veterans and caregivers when they can be conducted safely and when the benefits outweigh any risks.

Lack of Timely Information From VA

One commenter indicated they became aware of the IFR on the last day to provide comments and expressed concern that many caregivers do not receive timely emails, phone calls, or information from VA. VA provided a 30-day public comment period in response to the IFR, which was available for public viewing at *www.regulations.gov.* While VA considers this comment outside the scope of this final rule, VA is confirming that CSP does communicate news and updates about PCAFC, including matters related to rulemakings, through a variety of platforms, including, but not limited to, press releases, website updates, and messages via listserv.

VA makes no changes to the final rule in response to the public comments received in response to the IFR. However, as noted earlier in this discussion, VA is removing 38 CFR 71.60 now because the COVID–19 National Emergency is over, and § 71.60 is no longer operable.

Administrative Procedure Act

VA has considered all relevant input and information contained in the comments submitted in response to the IFR. 85 FR 34522 (June 5, 2020). However, § 71.60, as added by the IFR, was only effective for the duration of the COVID–19 National Emergency, which has ended. VA has decided to remove § 71.60 from VA regulations because it no longer applies.

Although this final rule differs from the IFR, the change is a logical outgrowth of the IFR. Section 71.60 is inherently and explicitly limited to the duration of the COVID–19 National Emergency, such that the duration of its effect was clear. The public could have reasonably anticipated that the IFR would no longer be effective after the COVID–19 National Emergency, and that it would no longer be relevant or needed in part 71 after the COVID–19 National Emergency. Therefore, removing § 71.60 from part 71 is a logical outgrowth of the IFR and does not require further notice and public procedure under 5 U.S.C. 553(b).

Additionally, VA finds there is good cause to publish this final rule with an immediate effective date and forego the 30-day delayed effective date generally required by 5 U.S.C. 553(d). This is because a delayed effective date for this final rule is unnecessary, as it removes a regulatory provision already rendered inoperable due to the end of the COVID–19 National Emergency. As this rule results in no change to existing practice and would have no effect, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs finds that there is good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) to forego the 30-day delay requirement.

Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 14094

VA examined the impact of this rulemaking as required by Executive Orders 12866 (Sept. 30, 1993) and 13563 (Jan. 18, 2011), which direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has determined that this rulemaking is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563. This final rule is a deregulatory action under Executive Order 14192 because it removes a regulation that no longer has effect.

Economic Impact: There are no transfers, costs, or cost savings associated with this rulemaking.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Secretary hereby certifies that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as they are defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612). This certification is based on the fact that this final rule pertains only to how VA previously conducted PCAFC home visits during the COVID–19 National Emergency and has no current or future impact on small businesses. Therefore, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the initial and final regulatory flexibility analysis requirements of 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604 do not apply.

Unfunded Mandates

This final rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of $100 million or more (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This final rule contains no provisions constituting a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3521).

List of Subjects in 38 CFR Part 71

Administrative practice and procedure, Claims, Health care, Health facilities, Health professions, Mental health programs, Public assistance programs, Travel and transportation expenses, Veterans.

Signing Authority

Douglas A. Collins, Secretary of Veterans Affairs, approved this document on 2/10/2026 and authorized the undersigned to sign and submit the document to the Office of the Federal Register for publication electronically as an official document of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Nicole R. Cherry,

Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Department of Veterans Affairs amends 38 CFR part 71 as set forth below:

PART 71—CAREGIVERS BENEFITS AND CERTAIN MEDICAL BENEFITS OFFERED TO FAMILY MEMBERS OF VETERANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 38 U.S.C. 501, 1720G, unless otherwise noted.

§ 71.60 [Removed]

■ 2. Remove § 71.60.

