



29 CFR Part 42

Employment and Training Administration

[Docket No. ETA–2025–0003]

RIN 1205–AC27

Wage and Hour Division

RIN 1235–AA50

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

RIN 1218–AD53

Rescission of Coordinated Enforcement Regulations

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration; Wage and Hour Division; Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor (Department) is rescinding the regulations that established formal procedures for coordination of enforcement activities among the Wage and Hour Division (WHD), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and Employment and Training Administration (ETA) with respect to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The Department is rescinding these regulations because they are obsolete, no longer reflect the Department’s organizational structure or operational practices, and are not needed for effective coordination among the relevant component agencies. This action will remove unnecessary regulatory burden and align the Department’s enforcement strategy with modern, effective, and flexible coordination models already in use.

DATES: This final rule is effective [INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For further information regarding responsibilities of the Employment and Training Administration, contact Kimberly Vitelli, Administrator, Office of Workforce Investment, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, Room C-4526, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210. For further information regarding responsibilities of the Wage and Hour Division, contact Daniel Navarrete, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, Room S-3502, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210, telephone: (202) 693-0406 (this is not a toll-free number). For further information regarding responsibilities of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, contact Erin Gilmore, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, Room N-3107, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210, telephone: (202) 693-2100 (this is not a toll-free number). For persons with a hearing or speech disability who need assistance using the telephone system, please dial 711 to access telecommunications relay services.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and History

The Department promulgated the regulations at 29 CFR part 42 (Part 42) in 1980 to improve coordination among its component agencies in enforcing protections for migrant farmworkers.¹ The purpose of the regulations is to coordinate activities of the component agencies and to ensure effective enforcement efforts under “the protective statutes,” which included the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act (FLCRA) (later repealed),² the

¹ The regulation arose partly in response to litigation filed in the 1970s. *See* 45 FR 39486 (June 10, 1980) (stating that Part 42 represents part of a settlement agreement concluding litigation in *National Ass’n for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Western Region v. Brennan*, No. 2010-72 (D.D.C.)).

² *See* Pub. L. No. 97-470, § 523 (1983).

Occupational Safety and Health Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act, in order to “maximize ... effectiveness, yet minimize unnecessary duplication.” 29 CFR 42.2. Specifically, the regulations require the Department to establish and maintain several processes and structures, including: (1) a National Farm Labor Coordinated Enforcement Committee (National Committee) with membership by the Under Secretary of Labor (now the Deputy Secretary),³ the Solicitor of Labor, ETA, OSHA, and the Employment Standards Administration (ESA, a now-defunct agency that incorporated WHD at the time the Department promulgated Part 42),⁴ and supported by a staff level working group, to review the subagencies’ policies and enforcement strategies; (2) Regional Farm Labor Coordinated Enforcement Committees (Regional Committees); and (3) the development of enforcement strategies and coordination plans, both regionally and nationally. In addition, the regulations require the Department to designate Farm Labor Specialists in WHD and Compliance Officers in OSHA to serve as farm labor contact persons, and to collect and review specific data pertaining to enforcement of protective statutes to be reviewed by the National Committee and to be used to inform future agency efforts. The regulations also prescribe specific frequency of meetings for the National Committee and the Regional Committees, and public attendance at certain of these meetings.

For at least a decade after promulgating Part 42 in 1980, the Department maintained a National Committee and Regional Committees as prescribed in the regulations. The Department subsequently largely ceased maintaining those formal committees, although available records do not establish precisely when that occurred. Rather, as explained in more detail later in this preamble, the Department has since implemented more effective mechanisms that do not rely on the specific structures of Part 42 to ensure coordinated enforcement of the current migrant farmworker laws by WHD, ETA, and OSHA.

³ Department of Labor Executive Level Conforming Amendments of 1986, Pub. L. 99-619, sec. 2(a)(1), 100 Stat. 3491 (Nov. 6, 1986).

⁴ In 2009, ESA was dissolved, and the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division was delegated the relevant authorities of the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards. *See* Sec’y’s Order 9-2009, 74 FR 58836 (Nov. 13, 2009).

