information collection, including (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; 49 CFR 1.49; and DOT Order 1351.29A.

Gamunu Ukwattege Wijetunge,

Acting Associate Administrator, Research and Program Development.

[FR Doc. 2026–23054 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA–2026–0529]

Pipeline Safety: Information Collection Activities

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), PHMSA is forwarding the information collection request described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. PHMSA published a **Federal Register** notice with a 60-day comment period soliciting comment on this information collection on June 18, 2026.

DATES: Submit comments by December 14, 2026.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments regarding this information collection request by mail to Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503. Comments can also be submitted electronically at *www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angela Hill, Standards and Rulemaking Division, by email at *angela.hill@dot.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), PHMSA must provide interested members of the public and affected agencies with the opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests before the agency submits them to OMB for approval. In accordance with this requirement, PHMSA published a **Federal Register** notice providing a 60-day comment period on its intent to request OMB approval of the information collection requests described below.[1]

During the 60-day comment period, PHMSA received 10 comments—a joint comment from the American Gas Association (AGA) and the American Public Gas Association (APGA); a joint comment from the American Petroleum Institute (API) and the Liquid Energy Pipeline Association (LEPA); a joint comment from the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) and API; a comment from GPA Midstream Association (GPA Midstream); a comment from Summit Utilities Inc. (SUI); a comment from Environmental Defense Fund (EDF); a comment from National Association of Pipeline Safety Representatives (NAPSR); a comment from Pipeline Safety Trust (PST); and two comments from individual stakeholders.[2] Below is a summary of the comments received and PHMSA's responses.[3]

[1] *Pipeline Safety: Information Collection Activities,* 91 FR 36946 (June 18, 2026).

[2] AGA and APGA, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0015 (Aug. 18, 2026); API and LEPA, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0018 (Aug. 19, 2026); INGAA and API, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0013 (Aug. 18, 2026); GPA Midstream, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0010 (Aug. 18, 2026); SUI, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0011 (Aug. 18, 2026); EDF, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0016 (Aug. 18, 2026); NAPSR, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0014 (Aug. 18, 2026); PST, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0012; A. Rehman, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0009 (Jun. 29, 2026); Anonymous, Comment, Docket ID PHMSA–2026–0529–0017 (Aug. 18, 2026).

[3] The initial information collection concerns two topics: (1) annual reports, and (2) incident and accident reports. PHMSA is addressing the comments received in response to the initial information collection in two separate **Federal Register** notices. This notice addresses comments received on annual reports. PHMSA will address the comments received in response to incident and accident reports in a separate **Federal Register** notice.

A. Form PHMSA F 7100.1–1 Annual Report for Gas Distribution Pipeline Systems

1. Diameter-Based Reporting

PHMSA proposed eliminating diameter-based reporting of main miles and the number of services. Instead, operators would report cast and wrought iron pipelines six inches or less in diameter and two types of plastic pipe widely regarded as having poor material properties: polyvinyl chloride (PVC) and acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene (ABS). The proposal would simplify parts B2 and B3 to focus only on higher-risk materials.

Comments Received

AGA and APGA support PHMSA's broader data revitalization effort and recommend that PHMSA remove terms and definitions from the instructions that are no longer relevant under the proposed amended report fields. AGA and APGA assert that such amendments will reduce confusion.

NAPSR, EDF, and PST do not support the proposed amendments and believe that there is still value in collecting distribution pipe diameter data. NAPSR asserted that larger-diameter pipes pose higher safety risks because they are easier for third parties to strike, carry more gas, and take longer to isolate during a shutdown. NAPSR further commented that comparing annual diameter data helps target inspections toward recent construction activity. EDF commented that diameter data is valuable to understand the scope of an operator's overall system and potential safety risks. PST commented that PHMSA's claim that pipe diameter is not a significant risk factor to pipeline integrity is unsubstantiated as American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) B31.8S, incorporated by reference in 49 CFR part 192, lists pipeline diameter as a data element necessary for risk assessment.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to eliminate diameter-based reporting of main miles and the number of services. PHMSA notes that the Federal Pipeline Safety Regulations governing distribution integrity management programs (DIMP) under part 192, subpart P, do not reference ASME B31.8S. Though it is important for pipeline operators to know the diameter of individual gas distribution pipelines, gas distribution integrity decisions are not strongly influenced by pipeline diameter. Commenters did not raise additional pipeline materials that PHMSA should include in parts B2 and

B3 of the annual report. In addition to the changes already proposed, PHMSA requests that OMB approve adding ''other plastic'' to parts B2 and B3. Any plastic other than polyethylene (PE) is considered a higher risk material and warrants individual reporting in part B. Contrary to comments, all portions of the instructions for part B are relevant and needed for part B.