[FR Doc. 2026–02978 Filed 2–12–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0485; FRL–13167–01–OCSPP]

Sulfonic Acids, C14-16-Alkane Hydroxy and C14-16-Alkene, Sodium Salts in Pesticide Formulations; Exemption From the Requirement for a Tolerance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts (CAS Reg. No. 68439–57–6) when used as an inert ingredient (surfactant) in antimicrobial formulations applied to food-contact surfaces in public eating places, dairy-processing equipment, and food-processing equipment and utensils under 40 CFR 180.940(a), at a maximum concentration of 1% in pesticide formulations. Ramboll US Consulting Inc., on behalf of Ecolab Inc., submitted a petition to EPA under the Federal

Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), requesting establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. This regulation eliminates the need to establish a maximum permissible level for residues of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts, when used in accordance with the terms of those exemptions.

DATES: This regulation is effective February 13, 2026. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before April 14, 2026 and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of this document).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0485, is available online at *https://www.regulations.gov.* Additional information about dockets generally, along with instructions for visiting the docket in-person, is available at *https://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Smith, Registration Division (7505T), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (202) 566–1030; email address: *RDFRNotices@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Executive Summary

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer, or pesticide manufacturer. The following list of North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide to help readers determine whether this document applies to them. Potentially affected entities may include:

- Crop production (NAICS code 111).
- Animal production (NAICS code 112).
- Food manufacturing (NAICS code 311).
- Pesticide manufacturing (NAICS code 32532).

If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. What is EPA's authority for taking this action?

EPA is issuing this rulemaking under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(A)(i) allows EPA to establish an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance (the legal limit for a pesticide chemical residue in or on a food) only if EPA determines that the exemption is ''safe.'' FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(A)(ii) defines ''safe'' to mean that ''there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue, including all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information.'' This includes exposure through drinking water and in residential settings but does not include occupational exposure. Pursuant to FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), in establishing or maintaining in effect an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance, EPA must take into account the factors set forth in FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(C), which require EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue. . . .'' Additionally, FFDCA section 408(b)(2)(D) requires that the Agency consider, among other things, ''available information concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues'' and ''other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.''

C. How can I file an objection or hearing request?

Under FFDCA section 408(g), 21 U.S.C. 346a(g), any person may file an objection to any aspect of this regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. If you fail to file an objection to the final rule within the time period specified in the final rule, you will have waived the right to raise any issues resolved in the final rule. You must file your objection or request a hearing on this regulation in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, you must identify the docket ID number EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0485 in the subject line on the first page of your submission. All objections and requests for a hearing must be in writing and must be received by the Hearing Clerk on or before April 14, 2026.

EPA's Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ), in which the Hearing Clerk is housed, urges parties to file and serve documents by electronic means only, notwithstanding any other particular requirements set forth in other procedural rules governing those proceedings. *See* ''Revised Order Urging Electronic Filing and Service,'' dated June 22, 2023, which can be found at *https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-06/2023-06-22%20-%20revised%20order%20urging%20electronic%20filing%20and%20service.pdf.* Although EPA's regulations require submission via U.S. Mail or hand delivery, EPA intends to treat submissions filed via electronic means as properly filed submissions; therefore, EPA believes the preference for submission via electronic means will not be prejudicial. When submitting documents to the OALJ electronically, a person should utilize the OALJ e-filing system at *https://yosemite.epa.gov/oa/eab/eab-alj_upload.nsf.*

In addition to filing an objection or hearing request with the Hearing Clerk as described in 40 CFR part 178, please submit a copy of the filing (excluding any Confidential Business Information (CBI)) for inclusion in the public docket at *https://www.regulations.gov.* Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. If you wish to include CBI in your request, please follow the applicable instructions at *https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets#rules* and clearly mark the information that you claim to be CBI. Information not marked confidential pursuant to 40 CFR part 2 may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice.

II. Petitioned for Exemption

In the **Federal Register** of October 26, 2023 (88 FR 73571, FRL–10579–09–OCSPP), EPA issued a document pursuant to FFDCA section 408, 21 U.S.C. 346a, announcing the filing of a pesticide petition (PP IN–11753) by Ramboll US Consulting Inc., on behalf of Ecolab Inc., 1 Ecolab Place, St. Paul, MN 55102. The petition requested that 40 CFR be amended by establishing an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts (also known as sodium C14-C16 alpha olefin or sodium C14-C16 AOS; CAS Reg. No. 68439–57–6) when used as an inert ingredient (surfactant) in antimicrobial formulations (food-contact surface sanitizing solutions) applied to food-contact surfaces in public eating places, dairy-processing equipment, and food-processing equipment and utensils under 40 CFR 180.940(a), at a maximum concentration of 1% in pesticide formulations. That document referenced a summary of the petition prepared by

Ramboll US Consulting Inc., on behalf of Ecolab Inc., the petitioner, which is available in the docket (EPA–HQ–OPP–2023–0485). There were no comments received in response to the notice of filing.

