remains that the regulations at issue in this final rule have been inoperable since 1992, when OSM published notice that it was suspending the regulation. Any opposition to that suspension was required to be filed at that time—*i.e.,* 34 years ago. While OSM agreed at that time that it would follow the notice and comment requirements for the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) for any future rulemakings to revise the time and distance requirements for backfilling and grading, OSM has not proposed any new regulations to replace the suspended provisions and is not doing so at this time. OSM is merely removing language that has no application, cannot be enforced, and could be confusing to someone without deep familiarity with the history of the SMCRA implementing regulations and esoteric procedures related to the Code of Federal Regulations.

Further, OSM rejects the commenters' assertions that the language of 30 CFR 816.101 is necessary and lawful. As noted above, this provision has no applicability, making it unnecessary, and any attempt to enforce this provision would be rejected because the provision was suspended over 30 years ago, making any attempt to enforce the provision unlawful.

Finally, commenters contend that the topic of time and distance requirements for backfilling and grading is simply too controversial to be addressed by a direct final rule and that classifying the rule as ''technical'' does not insulate it from controversy that would require notice and comment rulemaking. In support of this position, one commenter attached documents alleging environmental harms related to surface coal mining operations for which reclamation was delayed for years after active coal extraction ended. OSM rejects the characterization of a direct final rule removing inoperative language as controversial merely because the inoperative language, if operative, would pertain to an issue of importance to the commenter. By that logic, no technical or housekeeping rule could ever be promulgated without notice and comment if even one individual alleges that the large, more general topic itself is controversial. Further, the commenters' own inaction on this issue for the last thirty years undercut their arguments. In the three decades since this rule was suspended, commenters have not requested a rulemaking on this topic and, as recently as last year, when the Department sought comments on regulations that should be modified or repealed. Neither commenter suggested any revisions to this provision. 90 FR 21504 (May 20, 2025) (Docket DOI–2025–0005); *see also* 30 CFR 700.12.

As OSM made clear in the preamble to the rule, OSM had good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) to forgo notice-and-comment rulemaking because the rule is noncontroversial, only makes a technical update to remove a long suspended an inoperative rule, involves little agency discretion, and is unlikely to generate significant adverse comments. *See* 90 FR 54573. Moreover, even if OSM had no good cause to forgo notice-and-comment rulemaking, the direct final rule itself provided notice and an opportunity for comment and the commenters availed themselves of that opportunity. On that basis, the direct final rule complies with the APA.

For the reasons stated above, OSM determined that the two timely comments received on this rule were not significant adverse comments and there is no need to withdraw the direct final rule or provide any further notice and comment. As such, this notice confirms that this final rule will be effective on March 30, 2026.

Lanny E. Erdos,

Director, Office of Surface Mining Exercising the Authority of the Assistant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management.

[FR Doc. 2026–06197 Filed 3–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 874

[Docket No. OSM–2025–0015; S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000 256S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 25XS501520]

RIN 1029–AC99

General Reclamation Requirements

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Interior

ACTION: Direct final rule; confirmation of effective date.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is confirming the effective date of March 30, 2026, for the direct final rule entitled, ''General Reclamation Requirements,'' which was published in the **Federal Register** on November 28, 2025. The direct final rule revised the Federal regulations to rescind obsolete language requiring compliance with the regulations when funding reclamation projects with prior balance replacement funds, which are moneys from the United States Treasury's General Fund that replaced State or Tribal share funds that were allocated before October 1, 2007, but were never appropriated by Congress. During the comment period, OSM received comments that required further review and consideration to determine whether the comments warranted a response, or the withdrawal or modification of the final rule. After further review and consideration, OSM determined that these comments were not significant adverse comments and is confirming the effective date.

DATES: The effective date of March 30, 2026, for the direct final rule published at 90 FR 54582 (Nov. 28, 2025), delayed at 91 FR 3374 (Jan. 27, 2026), is confirmed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Tyree, Chief, Division of Regulatory Support, (202) 208–4479, *jtyree@osmre.gov.* 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: The direct final rule, which was published at 90 FR 54582 (Nov. 28, 2025), included a 30-day public comment period that ended on December 29, 2025. The original effective date of the direct final rule was January 27, 2026; however, OSM received four timely comments on the rule, and OSM extended the original effective date to allow for sufficient time to review and consider those comments to determine whether they were significant adverse comments that might warrant a response or withdrawal or modification of the final rule. Consequently, on January 27, 2026, OSM published a document in the **Federal Register** (91 FR 3374) delaying the effective date of the rule for 60 days, until March 30, 2026.

The four timely comments were generally generic and discussed broad, mostly non-germane themes related to reclamation, coal mining, and funding to Indian tribes. One comment, submitted anonymously, did raise some questions related to prior balance replacement funds in an effort to seek administrative clarity. No commenter expressly disagreed with the rule. In addition to receiving the four timely comments, in March 2026, long after the close of the comment period, OSM received one additional comment that purported to make comments on this

rule; due to the untimely nature of this comment, it was not considered.