2. PE Brittle-Like

PHMSA proposed updating the annual report instructions to define ''PE Brittle-Like'' materials based on Advisory Bulletin 07–01.[4] Under the proposal, operators would report the total mileage for ''PE Brittle-Like'' distribution mains and services, as well as the number of ''PE Brittle-Like'' fittings installed on pipelines that are not ''PE Brittle-Like.''

Comments Received

AGA and APGA support PHMSA's objective and acknowledge that ''PE Brittle-Like'' mains and services can provide meaningful information but question the utility of tracking ''PE Brittle-Like'' fittings installed on pipelines that are not ''PE Brittle-Like.'' Because historical component records are often incomplete or unverifiable, AGA and APGA state that immediate reporting would yield unreliable data and recommend removing or deferring the fitting-level requirement. NAPSR supports the explicit tracking of ''PE Brittle-Like'' materials but commented that PHMSA should provide guidance on how operators should report information if the operator does not have the manufacturer details available. PST commented in support of PHMSA's proposal as they believe these specific PE materials have a well-documented history of brittle-like failure.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to collect ''PE Brittle-Like'' main miles and service lines. However, PHMSA is withdrawing its proposal to require separate counts for ''PE Brittle-Like'' fittings installed on pipelines that are not ''PE Brittle-Like.'' In addition to the records issue noted by commenters, PHMSA, at this time, doubts that a ''PE Brittle-Like'' fitting would be connected to a pipeline that is not ''PE Brittle-Like.'' PHMSA will monitor the ''PE Brittle-Like'' main miles and service lines data and will evaluate the need for fitting-level reporting in the future.

[4] *Pipeline Safety: Updated Notification of the Susceptibility to Premature Brittle-Like Cracking of Older Plastic Pipe,* 72 FR 51301 (Sept. 6, 2007).

3. Unaccounted for Gas

PHMSA proposed removing and reserving part G of the gas distribution annual report where operators report the percentage of gas unaccounted for over a one-year period. PHMSA considers unaccounted for gas a financial accounting consideration for ratemaking purposes rather than a meaningful indicator of pipeline integrity.

Comments Received

AGA and APGA support removing and reserving part G, asserting that this data collection is onerous and does not relate to pipeline safety.

NAPSR states that there may be value in keeping this data collection, noting that some small operators may rely on this data to demonstrate compliance with pipeline safety requirements mandated under section 114 of the Protecting Our Infrastructure of Pipelines and Enhancing Safety Act of 2020, Public Law 116–260 (Dec. 27, 2020) (2020 PIPES Act).

EDF opposes the removal, asserting that lost and unaccounted for (LAUF) gas serves as a valuable metric for the public and stakeholders evaluating the economic and environmental impacts of gas losses. EDF asserts that significant progress has been made toward distinguishing the proportion of LAUF gas attributable to measurable system leakage versus other factors.

Similarly, PST asserts that PHMSA should cite multiple sources to support its position rather than its own report. PST further recommends that PHMSA retain and modify the reporting requirement to account for the nuances between measurement uncertainty, leaks, and other sources of LAUF gas rather than delete it.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove the percentage of unaccounted-for gas from the annual report. Regarding NAPSR's comment, PHMSA notes that operators can continue calculating LAUF gas to the extent that is necessary to demonstrate compliance with any other applicable laws and regulations, including section 114 of the 2020 PIPES Act. As for the comments provided by EDF and PST, PHMSA notes that neither offers a methodology for distinguishing the economic and environmental portions of LAUF gas, and PHMSA is unaware of any such method. As such, PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal.

4. Contact Information

PHMSA proposed changing the title of part I from ''PREPARER'' to ''CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS'' to receive the name and contact information of the person most knowledgeable about the report or the person to be contacted for more information.

Comments Received

NAPSR supports the clarification but recommends that PHMSA strengthen the accompanying reporting instructions to reinforce compliance expectations and promote consistent identification of the appropriate contact.

