

officer or inspector, nor a direct supervisor of the issuing officer or inspector.

- Legal review should be incorporated, where applicable.
- Each RDR Reconsideration closed with the status “Closed—No Data Correction Made” must adequately explain the facts and analysis supporting the decision. Responses must contain the following information:
  - Decision-maker (name and title);
  - Description of evidence reviewed;
  - Decision;
  - Specific reason(s) for decision; and
  - Next steps/directions for more information (Final Review process).

#### Final Review Process Requirements

- The Final Review process is applicable to requests that received a full review and a decision during the Initial Review phase, RDR Reconsideration phase, and the requestor is seeking a third and final level of review. States must open a Final Review request within seven days of the request.
- As in the Initial Review and RDR Reconsideration processes, if the State requests additional information from the requestor during the Final Review, the requestor has 14 days to provide the information. These 14 days do not impact the timeline for the State’s review. The clock will stop while the requestor gathers additional information and will restart if the requestor responds to the State. If the requestor does not respond, the system will close the request with the status “Closed—No Requestor Response.”
- States must reach a decision on the Final Review and communicate it to the submitter within 30 days.
- The Final Review must be escalated for review by a responsible decision-maker identified by the State (e.g., Senior Leader in the MCSAP Office) who is outside the chain of command for the issuing officer or inspector. Alternatively, the review may be delegated to a panel that provides a recommendation to the decision-maker. Panels could include representatives from the State’s existing DataQs Review Council, CVSA, or the trucking industry, etc. However, the person(s) or panel reviewing and/or deciding the Final Review must not be anyone involved in the review or decision of the Initial RDR decision or RDR Reconsideration decision.
- The State’s decision would be considered final by FMCSA after the Final Review is completed.
- FMCSA will be available to consult during the RDR Reconsideration or Final Review processes if a State

requests FMCSA’s assistance or interpretation of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations, Hazardous Materials Regulations, or related policy.

#### Burden of Proof Applicable to RDRs, RDR Reconsideration Requests, and Final Review Requests

- The burden of proof for all requests within DataQs (RDRs, RDR Reconsideration Requests, and Final Review Requests) remains with the requester. Requests to remove or modify information that negatively impacts the requester or others will not be successful without factual and/or legal justification of why the information is incorrect or incomplete, providing documentation supporting the request when necessary.
- Unsubstantiated requests may be returned to the requester for more information or closed with no action taken. Requests that are closed for no response from the requester will not be deemed a substantive decision by the State and may be reopened once a sufficient response is received.
- For RDR Reconsideration Requests and Final Review Requests, requesters must address the State’s factual and/or legal basis for the decision and explain why the requestor believes the decision to be incorrect, with submission of additional documentation supporting the request when necessary.

#### V. Comments Sought

FMCSA seeks comments on the proposal described above. In addition, the Agency is asking for input on the following questions related to the proposal:

1. FMCSA outlined proposed revisions to DataQs requirements for MCSAP Grant funding in Section IV above. What are the potential benefits associated with this proposal? What are the potential challenges?
2. What challenges, if any, will States face in adhering to the timelines for each stage of the RDR process outlined above? Are there any other factors FMCSA should consider related to timelines?
  - a. FMCSA proposes that the time an RDR spends with the requestor when the State asks for additional information will not impact the timeline for the State’s review. The clock will stop while the requestor gathers additional information and will restart if the requestor responds. Is this approach reasonable?
  - b. When the State requests additional information from other State/local enforcement entities, how should FMCSA account for the time when the RDR needs input from State or Federal

personnel outside the MCSAP Lead Agency?

- c. FMCSA acknowledges that meeting the timeline standard for every RDR may not be achievable. How should delays by either the State or the requestor in the RDR process be handled? What are some examples of extenuating circumstances that would delay the review of an RDR?

3. The proposal outlined in Section IV revises MCSAP Grant requirements and would impact funding distributed by FMCSA. How should States be held accountable for compliance?

4. If the State does not receive information from the requestor when additional information is requested, or the additional information the requestor provides is inadequate, how should the RDR be handled? Should the State reserve the right to proceed with the review and come to a decision? Should the previous round of review get another chance to reconsider their previous decision when new information is provided?

5. To what extent should FMCSA prescriptively define the criteria for a “valid reason” for the Reconsideration Review Process described in Section IV versus leaving this determination to the States? If FMCSA were to define the process, what specific information should a submitter be required to provide to meet that standard?

