

click “Search.” Next, look for this document in the Search Results column, and click on it. Then click on the Comment option. If you cannot submit your material by using <https://www.regulations.gov>, call or email the person in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this proposed rule for alternate instructions.

Viewing material in the docket. To view available documents, find the docket as described in the previous paragraph, and then select “Supporting & Related Material” in the Document Type column. We will post public comments in our online docket.

Additional information is on the <https://www.regulations.gov> Frequently Asked Questions web page.

Personal information. We accept anonymous comments. Comments we post to <https://www.regulations.gov> will include any personal information you have provided. For more about privacy and submissions to the docket in response to this document, see DHS’s eRulemaking System of Records notice (85 FR 14226, March 11, 2020).

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Harbors, Marine safety, Navigation (water), Reporting and recordkeeping

requirements, Security measures, Waterways.

For the reasons discussed in the preamble, the Coast Guard is proposing to amend 33 CFR part 100 as follows:

PART 100—SAFETY OF LIFE ON NAVIGABLE WATERS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 46 U.S.C. 70041; 33 CFR 1.05–1.

■ 2. Amend Table 1 to § 100.901 by adding an entry for item (5) as follows:

TABLE 1 TO § 100.901		
Event	Location ¹	Date ²
Sector Eastern Great Lakes, NY		
(5) Cleveland Dragon Boat Festival	The special local regulation would cover all navigable waters of the Cuyahoga River from the Cleveland Rowing Foundation dock at 41°29'27.2" N, 081°42'13.1" W to the Columbus Rd. Bridge.	On or around the 4th weekend of August.

¹All coordinates listed in this table 1 reference North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 1983).

²As noted in the introductory text of this section, the enforcement dates and times for each of the listed events in this table are subject to change. In the event of a change, or for enforcement periods listed that do not allow a specific date or dates to be determined, the Captain of the Port will provide notice to the public by publishing a Notice of Enforcement in the **Federal Register**, as well as issuing a Broadcast Notice to Mariners.

Matthew J Walter,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port Sector Eastern Great Lakes.
[FR Doc. 2026–12819 Filed 6–24–26; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 9110–04–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

34 CFR Part 270

[Docket ID ED–2026–OESE–0958]

RIN 1810–AB72

Rescinding the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Education proposes to rescind the Equity Assistance Center Program regulations. The Department proposes to rescind these regulations to provide the Department greater flexibility in carrying out the statutory authority for this program and to enable the Department to align technical assistance activities with current and evolving priorities and needs to best achieve the statutory intent of the program. The Department seeks comments on any

reason to rescind or not rescind these regulations.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before July 27, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Comments must be submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for more details.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Michelle Daley. Telephone: (202) 987–1057. Email: OESE.EAC@ed.gov.

If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability and wish to access telecommunications relay services, please dial 7–1–1.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Invitation to Comment: We invite you to submit comments regarding these proposed regulations. Comments must be submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). However, if you require an accommodation or cannot otherwise submit your comments via [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), please contact the program contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The Department will not accept comments 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 comments only

once. Additionally, please include the Docket ID at the top of your comments.

Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to www.Regulations.gov to submit your comments electronically. Information on using [Regulations.gov](https://www.Regulations.gov), including instructions for accessing agency documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket, is available on the site under “FAQ.” Also included on [Regulations.gov](https://www.Regulations.gov) is a commenter checklist that addresses how to submit effective comments.

Comments containing personal threats will not be posted to [Regulations.gov](https://www.Regulations.gov) and may be referred to the appropriate authorities.

During and after the comment period, you may inspect public comments about the proposed regulations by accessing [Regulations.gov](https://www.Regulations.gov). To inspect comments in person, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Privacy Note: The Department’s policy is to generally make all comments received from members of the public available for public viewing in their entirety on the Federal eRulemaking Portal at [Regulations.gov](https://www.Regulations.gov). Therefore, commenters should be careful to include in their comments only information that they wish to make publicly available.