III. Inert Ingredient Definition

Inert ingredients are all ingredients that are not active ingredients as defined in 40 CFR 153.125 and include, but are not limited to, the following types of ingredients (except when they have a pesticidal efficacy of their own): solvents such as alcohols and hydrocarbons; surfactants such as polyoxyethylene polymers and fatty acids; carriers such as clay and diatomaceous earth; thickeners such as carrageenan and modified cellulose; wetting, spreading, and dispersing agents; propellants in aerosol dispensers; microencapsulating agents; and emulsifiers. The term ''inert'' is not intended to imply nontoxicity; the ingredient may or may not be chemically active. Generally, EPA has exempted inert ingredients from the requirement of a tolerance based on the low toxicity of the individual inert ingredients.

IV. Final Tolerance Actions

A. Aggregate Risk Assessment and Determination of Safety

EPA establishes exemptions from the requirement of a tolerance only in those cases where it can be clearly demonstrated that the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide chemical residues under reasonably foreseeable circumstances will pose no harm to human health. In order to determine the risks from aggregate exposure to pesticide inert ingredients, the Agency considers the toxicity of the inert in conjunction with possible exposure to residues of the inert ingredient through food, drinking water, and other exposures that occur as a result of pesticide use in residential settings. If EPA is able to determine that a finite tolerance is not necessary to ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure to the inert ingredient, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance may be established.

Consistent with FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(A), and the factors specified in FFDCA section 408(c)(2)(B), EPA has reviewed the available scientific data and other relevant information in support of this action. EPA has sufficient data to assess the hazards of and to make a determination on aggregate exposure for sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts, including exposure resulting from the exemption established by this action. EPA's assessment of exposures and risks associated with sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts follows.

B. Toxicological Profile

EPA has evaluated the available toxicity data and considered their validity, completeness, and reliability as well as the relationship of the results of the studies to human risk. EPA has also considered available information concerning the variability of the sensitivities of major identifiable subgroups of consumers, including infants and children. Specific information on the studies received and the nature of the adverse effects caused by sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts as well as the no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) and the lowest-observed-adverse-effect-level (LOAEL) from the toxicity studies are discussed in this unit.

Sodium C14-C16 AOS exhibits low levels of acute toxicity via the oral, dermal, and inhalation routes of exposure. It is moderately irritating to the eyes and skin at concentrations ≤40% but it is not a skin sensitizer.

The repeated-dose toxicity for sodium C14-C16 AOS is low. No adverse effects were reported in subchronic toxicity studies in rats up to the highest dose tested (1000 mg/kg/day) and concern for developmental or reproductive toxicity is low, based on the rapid metabolism and excretion, and lack of accumulation of the chemical. Furthermore, concern for carcinogenicity is low, based on negative results in mutagenicity studies, and the lack of treatment-related effects in an available chronic/carcinogenicity study.

C. Toxicological Points of Departure/ Levels of Concern

Once a pesticide's toxicological profile is determined, EPA identifies toxicological points of departure (POD) and levels of concern to use in evaluating the risk posed by human exposure to the pesticide. For hazards that have a threshold below which there is no appreciable risk, the toxicological POD is used as the basis for derivation of reference values for risk assessment. PODs are developed based on a careful analysis of the doses in each toxicological study to determine the dose at which no adverse effects are observed (NOAEL) and the lowest dose at which adverse effects of concern are identified (LOAEL). Uncertainty/safety factors are used in conjunction with the POD to calculate a safe exposure level, generally referred to as a population-adjusted dose (PAD) or a reference dose (RfD), and a safe margin of exposure (MOE). For non-threshold risks, the Agency assumes that any amount of exposure will lead to some degree of risk. Thus, the Agency estimates risk in terms of the probability of an occurrence of the adverse effect expected in a lifetime. For more information on the general principles EPA uses in risk characterization and a complete description of the risk assessment process, see EPA's website at *https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/overview-risk-assessment-pesticide-program.*

The hazard profile of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts is adequately defined. Overall, sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts are of low acute, subchronic, and developmental toxicity. No systemic toxicity is observed up to 1,000 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested. Therefore, the highest dose tested was identified as the NOAEL and a LOAEL was not established. Since signs of toxicity were not observed, no toxicological endpoints of concern or PODs were identified. Therefore, a qualitative risk assessment for sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts can be performed.

D. Exposure Assessment

1. *Dietary exposure from food and feed uses.* In evaluating dietary exposure to sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts, EPA considered exposure under the proposed exemption from the requirement of a tolerance. EPA assessed dietary exposures from sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts in food as follows.

Dietary exposure (food and drinking water) to sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts may occur following ingestion of foods with residues from their use in accordance with this exemption. However, a quantitative dietary exposure assessment was not conducted since a toxicological endpoint for risk assessment was not identified.

2. *From non-dietary exposure.* The term ''residential exposure'' is used in this document to refer to non-occupational, non-dietary exposure (*e.g.,* textiles (clothing and diapers), carpets, swimming pools, and hard surface disinfection on walls, floors, tables).

Sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts may result in residential exposures as they can be present in pesticide and non-pesticide products that may be used in and around the home. However, a quantitative residential exposure assessment was not conducted since a toxicological endpoint for risk assessment was not identified.

3. *Cumulative effects from substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) of FFDCA requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider ''available information'' concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and ''other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity.''

Based on the lack of toxicity in the available database, EPA has not found sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts to share a common mechanism of toxicity with any other substances, and sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts do not appear to produce a toxic metabolite produced by other substances. For the purposes of this tolerance exemption, therefore, EPA has assumed that sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts do not have a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances. For information regarding EPA's efforts to determine which chemicals have a common mechanism of toxicity and to evaluate the cumulative effects of such chemicals, see EPA's website at *https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/cumulative-assessment-risk-pesticides.*

E. Additional Safety Factor for the Protection of Infants and Children

Section 408(b)(2)(C) of FFDCA provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold (10X) margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the database on toxicity and exposure unless EPA determines, based on reliable data, that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. This additional margin of safety is commonly referred to as the Food Quality Protection Act Safety Factor. In applying this provision, EPA either retains the default value of 10X, or uses a different additional safety factor when reliable data available to EPA support the choice of a different factor.

Based on an assessment of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts, EPA has concluded that there are no toxicological endpoints of concern for the U.S. population, including infants and children, due to the low toxicity in the available studies. Because there are no threshold effects associated with sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts, EPA conducted a qualitative assessment. As part of that qualitative assessment, the Agency did not use safety factors for assessing risk, and no additional safety factor is needed for assessing risk to infants and children.

F. Aggregate Risks and Determination of Safety

Because no toxicological endpoints of concern were identified, EPA concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to the general population, or to infants and children, from aggregate exposure to sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts residues.

G. Analytical Enforcement Methodology

An analytical method is not required for enforcement purposes since the Agency is not establishing a numerical tolerance for residues of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts in or on any food commodities. EPA is establishing a limitation on the amount of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts that may be used in pesticide formulations applied. This limitation will be enforced through the pesticide registration process under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), 7 U.S.C. 136 *et seq.* EPA will not register any pesticide formulation for food use that exceeds 1% sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts in the final pesticide formulation.

H. Conclusions

Therefore, an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance is established for residues of sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts (CAS Reg. No. 68439–57–6) when used as an inert ingredient (surfactant) in antimicrobial formulations applied to food-contact surfaces in public eating places, dairy-processing equipment, and food-processing equipment and utensils under 40 CFR 180.940(a) at a maximum concentration of 1% of the pesticide formulation.

V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at *https://www.epa.gov/regulations/and-executive-orders.*

A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

This action is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993), because it establishes or modifies a pesticide tolerance or a tolerance exemption under FFDCA section 408.

B. Executive Order 14192: Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation

Executive Order 14192 (90 FR 9065, February 6, 2025) does not apply because actions that establish a tolerance under FFDCA section 408 are exempted from review under Executive Order 12866.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* because it does not contain any information collection activities.

D. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

This action is not subject to the RFA, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* The RFA applies only to rules subject to notice and comment rulemaking requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. 553, or any other statute. This rule is not subject to the APA but is subject to FFDCA section 408(d), which does not require notice and comment rulemaking to take this action in response to a petition.

E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

This action does not contain an unfunded mandate of $100 million or more (in 1995 dollars and adjusted annually for inflation) as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531–1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. The action imposes no enforceable duty on any State, local, or Tribal governments or the private sector.

F. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This action does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), because it will 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.

G. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

This action does not have tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000), because it will not have substantial direct effects on Tribal governments, on the relationship between the Federal government and the Indian Tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian Tribes.

H. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f)(1) of Executive Order 12866 (See Unit V.A.), and because EPA does not believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this action present a disproportionate risk to children.

However, EPA's 2021 *Policy on Children's Health* applies to this action. This rule finalizes tolerance actions under the FFDCA, which requires EPA to give special consideration to exposure of infants and children to the pesticide chemical residue in establishing a tolerance and to ''ensure that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to the pesticide chemical residue . . .'' (FFDCA 408(b)(2)(C)). The Agency's consideration is documented in the pesticide-specific registration review documents, located in the applicable docket at *https://www.regulations.gov.*

I. Executive Order 13211: Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution or Use

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355) (May 22, 2001) because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

J. National Technology Transfer Advancement Act (NTTAA)

This action does not involve technical standards that would require Agency consideration under NTTAA section 12(d), 15 U.S.C. 272.

K. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

This action is subject to the CRA, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.,* and EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action does not meet the criteria set forth in 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 9, 2026.

Charles Smith,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the EPA amends 40 CFR chapter I as follows:

PART 180—TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES IN FOOD

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.940, amend table 1 to paragraph (a) by adding, in alphabetical order, an entry for ''Sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts'' to read as follows:

§ 180.940 Tolerance exemptions for active and inert ingredients for use in antimicrobial formulations (Food-contact surface sanitizing solutions).

* * * * *

(a) * * *

TABLE 1 TO PARAGRAPH (a)

Pesticide chemical	CAS Reg. No.	Limits
* * * * * * *		
Sulfonic acids, C14-16-alkane hydroxy and C14-16-alkene, sodium salts.	68439–57–6	When ready for use, the end-use concentration is not to exceed 1%.
* * * * * * *		

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2026–02922 Filed 2–12–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 180

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2024–0322; FRL–13116–01–OCSPP]

Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This regulation establishes a tolerance for residues of the insecticide hexythiazox and its metabolites in or on lemon/lime, subgroup 10–10B at 0.6 parts per million (ppm). This regulation also establishes separate regional tolerances for grapefruit, subgroup 10–10C (CA, AZ, TX only) at 0.5 ppm and orange, subgroup 10–10A (CA, AZ, TX only) at 0.5 ppm. Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), Gowan Company submitted a petition to EPA requesting that EPA establish a maximum permissible level for residues of this pesticide.

DATES: This rule is effective on February 13, 2026. Objections and requests for hearings must be received on or before April 14, 2026 and must be filed in accordance with the instructions provided in 40 CFR part 178 (see also Unit I.C. of this document).

ADDRESSES: The docket for this action, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2024–0322, is available online at *https://www.regulations.gov.* Additional information about dockets generally, along with instructions for visiting the docket in person, is available at *https://www.epa.gov/dockets.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Smith, Director, Registration Division (7505T), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460–0001; main telephone number: (202) 566–1030; email address: *RDFRNotices@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Executive Summary

A. Does this action apply to me?

You may be potentially affected by this action if you are an agricultural