In 2024, a number of advocacy organizations—including commenter Sin Fronteras Organizing Project—filed a lawsuit alleging that the Department had failed to comply with Part 42. That litigation resulted in a settlement agreement in which the Department agreed to take certain steps to reconstitute the National Committee and Regional Committees and hold public meetings “for as long as the regulations at 29 C.F.R. Part 42 are in effect and unchanged.”⁵ The settlement agreement does not bar the Department from rescinding or modifying the regulation through the rulemaking process. The Department has complied with the settlement agreement since its effective date.

II. Proposal for Rescission

On July 1, 2025, the Department issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to rescind Part 42 because the regulation imposed outdated, unnecessary, and duplicative internal procedures; limited the Department’s discretion; and prevented the Department’s agencies from coordinating with regard to migrant farmworkers in more efficient, effective ways. 90 FR 28247. As detailed in the NPRM, the Department determined that Part 42 imposed stilted procedural mandates and organizational requirements that were outdated, had not been utilized in decades, and no longer reflected how the Department coordinated enforcement activity across its agencies. For instance, Part 42 referenced historical entities such as ESA, which was eliminated in 2009, imposed duties on the abolished offices of the Assistant Secretary for ESA and the ESA Regional Administrator, relied on repealed statutes such as the FLCRA (repealed in 1983), and mandated formal structures—such as national and regional enforcement committees, quarterly meetings, and designated contact personnel—that had long ago fallen into disuse.

Notwithstanding the dormancy of some structures and components set forth in Part 42, the Department has continued to conduct robust and effective enforcement related to migrant farmworkers through modern coordination mechanisms, including interagency working groups,

⁵ Stipulation and Order of Dismissal, *Farm Labor Organizing Committee, v. Su*, No. 24-706 (D.D.C. Dec. 9, 2024) (ECF No. 33).

task forces, and new statutory frameworks under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (MSPA) and the Immigration and Nationality Act's H-2A nonimmigrant visa program for temporary or seasonal agricultural workers. *See, e.g.*, 29 U.S.C. 1812, 1852; 8 U.S.C. 1188.

As described in the NPRM, OSHA has regularly hosted an agriculture task force that has engaged with agricultural concerns and issues in coordination with representatives from WHD and ETA. The task force was designed to identify, review, update, and develop OSHA's agricultural guidance products, including regulations and web pages. The task force contributed to several new agricultural guidance products over the years, including a 2017 update to OSHA's Agricultural Operations Safety and Health Topics web page with links to information ranging from heat illness prevention to youth employment in agriculture.⁶ Likewise, the NPRM stated that other Departmental initiatives reflect the Department's ongoing commitment to cross-agency coordination at the national and regional levels. For example, ETA Regional Monitor Advocates often host meetings for the relevant State Workforce Agencies, which representatives from WHD attend.

Additionally, the NPRM stated that the Department maintains contact and exchanges information with farm labor groups and the public on issues relating to the employment of migrant and seasonal farmworkers on an ongoing basis. As part of the Department's regular stakeholder engagement, OSHA, WHD and ETA all maintain contacts and meet with farmworker groups, as part of public outreach, roundtables, and conferences, at both the national and the regional level. The ETA National Monitor Advocate regularly meets with farmworker groups and, each year during harvest season, visits States with high numbers of migrant and seasonal farmworkers to meet with State Workforce Agencies and organizations that represent farmworkers.

⁶ Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. "Agricultural Operations - Overview." <https://www.osha.gov/agricultural-operations>. Accessed June 18, 2026.

Part 42 reflects an outdated legal landscape and depends on a bygone Departmental structure that made it increasingly difficult to implement the requirements of the regulation, as drafted. The Department further believes that the current coordination efforts of OSHA, ETA, and WHD more effectively address the employment-related problems faced by migrant farmworkers; are coordinated to maximize their effectiveness and minimize unnecessary duplication; and assure that employers of migrant farmworkers are complying with the laws that the Department enforces. Therefore, the Department suggested in the NPRM that Part 42 imposed bureaucratic obligations that did not allow for effective and efficient coordination outcomes, and that its continued presence in the Code of Federal Regulations was no longer necessary.