In addition to the proposals set forth by PHMSA, AGA and APGA commented that the reporting instructions contain outdated definitions. They further noted that the instructions for part D retain outdated implementation language—specifically, the phrase ''will be implemented for CY 2024 submittals'' and recommended its removal.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with the proposal, including strengthening the reporting instructions. PHMSA has updated the instructions to further reinforce expectations and promote consistent identification of contacts across all operators.

PHMSA will remove standalone definitions from the reporting instructions and instead insert direct cross-references into part 192. This ensures regulatory consistency and eliminates potential conflicts between the instructions and the regulatory text. PHMSA will also revise the instructions to strike all obsolete implementation references, including outdated language regarding prior calendar year submittals.

B. Form PHMSA F 7100.2–1 Annual Reports for Natural and Other Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems

1. Volume of Gas Transported

PHMSA proposed removing and reserving part C of the annual report, eliminating the requirement for gas transmission operators to submit the volume of gas transported during the calendar year. PHMSA does not consider the aggregate volume of gas transported across a transmission system to be a pertinent indicator of pipeline safety, and interstate gas transmission lines must already report such information to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under 18 CFR 260.1.

Comments Received

INGAA and API support the proposal, echoing PHMSA's underlying justification. GPA Midstream also supports the change, noting further that

eliminating this requirement aligns with the principles of the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA).

EDF opposes the removal, contending that it ignores PHMSA's role as the Federal pipeline safety regulator and its removal will increase the burden on stakeholders who have to consult databases maintained at multiple agencies that have varying disclosure methods and timeframes.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove and reserve part C. PHMSA has determined that the aggregate volume of gas transported across a transmission system is not a relevant indicator of pipeline safety. Furthermore, because other Federal agencies already collect this volume data and it remains publicly accessible, retaining part C is duplicative and unnecessary.

2. Number of Anomalies Reported

PHMSA proposed removing the number of anomalies reported from all sections of part F, including the number of anomalies an operator excavates in a given calendar year; the total number of anomalies an operator repairs based on each assessment method; and the number of anomalies repaired or eliminated by pipe replacement based on the class location or high consequence area (HCA) designation of the location of the anomaly.

Comments Received

INGAA and API support the proposal. They also recommend PHMSA remove all references to anomalies in the reporting instructions on pages 8, 10, 16, and 24. SUI supports the change, stating that anomaly count results in inconsistent data and the time and resources required to gather this data does not yield a proportional benefit in enabling meaningful industry-wide comparisons. GPA Midstream also favors the removal, noting that eliminating the requirement aligns with the principles of the PRA.

NAPSR opposes the complete elimination of anomaly counts. NAPSR urged PHMSA to retain high-level anomaly reporting or provide a clear alternative data source, emphasizing that anomaly metrics serve as a vital annual integrity management signal for State regulators to monitor operator performance and prioritize inspections. PST also opposes the proposal, arguing that anomaly data helps gauge the efficacy of different inspection methods. PST questioned the proposal's regulatory consistency, noting PHMSA separately proposed adding anomaly tracking to accident/incident reports.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA proposed to add anomaly questions to accident and incident reports while simultaneously eliminating anomaly tracking from the annual report. Gas transmission pipeline operators are currently required to report the number of anomalies identified and repaired across various pipeline inspection methods. Though Federal Pipeline Safety Regulations do not formally define ''anomaly,'' the term generally refers to a deviation—or an indication of a deviation—from sound material that requires further investigation. In addition to the number of anomalies, operators also report the number of conditions repaired in part F. Section 192.933(d) defines specific types of conditions inside HCAs, and a single repaired condition may encompass one or multiple anomalies. Outside HCAs, conditions are defined in § 192.714(d). Furthermore, while advancements in inspection technology have improved the detection of anomalies, many of these identified anomalies do not constitute actionable conditions that require repair. As such, PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove the reporting of anomaly counts. Part F of the annual report will continue to capture condition repairs, which PHMSA clearly defines in its regulations and provide the needed information to gauge the efficacy of different inspection methods.

3. Pipeline Diameter

Currently, gas transmission pipeline operators submit pipeline diameter data to PHMSA through two mechanisms: part H of the annual report, and as a spatial attribute within the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS). To eliminate duplicative reporting, PHMSA proposed removing part H from the annual report. Under the proposal, PHMSA would leverage NPMS submittals to generate tabular diameter data in the same format currently derived from the annual report. The agency would then publish this NPMS-sourced tabular data on its public website to ensure uninterrupted access for stakeholders.