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 this document. If you want to schedule an appointment for this type of accommodation or auxiliary aid, please contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Overview

The regulations in part 270 establishing the Equity Assistance Center Program implement the authority to provide “Technical assistance in preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for desegregation of public schools” in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000c—2000c–2, 2000c–5). This authority is also referred to under the name “Training and Advisory Services” by Congress and the Department. In this notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), we propose to rescind the regulations in part 270 (“2016 regulations”) regarding the Equity Assistance Center Program in order to provide the Department greater flexibility in carrying out this statutory authority, thereby enabling the Department to provide technical assistance activities with current priorities and needs to best achieve the intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Relatedly, as a separate action to pursue more effective and flexible service delivery methods, the Department recently announced an Interagency Agreement (IAA) with the Department of Justice (DOJ) to leverage DOJ’s considerable civil rights expertise, including in desegregation efforts, to implement this statutory authority.¹ While this partnership has not yet been implemented, under the IAA, in coordination with the Department, DOJ commits to providing technical assistance as authorized under 42 U.S.C. 2000c–2 with appropriate management and oversight by the Department. The Department believes this proposed rescission will provide greater flexibility to both departments to determine the best approaches to service delivery that will improve the support provided to eligible recipients and improve students’ access to a high-quality education.

The regulations in part 270 were last amended in 2016 and codify specific

requirements under the Equity Assistance Center program related to, among other things, eligibility for grants, eligibility for services, types of services provided, geographic regions served, applicable regulations and definitions, and procedures for the Secretary to award a grant. *See* 81 FR 46808 (July 18, 2016). As discussed in detail below, the existing regulations were promulgated to establish a competitive grant structure through which the Department would implement its statutory authority. The amendments finalized in 2016 continued operation of the program through a regional grant structure but provided the Department with flexibility in establishing the number and configuration of geographically based technical assistance centers. The Department believes that even with this flexibility, these regulations place unnecessary restrictions on the Department’s ability to support the technical assistance activities in the authorizing statute by removing options for other avenues of technical assistance which could be more cost effective and impactful, such as direct assistance from federal agency personnel, including potentially in partnership with DOJ.

The Existing Authorizing Statute

The statutory authority upon which the 2016 and preceding regulations rest is broad and flexible. Specifically, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the Department to provide technical assistance to support a broad range of recipients (*i.e.*, “any school board, State, municipality, school district, or other governmental unit legally responsible for operating a public school or schools who requests assistance”) “in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools” and that, to provide such assistance, the Department may make available Department staff or “other persons specially equipped to advise and assist them in coping with such problems.” (*See* 42 U.S.C. 2000c–2.) Importantly, the statute allows such technical assistance to be provided directly by the federal government, by contract, by grant, or by cooperative agreement.

Regulatory History of the Desegregation Centers Prior to 2016

This program has a lengthy regulatory history. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (the “Act”) focuses on the desegregation of public education. The statute authorized various programs and grants, including, under Section 403, technical assistance related to desegregation of public schools, where

the original statutory definition of desegregation referred to “the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin.” The passage of the Act preceded the establishment of the Department of Education, and the programs authorized under this title were initially operated under the Office of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). Following the passage of the Act, HEW first established regulations for the programs authorized under Title IV of the Act in April of 1965 (30 FR 4359, published Apr. 3, 1965) under a new Part 180 of Title 45 of the CFR. These regulations, however, focused on Training Institutes and Grants to School Boards authorized under Sections 404 and 405 of the Act, respectively, and did not establish regulations related to Section 403 on Technical Assistance. It was not until 1973 when HEW issued new regulations (*see* 38 FR 16065, published June 20, 1973) amending 45 CFR part 180 that it established regulations related to “Technical Assistance Arrangements With State Educational Agencies” (Subpart B) and “General Assistance Centers” (Subpart C), both authorized under Section 403. Prior to the issuance of these regulations, Congressional Reports from 1968–1970 indicate that HEW was providing technical assistance under the Act through state technical assistance units and federal staff in Washington DC and regional offices, in addition to the institutes and grants to school boards (*See* 114 Cong. Rec. 13536 (1968) (statement of Rep. Brademas); 115 Cong. Rec. 33058–33060 (1969); and 116 Cong. Rec. 15591 (1970)). The 1973 regulations established eligible entities as SEAs for Subpart B and any public or private agency (other than an SEA) for Subpart C. Additionally, the 1973 regulations established a broad list of authorized activities under both programs, as well as criteria for awards. The 1973 regulations also established, under Subpart C, a list of 26 service areas where each service area covered a specific state or set of states, setting up a regional service delivery system. The 1973 regulations also amended the regulations for Training Institutes and Grants to School Boards.