#### VI. Next Steps

FMCSA thanks industry stakeholders and enforcement personnel for engaging in the comment period to continually improve the RDR process and the DataQs program. These processes help ensure complete and accurate data is available to focus FMCSA resources where they will have the greatest impact on safety. A follow-up notice in the **Federal Register** will respond to any comments received and announce the revised MCSAP Grant requirements with ample time prior to implementation.

**Sue Lawless,**

*Assistant Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 2025–12059 Filed 6–27–25; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Office of Foreign Assets Control

#### Notice of OFAC Sanctions Actions

**AGENCY:** Office of Foreign Assets Control, Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice.

---

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) is publishing the names of persons who have been removed from OFAC's List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List).

**DATES:** This action was issued on May 28, 2025. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for relevant dates.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** OFAC: Associate Director for Global Targeting, 202-622-2420; Assistant Director for Licensing, 202-622-2480; the Assistant Director for Sanctions Compliance, 202-622-2490; or <https://ofac.treasury.gov/contact-ofac>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Electronic Availability**

The SDN List and additional information concerning OFAC sanctions

programs are available on OFAC's website: <https://ofac.treasury.gov>.

**Notice of OFAC Actions**

On May 28, 2025, OFAC has determined that circumstances no longer warrant the inclusion of the following persons on the SDN List and their property and interests in property are no longer blocked pursuant to Executive Order 14024:

1. BORTSOV, Nikolay Ivanovich (Cyrillic: БОРЦОВ, Николай Иванович), Russia; DOB 08 May 1945; nationality Russia; Gender Male; Secondary sanctions risk: See Section 11 of Executive Order 14024.; Member of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (individual) [RUSSIA-EO14024].

On May 28, 2025, OFAC removed from the SDN List the persons below, who were designated pursuant to the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act, 21 U.S.C. 1901-1908:

**Individual**

1. PEREZ ALVEAR, Jesus (a.k.a. "Chucho Perez"), Guerrero, Mexico; DOB 12 Nov 1984; POB Distrito Federal, Mexico; nationality Mexico; Gender Male; R.F.C. PEAJ-841112-UD1 (Mexico); C.U.R.P. PEAJ841112HDFRLS06 (Mexico) (individual) [SDNTK] (Linked To: CARTEL DE JALISCO NUEVA GENERACION; Linked To: LOS CUINIS; Linked To: GALLISTICA DIAMANTE).

**Entity**

1. GALLISTICA DIAMANTE (a.k.a. GALLISTICA DIAMANTE S.A. DE C.V.; a.k.a. TICKET PREMIER), Aguascalientes, Aguascalientes, Mexico; Quinta Los Pirules Num. Ext. 182, Quinta Los Naranjos, Leon, Guanajuato 37210, Mexico; website [www.ticketpremier.mx](http://www.ticketpremier.mx) [SDNTK].

**Lisa M. Palluconi,**

*Acting Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control.*

[FR Doc. 2025-12242 Filed 6-30-25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810-AL-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

**Internal Revenue Service**

**Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request on Form 1099-LTC—Long-Term Care and Accelerated Death Benefits**

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice of information collection; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the

IRS is inviting comments on the information collection request outlined in this notice.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before September 2, 2025 to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Andres Garcia, Internal Revenue Service, Room 6526, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20224, or by email to [pra.comments@irs.gov](mailto:pra.comments@irs.gov). Include OMB Control No. 1545-1519 in the subject line of the message.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

View the latest drafts of the tax forms related to the information collection listed in this notice at <https://www.irs.gov/draft-tax-forms>. Requests for additional information or copies of this collection should be directed to Marcus W. McCrary, (470) 769-2001.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The IRS, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the IRS assess the impact and minimize the burden of its information collection requirements. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (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 respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information.

**Title:** Long-Term Care and Accelerated Death Benefits.

**OMB Control Number:** 1545-1519.

**Form Number:** 1099-LTC.

**Abstract:** IRC sections 7702B and 101(g) respectively define situations under which benefits paid under a long-term health care insurance contract and accelerated death benefits paid under a life insurance policy may qualify for special tax treatment. IRC section 6050Q requires the payer to report all such benefit amounts paid during any calendar year, specifying whether or not the benefits were paid in whole or in part on a per diem or other periodic basis without regard to expenses. Benefit payers use Form 1099-LTC to report any long-term care or accelerated death benefits paid to an individual. Payers include insurance companies, governmental units, and viatical settlement providers.

**Current Actions:** There is no change to the previously approved information collection.

**Type of Review:** Extension of a currently approved collection.

**Affected Public:** Business or other for-profit organizations, and governments.

**Estimated Number of Respondents:** 3,000.

**Estimated Number of Responses:** 410,600.

**Estimated Time per Response:** 13 minutes.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:** 88,963.