Comments Received

INGAA and API support the proposal and concurred with PHMSA's justification for eliminating duplicative reporting. NAPSR cautioned that removing part H would cause transmission and gathering pipeline diameter data to be reported in separate systems, potentially creating confusion for users attempting to access the data. NAPSR urged PHMSA to ensure that the proposal does not further delay the information becoming publicly available.

EDF opposed the amendment, arguing that PHMSA failed to justify the change and that pipeline diameter is relevant to determine the potential impact radius. EDF also asserted that the current NPMS format makes it difficult for the public to navigate and extract meaningful information about pipeline infrastructure.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove part H from the annual report. While processing NPMS submittals may require additional time to update pipeline diameter, PHMSA finds that avoiding this minor delay does not justify retaining duplicative reporting requirements. To maintain public access and continuity, PHMSA will convert NPMS Geographic Information System (GIS) diameter data into tabular format and integrate it directly into the file containing data from the other parts of the annual report.

4. Pipeline Mileage by MAOP

PHMSA proposed modifying the reporting instructions for part Q, where gas transmission operators report pipeline mileage by maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) determination method. The proposed revision clarifies the proper timing for transitioning mileage from the § 192.619 portion of part Q to the § 192.624 portion as operators implement MAOP reconfirmation.

Comments Received

AGA and APGA recommend that PHMSA remove the rows for ''Class 1 (not in HCA or MCA)'' and ''Class 2 (not in HCA or MCA)'' from the § 192.624 table. They noted that mileage not subject to § 192.624(a) should remain under the § 192.619 section of part Q. They further recommended PHMSA strike the words ''is completed'' from the phrase ''Pressure test in accordance with § 192.624(c)(1), and material testing in accordance with § 192.607 is completed.'' AGA and APGA expressed concern that the current wording could cause confusion as it implies an operator must fully finalize all material verification activities under § 192.607 before it can report mileage as reconfirmed via pressure testing.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is accepting the AGA and APGA recommendation in part. PHMSA will remove the rows for ''Class 1 (not in HCA or MCA)'' and ''Class 2 (not in HCA or MCA)'' from the § 192.624 table in part Q, as mileage not subject to § 192.624(a) appropriately belongs in the § 192.619 portion. However, PHMSA will retain the phrase ''is completed'' regarding material verification under § 192.624(c)(1). PHMSA maintains that an operator must fully finalize material properties records verification in conjunction with pressure testing under § 192.624(c)(1). Operators with traceable, verifiable, and complete records meet the material properties records requirement without testing pipeline facilities. If material properties verification testing is required, the specific required tests are in § 192.607. Operators without traceable, verifiable, and complete records must excavate as needed to obtain material properties test results.

PHMSA has modified the instructions to remove the presumption that material testing is required but retains ''is completed.'' The new text describing when reconfirmation under § 192.624(c)(1) is completed is ''Pressure test in accordance with § 192.624(c)(1) and verification of material property records in accordance with § 192.607 is completed.''

5. Class 3 Pipe Mileage

PHMSA proposed to modify part K by requiring operators to report the total miles of eligible Class 3 pipe with MAOP confirmed or restored pursuant to § 192.624(a)(4).

Comments Received

INGAA and API, SUI, GPA Midstream, and AGA and APGA all point out a typographical error in the regulatory citation provided in the proposal (§ 192.624(a)(4)). They all request that PHMSA cite the correct regulatory reference—§ 192.611(a)(4)—across both the annual report form and its accompanying instructions. NAPSR supports collecting this data, asserting that it is relevant to recent regulatory requirements and assists PHMSA and State regulators in monitoring implementation.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with the proposal to modify part K and will correct the regulatory reference to § 192.611(a)(4) across all applicable form fields and reporting instructions.

C. Form PHMSA F 7000–1.1, Annual Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems

1. Pipeline Diameter and Breakout Tank Data

Currently, hazardous liquid pipeline operators submit pipeline diameter data (part H) and breakout tank data (part M) to PHMSA in two separate filings: the annual report and NPMS. To eliminate duplicative reporting, PHMSA proposes removing part H and part M from the annual report. Under this proposal, PHMSA will leverage NPMS submittals to generate tabular data matching the current annual report format. PHMSA will publish this NPMS-sourced tabular data on its public website to maintain uninterrupted access for stakeholders.

