the West Swanton Bridge; VT 78 to VT 2 in Alburg; VT 2 to the Richelieu River in Alburg; along the east shore of the Richelieu River to the Canadian border.

Interior Zone: That portion of Vermont east of the Lake Champlain Zone and west of a line extending from the Massachusetts border at I–91; north along I–91 to U.S. 2; east along U.S. 2 to VT 102; north along VT 102 to VT 253; north along VT 253 to the Canadian border.

Connecticut River Zone: The remaining portion of Vermont east of the Interior Zone.

Virginia

Western Zone: All counties and portions of counties west of I–95.

Eastern Zone: All counties and portions of counties east of I–95.

Mississippi Flyway

Illinois

North Zone: That portion of the State north of a line extending west from the Indiana border along Peotone-Beecher Road to Illinois Route 50, south along Illinois Route 50 to Wilmington-Peotone Road, west along Wilmington-Peotone Road to Illinois Route 53, north along Illinois Route 53 to New River Road, northwest along New River Road to Interstate Highway 55, south along I–55 to Pine Bluff-Lorenzo Road, west along Pine Bluff-Lorenzo Road to Illinois Route 47, north along Illinois Route 47 to I–80, west along I–80 to I–39, south along I–39 to Illinois Route 18, west along Illinois Route 18 to Illinois Route 29, south along Illinois Route 29 to Illinois Route 17, west along Illinois Route 17 to the Mississippi River, and due south across the Mississippi River to the Iowa border.

Central Zone: That portion of the State south of the North Duck Zone line to a line extending west from the Indiana border along I–70 to Illinois Route 4, south along Illinois Route 4 to Illinois Route 161, west along Illinois Route 161 to Illinois Route 158, south and west along Illinois Route 158 to Illinois Route 159, south along Illinois Route 159 to Illinois Route 3, south along Illinois Route 3 to St. Leo's Road, south along St. Leo's Road to Modoc Road, west along Modoc Road to Modoc Ferry Road, southwest along Modoc Ferry Road to Levee Road, southeast along Levee Road to County Route 12 (Modoc Ferry entrance Road), south along County Route 12 to the Modoc Ferry route and southwest on the Modoc Ferry route across the Mississippi River to the Missouri border.

South Zone: That portion of the State south and east of a line extending west from the Indiana border along I–70, south along U.S. Highway 45, to Illinois Route 13, west along Illinois Route 13 to Greenbriar Road, north on Greenbriar Road to Sycamore Road, west on Sycamore Road to N. Reed Station Road, south on N. Reed Station Road to Illinois Route 13, west along Illinois Route 13 to Illinois Route 127, south along Illinois Route 127 to State Forest Road (1025 N), west along State Forest Road to Illinois Route 3, north along Illinois Route 3 to the south bank of the Big Muddy River, west along the south bank of the Big Muddy River to the Mississippi River, west across the Mississippi River to the Missouri border.

South Central Zone: The remainder of the State between the south border of the Central Zone and the north border of the South Zone.

Indiana

North Zone: That part of Indiana north of a line extending east from the Illinois border along State Road 18 to U.S. 31; north along U.S. 31 to U.S. 24; east along U.S. 24 to Huntington; southeast along U.S. 224; south along State Road 5; and east along State Road 124 to the Ohio border.

Central Zone: That part of Indiana south of the North Zone boundary and north of the South Zone boundary.

South Zone: That part of Indiana south of a line extending east from the Illinois border along I–70; east along National Ave.; east along U.S. 150; south along U.S. 41; east along State Road 58; south along State Road 37 to Bedford; and east along U.S. 50 to the Ohio border.

Iowa

North Zone: That portion of Iowa north of a line beginning on the South Dakota-Iowa border at I–29, southeast along I–29 to State Highway 20 to the Iowa-Illinois border.

Central Zone: The remainder of Iowa not included in the North and South zones.

South Zone: That portion of Iowa west of I–29 and south of State Highway 92 east to the Iowa-Illinois border.

Kentucky

West Zone: All counties west of and including Butler, Daviess, Ohio, Simpson, and Warren Counties.

East Zone: The remainder of Kentucky.

Louisiana

East Zone: That area of the State beginning at the Arkansas border, then south on U.S. Hwy 79 to State Hwy 9, then south on State Hwy 9 to State Hwy 147, then south on State Hwy 147 to U.S. Hwy 167, then south and east on U.S. Hwy 167 to U.S. Hwy 90, then south on U.S. Hwy 90 to the Mississippi State line.

West Zone: Remainder of the State.

Michigan

North Zone: The Upper Peninsula.

Middle Zone: That portion of the Lower Peninsula north of a line beginning at the Michigan-Wisconsin boundary line in Lake Michigan, directly due west of the mouth of Stoney Creek in section 31, T14N R18W, Oceana County; then proceed easterly and southerly along the centerline of Stoney Creek to its intersection with Scenic Drive; southerly on Scenic Drive to Stoney Lake Road in section 5, T13N R18W, Oceana County; easterly on Stoney Lake Road then both west and east Garfield Roads (name change only; not an intersection) then crossing highway U.S.–31 to State Highway M–20 (north of the town of New Era; also locally named Hayes Road) in section 33, T14N R17W, Oceana County; easterly on M–20 through Oceana, Newaygo, Mecosta, Isabella, and Midland Counties to highway U.S.–10 business route in the city of Midland; easterly on U.S.–10 Business Route (BR) to highway U.S.–10 at the Bay County line; easterly on U.S.–10 then crossing U.S.–75 to State Highway M–25 (west of the town of Bay City); easterly along M–25 into Tuscola County; then

northeasterly and easterly on M–25 through Tuscola County into Huron County, turning southeasterly on M–25 (near the town of Huron City; also locally named North Shore Road) to the centerline of Willow Creek in section 4, T18N R14E, Huron County; then northerly along the centerline of Willow Creek to the mouth of Willow Creek into Lake Huron; then directly due east along a line from the mouth of Willow Creek heading east into Lake Huron to a point due east and on the Michigan/U.S.-Canadian border.

South Zone: The remainder of Michigan.

Minnesota

North Duck Zone: That portion of the State north of a line extending east from the North Dakota State line along State Highway 210 to State Highway 23 and east to State Highway 39 and east to the Wisconsin State line at the Oliver Bridge.

South Duck Zone: The portion of the State south of a line extending east from the South Dakota State line along U.S. Highway 212 to I–494 and east to I–94 and east to the Wisconsin State line.

Central Duck Zone: The remainder of the State.

Missouri

North Zone: That portion of Missouri north of a line running west from the Illinois border at I–70; west on I–70 to Hwy 65; north on Hwy 65 to Hwy 41, north on Hwy 41 to Hwy 24; west on Hwy 24 to MO Hwy 10, west on Hwy 10 to Hwy 69, north on Hwy 69 to MO Hwy 116, west on MO Hwy 116 to Hwy 59, south on Hwy 59 to the Kansas border.

Middle Zone: The remainder of Missouri not included in other zones.

South Zone: That portion of Missouri south of a line running west from the Illinois border on MO Hwy 74 to MO Hwy 25; south on MO Hwy 25. to U.S. Hwy 62; west on U.S. Hwy 62 to MO Hwy 53; north on MO Hwy 53 to MO Hwy 51; north on MO Hwy 51 to U.S. Hwy 60; west on U.S. Hwy 60 to MO Hwy 21; north on MO Hwy 21 to MO Hwy 72; west on MO Hwy 72 to MO Hwy 32; west on MO Hwy 32 to U.S. Hwy 65; north on U.S. Hwy 65 to U.S. Hwy 54; west on U.S. Hwy 54 to the Kansas border.

Ohio

Lake Erie Marsh Zone: Includes all land and water within the boundaries of the area bordered by a line beginning at the intersection of I–75 at the Ohio-Michigan State line and continuing south to Interstate 280, then south on I–280 to the Ohio Turnpike (I–80/I–90), then east on the Ohio Turnpike to the Erie-Lorain County line, then north to Lake Erie, then following the Lake Erie shoreline at a distance of 200 yards offshore, then following the shoreline west toward and around the northern tip of Cedar Point Amusement Park, then continuing from the westernmost point of Cedar Point toward the southernmost tip of the sand bar at the mouth of Sandusky Bay and out into Lake Erie at a distance of 200 yards offshore continuing parallel to the Lake Erie shoreline north and west toward the northernmost tip of Cedar Point National Wildlife Refuge, then following a direct line toward the southernmost tip of Wood Tick Peninsula in Michigan to a point that intersects the Ohio-Michigan State line, then following the State line back to the point of the beginning.

North Zone: That portion of the State, excluding the Lake Erie Marsh Zone, north of a line extending east from the Indiana State line along U.S. Highway (U.S.) 33 to State Route (SR) 127, then south along SR 127 to SR 703, then south along SR 703 and including all lands within the Mercer Wildlife Area to SR 219, then east along SR 219 to SR 364, then north along SR 364 and including all lands within the St. Mary's Fish Hatchery to SR 703, then east along SR 703 to SR 66, then north along SR 66 to U.S. 33, then east along U.S. 33 to SR 385, then east along SR 385 to SR 117, then south along SR 117 to SR 273, then east along SR 273 to SR 31, then south along SR 31 to SR 739, then east along SR 739 to SR 4, then north along SR 4 to SR 95, then east along SR 95 to SR 13, then southeast along SR 13 to SR 3, then northeast along SR 3 to SR 60, then north along SR 60 to U.S. 30, then east along U.S. 30 to SR 3, then south along SR 3 to SR 226, then south along SR 226 to SR 514, then southwest along SR 514 to SR 754, then south along SR 754 to SR 39/60, then east along SR 39/60 to SR 241, then north along SR 241 to U.S. 30, then east along U.S. 30 to SR 39, then east along SR 39 to the Pennsylvania State line.

South Zone: The remainder of Ohio not included in the Lake Erie Marsh Zone or the North Zone.

Tennessee

Reelfoot Zone: All or portions of Lake and Obion Counties.

Remainder of State: That portion of Tennessee outside of the Reelfoot Zone.

Wisconsin

North Zone: That portion of the State north of a line extending east from the Minnesota State line along U.S. Highway 10 to U.S. Highway 41, then north on U.S. Highway 41 to the Michigan State line.

Open Water Zone: That portion of the State extending 500 feet or greater from the Lake Michigan shoreline bounded by the Michigan State line and the Illinois State line.

South Zone: The remainder of the State.

Central Flyway

Colorado (Central Flyway Portion)

Special Teal Season Area: Lake and Chaffee Counties and that portion of the State east of Interstate Highway 25.

Northeast Zone: All areas east of Interstate 25 and north of Interstate 70.

Southeast Zone: All areas east of Interstate 25 and south of Interstate 70, and all of El Paso, Pueblo, Huerfano, and Las Animas Counties.

Mountain/Foothills Zone: All areas west of Interstate 25 and east of the Continental Divide, except El Paso, Pueblo, Huerfano, and Las Animas Counties.

Kansas

High Plains: That portion of the State west of U.S. 283.

Low Plains Early Zone: That part of Kansas bounded by a line from the Federal Hwy U.S.–283 and State Hwy 96 junction, then east on State Hwy 96 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–183, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–183 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–24, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–24 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–281, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–281 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–36, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–36 to its junction with State Hwy K–199, then south on State Hwy K–199 to its junction with Republic County 30th Road, then south on Republic County 30th Road to its junction with State Hwy K–148, then east on State Hwy K–148 to its junction with Republic County 50th Road, then south on Republic County 50th Road to its junction with Cloud County 40th Road, then south on Cloud County 40th Road to its junction with State Hwy K–9, then west on State Hwy K–9 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–24, then west on Federal Hwy U.S.–24 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–181, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–181 to its junction with State Hwy K–18, then west on State Hwy K–18 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–281, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–281 to its junction with State Hwy K–4, then east on State Hwy K–4 to its junction with interstate Hwy I–135, then south on interstate Hwy I–135 to its junction with State Hwy K–61, then southwest on State

Hwy K–61 to its junction with McPherson County 14th Avenue, then south on McPherson County 14th Avenue to its junction with McPherson County Arapaho Road, then west on McPherson County Arapaho Road to its junction with State Hwy K–61, then southwest on State Hwy K–61 to its junction with State Hwy K–96, then northwest on State Hwy K–96 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–56, then southwest on Federal Hwy U.S.–56 to its junction with State Hwy K–19, then east on State Hwy K–19 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–281, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–281 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–54, then west on Federal Hwy U.S.–54 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–183, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–183 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–56, then southwest on Federal Hwy U.S.–56 to its junction with North Main Street in Spearville, then south on North Main Street to Davis Street, then east on Davis Street to Ford County Road 126 (South Stafford Street), then south on Ford County Road 126 to Garnett Road, then east on Garnett Road to Ford County Road 126, then south on Ford County Road 126 to Ford Spearville Road, then west on Ford Spearville Road to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–400, then northwest on Federal Hwy U.S.–400 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–283, and then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–283 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–96.