Accordingly, the Department proposed to rescind the rule in its entirety under its general housekeeping and procedural authority at 5 U.S.C. 301 and consistent with Executive Order (E.O.) 14192 (Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation), 90 FR 9065 (Jan. 31, 2025), which directs agencies to eliminate unnecessary or obsolete regulations. As discussed later in this preamble, after reviewing all eight comments received, the Department is finalizing the rule as proposed.

III. Discussion of Final Rule

The NPRM invited comments from the public concerning this rescission of regulations for coordinated migrant farmworker labor law enforcement activities; the comment period closed on September 2, 2025. During the 60-day public comment period, the Department received a total of eight comment submissions. The comments received on the NPRM may be viewed at <https://www.regulations.gov> by entering docket number ETA-2025-0003.

The Department has considered these comments and has decided to finalize the rescission of Part 42 as proposed. After reviewing the rule's history, the regulatory record, and the considerations raised by commenters, the Department concludes that Part 42 no longer serves a meaningful operational purpose, it imposes unnecessary duplication of efforts and outdated

procedural requirements, and it is not needed to ensure effective enforcement of labor protections for migrant farmworkers.

Eight comments were submitted in opposition to the proposed rescission. These included submissions from legal advocacy organizations, a State interagency committee, nonprofit worker advocates, a State Workforce Agency, and one individual. While the commenters expressed concern that rescinding Part 42 might weaken enforcement or coordination, the Department finds that its proven ability to coordinate enforcement for decades without reliance on Part 42, as described later in this preamble, allays any concern that rescinding Part 42 might weaken enforcement or coordination.

Commenters such as the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP), the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), the National Employment Law Project (NELP), Texas RioGrande Legal Aid (TRLA), and Michigan's Interagency Migrant Services Committee (IMSC) asserted that Part 42 is essential to protect farmworkers and ensure cross-agency enforcement coordination. The Department disagrees, particularly because the commenters did not acknowledge or take into account certain activities and practices that the Department has developed over time, as set forth in this rule, or the substantive inefficacy of the bureaucratic requirements required. As noted in the NPRM and reiterated here, for several years the Department has not relied on some of the functions enumerated in Part 42 as it has successfully fulfilled the intended purposes of those engagements, both internal to the Department and with external stakeholders, through other more effective avenues. Although commenters cited a 2017 Midwest regional meeting as the most recent example of activity under the rule, the Department did not consistently implement these structures until the settlement agreement required some activities similar to those named in the regulation. The National Committee and Regional Committees, coordination plans, and required public meetings were not maintained in practice. Instead, the Department has played a key role in carrying out the types of enforcement and coordination activities intended by the Department when first creating these regulations.

Examples of Departmental coordination include, but are not limited to, participation in monthly Departmental Agriculture Taskforce meetings in which component agencies share information about enforcement as well as education and outreach activities in agriculture; quarterly Regional Agriculture Coordination calls that include regional and national representation of each component agency for information sharing; and recurring coordination calls among agencies to discuss ongoing and emerging issues. Additionally, each agency engages in planning enforcement strategies, conducting stakeholder outreach and engagement, developing and reviewing policies, providing referrals to appropriate agencies, and conducting deconfliction to prevent overlap, resolve conflicts, and ensure coordinated, efficient operations.

For example, OSHA continues to maintain and regularly update its Agricultural Operations Safety and Health Topics web page, which provides employers and workers with information regarding agricultural hazards, OSHA standards applicable to agriculture, hazard controls, publications, training materials, and compliance assistance resources. OSHA's agricultural guidance addresses hazards including heat exposure, grain bins and silos, hazardous machinery, falls, chemicals, respiratory hazards, noise exposure, vehicle hazards, and youth worker safety. These resources include materials addressing tractor and harvester hazards, grain handling hazards, heat illness prevention, confined-space hazards on farms, electrocution hazards, emergency preparedness, personal protective equipment, and youth worker protections in agriculture. OSHA makes these resources available in multiple formats, including fact sheets, QuickCards, hazard alerts, training materials, and multilingual publications.