The regulations in 45 CFR part 180 were also amended in 1975, 1976, and 1978. The 1975 regulations (40 FR 25208, published June 13, 1975) only governed awards made under the program from funds appropriated for Fiscal Year 1975. The 1976 regulations (41 FR 1875, published January 12, 1976) provided a full response to

¹ *See* Partnership Agreement here: <https://www.ed.gov/media/document/ed-and-doj-interagency-agreement-tas-partnership-updated-61526-114244.pdf>.

comments received in response to the 1975 proposed rulemaking (40 FR 12243, published March 17, 1975) and finalized regulations governing awards in 1976 and succeeding Fiscal Years. Of note in the 1975 and 1976 regulations, in alignment with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, HEW amended the definition of desegregation to include, for all programs covered under the regulations, desegregation on the basis of sex. Additionally, citing *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974) in their discussion, HEW also expanded the definition, for Subparts B and C authorized under Section 403 of the Act, to include, as part of national origin desegregation, desegregation on the basis of English language deficiencies resulting from students' non-English dominant environments. The geographic service areas for Subpart C were also updated to encompass 27 regions.

The 1978 regulations (see 43 FR 32372, published July 26, 1978) made several updates to the regulations in 45 CFR part 180, including Subparts B and C focused on technical assistance. Notably, citing in the initial proposed rule several studies that recommended to improve programs by focusing on needs directly related to desegregation (see 1978 Proposed Rule, 43 FR 11676, published March 20, 1978), HEW amended the regulations to limit eligibility for race desegregation assistance to those recipients of the highest need and to require that awardees under Subparts B and C prioritize providing assistance to recipients in earlier implementation stages of race desegregation plans. Additionally, the 1978 regulations renamed the "General Assistance Centers" to "Race, Sex, and National Origin Desegregation Assistance Centers" and established separate funding categories, various authorized activities for desegregation assistance, and criteria for awards for each area of desegregation assistance (race, sex, and national origin) under both Subparts B and C. Additionally, under Subpart C, the regulations related to service areas were amended to note that the HEW, in a "notice of closing date" would provide a "description of the geographical service areas for which applications may be submitted." The regulations did not specify a specific configuration or minimum number of service areas. The notice of closing date for 1978 established 15 service areas for race desegregation assistance; 10 for sex desegregation assistance; and 9 for national origin desegregation assistance. Additionally, the eligible entities for awards under Subpart C was updated to

"Any public agency (other than a SEA or a school board) or private, nonprofit organization."

Following the establishment of the Department of Education through the *Department of Education Organization Act*, the regulations in 45 CFR part 180 were amended in April of 1980 (45 FR 22540, published April 3, 1980) to incorporate references to the Education Department regulations, and again in November of 1980 (45 FR 77369, published November 21, 1980) to redesignate the regulations as 34 CFR part 270.

After these updates in 1980, the regulations in 34 CFR part 270 were not amended again until 1987. The 1987 regulations (52 FR 24962, published July 1, 1987) made several significant changes to the regulations implementing Title IV of the Act, including those as a result of deregulatory review. Specifically, the Department removed the regulations for Training Institutes and Grants to School Boards, based on the rationale that, at the time the regulations were finalized, these programs had not received funding from Congress in several years and were not expected to receive funding in that fiscal year. The regulations also established a new 34 CFR part 271 for the SEA Desegregation Program that consolidated the applications from SEAs to allow states to submit one noncompetitive application for all its desegregation assistance activities. For Desegregation Assistance Centers (DAC), the regulations established a new 34 CFR part 272 and required that each DAC provide assistance in all three of the desegregation areas that were defined in those regulations (race, sex, and national origin) and established 10 geographic regions for the DACs. The regulations also updated the definition of "National origin desegregation" and added a definition of "limited English proficiency" based on the definition used in the Bilingual Education Act. Also of note, the regulations clarified that funds for national origin and race desegregation assistance could not be used to develop or implement activities or curriculum materials for the direct instruction of students, except for the direct instruction of students of limited English proficiency.

The regulations in 34 CFR parts 270, 271, and 272 were not amended again until 2016. However, the 1999 Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards (NIA) (64 FR 1182) used the name "Equity Assistance Centers" for grants under the Desegregation Assistance Centers program, and the Department used two Invitational Priorities (which are priorities for which the Department

does not provide any absolute or competitive preference) for grants under the program, including for projects that encouraged "assisting public school districts that have been released from mandatory desegregation plans and that are seeking ways to maintain or advance the voluntary desegregation of their schools" and for projects that encouraged "assisting public school districts that promote equity in education by providing opportunities for students to learn how to interact in positive ways with students who are different from themselves, and to overcome racial and ethnic prejudices." The 2002 NIA (66 FR 57709) continued the use of the term "Equity Assistance Centers" and also included four Invitational Priorities, including one to encourage projects that prioritized "assisting public school districts to maintain or advance the desegregation of their schools in a manner that will result in higher achievement in reading, mathematics, and other core subjects" and another to encourage projects that prioritized "assisting public school districts to promote equity in education by ensuring access to qualified teachers, quality instruction, and challenging curricula, in order to help students meet high standards of achievement." While not codified in the program regulations, these examples illustrate the continued reshaping of the program over time from the focus on supporting districts with desegregation plans contemplated in the authorizing statute.

The 2016 Rulemaking

The Department most recently updated the regulations for this program in 2016. These regulations established several structural changes: they consolidated all program regulation under 34 CFR part 270, codified the name change from "desegregation assistance centers" to "Equity Assistance Centers" and removed the regulations for the SEA Desegregation Program, with the rationale in the proposed rule (see 81 FR 15665) noting that the program had not been funded since 1995 and the program was no longer administered by the Department.

In contrast to the authorizing statute, the 2016 regulations for Equity Assistance Centers restricts the Secretary's authority to provide flexible assistance. The regulations narrow the program to being a grant program (270.1), define recipients as public agencies or private nonprofits as being the only eligible entities to receive funds under the program (270.2), and set up the program as a geographical regional program, subject to six specific requirements the Secretary must

consider in creating a geographical region (270.5). Also of note, the 2016 regulations expanded the definitions of desegregation in two ways: one, it added religion desegregation as an area of desegregation assistance, in alignment to the inclusion of religion in the statutory definition of “desegregation.” It also amended the definition of sex desegregation to add language to clarify that such desegregation on the basis of sex included that based on “transgender status; gender identity; sex stereotypes, such as treating a person differently because he or she does not conform to sex-role expectations because he or she is attracted to or is in a relationship with a person of the same sex; and pregnancy and related conditions.” In its proposed rule introducing this change, the Department cited *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 490 U.S. 228, 242 (1989) and subsequent court decisions and argued the proposed definition would more accurately reflect the Office for Civil Rights’ and the Department’s interpretation at that time of Title IX and its regulations, its existing practices regarding sex desegregation, and the interpretations and rulemakings of other Federal agencies.