Low Plains Late Zone: That part of Kansas bounded by a line from the Federal Hwy U.S.–283 and State Hwy 96 junction, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–283 to the Kansas-Nebraska State line, then east along the Kansas-Nebraska State line to its junction with the Kansas-Missouri State line, then southeast along the Kansas-Missouri State line to its junction with State Hwy K–68, then west on State Hwy K–68 to its junction with interstate Hwy I–35, then southwest on interstate Hwy I–35 to its junction with Butler County NE 150th Street, then west on Butler County NE 150th Street to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–77, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–77 to its junction with the Kansas-Oklahoma State line, then west along the Kansas-Oklahoma State line to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–283, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–283 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–400, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–400 to its junction with Ford Spearville Road, then east on Ford Spearville Road to Ford County Road 126 (South Stafford Street), then north on Ford County Road 126 to Garnett Road, then west on Garnett Road to Ford County Road 126, then north on Ford County Road 126 to Davis Street, then west on Davis Street to North Main Street, then north on North Main Street to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–56, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–56 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–183, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–183 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–54, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–54 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–281, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–281 to its junction with State Hwy K–19, then west on State Hwy K–19 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–56, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–56 to its junction with State Hwy K–96, then southeast on State Hwy K–96 to its junction with State Hwy K–61, then northeast on State Hwy K–61 to its junction with McPherson County Arapaho Road, then east on McPherson County Arapaho Road to its junction with McPherson County 14th Avenue, then north on McPherson County 14th Avenue to its junction with State Hwy K–61, then east on State Hwy K–61 to its junction with interstate Hwy I–135, then north on interstate Hwy I–135 to its junction with State Hwy K–4, then west on State Hwy K–4 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–281, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–281 to its junction with State Hwy K–18, then east on State Hwy K–18 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–181, then north on Federal Hwy U.S.–181 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–24, then east on Federal Hwy U.S.–24 to its junction with State Hwy K–9, then east on State Hwy K–9 to its junction with Cloud County 40th Road, then north on Cloud County 40th Road to its junction with Republic County 50th Road, then north on Republic County 50th Road to its junction with State Hwy K–148, then west on State Hwy K–148 to its junction with Republic County 30th Road, then north on Republic County 30th Road to its junction with State Hwy K–199, then north on State Hwy K–199 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–36, then west on Federal Hwy U.S.–36 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–281, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–281 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–24, then west on Federal Hwy U.S.–24 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–183, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–183 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–96, and then west on Federal Hwy U.S.–96 to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–283.

Low Plains Southeast Zone: That part of Kansas bounded by a line from the Missouri-Kansas State line west on K–68 to its junction with I–35, then southwest on I–35 to its junction with Butler County, NE 150th Street, then west on NE 150th Street to its junction with Federal Hwy U.S.–77, then south on Federal Hwy U.S.–77 to the Oklahoma-Kansas State line, then east along the Kansas-Oklahoma State line to its junction with the Kansas-Missouri State line, then north along the Kansas-Missouri State line to its junction with State Hwy K–68.

Montana (Central Flyway Portion)

Zone 1: The Counties of Blaine, Carter, Daniels, Dawson, Fallon, Fergus, Garfield, Golden Valley, Judith Basin, McCone, Musselshell, Petroleum, Phillips, Powder River, Richland, Roosevelt, Sheridan, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Valley, Wheatland, and Wibaux.

Zone 2: The Counties of Big Horn, Carbon, Custer, Prairie, Rosebud, Treasure, and Yellowstone.

Nebraska

High Plains: That portion of Nebraska lying west of a line beginning at the South Dakota-Nebraska border on U.S. Hwy 183; south on U.S. Hwy 183 to U.S. Hwy 20; west on U.S. Hwy 20 to NE Hwy 7; south on NE Hwy 7 to NE Hwy 91; southwest on NE Hwy 91 to NE Hwy 2; southeast on NE Hwy 2 to NE Hwy 92; west on NE Hwy 92 to NE Hwy 40; south on NE Hwy 40 to NE Hwy 47; south on NE Hwy 47 to NE Hwy 23; east on NE Hwy 23 to U.S. Hwy 283; and south on U.S. Hwy 283 to the Kansas-Nebraska border.

Zone 1: Area bounded by designated Federal and State highways and political boundaries beginning at the South Dakota-Nebraska border at U.S. Hwy 183; south along Hwy 183 to NE Hwy 12; east to NE Hwy 137; south to U.S. Hwy 20; east to U.S. Hwy 281; north to the Niobrara River; east along the Niobrara River to the Boyd County Line; north along the Boyd County line to NE Hwy 12; east to NE 26E Spur; north along the NE 26E Spur to the Ponca State Park boat ramp; north and west along the Missouri River to the Nebraska-South Dakota border; west along the Nebraska-South Dakota border to U.S. Hwy 183. Both banks of the Niobrara River in Keya Paha and Boyd Counties east of U.S. Hwy 183 are included in Zone 1.

Zone 2: Those areas of the State that are not contained in Zones 1, 3, or 4.

Zone 3: Area bounded by designated Federal and State highways, County roads, and political boundaries beginning at the Wyoming-Nebraska border at its northernmost intersection with the Interstate Canal; southeast along the Interstate Canal to the northern border of Scotts Bluff County; east along northern borders of Scotts

Bluff and Morrill Counties to Morrill County Road 125; south to Morrill County Rd 94; east to County Rd 135; south to County Rd 88; east to County Rd 147; south to County Rd 88; southeast to County Rd 86; east to County Rd 151; south to County Rd 80; east to County Rd 161; south to County Rd 76; east to County Rd 165; south to County Rd 167; south to U.S. Hwy 26; east to County Rd 171; north to County Rd 68; east to County Rd 183; south to County Rd 64; east to County Rd 189; north to County Rd 70; east to County Rd 201; south to County Rd 60A; east to County Rd 203; south to County Rd 52; east to Keith County Line; north along the Keith County line to the northern border of Keith County; east along the northern boundaries of Keith and Lincoln Counties to NE Hwy 97; south to U.S. Hwy 83; south to E Hall School Rd; east to North Airport Road; south to U.S. Hwy 30; east to NE Hwy 47; south to NE Hwy 23; east on NE Hwy 23 to U.S. Hwy 283; south on U.S. Hwy 283 to the Kansas-Nebraska border; west along Kansas-Nebraska border to the Nebraska-Colorado border; north and west to the Wyoming-Nebraska border; north along the Wyoming-Nebraska border to its northernmost-intersection with the Interstate Canal.

Zone 4: Area encompassed by designated Federal and State highways and County Roads beginning at the intersection of U.S. Hwy 283 at the Kansas-Nebraska border; north to NE Hwy 23; west to NE Hwy 47; north to Dawson County Rd 769; east to County Rd 423; south to County Rd 766; east to County Rd 428; south to County Rd 763; east to NE Hwy 21; south to County Rd 761; east on County Rd 761 to County Road 437; south to the Dawson County Canal; southeast along Dawson County Canal; east to County Rd 444; south to U.S. Hwy 30; east to U.S. Hwy 183; north to Buffalo County Rd 100; east to 46th Ave.; north to NE Hwy 40; east to NE Hwy 10; north to County Rd 220 and Hall County Husker Highway; east to Hall County S 70th Rd; north to NE Hwy 2; east to U.S. Hwy 281; north to Chapman Rd; east to 7th Rd; south to U.S. Hwy 30; north and east to NE Hwy 14; south to County Rd 22; west to County Rd M; south to County Rd 21; west to County Rd K; south to U.S. Hwy 34; west to NE Hwy 2; south to U.S. Hwy I–80; west to Gunbarrel Rd (Hall/Hamilton County line); south to Giltner Rd; west to U.S. Hwy 281; south to W. 82nd St; west to Holstein Ave.; south to U.S. Hwy 34; west to NE Hwy 10; north to Kearney County Rd R and Phelps County Rd 742; west to Gosper County Rd 433; south to N. Railway Street; west to Commercial Ave.; south to NE Hwy 23; west to Gosper County Rd 427; south to Gosper County Rd 737; west to Gosper County Rd 426; south to Gosper County Rd 735; east to Gosper County Rd 427; south to Furnas County Rd 276; west to Furnas County Rd 425.5/425; south to U.S. Hwy 34; east to NE Hwy 4; east to NE Hwy 10; south to U.S. Hwy 136; east to NE Hwy 14; south to NE Hwy 8; east to U.S. Hwy 81; north to NE Hwy 4; east to NE Hwy 15; north to U.S. Hwy 6; east to NE Hwy 33; east to SW 142 Street; south to W. Hallam Rd; east to SW 100 Rd; south to W. Chestnut Rd; west to NE Hwy 103; south to NE Hwy 4; west to NE Hwy 15; south to U.S. Hwy 136; east to Jefferson County Rd 578 Ave.; south to PWF Rd; east to NE Hwy 103; south to NE Hwy 8; east to U.S. Hwy 75; north to U.S. Hwy 136; east to the intersection of U.S. Hwy 136 and the Steamboat Trace (Trace); north along the Trace to the intersection with Federal Levee R–562; north along Federal Levee R–562 to the intersection with Nemaha County Rd 643A; south to the Trace; north along the Trace/Burlington Northern Railroad right-of-way to NE Hwy 2; west to U.S. Hwy 75; north to NE Hwy 2; west to NE Hwy 50; north to Otoe County Rd D; east to N. 32nd Rd; north to Otoe County Rd B; west to NE Hwy 50; north to U.S. Hwy 34; west to NE Hwy 63; north to NE Hwy 66; north and west to U.S. Hwy 77; north to NE Hwy 109; west along NE Hwy 109 and Saunders County Rd X to Saunders County 19; south to NE Hwy 92; west to NE Hwy Spur 12F; south to Butler County Rd 30; east to County Rd X; south to County Rd 27; west to County Rd W; south to County Rd 26; east to County Rd X; south to County Rd 21 (Seward County Line); west to NE Hwy 15; north to County Rd 34; west to County Rd H; south to NE Hwy 92; west to U.S. Hwy 81; south to NE Hwy 66; west to Dark Island Trail, north to Merrick County Rd M; east to Merrick County Rd 18; north to NE Hwy 92; west to NE Hwy 14; north to NE Hwy 52; west and north to NE Hwy 91; west to U.S. Hwy 281; south to NE Hwy 58; west to NE Hwy 11; west and south to NE Hwy 2; west to NE Hwy 68; north to NE Hwy L82A; west to NE Hwy 10; north to NE Hwy 92; west to U.S. Hwy 183; north to Round Valley Rd; west to Sargent River Rd; west to Sargent Rd; west to NE Hwy S21A; west to NE Hwy 2; north to NE Hwy 91 to North Loup Spur Rd; north to North Loup River Rd; north and east along to Pleasant Valley/Worth Rd; east to Loup County Line; north along the Loup County Line to Loup-Brown County line; east along northern boundaries of Loup and Garfield Counties to NE Hwy 11; south to Cedar River Road; east and south to NE Hwy 70; east to U.S. Hwy 281; north to NE Hwy 70; east to NE Hwy 14; south to NE Hwy 39; southeast to NE Hwy 22; east to U.S. Hwy 81; southeast to U.S. Hwy 30; east to the Iowa-Nebraska border; south to the Missouri-Nebraska border; south to Kansas-Nebraska border; west along Kansas-Nebraska border to U.S. Hwy 283.

New Mexico (Central Flyway Portion)

North Zone: That portion of the State north of I–40 and U.S. 54.

South Zone: The remainder of New Mexico.

North Dakota

High Plains: That portion of the State south and west of a line beginning at the junction of U.S. Hwy 83 and the South Dakota State line, then north along U.S. Hwy 83 and I–94 to ND Hwy 41, then north on ND Hwy 41 to ND Hwy 53, then west on ND Hwy 53 to U.S. Hwy 83, then north on U.S. Hwy 83 to U.S. Hwy 2, then west on U.S. Hwy 2 to the Williams County line, then north and west along the Williams and Divide County lines to the Canadian border.

Low Plains: The remainder of North Dakota.

Oklahoma

High Plains: The Counties of Beaver, Cimarron, and Texas.

Low Plains Zone 1: That portion of the State east of the High Plains Zone and north of a line extending east from the Texas State line along OK 33 to OK 47, east along OK 47 to U.S. 183, south along U.S. 183 to I–40, east along I–40 to U.S. 177, north along U.S. 177 to OK 33, east along OK 33 to OK 18, north along OK 18 to OK 51, west along OK 51 to I–35, north along I–35 to U.S. 412, west along U.S. 412 to OK 132, then north along OK 132 to the Kansas State line.