Comments Received

NAPSR commented that it has noticed significant delays in NPMS data updates compared to the current process. NAPSR urged PHMSA to ensure that transitioning data to NPMS does not introduce publication delays or make accessing the information more difficult for State oversight authorities. PST opposes the proposal, arguing that shifting data collection to NPMS reduces public transparency because significant portions of the NPMS database are restricted or not fully accessible to the general public.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove part H and part M from the annual report. To preserve public transparency and ensure data accessibility, PHMSA will convert NPMS GIS data into a tabular format and integrate it directly into the file containing data from the other parts of the annual report. While processing NPMS submittals may require additional time to update pipeline diameter and breakout tank data, PHMSA finds that avoiding this minor delay does not justify retaining duplicative reporting requirements.

2. Anomaly Reporting

PHMSA proposed removing the number of anomalies reported from all sections of part F, including the number of anomalies an operator excavates in a given calendar year; the total number of anomalies an operator repairs based on each assessment method; and the number of anomalies repaired or eliminated by pipe replacement based on the HCA designation of the location of the anomaly.

Comments Received

API and LEPA support the proposal to eliminate anomaly counts, agreeing with PHMSA's goal of streamlining reporting requirements.

NAPSR opposes eliminating anomaly counts and urged PHMSA to retain high-level anomaly reporting or establish a clear alternative data source, arguing that anomaly metrics serve as a critical annual integrity management signal for State regulators to monitor operator performance and prioritize inspections. Similarly, PST commented that anomaly count data helps evaluate the overall efficacy of various inline inspection methods and questions PHMSA's proposal to add anomaly questions to accident and incident reports while simultaneously removing them from the annual report.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove the reporting of anomaly counts. Part F of the annual report will continue to capture condition repairs for each inspection method. The Federal Pipeline Safety Regulations clearly define conditions. Since PHMSA collects condition repairs for each inspection method, stakeholders can use the number of repairs to gauge the efficacy of different inspection methods.

3. Cathodic Protection Recommendation From Commenter

A. Rehman submitted a comment, recommending that PHMSA expand the annual report requirements to collect additional data on cathodic protection (CP). Specifically, the commenter suggested adding reporting fields for miles of pipeline under CP, the type of monitoring technology utilized, and the frequency of CP checks performed remotely versus physically.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is not adopting the commenter's suggestion to collect miles under CP, monitoring technology, or check frequencies in the annual report. Collecting such information would constitute a substantive change outside the scope of the 60-day notice. PHMSA cannot implement such a change without first affording the public an opportunity to review and comment. In addition, operators are already required to maintain comprehensive CP records and conduct regular inspections in accordance with part 192, subpart I, which State and Federal inspectors verify during routine regulatory oversight.

D. Form PHMSA F 7100.3–1, Annual Report for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Facilities

1. LNG Facility Duplicative Reporting

Currently, operators of LNG facilities report to PHMSA in two places: the annual report and NPMS submittals. PHMSA proposed adding the latitude and longitude of an LNG plant to the annual report. Once this change is implemented, PHMSA intends to eliminate the requirement in § 191.29 for LNG operators to submit to NPMS. These changes would preserve PHMSA's ability to generate maps showing the location of LNG plants and eliminate duplicative reporting.

Comments Received

NAPSR opposes the amendment, stating that NPMS data is used by emergency response officials. EDF commented that NPMS should continue collecting relevant information regarding LNG facilities.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with the proposal to add the latitude and longitude of an LNG plant to the annual report. PHMSA will use data collected through the annual report to construct an LNG GIS layer within NPMS. PHMSA will make this LNG GIS layer available to all stakeholders, including emergency response officials. This process mirrors PHMSA's established practice for underground natural gas storage (UNGS) facilities, ensuring consistent GIS mapping and data integration without imposing additional submittal burdens on operators.

2. Define ''Retired''

PHMSA proposed to define ''retired'' in the annual report instructions and remove the abandoned status code option from the report. An abandoned LNG plant would no longer be included in the annual report. To accommodate the possibility of facilities with varying status codes, PHMSA proposes adding the reporting of status code at the facility level. The operator would not enter the status code for the plant but it will be inferred from the status entered by the operator for each facility comprising the plant. These changes would ensure consistent reporting across the industry.