Furthermore, the Department's approach to rulemaking in this space reflects its commitment to ongoing coordination. ETA and WHD regularly issue joint regulations addressing the needs of farmworkers, and in the process meet with stakeholders about the implementation and enforcement of those regulations. For example, in 2025, ETA and WHD jointly proposed to amend the regulations governing the certification of agricultural labor or services performed by H-2A workers and the enforcement of the obligations applicable to

employers of such nonimmigrant workers. *See* 90 FR 28919 (July 2, 2025). In 2022, WHD and ETA issued a joint report to Congress about the Department's enforcement related to farm labor contractors. *See* https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/WHD/h2a/H-2A_Report2022.pdf. Additionally, WHD regularly hosts a Virtual Agricultural Seminar that is open to the public, provides guidance on Federal labor rules pertaining to the agricultural industry, and has at times included representatives from ETA.

Despite the dormancy of some structures and components set forth in Part 42, the Department has continued to conduct enforcement actions⁷ (e.g., investigations, audits, inspections, site visits) and coordinate effectively across WHD, OSHA, and ETA through mechanisms that do not rely on Part 42, including those provided by statutes and regulations that did not exist when Part 42 was promulgated. These include informal working groups, joint investigations, strategic referrals, and targeted interagency initiatives, none of which are dependent on or enhanced by the mandates in Part 42. The Department continues to carry out effective enforcement to safeguard the nation's workforce as illustrated by the high violation rate yielded by its enforcement actions, many of which involve targeted initiatives to focus limited investigative resources on employers that commit egregious violations.

Since Part 42 was promulgated in 1980, Congress has enacted major statutory frameworks specifically aimed at protecting migrant farmworkers. These include MSPA, which established comprehensive labor protections for farmworkers and significantly expanded the enforcement authority of WHD. Congress also enacted the H-2A visa program under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, creating a formal process for the employment of temporary foreign agricultural workers subject to Department-administered labor standards, which necessarily involves close collaboration between ETA on the certification side and WHD on the enforcement side of the H-2A program. In response, the Department has developed

⁷ The Department's enforcement data are available through the Open Data Portal at <https://data.dol.gov/>.

detailed regulations, enforcement strategies, and staffing structures under both MSPA and H-2A that did not exist when Part 42 was adopted. The Department has successfully relied on *these* regulations and programs—that is, the MSPA and H-2A regulations, not Part 42—including related outreach, to protect migrant farmworkers. The Department maintains its commitment to stakeholder engagement and outreach as essential to obtaining meaningful feedback, building trust, maintaining strong relationships, and strengthening outcomes. In furtherance of those efforts, the Department’s activities include, but are not limited to, component agencies participating in recurring conferences; ad hoc meetings with farmworker advocacy groups and other stakeholders; and agricultural initiative outreach work. For example, WHD hosts and participates in hundreds of outreach events each year where most are led by Community Outreach and Resource Planning Specialists (CORPS). CORPS are the primary contacts for stakeholders and public engagement and outreach. They schedule in-person and virtual events regularly throughout the nation. ETA’s Employment Service regulations continue to require several coordination points, including the referral of complaints to enforcement agencies, cross-referencing debarment lists, and discontinuation due to final determinations from enforcement agencies.

Several commenters, including AFOP, CLASP, and IMSC, urged the Department to retain and revise Part 42 by updating outdated statutory and organizational references (*e.g.*, replacing outdated references to the FLCRA or ESA) rather than eliminating the regulation entirely. The Department considered this approach but concluded that revision is not appropriate. The problems with Part 42 are not limited to terminology; they extend to the entire regulatory framework. The rule mandates organizational structures and processes that do not reflect the way the Department has operated for decades. Nor do these processes account for new statutes enacted by Congress to protect farmworkers. Updating outdated names would not address the fact that the core features of the regulation have not been needed in decades and are not relevant to current enforcement operations. In fact, the rescission of Part 42 enables the Department to

minimize unnecessary duplication, and to adapt to evolving processes, program demands, and realities inherent to the cross-agency coordination and engagements with public stakeholders without being limited by processes and structures designed over 40 years ago.