Low Plains Zone 2: The remainder of Oklahoma.

South Dakota

High Plains: That portion of the State west of a line beginning at the North Dakota State line and extending south along U.S. 83 to U.S. 14, east on U.S. 14 to Blunt, south on the Blunt-Canning Road to SD 34, east and south on SD 34 to SD 50 at Lee's Corner, south on SD 50 to I–90, east on I–90 to SD 50, south on SD 50 to SD 44, west on SD 44 across the Platte-Winner bridge to SD 47, south on SD 47 to U.S. 18, east on U.S. 18 to SD 47, south on SD 47 to the Nebraska State line.

Low Plains North Zone: That portion of northeastern South Dakota east of the

High Plains Unit and north of a line extending east along U.S. 212 to the Minnesota State line.

Low Plains South Zone: That portion of Gregory County east of SD 47 and south of SD 44; Charles Mix County south of SD 44 to the Douglas County line; south on SD 50 to Geddes; east on the Geddes Highway to U.S. 281; south on U.S. 281 and U.S. 18 to SD 50; south and east on SD 50 to the Bon Homme County line; the Counties of Bon Homme, Yankton, and Clay south of SD 50; and Union County south and west of SD 50 and I–29.

Low Plains Middle Zone: The remainder of South Dakota.

Texas

High Plains: That portion of the State west of a line extending south from the Oklahoma State line along U.S. 183 to Vernon, south along U.S. 283 to Albany, south along TX 6 to TX 351 to Abilene, south along U.S. 277 to Del Rio, then south along the Del Rio International Toll Bridge access road to the Mexico border.

Low Plains North Zone: That portion of northeastern Texas east of the High Plains Zone and north of a line beginning at the International Toll Bridge south of Del Rio, then extending east on U.S. 90 to San Antonio, then continuing east on I–10 to the Louisiana State line at Orange, Texas.

Low Plains South Zone: The remainder of Texas.

Wyoming (Central Flyway portion)

Zone C1: Big Horn, Converse, Goshen, Hot Springs, Natrona, Park, Platte, and Washakie Counties; and Fremont County excluding the portions west or south of the Continental Divide.

Zone C2: Campbell, Crook, Johnson, Niobrara, Sheridan, and Weston Counties.

Zone C3: Albany and Laramie Counties; and that portion of Carbon County east of the Continental Divide.

Pacific Flyway

Arizona

North Zone: Game Management Units 1–5, those portions of Game Management Units 6 and 8 within Coconino County, and Game Management Units 7, 9, 11M, and 12A.

South Zone: Those portions of Game Management Units 6 and 8 in Yavapai County, and Game Management Units 10 and 12B–46B.

California

Northeastern Zone: That portion of California lying east and north of a line beginning at the intersection of Interstate 5 with the California-Oregon line; south along Interstate 5 to its junction with Walters Lane south of the town of Yreka; west along Walters Lane to its junction with Easy Street; south along Easy Street to the junction with Old Highway 99; south along Old Highway 99 to the point of intersection with Interstate 5 north of the town of Weed; south along Interstate 5 to its junction with Highway 89; east and south along Highway 89 to Main Street Greenville; north and east to its junction with North Valley Road; south to its junction of Diamond Mountain Road; north and east to its junction with North Arm Road; south and west to the junction of North Valley Road; south to the junction with Arlington Road (A22); west to the junction of Highway 89; south and west to the junction of Highway 70; east on Highway 70 to Highway 395; south and east on Highway 395 to the point of intersection with the California-Nevada State line; north along the California-Nevada State line to the junction of the California-Nevada-Oregon State lines; west along the California-Oregon State line to the point of origin.

Colorado River Zone: Those portions of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial Counties east of a line from the intersection of Highway 95 with the California-Nevada State line; south on Highway 95 through the junction with Highway 40; south on Highway 95 to Vidal Junction; south through the town of Rice to the San Bernardino-Riverside County line on a road known as ''Aqueduct Road'' also known as Highway 62 in San Bernardino County; southwest on Highway 62 to Desert Center Rice Road; south on Desert Center Rice Road/Highway 177 to the town of Desert Center; east 31 miles on Interstate 10 to its intersection with Wiley Well Road; south on Wiley Well Road to Wiley Well; southeast on Milpitas Wash Road to the Blythe, Brawley, Davis Lake intersections; south on Blythe Ogilby Road also known as County Highway 34 to its intersection with Ogilby Road; south on Ogilby Road to its intersection with Interstate 8; east 7 miles on Interstate 8 to its intersection with the Andrade-Algodones Road/Highway 186; south on Highway 186 to its intersection with the U.S.-Mexico border at Los Algodones, Mexico.

Southern Zone: That portion of southern California (but excluding the Colorado River Zone) south and east of a line beginning at the mouth of the Santa Maria River at the Pacific Ocean; east along the Santa Maria River to where it crosses Highway 101–166 near the City of Santa Maria; north on Highway 101–166; east on Highway 166 to the junction with Highway 99; south on Highway 99 to the junction of Interstate 5; south on Interstate 5 to the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains at Tejon Pass; east and north along the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains to where it intersects Highway 178 at Walker Pass; east on Highway 178 to the junction of Highway 395 at the town of Inyokern; south on Highway 395 to the junction of Highway 58; east on Highway 58 to the junction of Interstate 15; east on Interstate 15 to the junction with Highway 127; north on Highway 127 to the point of intersection with the California-Nevada State line.

Southern San Joaquin Valley Zone: All of Kings and Tulare Counties and that portion of Kern County north of the Southern Zone.

Balance of State Zone: The remainder of California not included in the Northeastern, Colorado River, Southern, and the Southern San Joaquin Valley Zones.

Colorado (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Eastern Zone: Routt, Grand, Summit, Eagle, and Pitkin Counties; those portions of Saguache, San Juan, Hinsdale, and Mineral Counties west of the Continental Divide; those portions of Gunnison County except the North Fork of the Gunnison River Valley (Game Management Units 521, 53, and 63); and that portion of Moffat County east of the northern intersection of Moffat County Road 29 with the Moffat-Routt County line, south along Moffat County Road 29 to the intersection of Moffat County Road 29 with the Moffat-Routt County line (Elkhead Reservoir State Park).

Western Zone: All areas west of the Continental Divide not included in the Eastern Zone.

Idaho

Zone 1: All lands and waters within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, including private inholdings; Power County east of State Highway 37 and State Highway 39; and Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Butte, Caribou, Clark, Fremont, Jefferson, Madison, and Teton Counties.

Zone 2: Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone Counties.

Zone 3: Power County west of State Highway 37 and State Highway 39, and Ada, Adams, Blaine, Boise, Camas, Canyon, Cassia, Clearwater, Custer, Elmore, Franklin, Gem, Gooding, Idaho, Jerome, Latah, Lemhi, Lewis, Lincoln, Minidoka, Nez Perce, Oneida, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, and Washington Counties.

Zone 4: Valley County.

Nevada

Northeast Zone: Elko, Eureka, Lander, and White Pine Counties.

Northwest Zone: Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Humboldt, Lyon, Mineral, Pershing, Storey, and Washoe Counties.

South Zone: Clark, Esmeralda, Lincoln, and Nye Counties.

Moapa Valley Special Management Area: That portion of Clark County including the Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers.

Oregon

Zone 1: Benton, Clackamas, Clatsop, Columbia, Coos, Curry, Douglas, Gilliam, Hood River, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Marion, Morrow, Multnomah, Polk, Sherman, Tillamook, Umatilla, Wasco, Washington, and Yamhill Counties.

Zone 2: The remainder of Oregon not included in Zone 1.

Utah

Northern Zone: Box Elder, Cache, Daggett, Davis, Duchesne, Morgan, Rich, Salt Lake, Summit, Uintah, Utah, Wasatch, and Weber Counties, and that part of Toole County north of I–80.

Southern Zone: The remainder of Utah not included in the Northern Zone.

Washington

East Zone: All areas east of the Pacific Crest Trail and east of the Big White Salmon River in Klickitat County.

West Zone: The remainder of Washington not included in the East Zone.

Wyoming (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Snake River Zone: Beginning at the south boundary of Yellowstone National Park and the Continental Divide; south along the Continental Divide to Union Pass and the Union Pass Road (U.S.F.S. Road 600); west and south along the Union Pass Road to U.S.F.S. Road 605; south along U.S.F.S. Road 605 to the Bridger-Teton National Forest boundary; along the national forest boundary to the Idaho State line; north along the Idaho State line to the south boundary of Yellowstone National Park; east along the Yellowstone National Park boundary to the Continental Divide.

Balance of State Zone: The remainder of the Pacific Flyway portion of Wyoming not included in the Snake River Zone.

Geese

Atlantic Flyway

Connecticut

Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

South Zone: Same as for ducks.
North Zone: Same as for ducks.

Regular Seasons

AP Unit: Litchfield County and the portion of Hartford County west of a line beginning at the Massachusetts border in Suffield and extending south along Route 159 to its intersection with I–91 in Hartford, and then extending south along I–91 to its intersection with the Hartford-Middlesex County line.

NAP–H Unit: That part of the State east of a line beginning at the Massachusetts border in Suffield and extending south along Route 159 to its intersection with I–91 in Hartford and then extending south along I–91 to State Street in New Haven; then south on State Street to Route 34, west on Route 34 to Route 8, south along Route 8 to Route 110, south along Route 110 to Route 15, north along Route 15 to the Milford Parkway, south along the Milford Parkway to I–95, north along I–95 to the intersection with the east shore of the Quinnipiac River, south to the mouth of the Quinnipiac River, and then south along the eastern shore of New Haven Harbor to the Long Island Sound.

Atlantic Flyway Resident Population (AFRP) Unit: Remainder of the State not included in AP and NAP–H Units.

South Zone: Same as for ducks.

Maine

North NAP–H Zone: Same as North Zone for ducks.

Coastal NAP–L Zone: Same as Coastal Zone for ducks.

South NAP–H Zone: Same as South Zone for ducks.

Maryland

Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Eastern Unit: Calvert, Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Harford, Kent, Queen Anne's, St. Mary's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties; and that part of Anne Arundel County east of Interstate 895, Interstate 97, and Route 3; that part of Prince George's County east of Route 3 and Route 301; and that part of Charles County east of Route 301 to the Virginia State line.

Western Unit: Allegany, Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, Howard, Montgomery, and Washington Counties; and that part of Anne Arundel County west of Interstate 895, Interstate 97, and Route 3; that part of Prince George's County west of Route 3 and Route 301; and that part of Charles County west of Route 301 to the Virginia State line.

Regular Seasons

Resident Population (RP) Zone: Allegany, Frederick, Garrett, Montgomery, and Washington Counties; that portion of Prince George's County west of Route 3 and Route 301; that portion of Charles County west of Route 301 to the Virginia State line; and that portion of Carroll County west of Route 31 to the intersection of Route 97, and west of Route 97 to the Pennsylvania State line.

AP Zone: Remainder of the State.

Massachusetts

NAP Zone: Central and Coastal Zones (see duck zones).

AP Zone: The Western Zone (see duck zones).

Special Late Season Area: The Central Zone and that portion of the Coastal Zone (see duck zones) that lies north of the Cape Cod Canal, north to the New Hampshire State line.

New Hampshire

Same zones as for ducks.

New Jersey

AP Zone: North and South Zones (see duck zones).

NAP Zone: The Coastal Zone (see duck zones).

Special Late Season Area: In northern New Jersey, that portion of the State within a continuous line that runs east along the New York State boundary line to the Hudson River; then south along the New York State boundary to its intersection with Route 440 at Perth Amboy; then west on Route 440 to its intersection with Route 287; then west along Route 287 to its intersection with Route 206 in Bedminster (Exit 18); then north along Route 206 to its intersection with Route 94; then west along Route 94 to the toll bridge in Columbia; then north along the Pennsylvania State boundary in the Delaware River to the beginning point. In southern New Jersey, that portion of the State within a continuous line that runs west from the Atlantic Ocean at Ship Bottom along Route 72 to Route 70; then west along Route 70 to Route 206; then south along Route 206 to Route 536; then west along Route 536 to Route 322; then west along Route 322 to Route 55; then south along Route 55 to Route 553 (Buck Road); then south along Route 553 to Route 40; then east along Route 40 to route 55; then south along Route 55 to Route 552 (Sherman Avenue); then west along Route 552 to Carmel Road; then south along Carmel Road to Route 49; then

east along Route 49 to Route 555; then south along Route 555 to Route 553; then east along Route 553 to Route 649; then north along Route 649 to Route 670; then east along Route 670 to Route 47; then north along Route 47 to Route 548; then east along Route 548 to Route 49; then east along Route 49 to Route 50; then south along Route 50 to Route 9; then south along Route 9 to Route 625 (Sea Isle City Boulevard); then east along Route 625 to the Atlantic Ocean; then north to the beginning point.