Comments Received

INGAA and API commented that using both ''facility'' and ''plant'' within part B creates confusion and recommends that PHMSA select a single term for reporting purposes. They further recommend adopting the term ''out of service'' rather than ''retired,'' commenting that ''out-of-service'' provides greater granularity and is easier for operators to apply to specific assets.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA will continue using both ''plant'' and ''facility'' in its annual report form and accompanying instructions. As per § 193.2007, an ''LNG plant'' is typically multiple ''LNG facilities'' functioning as a unit. Operators need to understand the difference between ''plant'' and ''facility'' to properly complete the annual report. PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to define ''retired'' in the instructions, remove the ''abandoned'' status code, and collect status at the facility level to infer overall plant status. PHMSA disagrees with the recommendation to replace ''retired'' with ''out-of-service.'' The term ''retired'' connotes an intentional decision to no longer use a facility, whereas ''out-of-service'' is appropriate for a facility temporarily not in service, such as due to waiting for parts or funding.

3. Defining ''Maximum Liquefaction Rate'' and ''Maximum Vaporization Capacity''

Currently, part B of the LNG annual report requires operators to submit data for ''maximum liquefaction rate'' and ''maximum vaporization capacity.'' The annual report instructions, however, do not formally define these terms. To eliminate ambiguity and promote uniform, accurate reporting across regulated entities, PHMSA proposed to add explicit definitions for both terms to the reporting instructions.

Comments Received

INGAA and API stated that baseload LNG operators typically measure their liquefaction rate in terms of LNG produced rather than volumetric gas measurements. NAPSR submitted comments supporting defining the terms.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to establish explicit definitions for ''maximum liquefaction rate'' and ''maximum vaporization capacity'' in the annual report instructions. While larger LNG plants may measure the liquefaction rate in terms of the liquid produced, PHMSA continues to propose the ''maximum liquefaction rate'' in cubic feet of gas. However, PHMSA erroneously proposed ''of LNG'' as part of the instructions for ''maximum liquefaction rate.'' PHMSA proposes striking ''of LNG'' from ''(MMCF/D) of feed gas of LNG'' on the instructions for the liquefaction rate. Specifying ''MMCF/D of feed gas'' provides a clear, standardized metric for gas volume prior to liquefaction, ensuring consistent reporting across operators while eliminating ambiguity in the instructions.

4. Unit of Measurement Recommendation by Commenter

INGAA and API recommend that PHMSA use cubic meters instead of barrels when measuring liquid, as barrels are used primarily to measure crude oil and other hazardous liquids. INGAA and API also recommended reorganizing part B to position ''Type'' and ''Function'' fields directly beneath the location section to streamline data entry and logically group facility identification parameters.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA proposes implementing both recommendations. Grouping all plant data at the beginning of part B may help operators recognize the transition from plant data to facility data. For the same reason, PHMSA proposes replacing the term ''Process'' with ''Facilities'' in part B and modifying the instructions to emphasize the transition from plant to facility. As to the barrels versus cubic meters, implementing cubic meters for liquid volume aligns the annual report with standard commercial and operational accounting practices.

5. Vibration and Mechanical Fatigue

Recognizing that vibration and mechanical fatigue are documented causes of LNG piping and weld failures, PHMSA proposed adding ''vibration- or fatigue-related'' in part C. The amendment will improve root-cause data collection and safety tracking.

Comments Received

INGAA and API request that PHMSA adopt the broader term ''operational-related'' instead of ''vibration- or fatigue-related'' to categorize these piping and weld leaks. INGAA and API also recommended removing ''Excavation Damage'' as a cause category for leaks in part C, arguing that excavation activity within an LNG plant boundary is rare or handled under different operational controls. NAPSR also submitted comments supporting adding ''vibration- or fatigue-related'' in part C.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to add ''vibration- or fatigue-related'' as a fourth cause category for

leaks from piping or welds in part C and is retaining ''Excavation Damage'' as a cause category for leaks in part C. The agency determined that ''vibration- or fatigue-related'' provides specific, actionable safety data on known mechanical stress factors unique to plant piping systems, whereas a broad ''operational-related'' category would be overly generic and could obscure mechanical stress factors. Furthermore, retaining ''Excavation Damage'' ensures consistency across PHMSA reporting forms and maintains coverage for ground-disturbing activities that could occur within facility boundaries.

6. Emergency Shutdown Actuations

PHMSA proposed removing emergency shutdown (ESD) actuations that resulted from conditions other than an actual emergency from part D. Because a plant shutdown occurring in the absence of a genuine emergency does not directly reflect a safety threat or pipeline integrity issue, PHMSA proposed removing non-emergency ESD actuations from part D to streamline reporting requirements.