After careful review of the timely comments, and discussed in greater detail below, OSM has determined that the comments were not significant adverse comments that warrant withdrawal or modification of the final rule because the commenters did not effectively challenge the rule's underlying premise or approach or explain why the rule would be ineffective or inappropriate without a revision.

One commenter asked a series of questions related to prior balance replacement funds, such as the amount unspent by grantees and requesting a crosswalk that identifies the applicable Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) edition and key conditions for any remaining awards and a simple table showing remaining balances and project status by State and Tribe. While OSM appreciates the commenter's interest in clarity, neither a crosswalk nor a table of funding is necessary. Wyoming is the only State or Tribe that received prior balance replacement funds and that still has an unspent balance (less than $1 million). While we agree that this State should have clarity about how its prior balance replacement funds can be spent, the statutory framework has not changed, and Wyoming has operated under these requirements for many years and will continue to do so because Wyoming must continue to comply with the terms and conditions of its existing grant agreement, including the regulations in place at the time of the grant award. Because those requirements remain in effect, the direct final rule does not alter how the State obligates or expends its remaining funds, including for SMCRA's contractor responsibility, eligibility, and priority requirements. Likewise, Tribes with approved SMCRA reclamation programs are unaffected because they have already expended their prior balance replacement funds. Thus, the suggestions for additional information, to the extent they are even appropriate in a regulation, do not render the direct final rule, without such addition, ineffective.

Moreover, as OSM made clear in the preamble to the rule, iOSM had good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) to forgo notice-and-comment rulemaking because the rule is noncontroversial, makes only minor and technical updates, involves little agency discretion, and is unlikely to generate significant adverse comments. *See* 90 FR 54582. OSM also committed to withdrawing the rule or issuing a new rule if significant adverse comments were received. For the reasons stated above, OSM determined that the comments received on this rule are not significant adverse comments and that they do not justify making any modifications to the rule or withdrawing the final rule. Moreover, even if OSM had no good cause to forgo notice-and-comment rulemaking, the direct final rule itself provided notice and an opportunity for comment and the commenters availed themselves of that opportunity. On that basis, the direct final rule complies with the APA.

As such, this notice confirms that this final rule will be effective on March 30, 2026.

Lanny E. Erdos,

Director, Office of Surface Mining Exercising the Authority of the Assistant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management.

[FR Doc. 2026–06196 Filed 3–30–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

POSTAL SERVICE

39 CFR Part 111

Parcel Dimension Compliance

AGENCY: Postal Service.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Postal Service is amending *Mailing Standards of the United States Postal Service,* Domestic Mail Manual (DMM®) in various sections to expand the current requirement to include accurate parcel dimensions in a manifest.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 12, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine Knox at (202) 268–5636 or Garry Rodriguez at (202) 268–7281.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 8, 2026, the Postal Service published a notice of proposed rulemaking (91 FR 651–652) to expand the current dimensional reporting requirement to include accurate parcel dimensions in a Shipping Services file manifest or other approved electronic documentation (herein referred to as manifest). In response to the proposed rule the Postal Service received seven responses, some which included comments on multiple topics. A majority of the responses agreed with the requirement to include all parcel dimensions in the manifest with reservations. A majority of the responses also questioned the Postal Service approach to ensure accuracy. A few responses had other questions.

After reviewing the comments submitted and consulting with various stakeholders the Postal Service has decided to move forward with the proposed rulemaking in a two-phase approach.

Phase One

In phase one, effective July 12. 2026, the Postal Service will move forward with the implementation of requiring accurate dimensions be reported in the manifest for all parcels. During phase one, the Postal Service will evaluate data, review customer activity, identify thresholds, and implement and test trusted systems accuracy. Assessing the Dimension Noncompliance fee for omitting the dimensions or for inaccurately reported dimensions in the manifest will be deferred until the implementation of phase two. However, in the interim, the Postal Service will continue to charge the Dimension Noncompliance fee for parcels that exceed 1 cubic foot or 22 inches in length if the parcel's dimensions are omitted or inaccurate in the manifest until implementation of the ''Parcel Dimension Compliance'' initiative phase two.

Phase Two

In phase two, tentatively scheduled for early 2027, the Postal Service will implement an automated approach to detect dimensions are included and that they are accurate in the manifest. This schedule is tentative and subject to change. At this time, the Postal Service will begin to assess the Dimension Noncompliance fee for omitting the dimensions or for inaccurately reported dimensions in the manifest.

As the Postal Service moves forward in the development of this phase, we will establish the protocols that will be communicated to our business partners in response to the following:

- Dispute standards and recourse.
- Published specifications including tolerances and rounding rules.
- Will the equipment used to measure shipments be certified as legal for trade and conform to current county/state/municipality-level weights and measures rules.
- Will there be an exception process, and if so, how will the Postal Service communicate information regarding exceptions?
- How will the Postal Service resolve instances in which there are different dimensions of the same package from different pieces of equipment?
- Will soft packaging and ''Cubic Soft Packs'' be exempt from sampling and the assessment of a fee.

The establishment of phase two will require the Postal Service to work closely with our business partners to implement standards that are mutually