Some commenters, notably TRLA and CLASP, argued that rescinding Part 42 could violate the terms of the Department's 2024 court-approved settlement agreement in *Farm Labor Organizing Committee v. Su*. The Department disagrees. The settlement agreement expressly states that its terms apply only "for as long as the regulations at 29 C.F.R. Part 42 are in effect and unchanged." Therefore, the settlement agreement explicitly preserves the Department's discretion to modify or rescind the regulation through notice-and-comment rulemaking. The Department has complied with all terms of the settlement agreement since its effective date and is under no legal obligation to retain Part 42. Rescission is therefore fully consistent with the settlement agreement.

NELP, TRLA, and others argued that rescission of Part 42 is arbitrary and capricious, stating that the Department did not sufficiently justify in the NPRM how the regulation posed insurmountable restrictions on the Department's enforcement capabilities and suggesting that the Department update and revise Part 42 instead of removing it in its entirety. The Department disagrees. As the NPRM and this final rule make clear, the rescission is based on a reasoned and well-documented determination: Part 42 has not been consistently implemented for decades; its structures are outdated and inconsistent with current agency operations, which are centered around statutes and regulations that protect migrant farmworkers and were enacted after Part 42 was promulgated; it has not contributed to enforcement outcomes for decades; and coordination among ETA, WHD, and OSHA continues to occur effectively without it. The Administrative Procedure Act does not require agencies to retain outdated and unnecessary procedural regulations, particularly where enforcement activities are demonstrably robust in the regulation's absence. Agencies may amend or repeal a rule so long as they provide a reasoned explanation for the change. *See Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro*, 579 U.S. 211, 221 (2016). Here, where the

Department has determined that Part 42 was outdated, overly bureaucratic, and unnecessary, and where the Department has demonstrated its commitment to robust and effective enforcement through modern coordination mechanisms outside of Part 42, the Department believes that rescission of Part 42 is reasonable.

Some commenters, including CLASP and IMSC, expressed concern that rescission would eliminate public regional meetings and diminish opportunities for stakeholders to engage directly with the Department. While the Department values public input and stakeholder engagement, mandating a specific meeting structure codified in 1980 is not necessary to ensure meaningful communication. Instead, the Department has increasingly relied on more flexible and inclusive forms of engagement, including stakeholder roundtables, listening sessions, direct outreach, electronic communications, and virtual forums. These modern approaches reflect current communication practices, enhance accessibility, and allow for more timely and responsive interaction with farmworker advocates and other stakeholders than formalities born of a meeting structure with roots in pre-digital practices. Current methods of engagement will continue regardless of the rescission of Part 42. Further, the Department's representatives at these engagements include personnel from its Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy who can hear firsthand from stakeholders and effectively implement policy changes consistent with the Department's priorities and objectives. Moreover, advocacy groups and any other third party have always had, and continue to have, access to the Department, including the potential to file a complaint on a worker's behalf. In the Department's district offices throughout the nation, many stakeholders have collaborative working, symbiotic relationships at the local level.

The comments opposing rescission were considered in full but do not provide a compelling basis for retaining a regulation that is unnecessary and no longer reflects the Department's internal structure or enforcement strategy. The Department finds that rescinding Part 42 will promote administrative clarity, eliminate obsolete and unused procedural mandates,

and support modernized enforcement coordination, allowing the Department to continue to be flexible and nimble in addressing new challenges and opportunities.

Accordingly, the Department is finalizing the rescission of Part 42 in its entirety.

IV. Procedural and Other Matters

A. Review Under Executive Order 12866

E.O. 12866, “Regulatory Planning and Review,” 58 FR 51735 (Oct. 4, 1993), requires agencies, to the extent permitted by law, to (1) propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that its benefits justify its costs (recognizing that some benefits and costs are difficult to quantify); (2) tailor regulations to impose the least burden on society, consistent with obtaining regulatory objectives, taking into account, among other things, and to the extent practicable, the costs of cumulative regulations; (3) select, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those approaches that maximize net benefits; (4) to the extent feasible, specify performance objectives, rather than specifying the behavior or manner of compliance that regulated entities must adopt; and (5) identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives to encourage the desired behavior, such as user fees or marketable permits, or providing information upon which choices can be made by the public.