Changing Needs for Technical Assistance in the Preparation, Adoption, and Implementation of Plans for Desegregation of Public Schools

When this program was initially authorized, there was a significant need among school boards, districts, states, and other recipients for support related to desegregation orders. However, there have been very few new school desegregation orders issued by a court in decades, and the existing, active desegregation orders are disproportionately concentrated in one of the regions currently served by the Equity Assistance Center Program. There has also been a change in the overall demand for services from the field over time. In testimony to the House in 1970, HEW reported that, in 1967, the assistance services funded under the program received 1,400 requests for help, which increased to approximately 4,000 in 1968, and increased again to 6,223 in 1969. In their testimony, HEW reported that the Department expected requests to increase again in 1970 (116 Cong. Rec. 15591 (1970)). In contrast, in the fiscal year 2024 budget request, the Department noted that, in fiscal year 2022, the EACs provided targeted and intensive assistance to 24 State educational agencies, 222 local educational agencies, and 145 schools in 46 States and territories, and that

during that budget period, the program accepted 96% of the requests for assistance that were received (<https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/about/overview/budget/budget24/justifications/c-sip.pdf>). While not an exact comparison, this data suggests that there may be less demand for service currently compared to when the program was initially authorized. Internal data from the more recent reporting periods indicate that the overall levels of entities served is generally consistent with this data. The Department has also observed in its administration of the program that the number of entities served varies by region and that the services requested and received by entities also vary in complexity, intensity, and duration.

Compared to the clear and urgent national need for support that existed in years directly after the program was authorized, the Department believes that the current landscape of court-ordered desegregation orders and data on actual assistance provided suggest that there is not a need for the program to operate in the same regionally distributed way that the regulations require and that there is an opportunity to explore other means of service delivery that address these varied needs in a more flexible manner. With broader advancements in and greater use of technology, the Department also believes that using other, more modern methods of support could be more appropriate to meet current needs.

This Proposed Rule

The regulatory and implementation history of the programs authorized under Title IV of the Act demonstrate several important facts relative to the Department’s proposal to rescind the regulations in Part 270. First, the federal government has a well-established history of amending the regulations relating to these programs based on Congressional appropriations, needs of the field, relevant legislative actions and legal rulings, and the government’s experience in administering these programs and changing policy priorities. This history includes several examples of removing program regulations when there is no longer a need for such regulations. Second, the federal government has taken several approaches to fulfilling the statutory authority for Technical Assistance under Section 403 under the Act, including through grants to SEAs, direct federal assistance from agency staff, and various iterations of regional centers and amended regulations accordingly. Third, the regulations have varied in their level of prescriptiveness of the

activities, structure of grant programs, and entities eligible for funding, often well beyond the flexible approach authorized by the program statute and the types of desegregation assistance permitted by the regulations, which has expanded over time since the initial passage of the Act.

The Department views this proposal to rescind the regulations in Part 270 as a continuation of the overall de-regulatory history of the program, where regulations have been rescinded as they become unnecessary or obsolete. The Department believes it is also a necessary elimination of an overly restrictive and outdated regulatory framework that precludes other potentially effective approaches the Department could take to provide technical assistance. Without the restrictions currently in the regulations in part 270, the Department could pursue other approaches to providing technical assistance and services based on actual need without being overly constrained by a geographic system of multi-year grant awards. This could include services directly from federal agency staff, potentially through partnerships with other federal agencies, including DOJ, whose work is better aligned to the statutory emphasis on desegregation; services provided through contracts; or other appropriate means to provide school boards access to relevant specialized expertise.

The Department did consider alternatives to rescinding the regulations. However, after considering these alternatives, the Department believes this option is best aligned to meet the goals of the Department to maximize flexibility based on current need and return to the original statutory authority of the program. Specifically, the Department considered simply revising the existing regulations. However, this would not achieve the Department’s goal of having the option to pursue other more flexible means of delivery authorized by statute. Issuing new regulations to replace the current regulations is not necessary to achieve the Department’s goals and would conflict with the Administration’s policy to support deregulation and move away from issuing burdensome regulations that hinder effective government services. *See, e.g.*, “Unleashing Prosperity through Deregulation” Executive Order 14192, January 31, 2025 (90 FR 10583). The Department believes a full rescission of the regulations is necessary in order for the Department to have the flexibility to pursue other vehicles for service delivery beyond regional grants and to ensure that the services are responsive

to recipient needs while meeting the statutory purposes of the program.

Reliance Interests

The Department does not believe that there are significant reliance interests related to this proposed rescission. The Department will continue to ensure that technical assistance services are provided to the field, pending continued Congressional appropriations, in order to meet the needs of recipients requesting services. Additionally, the proposed rescission of these regulations would govern new Training and Advisory Services activities and would not apply to any currently funded entities, as the regulations in part 270 primarily relate to the establishment of new awards and rescission of these regulations does not alter the terms and conditions of existing grants or cooperative agreements. If the Department were to make new awards after this rescission, the regulations in part 270 would not apply.

Without the restrictions in place through these regulations, the Department could pursue other approaches beyond regional grants, which could include procuring services from another government agency, including DOJ, to administer the program fund or utilizing a contract or alternative grant structure to provide services. To pursue such approaches, the Department may, in the future, end existing grants or not run a competition for new grant awards at the conclusion of the current grant cycle. While this could impact current grantees who no longer would have access to these awards, this would be limited to only three grants under the Equity Assistance Center Program that remain active. The Department does not believe the potential for future changes enabled by this proposed rescission materially alter the conditions under which these grantees are currently operating for a few reasons. First, grantee funding in a multi-year project is never guaranteed for a subsequent budget period, and eligibility for non-competitive continuation funding is always contingent upon a number of prospective factors, including grantee performance, the availability of funding, the grantee continuing to meet all eligibility requirements, and assessing whether additional funding is in the best interest of the Federal Government. Second, if projects do end early or at the end of the project cycle, as part of their orderly closeout, grantees would be able to charge reasonable and necessary closeout costs to their respective grants, thereby further limiting economic and

programmatic impact to previously obligated federal funds. Finally, in any transition to a more flexible approach, the Department would work with the three grantees and their clients provided services under this program to ensure, as needed, an orderly transition of technical assistance.

For the reasons discussed above, the Department proposes to rescind all regulations under Part 270. The regulations will be rescinded in order to support the original intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 while also allowing flexibility to address the evolving needs of the intended recipients. Rescission will allow the Department the ability to explore alternative ways to implement the authorizing statute. In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(4), a brief summary of this rule may be found at <https://www.regulations.gov/document/ED-2026-OESE-0958>.

Procedural Issues and Regulatory Review

Executive Orders 12866, 13563, and 14192

Regulatory Impact Analysis

This proposed rule is a significant regulatory action subject to review by OMB under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866.

We have also reviewed this proposed rule under Executive Order 13563. This proposed rule would rescind regulations that are not in alignment with current Department priorities. In choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, we believe that rescinding the regulations maximizes net benefits relative to other approaches the Department could have taken such as amending the regulations or issuing new regulations. We are issuing this proposed rule on a reasoned determination that the deregulatory benefit of removing unnecessary provisions from the Code of Federal Regulations justifies its cost. Based on the analysis that follows, the Department believes that this regulatory action is consistent with the principles in Executive Order 13563.

We also have determined that this regulatory action would not unduly interfere with State, local, and Tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions. As discussed above, the Department does not believe that this rescission will negatively affect the Department's ability to fulfill the statutory authority to provide technical assistance to eligible state, local, and tribal governments who may request such assistance. None of the existing grantees are state, local, or tribal

governments, further suggesting that this rescission and the potential changes in service delivery it will enable would not unduly interfere with State, local, and Tribal government functions.

Discussion of Costs and Benefits

We are issuing this proposed rule on a reasoned determination that the deregulatory benefit of removing unnecessary provisions from the Code of Federal Regulations justifies its cost. The removal of the regulations could permit the Department to conduct technical assistance activities through means other than regional technical assistance grants, which the Department believes could result in lower costs and other benefits. However, the Department acknowledges that this change could result in losses for current grantees if a change in service delivery model is implemented prior to the end of the performance period and could impact access to future funding streams for eligible entities under the current program if the Department pursues approaches to service delivery other than regional grants.

One potential cost reduction if the Department moves away from a regional model of service delivery is in the area of travel, as the Department expects that a change in service delivery models away from regional grants would enable the Department to better position providers where services are needed. The three current grantees under the regional model budgeted a total of approximately \$141,000 for travel in the most recently completed program year (FY 2024 funds awarded for services provided in FY 2025). We believe that travel costs would be lower under any alternative model and estimate a minimum 10 percent reduction in annual travel costs relative to the most recent planned spending of current grantees, or \$14,100.

Another potential cost reduction is if the Department pursues non-grant options to administer the program, this would eliminate grant-specific costs such as peer review and grantees' indirect costs. In summary, the Department would have the flexibility to select service delivery models that may be more cost effective than regional grants and that meet the demand for services more flexibly than is possible under a five-year, regional grant model. Specifically, the Department would be better positioned to allocate resources based on need as recipients request services. Allowing new types of service delivery provides an opportunity for improved performance that would better leverage available funding to meet recipient needs.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

This section considers the effects that the final regulations may have on small entities in the educational sector as required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* The Department estimates that the proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, as the proposed rule would rescind existing regulations and does not contain any new mandates. Accordingly, an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required, and the Secretary certifies that this proposed rescission would not have a substantial economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The U.S. Small Business Administration Size Standards define proprietary institutions as small businesses if they are independently owned and operated, are not dominant in their field of operation, and have total annual revenue below \$7,000,000. Nonprofit institutions are defined as small entities if they are independently owned and operated and not dominant in their field of operation. Public institutions are defined as small organizations if they are operated by a government overseeing a population below 50,000.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The proposed rescission does not contain any information collection requirements.

Accessible Format: On request to the program contact person 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 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.

List of Subjects in 34 CFR Part 270

Elementary and secondary education, Equal educational opportunity, Grant programs—education, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Kirsten Baesler,

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.

PART 270—[REMOVED]

■ For the reasons set forth in the preamble and under the authority of 42 U.S.C. 2000c—2000c–2, 2000c–5, unless otherwise noted, the Department of Education is proposing to remove part 270 of chapter II of subtitle B of title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

[FR Doc. 2026–12861 Filed 6–24–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 6

[EPA–HQ–AO–2025–1080; FRL–8008.1–02–OA]

RIN 2010–AA16

Update of Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act and Assessing the Environmental Effects Abroad of EPA Actions

AGENCY: United States Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) is proposing amendments to its procedures for implementing the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). This proposed rule would also include technical amendments to the Agency's procedures to improve clarity, correct errors, and update office names and titles. This proposed rule would amend EPA's NEPA implementing procedures by incorporating proposed revisions to create efficiencies in the implementation of NEPA and to harmonize EPA's NEPA Implementing Procedures with other federal agencies' procedures, where possible. The proposed rule also incorporates the amendments to NEPA enacted through the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA) and the One Big Beautiful Bill Act of 2025 (OBBBA); makes changes consistent with Executive Order (E.O.) 14154, *Unleashing American Energy*; makes changes based on the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ)

subsequent rescission of its NEPA regulations; and to reflect the Supreme Court's May 29, 2025 decision in *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County, Colorado*, 605 U.S. 168(2025) (hereinafter *Seven County*).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 27, 2026.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–AO–2025–1080 by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <https://www.regulations.gov/> (our preferred method). Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- **Mail:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Docket Center, Federal Activities Division Docket, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460.
- **Hand Delivery or Courier:** EPA Docket Center, WJC West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004. The Docket Center's hours of operations are 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday–Friday (except Federal Holidays).

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. for this rulemaking. Comments received may be posted without change to https://www.regulations.gov, including personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Public Participation” heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Abrams, Deputy Director, Federal Activities Division (MC 2203A), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 564–8783; email address: abrams.nancy@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. Public Participation
 - Written Comments
- II. General Information
 - Does this proposed rule apply to me?
- III. Introduction
 - A. Statutory Authority
 - B. Background
 - C. Purpose and Policy
 - D. Exemptions From NEPA for Certain EPA Actions
 - E. Consultation With CEQ
- IV. Proposed Revisions to the Title for EPA's Regulation at Part 6
 - A. Proposed Revisions To Incorporate the FRA and OBBBA Amendments to NEPA
 - B. Amendments To Remove References to the CEQ NEPA Regulations and Address Gaps in EPA's NEPA procedures Due to the Rescission of the CEQ Regulations