Comments Received

INGAA and API commented in support of the proposal, reiterating that non-emergency ESD actuations do not indicate a safety issue.

NAPSR commented in opposition to the proposal, asserting that tracking non-emergency ESD actuations provides a useful reliability indicator for a critical safety system. NAPSR noted that a high frequency of false or non-emergency ESD events can foster operator complacency and lead to dangerous response lags during actual emergency events.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to remove ESD actuations resulting from conditions other than an actual emergency from part D. While PHMSA acknowledges NAPSR's concerns regarding safety system reliability and potential operator complacency, PHMSA maintains that routine or maintenance-related shutdowns do not directly correlate with active safety hazards or operational failures. Removing non-emergency ESD actuations focuses part D data collection on genuine safety events, reducing administrative burden while ensuring PHMSA and State oversight authorities retain visibility over true emergency operations and system performance.

7. Physical Security and Cybersecurity

PHMSA proposed to modify the annual report form and instructions to ensure that only physical security, not cybersecurity, breaches are reported in part D to ensure consistent reporting across the industry.

Comments Received

NAPSR expresses concern over excluding cybersecurity events, asserting that State pipeline safety programs require consistent annual visibility into cybersecurity incidents which could impact the safe operation of LNG facilities.

INGAA and API recommended eliminating the security breach reporting requirement entirely. They stated that operators already report security incidents to other Federal entities—such as the U.S. Coast Guard under the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA)—and argued that a disaggregated annual count without context does not provide a meaningful indicator of safety. They further recommended that PHMSA limit reporting physical breaches and exempt Coast Guard-regulated facilities if it retains physical security breach reporting.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with its proposal to limit part D security breach reporting to physical security incidents only. PHMSA is not adopting INGAA and API's request to eliminate security breach reporting entirely or exempt facilities regulated under MTSA. Annual tracking of physical security breaches provides PHMSA and State inspection personnel with vital baseline trend data to evaluate physical facility security controls over time. As to NAPSR's concerns, there is an inherent time lag between the occurrence of a cyber event and the submittal of an annual report, rendering an annual metric ineffective for real-time cybersecurity response and oversight. Cybersecurity threats require immediate notification and mitigation, which operators already perform under mandatory reporting protocols established by other Federal authorities, such as the Transportation Security Administration and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency. In 2010, TSA issued the initial edition of its Pipeline Security Guidelines to assist operators of gas pipelines and LNG facilities in the development and evaluation of comprehensive security programs at their facilities. TSA's Pipeline Security Guidelines, which have been updated several times (most recently in April 2021), set forth non-binding guidance pertaining to corporate security policies, security vulnerability assessments, physical security measures, and cybersecurity efforts.[5] TSA conducts voluntary visits with pipeline operators as part of its Corporate Security Review Program. TSA personnel work with operator personnel during these visits to analyze FSPs and policies and compare practices against the Pipeline Security Guidelines.

Restricting part D strictly to physical security events eliminates redundant multi-agency reporting burdens while maintaining appropriate physical security visibility.

E. National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) (2137–0596)

1. Interstate or Intrastate Breakout Tank

PHMSA proposed adding an attribute indicating whether a breakout tank is interstate or intrastate to eliminate duplicative reporting.

Comments Received

NAPSR commented that they do not oppose the amendment.

PHMSA Response

PHMSA is proceeding with the proposal.

II. Summary of Impacted Collection

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.8(d), PHMSA provides interested members of the public and affected agencies an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping requests. This notice identifies information collection requests that PHMSA will submit to OMB for revision.

The following information is provided for these information collections: (1) Title of the information collection; (2) OMB control number; (3) Current expiration date; (4) Type of request; (5) Abstract of the information collection activity; (6) Description of affected public; (7) Estimate of total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden; and (8) Frequency of collection. PHMSA will request a three-year term of approval for these information collections. PHMSA requests comments on the following information:

1. *Title:* Annual Report for Gas Distribution Operators.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0629.