Section 6(a) of E.O. 12866 also requires agencies to submit “significant regulatory actions” to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) for review. OIRA has determined that this final rule does not constitute a “significant regulatory action” under section 3(f) of E.O. 12866. Accordingly, this final rule was not submitted to OIRA for review under E.O. 12866.

B. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) requires preparation of an initial regulatory flexibility analysis and a final regulatory flexibility analysis (FRFA) for any rule that by law must be proposed for public comment, unless the agency certifies that the rule, if

promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The Department reviewed this rescission under the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. The regulation the Department is rescinding pertains to procedures within the Department for the coordination of enforcement activities by WHD, OSHA, and ETA relating to migrant farmworkers, so there is no impact on small entities. Therefore, the Department concludes that the impacts of the rescission would not have a “significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities,” and that the preparation of an FRFA is not warranted.

C. Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

This rescission imposes no information collection or record-keeping requirements. Accordingly, Office of Management and Budget clearance is not required under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

D. Review Under Executive Order 13132

E.O. 13132, “Federalism,” 64 FR 43255 (Aug. 10, 1999), imposes certain requirements on Federal agencies formulating and implementing policies or regulations that preempt State law or that have federalism implications. E.O. 13132 requires agencies to examine the constitutional and statutory authority supporting any action that would limit the policymaking discretion of the States and to carefully assess the necessity for such actions. E.O. 13132 also requires agencies to have an accountable process to ensure meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications.

The Department has examined this rescission and has determined that it does not have a substantial direct effect on the States, on the relationship between the Federal government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

E. Review Under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) requires each Federal agency to assess the effects of Federal regulatory actions on State, local, and Tribal governments and the private sector. Pub. L. 104-4, sec. 201 (codified at 2 U.S.C. 1531). For a regulatory action likely to result in a rule that may cause the expenditure by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector of \$100 million or more in any one year (adjusted annually for inflation), section 202 of UMRA requires a Federal agency to publish a written statement that estimates the resulting costs, benefits, and other effects on the national economy. 2 U.S.C. 1532(a), (b). The UMRA also requires a Federal agency to develop an effective process to permit timely input by elected officers of State, local, and Tribal governments on a “significant intergovernmental mandate,” and requires an agency plan for giving notice and opportunity for timely input to potentially affected small governments before establishing any requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect them.

The Department examined this rescission according to UMRA and its statement of policy and determined that the rescission does not contain a Federal intergovernmental mandate, nor is it expected to require expenditures of \$100 million or more in any one year by State, local, and Tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector. As a result, the analytical requirements of UMRA do not apply.

F. Executive Order 13175 (Indian Tribal Governments)

The Department has reviewed this final rule under the terms of E.O. 13175 and the Department’s Tribal Consultation Policy and has concluded that the changes to regulatory text will not have Tribal implications. These changes do not have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian Tribes, the relationship between the Federal government and Indian Tribes, nor the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Tribal governments.

G. Plain Language

E.O. 12866, E.O. 13563, and the Presidential Memorandum of June 1, 1998 (Plain Language in Government Writing), direct executive departments and agencies to use plain language in all rulemaking documents published in the *Federal Register*. The goal is to make the government more responsive, accessible, and understandable in its communications with the public. Accordingly, the Department drafted this final rule in plain language.

List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 42

Law enforcement, Migrant labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

PART 42—[REMOVED AND RESERVED]

For the reasons stated in the preamble, and under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 301, the Department removes and reserves 29 CFR part 42.

Marek Laco,

Acting Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training.

David Keeling,

Assistant Secretary, Occupational Safety and Health.

Andrew B. Rogers,

Administrator, Wage and Hour Division.

[FR Doc. 2026-17726 Filed: 8/28/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 8/31/2026]