

• **Annual Reporting Tool (ART)**—The ART is a survey instrument collected yearly to monitor state, territory, tribal entity, and community-level performance, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the SPF Rx program. This tool is completed by grantees and subrecipient community project directors and provides process data related to funding use and effectiveness, organizational capacity, collaboration

with community partners, data infrastructure, planned intervention targets, evaluation, contextual factors, and sustainability.

• **Grantee-and Community-Level Outcomes Modules**—These modules collect data on key SPF Rx program outcomes, including opioid prescribing patterns and provider use of PDMP. Grantees will provide outcomes data at the grantee level for their state, tribal

area, or jurisdiction, as well as at the community level for each of their subrecipient communities.

• **Grantee-Level Interview**—This qualitative interview will be administered annually to obtain information from the grantee project directors on their programs, staffing, populations of focus, infrastructure, capacity, lessons learned, and collaboration.

#### AVERAGE ANNUALIZED DATA COLLECTION BURDEN FOR THE PEPC DATA COLLECTION <sup>a</sup>

Instrument	Average number of respondents	Average number of responses per respondent	Average number of responses	Hours per response	Average burden hours	Hourly wage <sup>c,d</sup>	Annualized data collection burden
ART .....	<sup>b</sup> 107 <sup>c</sup> 21	1 1	107 21	1.5 1.5	161 31	\$30.56 50.85	\$4,920.16 1,576.35
Total Burden for ART .....	128	.....	128	.....	192	.....	6,496.51
Grantee-Level PDMP Outcomes Module .....	<sup>c</sup> 21	1	21	2.5	52	50.85	2,627.25
Community-Level PDMP Outcomes Module ...	<sup>c</sup> 21	5.2	107	1.25	134.17	50.85	6,822.38
Grantee-Level Interview .....	<sup>c</sup> 21	1	21	1.5	31	50.85	1,576.35
Total Annualized Burden .....	191	.....	277	.....	409.17	.....	17,522.49

<sup>a</sup> *Annualized Data Collection Burden* captures the average number of respondents and responses, burden hours, and respondent cost over the 3 years (FY 2026–FY 2028).

<sup>b</sup> Community subrecipient respondent.

<sup>c</sup> Grantee respondent.

<sup>d</sup> *Grantee Project Director or Evaluator hourly wage* is based on the mean hourly wage for state government managers, as reported in the 2023 Occupational Employment (OES) by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) found at [https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4\\_999200.htm#11-0000](https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4_999200.htm#11-0000).

<sup>e</sup> *Subrecipient Staff hourly wage* is based on the mean hourly wage for local government counselors, social workers, and other community and social service specialists, as reported in the 2023 OES by the BLS found at [https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4\\_999300.htm](https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4_999300.htm).

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](http://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.

**Carlos Graham,**  
Social Science Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2026-02494 Filed 2-6-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4162-20-P

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-458 and 731-TA-1154 (Third Review)]**

#### Kitchen Appliance Shelving and Racks From China; Scheduling of Expedited Five-Year Reviews

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of expedited reviews pursuant to the Tariff Act of

1930 (“the Act”) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on kitchen appliance shelving and racks from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

**DATES:** January 26, 2026.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Juan-Carlos Pena-Flores (202–205–3169), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436.

Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this proceeding may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Background.**—On January 26, 2026, the Commission determined that the

domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (90 FR 42443, September 2, 2025) of the subject five-year reviews was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting full reviews.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct expedited reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)).<sup>2</sup>

For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

**Staff report.**—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the reviews has been placed in the nonpublic record, and will be made available to persons on the

<sup>1</sup> A record of the Commissioners’ votes, the Commission’s statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner’s statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission’s website.

<sup>2</sup> Commissioner David S. Johanson voted to conduct full reviews.

Administrative Protective Order service list for these reviews on February 27, 2026. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to § 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

**Written submissions.**—As provided in § 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the reviews and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,<sup>3</sup> and any party other than an interested party to the reviews may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the reviews. Comments are due on or before 5:15 p.m. on March 5, 2026, and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year reviews nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the reviews by March 5, 2026. However, should the Department of Commerce ("Commerce") extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its reviews, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of §§ 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's *Handbook on Filing Procedures*, available on the Commission's website at [https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook\\_on\\_filing\\_procedures.pdf](https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf), elaborates upon the Commission's procedures with respect to filings.

In accordance with §§ 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the reviews must be served on all other parties to the reviews (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

**Determination.**—The Commission has determined these reviews are extraordinarily complicated and therefore has determined to exercise its authority to extend the review period by up to 90 days pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(5)(B).

**Authority:** These reviews are being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is

<sup>3</sup> The Commission has found the responses submitted on behalf of SSW Advanced Technologies ("SSW") and Nashville Wire Products Manufacturing Company ("Nashville Wire") to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (see 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

published pursuant to § 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 5, 2026.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2026-02538 Filed 2-6-26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violations alleged in the Complaint.

After this Response has been published in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(d), the United States will move the Court to enter the proposed Final Judgment. On December 30, 2025, the Court approved the United States' request to publish the public comments on the Antitrust Division's website due to the expense of publishing the comments in the **Federal Register** and the accessibility to the public of the Division's website.<sup>2</sup> These comments can be accessed at [www.justice.gov/atr](http://www.justice.gov/atr).

## I. Procedural History

On August 23, 2024, the United States, along with several states ("Plaintiffs"), filed a civil antitrust Complaint against RealPage, Inc. ("RealPage") (Doc. 1). On January 7, 2025, Plaintiffs amended their civil Complaint (the "Complaint") to add Greystar Management Services, LLC<sup>3</sup> ("Greystar") and five other landlords as Defendants (Doc. 47) alleging that Greystar's agreements with RealPage and other landlords to share information and align pricing violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The Complaint seeks to enjoin Defendants from sharing and exploiting competitively sensitive data.

On August 8, 2025, the United States filed a proposed Final Judgment (Doc. 152-1) as to Greystar, which is designed to remedy the loss of competition alleged in the Complaint due to Greystar's conduct, and a Stipulation and Proposed Order (Doc. 152), in which Greystar consented to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act.<sup>4</sup> On August 25, 2025, the United States filed a Competitive Impact Statement describing the proposed Final Judgment as to Greystar. (Doc. 155).

The United States arranged for the publication of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement in the **Federal Register** on September 9, 2025, see 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(c); 90 FR 43070 (Sept. 9, 2025), and caused notice regarding the same, together with directions for the

<sup>2</sup> Doc. 166.

<sup>3</sup> The Complaint initially named Greystar Real Estate Partners, LLC, as the defendant. By agreement, Greystar Management Services, LLC, was later substituted as the defendant (see Doc. 143).

<sup>4</sup> The Stipulation and Proposed Order, and the proposed Final Judgment, pertain only to Greystar's conduct. They do not propose to resolve the anticompetitive conduct alleged in the Complaint against any other Defendant. Nor do they resolve the claims of any other Plaintiff besides the United States.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States et al. v. RealPage, Inc. et al.; Response of the United States to Public Comments

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that the Response of the United States to Public Comment on the Proposed Final Judgment in *United States of America et al. v. RealPage et al.*, Civil Action No. 24-cv-00710-WLO-JLW, in regards to Defendant Greystar Management Services, LLC., has been filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, together with the response of the United States to the comments. Copies of the public comment and the United States' Response are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division's website at <http://www.justice.gov/atr>.

**Suzanne Morris,**

*Deputy Director Civil Enforcement Operations, Antitrust Division.*

#### In the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina

*United States of America, et al.*, Plaintiffs, vs. *RealPage, Inc., et al.*, Defendants.

No. 1:24-cv-00710-WLO-JLW

#### Response of Plaintiff United States to Public Comments on the Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (the "APPA" or "Tunney Act"), 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), the United States submits this response to the five public comments received regarding the proposed Final Judgment as to Defendant Greystar Management Services, LLC (Doc. 152-1).<sup>1</sup>

After careful consideration of the submitted comments, the United States continues to believe that the proposed Final Judgment will provide an effective

<sup>1</sup> The United States has redacted personally identifiable information from the comments. If the Court requests unredacted versions, the United States will provide unredacted comments under seal.