New York

Lake Champlain Goose Area: The same as the Lake Champlain Waterfowl Hunting Zone, which is that area of New York State lying east and north of a continuous line extending along Route 11 from the New York-Canada international boundary south to Route 9B, south along Route 9B to Route 9, south along Route 9 to Route 22 south of Keeseville, south along Route 22 to the west shore of South Bay along and around the shoreline of South Bay to Route 22 on the east shore of South Bay, southeast along Route 22 to Route 4, northeast along Route 4 to the New York-Vermont boundary.

Northeast Goose Area: The same as the Northeastern Waterfowl Hunting Zone, which is that area of New York State lying north of a continuous line extending from Lake Ontario east along the north shore of the Salmon River to Interstate 81, south along Interstate 81 to Route 31, east along Route 31 to Route 13, north along Route 13 to Route 49, east along Route 49 to Route 365, east along Route 365 to Route 28, east along Route 28 to Route 29, east along Route 29 to Route 22 at Greenwich Junction, north along Route 22 to Washington County Route 153, east along CR 153 to the New York-Vermont boundary, exclusive of the Lake Champlain Zone.

East Central Goose Area: That area of New York State lying inside of a continuous line extending from Interstate Route 81 in Cicero, east along Route 31 to Route 13, north along Route 13 to Route 49, east along Route 49 to Route 365, east along Route 365 to Route 28, east along Route 28 to Route 29, east along Route 29 to Route 147 at Kimball Corners, south along Route 147 to Schenectady County Route 40 (West Glenville Road), west along Route 40 to Touareuna Road, south along Touareuna Road to Schenectady County Route 59, south along Route 59 to State Route 5, east along Route 5 to the Lock 9 bridge, southwest along the Lock 9 bridge to Route 5S, southeast along Route 5S to Schenectady County Route 58, southwest along Route 58 to the NYS Thruway, south along the Thruway to Route 7, southwest along Route 7 to Schenectady County Route 103, south along Route 103 to Route 406, east along Route 406 to Schenectady County Route 99 (Windy Hill Road), south along Route 99 to Dunnsville Road, south along Dunnsville Road to Route 397, southwest along Route 397 to Route 146 at Altamont, west along Route 146 to Albany County Route 252, northwest along Route 252 to Schenectady County Route 131, north along Route 131 to Route 7, west along Route 7 to Route 10 at Richmondville, south on Route 10 to Route 23 at Stamford, west along Route 23 to Route 7 in Oneonta, southwest along Route 7 to Route 79 to Interstate Route 88 near Harpursville, west along Route 88 to Interstate Route 81, north along Route 81 to the point of beginning.

West Central Goose Area: That area of New York State lying within a continuous line beginning at the point where the northerly extension of Route 269 (County Line Road on the Niagara-Orleans County boundary) meets the international boundary with Canada, south to the shore of Lake Ontario at the eastern boundary of Golden Hill State Park, south along the extension of Route 269 and Route 269 to Route 104 at Jeddo, west along Route 104 to Niagara County Route 271, south along Route 271 to Route 31E at Middleport, south along Route 31E to Route 31, west along Route 31 to Griswold Street, south along Griswold Street to Ditch Road, south along Ditch Road to Foot Road, south along Foot Road to the north bank of Tonawanda Creek, west along the north bank of Tonawanda Creek to Route 93, south along Route 93 to Route 5, east along Route 5 to Crittenden-Murrays Corners Road, south on Crittenden-Murrays Corners Road to the NYS Thruway, east along the Thruway 90 to Route 98 (at Thruway Exit 48) in Batavia, south along Route 98 to Route 20, east along Route 20 to Route 19 in Pavilion Center, south along Route 19 to Route 63, southeast along Route 63 to Route 246, south along Route 246 to Route 39 in Perry, northeast along Route 39 to Route 20A, northeast along Route 20A to Route 20, east along Route 20 to Route 364 (near Canandaigua), south and east along Route 364 to Yates County Route 18 (Italy Valley Road), southwest along Route 18 to Yates County Route 34, east along Route 34 to Yates County Route 32, south along Route 32 to Steuben County Route 122, south along Route 122 to Route 53, south along Route 53 to Steuben County Route 74, east along Route 74 to Route 54A (near Pulteney), south along Route 54A to Steuben County Route 87, east along Route 87 to Steuben County Route 96, east along Route 96 to Steuben County Route 114, east along Route 114 to Schuyler County Route 23, east and southeast along Route 23 to Schuyler County Route 28, southeast along Route 28 to Route 409 at Watkins Glen, south along Route 409 to Route 14, south along Route 14 to Route 224 at Montour Falls, east along Route 224 to Route 228 in Odessa, north along Route 228 to Route 79 in Mecklenburg, east along Route 79 to Route 366 in Ithaca, northeast along Route 366 to Route 13, northeast along Route 13 to Interstate Route 81 in Cortland, north along Route 81 to the north shore of the Salmon River to shore of Lake Ontario, extending generally northwest in a straight line to the nearest point of the international boundary with Canada, south and west along the international boundary to the point of beginning.

Hudson Valley Goose Area: That area of New York State lying within a continuous line extending from Route 4 at the New York-Vermont boundary, west and south along Route 4 to Route 149 at Fort Ann, west on Route 149 to Route 9, south along Route 9 to Interstate Route 87 (at Exit 20 in Glens Falls), south along Route 87 to Route 29, west along Route 29 to Route 147 at Kimball Corners, south along Route 147 to Schenectady County Route 40 (West Glenville Road), west along Route 40 to Touareuna Road, south along Touareuna Road to Schenectady County Route 59, south along Route 59 to State Route 5, east along Route 5 to the Lock 9 bridge, southwest along the Lock 9 bridge to Route 5S, southeast along Route 5S to Schenectady County Route 58, southwest along Route 58 to the NYS Thruway, south along the Thruway to Route 7, southwest along Route 7 to Schenectady County Route 103, south along Route 103 to Route 406, east along Route 406 to Schenectady County Route 99 (Windy Hill Road), south along Route 99 to Dunnsville Road, south along Dunnsville Road to Route 397, southwest along Route 397 to Route 146 at Altamont, southeast along Route 146 to Main Street in Altamont, west along Main Street to Route 156, southeast along Route 156 to Albany County Route 307, southeast along Route 307 to Route 85A, southwest along Route 85A to Route 85, south along Route 85 to Route 443, southeast along Route 443 to Albany County Route 301 at Clarksville, southeast along Route 301 to Route 32, south along Route 32 to Route 23 at Cairo, west along Route 23 to Joseph Chadderdon Road, southeast along Joseph Chadderdon Road to Hearts Content Road (Greene County Route 31),

southeast along Route 31 to Route 32, south along Route 32 to Greene County Route 23A, east along Route 23A to Interstate Route 87 (the NYS Thruway), south along Route 87 to Route 28 (Exit 19) near Kingston, northwest on Route 28 to Route 209, southwest on Route 209 to the New York-Pennsylvania boundary, southeast along the New York-Pennsylvania boundary to the New York-New Jersey boundary, southeast along the New York-New Jersey boundary to Route 210 near Greenwood Lake, northeast along Route 210 to Orange County Route 5, northeast along Orange County Route 5 to Route 105 in the Village of Monroe, east and north along Route 105 to Route 32, northeast along Route 32 to Orange County Route 107 (Quaker Avenue), east along Route 107 to Route 9W, north along Route 9W to the south bank of Moodna Creek, southeast along the south bank of Moodna Creek to the New Windsor-Cornwall town boundary, northeast along the New Windsor-Cornwall town boundary to the Orange-Dutchess County boundary (middle of the Hudson River), north along the county boundary to Interstate Route 84, east along Route 84 to the Dutchess-Putnam County boundary, east along the county boundary to the New York-Connecticut boundary, north along the New York-Connecticut boundary to the New York-Massachusetts boundary, north along the New York-Massachusetts boundary to the New York-Vermont boundary, north to the point of beginning.

Eastern Long Island Goose Area (NAP High Harvest Area): That area of Suffolk County lying east of a continuous line extending due south from the New York-Connecticut boundary to the northernmost end of Roanoke Avenue in the Town of Riverhead; then south on Roanoke Avenue (which becomes County Route 73) to State Route 25; then west on Route 25 to Peconic Avenue; then south on Peconic Avenue to County Route (CR) 104 (Riverleigh Avenue); then south on CR 104 to CR 31 (Old Riverhead Road); then south on CR 31 to Oak Street; then south on Oak Street to Potunk Lane; then west on Stevens Lane; then south on Jessup Avenue (in Westhampton Beach) to Dune Road (CR 89); then due south to international waters.

Western Long Island Goose Area (RP Area): That area of Westchester County and its tidal waters southeast of Interstate Route 95 and that area of Nassau and Suffolk Counties lying west of a continuous line extending due south from the New York-Connecticut boundary to the northernmost end of Sound Road (just east of Wading River Marsh); then south on Sound Road to North Country Road; then west on North Country Road to Randall Road; then south on Randall Road to Route 25A, then west on Route 25A to the Sunken Meadow State Parkway; then south on the Sunken Meadow Parkway to the Sagtikos State Parkway; then south on the Sagtikos Parkway to the Robert Moses State Parkway; then south on the Robert Moses Parkway to its southernmost end; then due south to international waters.

Central Long Island Goose Area (NAP Low Harvest Area): That area of Suffolk County lying between the Western and Eastern Long Island Goose Areas, as defined above.

South Goose Area: The remainder of New York State, excluding New York City.

North Carolina

Northeast Zone: Includes the following counties or portions of counties: Bertie (that portion north and east of a line formed by NC 45 at the Washington County line to U.S. 17 in Midway, U.S. 17 in Midway to U.S. 13 in Windsor, U.S. 13 in Windsor to the Hertford County line), Camden, Chowan, Currituck, Dare, Hyde, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Tyrrell, and Washington.

RP Zone: Remainder of the State.

Pennsylvania

Resident Canada and Cackling Goose Zone: All of Pennsylvania area east of route SR 97 from the Maryland State Line to the intersection of SR 194, east of SR 194 to the intersection of U.S. Route 30, south of U.S. Route 30 to SR 441, east of SR 441 to SR 743, east of SR 743 to intersection of I–81, east of I–81 to intersection of I–80, and south of I–80 to the New Jersey State line.

AP Zone: The area east of route SR 97 from Maryland State Line to the intersection of SR 194, east of SR 194 to intersection of U.S. Route 30, south of U.S. Route 30 to SR 441, east of SR 441 to SR 743, east of SR 743 to intersection of I–81, east of I–81 to intersection of I–80, south of I–80 to the New Jersey State line.

Rhode Island

Special Area for Canada and Cackling Geese: Kent and Providence Counties and portions of the towns of Exeter and North Kingston within Washington County (see State regulations for detailed descriptions).

South Carolina

Canada and Cackling Goose Area: Statewide except for the following area:

East of U.S. 301: That portion of Clarendon County bounded to the north by S–14–25, to the east by Hwy 260, and to the south by the markers delineating the channel of the Santee River.

West of U.S. 301: That portion of Clarendon County bounded on the north by S–14–26 extending southward to that portion of Orangeburg County bordered by Hwy 6.

Vermont

Same zones as for ducks.

Virginia

AP Zone: The area to the east of the following line: the ''Blue Ridge'' (Loudoun-Clarke Counties border) at the West Virginia-Virginia border, south to Interstate 64 (the Blue Ridge line follows county borders along the western edge of Loudoun, Fauquier, Rappahannock, Madison, Greene, Albemarle, and into Nelson Counties), then east along Interstate 64 to Interstate 95 in Richmond, then south along Interstate 95 to Route 460 in Petersburg, then southeast along Route 460 to Route 32 in the City of Suffolk, then south to the North Carolina border.

RP Zone: The remainder of the State west of the AP Zone.

Mississippi Flyway

Arkansas

Northwest Zone: Baxter, Benton, Boone, Carroll, Conway, Crawford, Faulkner, Franklin, Johnson, Logan, Madison, Marion, Newton, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Searcy, Sebastian, Scott, Van Buren, Washington, and Yell Counties.

Remainder of State: That portion of the State outside of the Northwest Zone.

Illinois

North Zone: That portion of the State north of a line extending west from the Indiana border along Interstate 80 to I–39, south along I–39 to Illinois Route 18, west along Illinois Route 18 to Illinois Route 29, south along Illinois Route 29 to Illinois Route 17, west along Illinois Route 17 to the Mississippi River, and due south across the Mississippi River to the Iowa border.

Central Zone: That portion of the State south of the North Goose Zone line to a line extending west from the Indiana border along I–70 to Illinois Route 4, south along Illinois Route 4 to Illinois Route 161, west along Illinois Route 161 to Illinois Route 158, south and west along Illinois Route 158 to Illinois Route 159, south along Illinois Route 159 to Illinois Route 3, south along Illinois Route 3 to St. Leo's Road, south along St. Leo's Road to Modoc Road, west along Modoc Road to Modoc Ferry Road, southwest along Modoc Ferry Road to Levee Road, southeast along Levee Road to County Route 12

(Modoc Ferry entrance Road), south along County Route 12 to the Modoc Ferry route, and southwest on the Modoc Ferry route across the Mississippi River to the Missouri border.

South Zone: Same zone as for ducks.

South Central Zone: Same zone as for ducks.

Indiana

Same zones as for ducks.

Iowa

Same zones as for ducks.

Kentucky

Western: The area that includes all counties west of and including Hardin, Nelson, Washington, Marion, Taylor, Adair, and Cumberland Counties.

Eastern: The area that includes Bullitt County in its entirety and all other counties not included in the Western goose zone.

Louisiana

Same zones as for ducks.

Michigan

North Zone: Same as North duck zone.

Middle Zone: Same as Middle duck zone.

South Zone: Same as South duck zone.

Allegan County Game Management Unit (GMU): That area encompassed by a line beginning at the junction of 136th Avenue and Interstate Highway 196 in Lake Town Township and extending easterly along 136th Avenue to Michigan Highway 40, southerly along Michigan 40 through the city of Allegan to 108th Avenue in Trowbridge Township, westerly along 108th Avenue to 46th Street, northerly along 46th Street to 109th Avenue, westerly along 109th Avenue to I–196 in Casco Township, then northerly along I–196 to the point of beginning.

Muskegon Wastewater GMU: That portion of Muskegon County within the boundaries of the Muskegon County wastewater system, east of the Muskegon State Game Area, in sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, 30, and 32, T10N R14W, and sections 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 24, and 25, T10N R15W, as posted.

Minnesota

Same zones as for ducks.

Missouri

Same zones as for ducks.

Ohio

Same zones as for ducks.

Tennessee

Reelfoot Zone: The lands and waters within the boundaries of Reelfoot Lake WMA only.

Remainder of State: The remainder of the State.

Wisconsin

North and South Zones: Same zones as for ducks.

Mississippi River Zone: That area encompassed by a line beginning at the intersection of the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway and the Illinois State line in Grant County and extending northerly along the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway to the city limit of Prescott in Pierce County, then west along the Prescott city limit to the Minnesota State line.

Central Flyway

Colorado (Central Flyway Portion)

North Park Area: Jackson County.

South Park Area: Chaffee, Custer, Fremont, Lake, Park, and Teller Counties.

San Luis Valley Area: All of Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, and Rio Grande Counties, and those portions of Saguache, Mineral, Hinsdale, Archuleta, and San Juan Counties east of the Continental Divide.

Remainder: Remainder of the Central Flyway portion of Colorado.

Eastern Colorado Late Light Goose Area: That portion of the State east of Interstate Highway 25.

Montana (Central Flyway Portion)

Zone 1: Same as Zone 1 for ducks and coots.

Zone 2: Same as Zone 2 for ducks and coots.

Nebraska

Dark Geese

Niobrara Unit: That area contained within and bounded by the intersection of the Nebraska-South Dakota border and U.S. Hwy 83, south to U.S. Hwy 20, east to NE Hwy 14, north along NE Hwy 14 to NE Hwy 59 and County Road 872, west along County Road 872 to the Knox County line, north along the Knox County line to the Nebraska-South Dakota border, west along the Nebraska-South Dakota border to U.S. Hwy 83. Where the Niobrara River forms the boundary, both banks of the river are included in the Niobrara Unit.

Platte River Unit: The area bounded starting at the northernmost intersection of the Interstate Canal at the Nebraska-Wyoming border; south along the Nebraska-Wyoming border to the Nebraska-Colorado border; east and south along the Nebraska-Colorado border to the Nebraska-Kansas border; east along the Nebraska-Kansas border to the Nebraska-Missouri border; north along the Nebraska-Missouri and Nebraska-Iowa borders to the Burt-Washington Counties line; west along the Burt-Washington Counties line to U.S. Hwy 75; south to Dodge County Road 4/Washington County Road 4; west to U.S. Hwy 77; south to U.S. Hwy 275; northwest to U.S. Hwy 91; west to NE Hwy 45; north to NE Hwy 32; west to NE Hwy 14; north to NE Hwy 70; west to U.S. Hwy 281; south to NE Hwy 70; west along NE Hwy 70/91 to NE Hwy 11; north to the Holt County line; west along the northern border of Garfield, Loup, Blaine, and Thomas Counties to the Hooker County line; south along the Thomas-Hooker Counties lines to the McPherson County line; east along the south border of Thomas County to the Custer County line; south along the Custer-Logan Counties line to NE Hwy 92; west to U.S. Hwy 83; north to NE Hwy 92; west to NE Hwy 61; north to NE Hwy 2; west along NE Hwy 2 to the corner formed by Garden, Grant, and Sheridan Counties; west along the north borders of Garden, Morrill, and Scotts Bluff Counties to the intersection with the Interstate Canal; north and west along the Interstate Canal to the intersection with the Nebraska-Wyoming border.

North-Central Unit: Those portions of the State not in the Niobrara and Platte River zones.

Light Geese

Rainwater Basin Light Goose Area: The area bounded by the junction of NE Hwy 92 and NE Hwy 15, south along NE Hwy 15 to NE Hwy 4, west along NE Hwy 4 to U.S. Hwy 34, west along U.S. Hwy 34 to U.S. Hwy 283, north along U.S. Hwy 283 to U.S. Hwy 30, east along U.S. Hwy 30 to NE Hwy 92, east along NE Hwy 92 to the beginning.

Remainder of State: The remainder of Nebraska.

New Mexico (Central Flyway Portion)

Dark Geese

Middle Rio Grande Valley Unit: Sierra, Socorro, and Valencia Counties.

Remainder: The remainder of the Central Flyway portion of New Mexico.

North Dakota

Missouri River Canada and Cackling Goose Zone: The area within and bounded by a line starting where ND Hwy 6 crosses the South Dakota border; then north on ND Hwy 6 to I–94; then west on I–94 to ND Hwy 49; then north on ND Hwy 49 to ND Hwy 200; then west on ND Hwy 200; then north on ND Hwy 8 to the Mercer-McLean Counties

line; then east following the county line until it turns south toward Garrison Dam; then east along a line (including Mallard Island) of Lake Sakakawea to U.S. Hwy 83; then south on U.S. Hwy 83 to ND Hwy 200; then east on ND Hwy 200 to ND Hwy 41; then south on ND Hwy 41 to U.S. Hwy 83; then south on U.S. Hwy 83 to I–94; then east on I–94 to U.S. Hwy 83; then south on U.S. Hwy 83 to the South Dakota border; then west along the South Dakota border to ND Hwy 6.

Western North Dakota Canada and Cackling Goose Zone: Same as the High Plains Unit for ducks, mergansers, and coots, excluding the Missouri River Canada Goose Zone.

Rest of State: Remainder of North Dakota.

South Dakota

Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Special Early Canada and Cackling Goose Unit: The Counties of Campbell, Clark, Codington, Day, Deuel, Grant, Hamlin, Marshall, Roberts, and Walworth; that portion of Perkins County west of State Highway 75 and south of State Highway 20; that portion of Dewey County north of Bureau of Indian Affairs Road 8, Bureau of Indian Affairs Road 9, and the section of U.S. Highway 212 east of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Road 8 junction; that portion of Potter County east of U.S. Highway 83; that portion of Sully County east of U.S. Highway 83; portions of Hyde, Buffalo, Brule, and Charles Mix Counties north and east of a line beginning at the Hughes-Hyde County line on State Highway 34, east to Lees Boulevard, southeast to State Highway 34, east 7 miles to 350th Avenue, south to Interstate 90 on 350th Avenue, south and east on State Highway 50 to Geddes, east on 285th Street to U.S. Highway 281, and north on U.S. Highway 281 to the Charles Mix-Douglas Counties boundary; that portion of Bon Homme County north of State Highway 50; those portions of Yankton and Clay Counties north of a line beginning at the junction of State Highway 50 and 306th Street/County Highway 585 in Bon Homme County, east to U.S. Highway 81, then north on U.S. Highway 81 to 303rd Street, then east on 303rd Street to 444th Avenue, then south on 444th Avenue to 305th Street, then east on 305th Street/Bluff Road to State Highway 19, then south to State Highway 50 and east to the Clay/Union County Line; Aurora, Beadle, Brookings, Brown, Butte, Corson, Davison, Douglas, Edmunds, Faulk, Haakon, Hand, Hanson, Harding, Hutchinson, Jackson, Jerauld, Jones, Kingsbury, Lake, McCook, McPherson, Meade, Mellette, Miner, Moody, Oglala Lakota (formerly Shannon), Sanborn, Spink, Todd, Turner, and Ziebach Counties; and those portions of Minnehaha and Lincoln Counties outside of an area bounded by a line beginning at the junction of the South Dakota-Minnesota State line and Minnehaha County Highway 122 (254th Street) west to its junction with Minnehaha County Highway 149 (464th Avenue), south on Minnehaha County Highway 149 (464th Avenue) to Hartford, then south on Minnehaha County Highway 151 (463rd Avenue) to State Highway 42, east on State Highway 42 to State Highway 17, south on State Highway 17 to its junction with Lincoln County Highway 116 (Klondike Road), and east on Lincoln County Highway 116 (Klondike Road) to the South Dakota-Iowa State line, then north along the South Dakota-Iowa and South Dakota-Minnesota border to the junction of the South Dakota-Minnesota State line and Minnehaha County Highway 122 (254th Street).

Regular Seasons

Unit 1: Same as that for the Special Early Canada and Cackling Goose Unit.

Unit 2: All of South Dakota not included in Unit 1 and Unit 3.

Unit 3: Bennett County.

Texas

Northeast Goose Zone: That portion of Texas lying east and north of a line beginning at the Texas-Oklahoma border at U.S. 81, then continuing south to Bowie and then southeasterly along U.S. 81 and U.S. 287 to I–35W and I–35 to the juncture with I–10 in San Antonio, then east on I–10 to the Texas-Louisiana border.

Southeast Goose Zone: That portion of Texas lying east and south of a line beginning at the International Toll Bridge at Laredo, then continuing north following I–35 to the juncture with I–10 in San Antonio, then easterly along I–10 to the Texas-Louisiana border.

West Goose Zone: The remainder of the State.

Wyoming (Central Flyway Portion)

Dark Geese

Zone G1: Big Horn, Converse, Hot Springs, Natrona, Park, and Washakie Counties.

Zone G1A: Goshen and Platte Counties.

Zone G2: Campbell, Crook, Johnson, Niobrara, Sheridan, and Weston Counties.

Zone G3: Albany and Laramie Counties; and that portion of Carbon County east of the Continental Divide.

Zone G4: Fremont County excluding those portions south or west of the Continental Divide.

Pacific Flyway

Arizona

Same zones as for ducks.

California

Northeastern Zone: That portion of California lying east and north of a line beginning at the intersection of Interstate 5 with the California-Oregon line; south along Interstate 5 to its junction with Walters Lane south of the town of Yreka; west along Walters Lane to its junction with Easy Street; south along Easy Street to the junction with Old Highway 99; south along Old Highway 99 to the point of intersection with Interstate 5 north of the town of Weed; south along Interstate 5 to its junction with Highway 89; east and south along Highway 89 to main street Greenville; north and east to its junction with North Valley Road; south to its junction of Diamond Mountain Road; north and east to its junction with North Arm Road; south and west to the junction of North Valley Road; south to the junction with Arlington Road (A22); west to the junction of Highway 89; south and west to the junction of Highway 70; east on Highway 70 to Highway 395; south and east on Highway 395 to the point of intersection with the California-Nevada State line; north along the California-Nevada State line to the junction of the California-Nevada-Oregon State lines west along the California-Oregon State line to the point of origin.

Klamath Basin Special Management Area: Beginning at the intersection of Highway 161 and Highway 97; east on Highway 161 to Hill Road; south on Hill Road to N Dike Road West Side; east on N Dike Road West Side until the junction of the Lost River; north on N Dike Road West Side until the Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway; east on Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway until N Dike Road East Side; south on the N Dike Road East Side; continue east on N Dike Road East Side to Highway 111; south on Highway 111/Great Northern Road to Highway 120/Highway 124; west on Highway 120/Highway 124 to Hill Road; south on Hill Road until Lairds Camp Road; west on Lairds Camp Road until Willow Creek; west and south on Willow Creek to Red Rock Road; west on Red Rock Road until Meiss Lake Road/Old State Highway; north on Meiss Lake Road/Old State Highway to

Highway 97; north on Highway 97 to the point of origin.

Colorado River Zone: Those portions of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial Counties east of a line from the intersection of Highway 95 with the California-Nevada State line; south on Highway 95 through the junction with Highway 40; south on Highway 95 to Vidal Junction; south through the town of Rice to the San Bernardino-Riverside Counties line on a road known as ''Aqueduct Road'' also known as Highway 62 in San Bernardino County; southwest on Highway 62 to Desert Center Rice Road; south on Desert Center Rice Road/Highway 177 to the town of Desert Center; east 31 miles on Interstate 10 to its intersection with Wiley Well Road; south on Wiley Well Road to Wiley Well; southeast on Milpitas Wash Road to the Blythe, Brawley, Davis Lake intersections; south on Blythe Ogilby Road also known as County Highway 34 to its intersection with Ogilby Road; south on Ogilby Road to its intersection with Interstate 8; east 7 miles on Interstate 8 to its intersection with the Andrade-Algodones Road/Highway 186; south on Highway 186 to its intersection with the U.S.-Mexico border at Los Algodones, Mexico.

Southern Zone: That portion of southern California (but excluding the Colorado River zone) south and east of a line beginning at the mouth of the Santa Maria River at the Pacific Ocean; east along the Santa Maria River to where it crosses Highway 101–166 near the City of Santa Maria; north on Highway 101–166; east on Highway 166 to the junction with Highway 99; south on Highway 99 to the junction of Interstate 5; south on Interstate 5 to the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains at Tejon Pass; east and north along the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains to where it intersects Highway 178 at Walker Pass; east on Highway 178 to the junction of Highway 395 at the town of Inyokern; south on Highway 395 to the junction of Highway 58; east on Highway 58 to the junction of Interstate 15; east on Interstate 15 to the junction with Highway 127; north on Highway 127 to the point of intersection with the California-Nevada State line.

Imperial County Special Management Area: The area bounded by a line beginning at Highway 86 and the Navy Test Base Road; south on Highway 86 to the town of Westmoreland; continue through the town of Westmoreland to Route S26; east on Route S26 to Highway 115; north on Highway 115 to Weist Road; north on Weist Road to Flowing Wells Road; northeast on Flowing Wells Road to the Coachella Canal; northwest on the Coachella Canal to Drop 18; a straight line from Drop 18 to Frink Road; south on Frink Road to Highway 111; north on Highway 111 to Niland Marina Road; southwest on Niland Marina Road to the old Imperial County boat ramp and the water line of the Salton Sea; from the water line of the Salton Sea, a straight line across the Salton Sea to the Salinity Control Research Facility and the Navy Test Base Road; southwest on the Navy Test Base Road to the point of beginning.

Balance of State Zone: The remainder of California not included in the Northeastern, Colorado River, and Southern Zones.

North Coast Special Management Area: Del Norte and Humboldt Counties.

Sacramento Valley Special Management Area: That area bounded by a line beginning at Willows south on I–5 to Hahn Road; easterly on Hahn Road and the Grimes-Arbuckle Road to Grimes; northerly on CA 45 to the junction with CA 162; northerly on CA 45/162 to Glenn; and westerly on CA 162 to the point of beginning in Willows.

Colorado (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Same zones as for ducks.

Idaho

Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Zone 1: Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Fremont, Jefferson, Madison, and Teton Counties.

Zone 2: Bannock County; Bear Lake County west of Highway 30 to Montpelier, south of Highway 89 to Ovid, and east of Highway 89 to the state line; Bingham County except that portion within the Blackfoot Reservoir drainage; Blaine County; Caribou County south of Highway 30; and Cassia, Franklin, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Oneida, Power, and Twin Falls Counties.

Zone 3: Ada, Adams, Boise, Camas, Canyon, Clearwater, Custer, Elmore, Gooding, Idaho, Latah, Lemhi, Lewis, Nez Perce, Owyhee, Payette, and Washington Counties.

Zone 4: Bear Lake County east of Highway 30 to Montpelier, south of Highway 89 to Ovid, and east of Highway 89 to the state line, and Caribou County north of Highway 30.

Zone 5: Valley County.

Zone 6: Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone Counties.

Regular Seasons

Canada and Cackling Geese and Brant

Same as for early Canada and cackling goose seasons.

White-Fronted Geese

Zone 1: Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Butte, Caribou, Clark, Fremont, Jefferson, and Madison Counties; Power County east of State Highway 37 and State Highway 39; and Teton County.

Zone 2: Adams, Blaine, Camas, Clearwater, Custer, Franklin, Idaho, Latah, Lemhi, Lewis, Nez Perce, and Oneida Counties; and Power County west of State Highway 37 and State Highway 39.

Zone 3: Ada, Boise, Canyon, Cassia, Elmore, Gem, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, and Washington Counties.

Zone 4: Valley County.

Zone 5: Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone Counties.

Light Geese

Zone 1: Bannock and Bear Lake Counties; Bingham County east of the west bank of the Snake River, west of the McTucker boat ramp access road, and east of the American Falls Reservoir bluff; Bonneville County east of Interstate 15; Caribou County; Clark County east of Interstate 15; Fremont County; Jefferson County east of Interstate 15; Madison County; and Power County below the American Falls Reservoir bluff and within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation; and Teton County.

Zone 2: Bingham County west of the west bank of the Snake River, east of the McTucker boat ramp access road, and west of the American Falls Reservoir bluff; Bonneville County west of Interstate 15; Butte County; Clark County west of Interstate 15; Franklin County; Jefferson County west of Interstate 15; Oneida County; and Power County except below the American Falls Reservoir bluff and those lands and waters within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

Zone 3: Ada, Blaine, Boise, Camas, Canyon, Cassia, Elmore, Gem, Gooding, Jerome, Lincoln, Minidoka, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, and Washington Counties.

Zone 4: Adams, Clearwater, Custer, Idaho, Latah, Lemhi, Lewis, and Nez Perce Counties.

Zone 5: Valley County.

Zone 6: Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, Kootenai, and Shoshone Counties.

Nevada

Same zones as for ducks.

New Mexico (Pacific Flyway Portion)

North Zone: The Pacific Flyway portion of New Mexico located north of I–40.

South Zone: The Pacific Flyway portion of New Mexico located south of I–40.

Oregon

Northwest Permit Zone: Benton, Clackamas, Clatsop, Columbia, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Marion, Multnomah, Polk, Tillamook, Washington, and Yamhill Counties.

Tillamook County Management Area: That portion of Tillamook County beginning at the point where Old Woods Road crosses the south shores of Horn Creek, north on Old Woods Road to Sand Lake Road at Woods, north on Sand Lake Road to the intersection with McPhillips Drive, due west (approximately 200 yards) from the intersection to the Pacific coastline, south along the Pacific coastline to a point due west of the western end of Pacific Avenue in Pacific City, east from this point (approximately 250 yards) to Pacific Avenue, east on Pacific Avenue to Brooten Road, south and then east on Brooten Road to Highway 101, north on Highway 101 to Resort Drive, north on Resort Drive to a point due west of the south shores of Horn Creek at its confluence with the Nestucca River, due east (approximately 80 yards) across the Nestucca River to the south shores of Horn Creek, east along the south shores of Horn Creek to the point of beginning.

Southwest Zone: Those portions of Douglas, Coos, and Curry Counties east of Highway 101, and Josephine and Jackson Counties.

South Coast Zone: Those portions of Douglas, Coos, and Curry Counties west of Highway 101.

Eastern Zone: Baker, Crook, Deschutes, Grant, Harney, Jefferson, Klamath, Lake, Malheur, Union, Wallowa, and Wheeler Counties.

Mid-Columbia Zone: Gilliam, Hood River, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, and Wasco Counties.

Utah

East Box Elder County Zone: Boundary begins at the intersection of the eastern boundary of Public Shooting Grounds Waterfowl Management Area and SR–83 (Promontory Road); east along SR–83 to I–15; south on I–15 to the Perry access road; southwest along this road to the Bear River Bird Refuge boundary; west, north, and then east along the refuge boundary until it intersects the Public Shooting Grounds Waterfowl Management Area boundary; east and north along the Public Shooting Grounds Waterfowl Management Area boundary to SR–83.

Wasatch Front Zone: Boundary begins at the Weber-Box Elder Counties line at I–15; east along Weber County line to U.S.–89; south on U.S.–89 to I–84; east and south on I–84 to I–80; south on I–80 to U.S.–189; south and west on U.S.–189 to the Utah County line; southeast and then west along this line to the Tooele County line; north along the Tooele County line to I–80; east on I–80 to Exit 99; north from Exit 99 along a direct line to the southern tip of Promontory Point and Promontory Road; east and north along this road to the causeway separating Bear River Bay from Ogden Bay; east on this causeway to the southwest corner of Great Salt Lake Mineral Corporation's (GSLMC) west impoundment; north and east along GSLMC's west impoundment to the northwest corner of the impoundment; north from this point along a direct line to the southern boundary of Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge; east along this southern boundary to the Perry access road; northeast along this road to I–15; south along I–15 to the Weber-Box Elder Counties line.

Southern Zone: Boundary includes Beaver, Carbon, Emery, Garfield, Grand, Iron, Juab, Kane, Millard, Piute, San Juan, Sanpete, Sevier, Washington, and Wayne Counties, and that part of Tooele County south of I–80.

Northern Zone: The remainder of Utah not included in the East Box Elder County, Wasatch Front, and Southern Zones.

Washington

Area 1: Skagit and Whatcom Counties, and that portion of Snohomish County west of Interstate 5.

Area 2 Inland (Southwest Permit Zone): Clark, Cowlitz, and Wahkiakum Counties, and that portion of Grays Harbor County east of Highway 101.

Area 2 Coastal (Southwest Permit Zone): Pacific County and that portion of Grays Harbor County west of Highway 101.

Area 3: All areas west of the Pacific Crest Trail and west of the Big White Salmon River that are not included in Areas 1, 2 Coastal, and 2 Inland.

Area 4: Adams, Benton, Chelan, Douglas, Franklin, Grant, Kittitas, Lincoln, Okanogan, Spokane, and Walla Walla Counties.

Area 5: All areas east of the Pacific Crest Trail and east of the Big White Salmon River that are not included in Area 4.

Wyoming (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Early Canada and Cackling Goose Seasons

Teton County Zone: Teton County.

Balance of State Zone: Remainder of the State.

Brant

Pacific Flyway

California

Northern Zone: Del Norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino Counties.

Balance of State Zone: The remainder of the State not included in the Northern Zone.

Washington

Puget Sound Zone: Clallam, Skagit, and Whatcom Counties.

Coastal Zone: Pacific County.

Swans

Central Flyway

South Dakota

Open Area: Aurora, Beadle, Brookings, Brown, Brule, Buffalo, Campbell, Clark, Codington, Davison, Day, Deuel, Edmunds, Faulk, Grant, Hamlin, Hand, Hanson, Hughes, Hyde, Jerauld, Kingsbury, Lake, Marshall, McCook, McPherson, Miner, Minnehaha, Moody, Potter, Roberts, Sanborn, Spink, Sully, and Walworth Counties.

Pacific Flyway

Idaho

Open Area: Benewah, Bonner, Boundary, and Kootenai Counties.

Montana (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Open Area: Cascade, Chouteau, Hill, Liberty, and Toole Counties and those portions of Pondera and Teton Counties lying east of U.S. 287–89.

Nevada

Open Area: Churchill, Lyon, and Pershing Counties.

Utah

Open Area: Begins at I–15 and Exit 365 (SR 13/83); west and north on SR–83 to I–84; west on I–84 to SR–30; southwest on SR–30 to the Nevada-Utah State line; south on this State line to I–80; east on I–80 to I–15; north on I–15 to Exit 365 (SR 13/83).

Doves

Alabama

South Zone: Baldwin, Coffee, Covington, Dale, Escambia, Geneva, Henry, Houston, and Mobile Counties.

North Zone: Remainder of the State.

Florida

Northwest Zone: The Counties of Bay, Calhoun, Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Liberty, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Walton, Washington, Leon (except that portion north of U.S. 27 and east of State Road

155), Jefferson (south of U.S. 27, west of State Road 59 and north of U.S. 98), and Wakulla (except that portion south of U.S. 98 and east of the St. Marks River).

South Zone: The remainder of the State.

Louisiana

North Zone: That portion of the State north of a line extending east from the Texas border along State Highway 12 to U.S. Highway 190, east along U.S. Highway 190 to Interstate Highway 12, east along Interstate Highway 12 to Interstate Highway 10, then east along Interstate Highway 10 to the Mississippi border.

South Zone: The remainder of the State.

Mississippi

North Zone: That portion of the State north and west of a line extending west from the Alabama State line along U.S. Highway 84 to its junction with State Highway 35, then south along State Highway 35 to the Louisiana State line.

South Zone: The remainder of Mississippi.

New Mexico

North Zone: North of I–40 from the New Mexico-Arizona border to U.S. Hwy. 54 at Tucumcari; U.S. Hwy. 54 from Tucumcari to the New Mexico-Texas border.

South Zone: South of I–40 from the New Mexico-Arizona border to U.S. Hwy. 54 at Tucumcari; U.S. Hwy. 54 from Tucumcari to the New Mexico-Texas border.

Oregon

Zone 1: Benton, Clackamas, Clatsop, Columbia, Coos, Curry, Douglas, Gilliam, Hood River, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Marion, Morrow, Multnomah, Polk, Sherman, Tillamook, Umatilla, Wasco, Washington, and Yamhill Counties.

Zone 2: The remainder of Oregon not included in Zone 1.

Texas

North Zone: That portion of the State north of a line beginning at the International Bridge south of Fort Hancock; north along FM 1088 to TX 20; west along TX 20 to TX 148; north along TX 148 to I–10 at Fort Hancock; east along I–10 to I–20; northeast along I–20 to I–30 at Fort Worth; northeast along I–30 to the Texas-Arkansas State line.

Central Zone: That portion of the State lying between the North and South Zones.

South Zone: That portion of the State south and west of a line beginning at the International Bridge south of Del Rio, proceeding east on U.S. 90 to State Loop 1604 west of San Antonio; then south, east, and north along Loop 1604 to I–10 east of San Antonio; then east on I–10 to Orange, Texas.

Special White-Winged Dove Area: Same as the South Zone.

New Mexico

North Zone: That portion of the State north of a line following I–40 from the Arizona border east to U.S. Hwy 54 at Tucumcari and U.S. Hwy 54 at Tucumcari east to the Texas border.

South Zone: The remainder of the State not included in the North Zone.

Band-Tailed Pigeons

California

North Zone: Alpine, Butte, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity Counties.

South Zone: The remainder of the State not included in the North Zone.

New Mexico

North Zone: North of a line following U.S. 60 from the Arizona State line east to I–25 at Socorro and then south along I–25 from Socorro to the Texas State line.

South Zone: The remainder of the State not included in the North Zone.

Washington

Western Washington: The State of Washington excluding those portions lying east of the Pacific Crest Trail and east of the Big White Salmon River in Klickitat County.

American Woodcock

New Jersey

North Zone: That portion of the State north of NJ 70.

South Zone: The remainder of the State.

Sandhill Cranes

Mississippi Flyway

Alabama

Open Area: That area north of Interstate 20 from the Georgia State line to the interchange with Interstate 65, then east of Interstate 65 to the interchange with Interstate 22, then north of Interstate 22 to the Mississippi State line.

Minnesota

Northwest Zone: That portion of the State encompassed by a line extending east from the North Dakota border along U.S. Highway 2 to State Trunk Highway (STH) 32, north along STH 32 to STH 92, east along STH 92 to County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 2 in Polk County, north along CSAH 2 to CSAH 27 in Pennington County, north along CSAH 27 to STH 1, east along STH 1 to CSAH 28 in Pennington County, north along CSAH 28 to CSAH 54 in Marshall County, north along CSAH 54 to CSAH 9 in Roseau County, north along CSAH 9 to STH 11, west along STH 11 to STH 310, and north along STH 310 to the Manitoba border.

Tennessee

Southeast Crane Zone: That portion of the State south of Interstate 40 and east of State Highway 56.

Remainder of State: That portion of Tennessee outside of the Southeast Crane Zone.

Central Flyway

Colorado (Central Flyway Portion)

Open Area: The Central Flyway portion of the State except the San Luis Valley (Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Hinsdale, Mineral, Rio Grande, and Saguache Counties east of the Continental Divide) and North Park (Jackson County).

Kansas

Central Zone: That portion of the State within an area bounded by a line beginning where I–35 crosses the Kansas-Oklahoma border, then north on I–35 to Wichita, then north on I–135 to Salina, then north on U.S. 81 to the Nebraska border, then west along the Kansas-Nebraska border to its intersection with Hwy 283, then south on Hwy 283 to the intersection with Hwy 18/24, then east along Hwy 18 to Hwy 183, then south on Hwy 183 to Route 1, then south on Route 1 to the Oklahoma border, then east along the Kansas-Oklahoma border to where it crosses I–35.

West Zone: That portion of the State west of the western boundary of the Central Zone.

Montana (Central Flyway Portion)

Regular Season Open Area: The Central Flyway portion of the State except for that area south and west of Interstate 90.

Special Season Open Areas:

Zone 7: Golden Valley and Wheatland Counties and those portions of Stillwater and Sweetgrass Counties north of I–90.

Zone 8: Carbon County.

New Mexico (Central Flyway Portion)

Regular-Season Open Area: Chaves, Curry, De Baca, Eddy, Lea, Quay, and Roosevelt Counties.

Special Season Open Areas:

Middle Rio Grande Valley Area: The Central Flyway portion of New Mexico in Socorro and Valencia Counties.

Estancia Valley Area: Those portions of Santa Fe, Torrance, and Bernallilo Counties within an area bounded on the west by New Mexico Highway 55 beginning at Mountainair north to NM 337, north to NM 14, north to I–25; on the north by I–25 east to U.S. 285; on the east by U.S. 285 south to U.S. 60; and on the south by U.S. 60 from U.S. 285 west to NM 55 in Mountainair.

Southwest Zone: Area bounded on the south by the New Mexico-Mexico border; on the west by the New Mexico-Arizona border north to Interstate 10; on the north by Interstate 10 east to U.S. 180, north to NM 26, east to NM 27, north to NM 152, and east to Interstate 25; on the east by Interstate 25 south to Interstate 10, west to the Luna County line, and south to the New Mexico-Mexico border.

North Dakota

Area 1: That portion of the State west of U.S. 281.

Area 2: That portion of the State east of U.S. 281.

Oklahoma

Open Area: That portion of the State west of I–35.

South Dakota

Open Area: That portion of the State lying west of a line beginning at the South Dakota-North Dakota border and State Highway 25, south on State Highway 25 to its junction with State Highway 34, east on State Highway 34 to its junction with U.S. Highway 81, then south on U.S. Highway 81 to the South Dakota-Nebraska border.

Texas

Zone A: That portion of Texas lying west of a line beginning at the international toll bridge at Laredo; then northeast along U.S. Highway 81 to its junction with Interstate Highway 35 in Laredo; then north along Interstate Highway 35 to its junction with Interstate Highway 10 in San Antonio; then northwest along Interstate Highway 10 to its junction with U.S. Highway 83 at Junction; then north along U.S. Highway 83 to its junction with U.S. Highway 62, 16 miles north of Childress; then east along U.S. Highway 62 to the Texas-Oklahoma State line.

Zone B: That portion of Texas lying within boundaries beginning at the junction of U.S. Highway 81 and the Texas-Oklahoma State line; then southeast along U.S. Highway 81 to its junction with U.S. Highway 287 in Montague County; then southeast along U.S. Highway 287 to its junction with Interstate Highway 35W in Fort Worth; then southwest along Interstate Highway 35 to its junction with Interstate Highway 10 in San Antonio; then northwest along Interstate Highway 10 to its junction with U.S. Highway 83 in the town of Junction; then north along U.S. Highway 83 to its junction with U.S. Highway 62, 16 miles north of Childress; then east along U.S. Highway 62 to the Texas-Oklahoma State line; then south along the Texas-Oklahoma State line to the south bank of the Red River; then eastward along the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River to U.S. Highway 81.

Zone C: The remainder of the State, except for the closed areas.

Closed areas:

a. That portion of the State lying east and north of a line beginning at the junction of U.S. Highway 81 and the Texas-Oklahoma State line, then southeast along U.S. Highway 81 to its junction with U.S. Highway 287 in Montague County, then southeast along U.S. Highway 287 to its junction with I–35W in Fort Worth, then southwest along I–35 to its junction with U.S. Highway 290 East in Austin, then east along U.S. Highway 290 to its junction with Interstate Loop 610 in Harris County, then south and east along Interstate Loop 610 to its junction with Interstate Highway 45 in Houston, then south on Interstate Highway 45 to State Highway 342, then to the shore of the Gulf of America (the area formerly known as the Gulf of Mexico), and then north and east along the shore of the Gulf of America to the Texas-Louisiana State line.

b. That portion of the State lying within the boundaries of a line beginning at the Kleberg-Nueces County line and the shore of the Gulf of America, then west along the County line to Park Road 22 in Nueces County, then north and west along Park Road 22 to its junction with State Highway 358 in Corpus Christi, then west and north along State Highway 358 to its junction with State Highway 286, then north along State Highway 286 to its junction with Interstate Highway 37, then east along Interstate Highway 37 to its junction with U.S. Highway 181, then north and west along U.S. Highway 181 to its junction with U.S. Highway 77 in Sinton, then north and east along U.S. Highway 77 to its junction with U.S. Highway 87 in Victoria, then south and east along U.S. Highway 87 to its junction with State Highway 35 at Port Lavaca, then north and east along State Highway 35 to the south end of the Lavaca Bay Causeway, then south and east along the shore of Lavaca Bay to its junction with the Port Lavaca Ship Channel, then south and east along the Lavaca Bay Ship Channel to the Gulf of America, and then south and west along the shore of the Gulf of America to the Kleberg-Nueces Counties line.

Wyoming (Central Flyway Portion)

Area 4: All lands within the Bureau of Reclamation's Riverton and Boysen Unit boundaries; those lands within Boysen State Park south of Cottonwood Creek, west of Boysen Reservoir, and south of U.S. Highway 20–26; and all non-Indian owned fee title lands within the exterior boundaries of the Wind River Reservation, excluding those lands within Hot Springs County.

Area 6: Big Horn, Hot Springs, Park, and Washakie Counties.

Area 7: Campbell, Converse, Crook, Goshen, Laramie, Niobrara, Platte, and Weston Counties.

Area 8: Johnson, Natrona, and Sheridan Counties.

Pacific Flyway

Arizona

Zone 1: Beginning at the junction of the New Mexico State line and U.S. Hwy 80; south along the State line to the U.S.-Mexico border; west along the border to the San Pedro River; north along the San Pedro River to the junction with Arizona Hwy 77; northerly along Arizona Hwy 77 to the Gila River; northeast along the Gila River to the San Carlos Indian Reservation boundary; south then east and north along the reservation boundary to U.S. Hwy 70; southeast on U.S. Hwy 70 to U.S. Hwy 191; south on U.S. Hwy 191 to the 352 exit on I–10; east on I–10 to Bowie-Apache Pass Road; southerly on the Bowie-Apache Pass Road to Arizona Hwy 186; southeasterly on Arizona Hwy 186 to Arizona Hwy 181; south on Arizona Hwy 181 to the West Turkey Creek-Kuykendall cutoff road; southerly on the Kuykendall cutoff road to Rucker Canyon Road; easterly on Rucker Canyon Road to the Tex Canyon Road; southerly on Tex Canyon Road to U.S. Hwy 80; northeast on U.S. Hwy 80 to the New Mexico State line.

Zone 2: Beginning at I–10 and the New Mexico State line; north along the State line to Arizona Hwy 78; southwest on Arizona Hwy 78 to U.S. Hwy 191; northwest on U.S. Hwy 191 to Clifton; westerly on the Lower Eagle Creek Road (Pump Station Road) to Eagle Creek; northerly along Eagle Creek to the San Carlos Indian Reservation boundary; southerly and west along the reservation boundary to U.S. Hwy 70; southeast on U.S. Hwy 70 to U.S. Hwy 191; south on

U.S. Hwy 191 to I–10; easterly on I–10 to the New Mexico State line.

Zone 3: Beginning on I–10 at the New Mexico State line; westerly on I–10 to the Bowie-Apache Pass Road; southerly on the Bowie-Apache Pass Road to AZ Hwy 186; southeast on AZ Hwy 186 to AZ Hwy 181; south on AZ Hwy 181 to the West Turkey Creek-Kuykendall cutoff road; southerly on the Kuykendall cutoff road to Rucker Canyon Road; easterly on the Rucker Canyon Road to Tex Canyon Road; southerly on Tex Canyon Road to U.S. Hwy 80; northeast on U.S. Hwy 80 to the New Mexico State line; north along the State line to I–10.

Idaho

Area 1: All of Bear Lake County and all of Caribou County except that portion lying within the Grays Lake Basin.

Area 2: All of Teton County except that portion lying west of State Highway 33 and south of Packsaddle Road (West 400 North) and north of the North Cedron Road (West 600 South) and east of the west bank of the Teton River.

Area 3: All of Fremont County except the Chester Wetlands Wildlife Management Area.

Area 4: All of Jefferson County.

Area 5: All of Bannock County east of Interstate 15 and south of U.S. Highway 30; and all of Franklin County.

Area 6: That portion of Oneida County within the boundary beginning at the intersection of the Idaho-Utah border and Old Highway 191, then north on Old Highway 191 to 1500 S, then west on 1500 S to Highway 38, then west on Highway 38 to 5400 W, then south on 5400 W to Pocatello Valley Road, then west and south on Pocatello Valley Road to 10000 W, then south on 10000 W to the Idaho-Utah border, then east along the Idaho-Utah border to the beginning point.

Montana (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Zone 1: Those portions of Deer Lodge County lying within the following described boundary: beginning at the intersection of I–90 and Highway 273, then westerly along Highway 273 to the junction of Highway 1, then southeast along said highway to Highway 275 at Opportunity, then east along said highway to East Side County road, then north along said road to Perkins Lane, then west on said lane to I–90, then north on said interstate to the junction of Highway 273, the point of beginning. Except for sections 13 and 24, T5N, R10W; and Warm Springs Pond number 3.

Zone 2: That portion of the Pacific Flyway, located in Powell County lying within the following described boundary: beginning at the junction of State Routes 141 and 200, then west along Route 200 to its intersection with the Blackfoot River at Russell Gates Fishing Access Site (Powell-Missoula County line), then southeast along said river to its intersection with the Ovando-Helmville Road (County Road 104) at Cedar Meadows Fishing Access Site, then south and east along said road to its junction with State Route 141, then north along said route to its junction with State Route 200, the point of beginning.

Zone 3: Beaverhead, Gallatin, Jefferson, and Madison Counties.

Zone 4: Broadwater County.

Zone 5: Cascade and Teton Counties.

Zone 6: Meagher County.

Utah

Cache County: Cache County.

East Box Elder County: That portion of Box Elder County beginning on the Utah-Idaho State line at the Box Elder-Cache County line; west on the State line to the Pocatello Valley County Road; south on the Pocatello Valley County Road to I–15; southeast on I–15 to SR–83; south on SR–83 to Lamp Junction; west and south on the Promontory Point County Road to the tip of Promontory Point; south from Promontory Point to the Box Elder-Weber Counties line; east on the Box Elder-Weber Counties line to the Box Elder-Cache Counties line; north on the Box Elder-Cache Counties line to the Utah-Idaho State line.

Rich County: Rich County.

Uintah County: Uintah and Duchesne Counties.

Wyoming (Pacific Flyway Portion)

Area 1: All of the Bear River and Ham's Fork River drainages in Lincoln County.

Area 2: All of the Salt River drainage in Lincoln County south of the McCoy Creek Road.

Area 3: All lands within the Bureau of Reclamation's Eden Project in Sweetwater County.

Area 5: Uinta County.

All Migratory Game Birds in Alaska

North Zone: State Game Management Units 11–13 and 17–26.

Gulf Coast Zone: State Game Management Units 5–7, 9, 14–16, and 10 (Unimak Island only).

Southeast Zone: State Game Management Units 1–4.

Pribilof and Aleutian Islands Zone: State Game Management Unit 10 (except Unimak Island).

Kodiak Zone: State Game Management Unit 8.

All Migratory Game Birds in the Virgin Islands

Ruth Cay Closure Area: The island of Ruth Cay, just south of St. Croix.

All Migratory Game Birds in Puerto Rico

Municipality of Culebra Closure Area: All of the municipality of Culebra.

Desecheo Island Closure Area: All of Desecheo Island.

Mona Island Closure Area: All of Mona Island.

El Verde Closure Area: Those areas of the municipalities of Rio Grande and Loiza delineated as follows: (1) All lands between Routes 956 on the west and 186 on the east, from Route 3 on the north to the juncture of Routes 956 and 186 (Km 13.2) in the south; (2) all lands between Routes 186 and 966 from the juncture of 186 and 966 on the north, to the Caribbean National Forest Boundary on the south; (3) all lands lying west of Route 186 for 1 kilometer from the juncture of Routes 186 and 956 south to Km 6 on Route 186; (4) all lands within Km 14 and Km 6 on the west and the Caribbean National Forest Boundary on the east; and (5) all lands within the Caribbean National Forest Boundary whether private or public.

Cidra Municipality and adjacent areas: All of Cidra Municipality and portions of Aguas Buenas, Caguas, Cayey, and Comerio Municipalities as encompassed within the following boundary: beginning on Highway 172 as it leaves the municipality of Cidra on the west edge, north to Highway 156, east on Highway 156 to Highway 1, south on Highway 1 to Highway 765, south on Highway 765 to Highway 763, south on Highway 763 to the Rio Guavate, west along Rio Guavate to Highway 1, southwest on Highway 1 to Highway 14, west on Highway 14 to Highway 729, north on Highway 729 to Cidra Municipality boundary to the point of the beginning.

Kevin Lilly,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 2025–15703 Filed 8–15–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333–15–P

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 90, No. 157

Monday, August 18, 2025

CUSTOMER SERVICE AND INFORMATION

Federal Register/Code of Federal Regulations

General Information, indexes and other finding aids **202–741–6000**

Laws **741–6000**

Presidential Documents

Executive orders and proclamations **741–6000**

The United States Government Manual **741–6000**

Other Services

Electronic and on-line services (voice) **741–6020**

Privacy Act Compilation **741–6050**

ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

World Wide Web

Full text of the daily Federal Register, CFR and other publications is located at: **www.govinfo.gov.**

Federal Register information and research tools, including Public Inspection List and electronic text are located at: **www.federalregister.gov.**

E-mail

FEDREGTOC (Daily Federal Register Table of Contents Electronic Mailing List) is an open e-mail service that provides subscribers with a digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents. The digital form of the Federal Register Table of Contents includes HTML and PDF links to the full text of each document.

To join or leave, go to **https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USGPOOFR/subscriber/new**, enter your email address, then follow the instructions to join, leave, or manage your subscription.

PENS (Public Law Electronic Notification Service) is an e-mail service that notifies subscribers of recently enacted laws.

To subscribe, go to **http://listserv.gsa.gov/archives/publaws-l.html and select** *Join or leave the list (or change settings);* then follow the instructions.

FEDREGTOC and **PENS** are mailing lists only. We cannot respond to specific inquiries.

Reference questions. Send questions and comments about the Federal Register system to: **fedreg.info@nara.gov**

The Federal Register staff cannot interpret specific documents or regulations.

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATE, AUGUST

36101–36372 1
36373–37372 4
37373–37780 5
37781–38000 6
38001–38392 7
38393–38602 8
38603–38704 11
38705–38934 12
38935–39088 13
39089–39306 14
39307–40024 15
40025–40218 18

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING AUGUST

At the end of each month the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

3 CFR

Proclamations:
10960 36369
10961 36371
10962 37727
10963 38919

Executive Orders:
14256 (superseded in part by EO 14324) 37775
14323 37739
14324 37775
14325 37957
14326 37963
14327 37993
14328 38597
14329 38701
14330 38921
14331 38925
14332 38929
14333 39301
14334 39305

Administrative Orders:
Memorandums:
Memorandum of June 30, 2025 38913
Memorandum of August 4, 2025 40013
Presidential Determinations:
No. 2025–07 of August 4, 2025 40017
No. 2025–10 of August 4, 2025 40019
No. 2025–08 of August 8, 2025 40021
No. 2025–09 of August 8, 2025 40023
Notices:
Notice of July 15, 2025 37371
Notice of August 4, 2025 37999
Notice of August 6, 2025 38601

5 CFR

213 38604
315 38604
362 38603
537 38604

7 CFR

245 38393
354 39307
400 39089
460 ..... 38607, 39089
1930 40025

10 CFR

72 39308

12 CFR

Proposed Rules:
1090 ..... 38409, 38412, 38415, 38418

13 CFR

Proposed Rules:
124 40047
125 40047

14 CFR

25 39313
29 37373
33 ..... 36373, 36375
39 ..... 37376, 37781, 37786, 37787, 39090, 39093, 39102, 39106, 39109, 40025, 40028, 40030, 40032, 40035, 40038
43 40041
45 40041
61 40041
71 ..... 36101, 36102, 36104, 38393
97 38394

Proposed Rules:
33 38076
36 38212
39 ..... 37432, 37434, 37808, 37810, 38078, 38081, 38713
43 38212
45 38212
48 38212
71 ..... 36400, 38421, 38614, 38615, 38618, 38716, 40048
89 38212
91 38212
107 38212
108 38212
119 38212
133 38212
135 38212
137 38212
141 ..... 37815, 37816
146 38212

15 CFR

30 39112
921 38001
922 38001
923 38001

19 CFR

24 40042
128 40042

21 CFR

73 37793
1308 ..... 38396, 39314

Proposed Rules:
1 38084
146 ..... 37817, 39139

22 CFR

41.....37378, 38610

Proposed Rules:

42.....37437

26 CFR

Proposed Rules:

1.....37824

29 CFR

95.....40044
96.....40044
97.....40044
99.....40044
2550.....38909
4000.....39320
4006.....39320
4007.....39320
4010.....39320
4041.....39320
4041A.....39320
4043.....39320
4044.....39320
4065.....39320
4203.....39320
4204.....39320
4207.....39320
4211.....39320
4219.....39320
4220.....39320
4233.....39320
4245.....39320
4262.....39320
4281.....39320
4909.....39320

30 CFR

250.....36106, 38935
551.....38705
585.....37386
1219.....38938

Proposed Rules:

926.....36402, 36404, 36406, 36407

31 CFR

528.....38940
542.....38941
544.....38941
561.....38941
594.....38941
597.....38941

32 CFR

516.....38398

33 CFR

100.....36378, 37793, 38942, 39330
117.....36109
165.....36111, 36378, 36379, 36381, 37793, 38399, 38401, 38942
207.....38403
326.....38403

Proposed Rules:

100.....38423
110.....36409
165.....36412, 37829

34 CFR

Proposed Rules:

685.....40154

37 CFR

1.....39124

38 CFR

Proposed Rules:

17.....36415

39 CFR

Proposed Rules:

111.....38716

40 CFR

52.....37386, 37389, 38005, 38009, 38406, 39126, 39128, 39130, 39132, 39135
60.....39333
63.....39333
81.....38406
174.....37797
180.....37800, 39335

Proposed Rules:

52.....38088, 38093, 38095, 39139, 39142, 39144, 39148, 39340
81.....38095, 39148
85.....36125, 36288, 39345
86.....36125, 36288, 39345
180.....38426
257.....38619
600.....36125, 36288, 39345
1036.....36125, 36288, 39345
1037.....36125, 36288, 39345
1039.....36125, 36288, 39345

42 CFR

412.....36536, 37628, 37678
413.....37310
418.....37404
495.....36536
512.....36536

Proposed Rules:

405.....39155
410.....39155
414.....39155
424.....39155
425.....39155
427.....39155
428.....39155
495.....39155
512.....39155

43 CFR

2800.....36111
3100.....36114, 36117, 36118
3120.....36118
3170.....36120
3470.....36122

45 CFR

170.....36536

47 CFR

0.....36383
1.....36385, 36396
2.....38045
8.....38406
15.....38045
20.....38406
24.....36396
27.....36385
51.....38406
63.....36396
73.....38942, 39137
79.....36396

48 CFR

Ch. 1.....38206, 38209
32.....38208
43.....38208
52.....38206, 38208

49 CFR

227.....38071

Proposed Rules:

192.....38429
1540.....38212
1544.....38212

50 CFR

11.....40045
20.....40178
217.....38001
218.....38001
222.....38001
223.....38001, 39339
224.....38001
226.....38001
229.....38001
300.....38001, 38610
600.....38001
622.....37804, 38001
635.....38001, 38708, 38709
648.....38612
679.....38711
697.....38001

Proposed Rules:

17.....37445, 39161
217.....39346
679.....37831

LIST OF PUBLIC LAWS

This is a continuing list of public bills from the current session of Congress which have become Federal laws. This list is also available online at *https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/laws/current.html*.

The text of laws is not published in the **Federal Register** but may be ordered in ''slip law'' (individual pamphlet) form from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (phone, 202–512–1808). The text is available at *https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/plaw*. Some laws may not yet be available.

S. 201/P.L. 119–32
ACES Act of 2025 (Aug. 14, 2025; 139 Stat. 480)

S. 423/P.L. 119–33
Protecting Regular Order for Veterans Act of 2025 (Aug. 14, 2025; 139 Stat. 483)

Last List August 5, 2025

Public Laws Electronic Notification Service (PENS)

PENS is a free email notification service of newly enacted public laws. To subscribe, go to *https://portalguard.gsa.gov/__layouts/pg/register.aspx*.

Note: This service is strictly for email notification of new laws. The text of laws is not available through this service. **PENS** cannot respond to specific inquiries sent to this address.