Current Expiration Date: 9/30/2026.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: This mandatory information collection covers the collection of data from operators of gas distribution pipeline systems for annual reports. 49 CFR 191.11 requires operators of gas distribution systems to submit an

[5] TSA, *Pipeline Security Guidelines* (Apr. 2021), *https://www.tsa.gov/sites/default/files/pipeline_security_guidelines.pdf.*

annual report by March 15 for the preceding calendar year. PHMSA proposes revisions modifying Parts B2, B3, G, and I of DOT Form PHMSA F 7100.1–1 by removing certain data elements and clarifying others. As a result, PHMSA expects the time burden for completing this report to decrease by two hours, from 20 hours to 18 hours per report.

Affected Public: Operators of Gas Distribution Pipeline Systems.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Responses: 1,446.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 26,028.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

2. *Title:* Annual Reports for Gas Pipeline Operators.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0522.

Current Expiration Date: 9/30/2026.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: This mandatory information collection covers the requirements for operators of natural gas pipelines (not distribution systems), underground natural gas storage facilities, and liquefied natural gas facilities to submit annual reports to PHMSA. 49 CFR 191.17 requires operators of UNGS facilities, gas transmission systems, LNG facilities, and gas gathering systems to submit an annual report by March 15 for the preceding calendar year.

For Form PHMSA F 7100.2–1, *Annual Report for Natural and Other Gas Transmission and Gathering Pipeline Systems,* PHMSA proposes to remove parts C and H, modify parts F and K, and revise the instructions for part Q to improve clarity. PHMSA expects the time burden for completing Form PHMSA F 7100.2–1 to decrease by four hours, from 54 hours to 50 hours per report. PHMSA has also updated the estimated number of annual submissions for this form from 1,810 to 1,461 based on a three-year average. For Form PHMSA F 7100.3–1, *Annual Report for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Facilities,* PHMSA proposes to modify parts B, C, and D. These modifications are not expected to change the per-report time burden. PHMSA has updated the estimated number of annual submissions for this form, from 113 to 184 based on a three-year average.

Affected Public: Operators of Natural Gas Pipelines, Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities, and Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Responses: 2,167.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 80,758.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

3. *Title:* Annual Report for Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Systems.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0614.

Current Expiration Date: 3/31/2029.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: 49 CFR 195.49 requires operators of hazardous liquid pipelines to submit specific data on the safety of their pipelines by annually completing Form PHMSA F 7000–1.1. This mandatory information collection requires operators to submit data on the preceding year electronically by June 15 of each calendar year.

PHMSA proposes to modify Form PHMSA F 7000–1.1 to remove parts H and M, and revise part F to remove the requirement to report on anomalies. As a result, PHMSA expects the time burden for completing this report to decrease by two hours, from 20 hours to 18 hours per report. PHMSA has updated the estimated number of annual submissions from 475 to 678 based on a three-year average. In addition, PHMSA is removing a one-time burden of 18 hours per operator previously allotted for system updates related to excavation damage data, resulting in a reduction of 475 responses and 8,550 hours.

Affected Public: Operators of Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Facilities.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Responses: 678.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 12,204.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

4. *Title:* National Pipeline Mapping Program.

OMB Control Number: 2137–0596.

Current Expiration Date: 3/31/2029.

Type of Request: Revision.

Abstract: The Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–355), 49 U.S.C. 60132, requires an operator of a pipeline facility (except distribution lines and gathering lines) to submit to PHMSA geospatial data appropriate for use in NPMS, including operator contact information. PHMSA proposes to modify this data collection to require an operator to indicate whether a hazardous liquid breakout tank is intrastate or interstate when submitting geospatial data. PHMSA does not expect a change in burden due to this modification.

Affected Public: Operators of Hazardous Liquid and Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Facilities.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:

Estimated Number of Responses: 1,346.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 162,208.

Frequency of Collection: Annually.

Comments are invited on:

(a) The need for the renewal and revision of these information collections for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility.

(b) The accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used.

(c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.

(d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques.

Authority: The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995; 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended; and 49 CFR 1.48.

Issued in Washington, DC, under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.97.

Thomas Correll,

Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.

[FR Doc. 2026–23022 Filed 11–10–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–60–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

[Docket No. PHMSA–2026–3961 (Notice No. 2026–05)]

Hazardous Materials: Information Collection Activities

AGENCY: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, PHMSA invites comments on two Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control numbers pertaining to hazardous materials transportation. PHMSA intends to request renewal and extension for these two control numbers from OMB.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before January 11, 2027.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments identified by the Docket Number PHMSA–2026–3961 (Notice No. 2026–05) by any of the following methods: