

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 91, No. 194

Thursday, October 8, 2026

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

[Docket No. APHIS–2021–0081]

Notice of Decision To Deregulate *Chrysanthemum* White Rust and the Importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. Cuttings, and *In Vitro* Plantlets, and Synonymous Taxa From Certain Countries Into the Continental United States

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We are advising the public of our decision to deregulate *Chrysanthemum* White Rust and authorize the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. cuttings, *in vitro* plantlets, and synonymous taxa from certain countries into the continental United States as described in this notice. Based on the findings of the pest risk analyses, which we made available to the public for review and comment through a previous notice, we modified and updated the commodity import evaluation and pest list documents and determined that the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. cuttings, *in vitro* plantlets, and synonymous genera from certain countries does not pose a risk of introducing quarantine pests into the United States.

DATES: Imports may be authorized beginning November 9, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Heather Coady and Ms. Shannon Jarman, Regulatory Policy Specialist, Plants for Planting Policy, PPQ, APHIS, 5601 Sunnyside Ave., Beltsville, MD 20705; (240) 935–1598; PPQ.NAPPPRA@USDA.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under the regulations in “Subpart H—Plants for Planting” (7 CFR 319.37–1 through 319.37–23, referred to below as the regulations), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) prohibits or restricts the importation of plants for planting into the United States from certain parts of the world to prevent plant pests from being introduced into or disseminated within the United States.

Section 319.37–4 provides that certain taxa of plants for planting are not authorized for importation into the United States pending pest risk analysis (NAPPPRA) to prevent the introductions of quarantine pests into the United States. Paragraph (e) of that section describes the process of removing a taxon from the NAPPPRA list. Under that process, APHIS proposes the importation of the taxon into the United States if, based on findings of a pest risk analysis, we determine that taxon-specific restrictions can mitigate the pest risk associated with the importation of that taxon. APHIS then publishes a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing the availability of the pest risk analysis in response to the request to remove taxa from the NAPPPRA list. Following the close of the comment period, APHIS will issue a subsequent **Federal Register** notice announcing whether or not we will remove the taxa.

In accordance with that process, we published a notice ¹ in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 2023 (88 FR 23390–23391, Docket No. APHIS–2021–0081) in which we announced the availability, for review and comment, of pest risk analyses. One of the analyses evaluated the risks associated with the importation of *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa cuttings (stems, leaves) and *in vitro* plantlets under a systems approach from Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Germany, Guatemala, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Spain, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Kingdom, and Vietnam into the continental United States. The 20

countries referenced above submitted a request related to the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. and synonymous genera cuttings and *in vitro* plantlets. The other analysis evaluated the risk associated with the importation of cuttings, *in vitro* tissue culture plantlets, *in vitro* tissue culture plants with roots, and bare-root plants of the same taxa from Canada under a separate protocol and in response to a request from Canada.

We also made available an economic evaluation (EE) analyzing *Chrysanthemum* White Rust’s (CWR) regulatory status pursuant to biological research that revealed CWR can be systemic and survive in below-ground parts. (The EE was initially completed in 2019; however, APHIS reviewed the document in September 2026 and confirmed that the 2019 data analyzed remains accurate.) Through the EE, APHIS determined that the United States eradication policy for CWR is no longer technically and economically justified. Specifically, APHIS found that efforts to eradicate CWR are costly because the pathogen can overwinter and survive in dormant below-ground parts, with a latency of expression. Additionally, APHIS found that fungicides are available and provide growers with a compliance alternative at a fraction of the cost of the value of a *chrysanthemum* plant. To that end, APHIS determined that CWR is no longer considered a pest of quarantine significance and should be moved to a management phase.

We solicited comments on the notice for 60 days, ending on June 16, 2023. We received 13 comments by that date.

In response to the initial notice of availability, several commenters noted that we did not delineate “synonymous genera” and requested that the intended taxa be included by that term. Based on these comments, APHIS modified and updated the pest lists to clarify and refine references to regulatory taxa, consolidated both pest lists into one list, and revised the Commodity Import Evaluation Document (CIED). In addition, APHIS updated the list of affected nations and genera referenced in these documents to ensure that all descriptions are clear and accurate and in alignment with the regulations. Outside of the 20 countries identified in this notice, NAPPPRA still applies to all other countries to prevent the

¹ To view the notice and the supporting documents, go to www.regulations.gov. Enter APHIS–2021–0081 in the Search field.

introductions of quarantine pests into the United States. As a result, 7 CFR 319.5 requires the national plant protection organization (NPPPO) of such countries to submit a request for possible changes to import requirements for plants for planting from the countries, and § 319.37–4 of the regulations requires APHIS to conduct a pest risk analysis and take public comment using a notice-based process before removing certain taxa of plants for planting for importation into the U.S. from a requesting country.

In accordance with § 319.37–4(ii), on May 27, 2025, we published a subsequent notice in the **Federal Register** (90 FR 22225–22226, Docket No. APHIS–2021–0081) reopening the comment period to allow interested persons time to review the revised supporting documents. We solicited comments on the notice for 30 days, ending on June 26, 2025. We received 21 comments by that date.

APHIS received comments from businesses that import, export, and distribute flowers, trade associations, as well as local and foreign governments. Most commenters supported deregulating CWR and the systems approach for imports. Other commenters opposed to deregulating CWR noted concerns with the pest risks and compliance measures for movement. In addition, a few commenters provided technical comments regarding the CIED and economic comments. The comments are discussed below.

Commenters in support of deregulating CWR stated that deregulation would reduce the impact on growers and stated that the technical basis for maintaining federal quarantine for CWR no longer exists. Others stated that deregulating CWR aligns with U.S. phytosanitary policy.

APHIS agrees with the commenters. As detailed in the EE that accompanied the initial notice, the eradication policy for CWR is no longer technically and economically justified.

General Comments

One commenter stated that deregulating CWR opens trade channels and aligns with international best practices. Specifically, the commenter stated that the current restriction has limited innovation and has placed U.S. growers at a disadvantage in global markets. The commenter added that opening trade channels supports a more dynamic, diverse, and economically resilient ornamental plant industry. In addition, the commenter claimed that it would align with international best

practices and reduce unnecessary trade barriers.

APHIS agrees that deregulating CWR opens trade channels and aligns with international best practices. Based on our EE, APHIS determined that CWR is no longer considered to be a quarantine pest and that moving CWR to a management phase is appropriate and aligns with the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM).

On the other hand, some commenters stated that the proposed pathway of regulatory change would encourage a reduction of regulatory harmonization between U.S. and Canada and cause unintended trade disruption. One commenter requested that APHIS consider a working group with APHIS and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) on a coordinated approach to deregulation in order to minimize any potential trade disruptions.

In response to these comments, CFIA has repeatedly indicated to APHIS that they intend to harmonize with the U.S. on the deregulation of CWR. This will include harmonization through the U.S.-Canada Greenhouse-Grown Plant Certification Program (GCP), and requiring a phytosanitary certificate with an additional declaration regarding the pests of concern from the pest list for Canadian origin *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa being shipped other than under the GCP program or systems approach. As explained in the CIED and in the technical requirements document of the GCP referenced in the CIED, the GCP is a bilateral audit-based export certification program wherein facilities authorized by APHIS or CFIA must meet all of the phytosanitary import requirements of both the U.S. and Canada in addition to completing all requirements of the GCP. A working group with APHIS and CFIA representatives related to this matter already exists and communicates frequently with each other to promote alignment of regulatory approaches between the U.S. and Canada.

Some commenters expressed concerns that deregulation could prove disruptive to U.S. exports to Canada. The commenters stated that the GCP was not designed to address possible deregulation of CWR, and that Canadian exports would thus have to be accompanied by a phytosanitary certificate. The commenters opined that the implementation of the proposed deregulation would result in additional restrictions on U.S. exporters of chrysanthemums to Canada due to their plants being deemed ineligible for entry

into Canada under the GCP or under a phytosanitary certificate.

As noted above, Canada has indicated to APHIS that they intend to harmonize with the U.S. on deregulation of CWR, including within the GCP. As noted in the CIED, APHIS has determined that the measures and requirements of the GCP are equivalent to the systems approach required for the above-specified NAPPRA countries. The minimum standards for the places of production in the GCP meet most requirements in the systems approach program above. Furthermore, these GCP facilities have a minimum of two audits annually, which encourages compliance.

Three commenters opposed to deregulating CWR on imported plants for planting stated concerns with the biological security of U.S. ornamental and agricultural industries and the impact on domestic producers work towards pathogen-free propagation systems. For example, according to the commenters, CWR is very contagious within a mum planting, and can be spread to other plantings by wind during rainy weather. One of these commenters indicated that the domestic chrysanthemum industry has done an effective job under the current domestic eradication protocols at controlling outbreaks of CWR and managing its spread. Another commenter stated that CWR should remain regulated in order to protect native chrysanthemum species within the United States.

For reasons set forth in the EE that accompanied the initial notice, we disagree that the current domestic eradication-based protocols are proving effective. As noted in the EE, chrysanthemum cuttings imported for propagation have largely been from South America, Europe and Africa; however, the sources of outbreaks in Eastern States were likely from California rather than from imports. The EE also noted that the linked genotypes between the West Coast and East Coast appear to indicate that CWR is endemic within the United States.

We acknowledge CWR has limited host range and spore survival with limited natural distribution. However, as noted in the EE, CWR spores can overwinter in below-ground parts, such as roots, and the disease can become systemic but asymptomatic in affected plants. Provided that CWR is likely already established in the environment, APHIS' position remains that the removal of the CWR eradication policy may be the most efficient option from society's benefit-cost point of view. To that end, best management practices are available for growers to manage disease

occurrences economically. Similarly, we disagree that Federal control of CWR is warranted. The ability of *P. horiana* to overwinter and survive in plants renders it costly to eliminate in accordance with the current domestic eradication protocols, and available fungicides are effective and economical alternatives to compliance with the current domestic eradication protocols. APHIS is aware of six fungicides that are labeled for general use for CWR, however the total number of fungicides in use varies among States. Finally, while the commenter did not specify which purportedly native species of chrysanthemum they had in mind, *Chrysanthemum arcticum*, in northern, coastal Alaska, is the only known native species within the United States. Due to climatic conditions in northern, coastal Alaska, this species will not be significantly impacted by deregulation of CWR due to the limited distribution of *Chrysanthemum arcticum* in northern coastal Alaska.

Two commenters expressed concern that overseas production systems for chrysanthemums may not be equivalent to domestic production systems for chrysanthemums, and relaxing import restrictions could, the commenters indicated, result in the introduction of other pests and diseases into the domestic production system.

The systems approach that we proposed for chrysanthemum imports is designed to have equivalent safeguards to those used by U.S. ornamental and agricultural industries. The mitigations proposed for imports would control many pests, not just CWR and the pests identified in the pest list, and the justification for their efficacy, which the commenters did not directly challenge, was detailed at length in the revised CIED that we issued. Additionally, with respect to Canada, as noted above, the GCP program is a bilateral program ran jointly by CFIA and APHIS, and all import requirements of both Canada and the U.S. must be met for authorized facilities to import.

One commenter stated that, instead of deregulation of CWR, additional resources should be devoted to hiring and training additional resources as identifiers and eradicators of CWR.

The EE indicates that eradication under the current protocol would be increasingly costly and resource intensive with limited feasibility of success. As stated above, fungal pathogens like *P. horiana* can infect plants systemically, even when they appear asymptomatic, which provides a mechanism for overwintering and long-term survival in the environment. This undermines eradication efforts because

plants can harbor early-stage infections that are unable to be visually detected. Furthermore, CWR is likely already endemic throughout the United States, which further complicates the current eradication protocol. As noted in the EE, many potted plants are sold for landscape use in local U.S. areas. As a result, the number of backyards and other sites that would require inspections to effectively eliminate the disease would be burdensome. Additionally, chrysanthemum hobbyists often exchange cuttings. This swapping has created another pathway for spreading CWR making it difficult to regulate. To that end, APHIS maintains that the EE's conclusions are correct and that CWR should not be considered a quarantine pest subject to Federal eradication protocols.

With that being said, we do acknowledge that maintaining technical expertise in diagnostic capabilities in the identification and management of plant pathogens is important, and APHIS devotes both Federally appropriated and user-fee funds to this purpose. We will also continue to collaborate with State agencies, industry partners, and diagnostic networks to ensure robust early response to new plant pest outbreaks.

The same commenter expressed the opinion that CWR deregulation would directly contribute to increased fungicide usage, which the commenter considered to have a negative environmental impact.

APHIS acknowledges that there could potentially be an increase in fungicide usage, provided that the usage varies by State. However, fungicide usage remains subject to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA, 7 U.S.C. 136–136y) which allows for the registration of pesticides if it is determined that the product will not cause “unreasonable adverse effects on the environment.”² To that end, APHIS is confident that any increased fungicide usage will not cause substantial economic and environmental costs.

Finally, the commenter encouraged USDA to develop policy to support farmers who grow native and heirloom varieties, rather than non-native species such as *Chrysanthemum* spp.

This comment is outside the scope of this notice.

² 7 U.S.C. 136(bb) defines the term “unreasonable adverse effects on the environment” to mean: “(1) any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide, or (2) a human dietary risk from residues that result from a use of a pesticide in or on any food inconsistent with the standard under section 346a of title 21.”

Systems Approach Comments

Several commenters noted concerns with the proposed systems approach. APHIS proposed that a written agreement, known as an Operational Work Plan (OWP), would have to be established and signed by APHIS and the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of the exporting country to outline the conditions for producing and monitoring plant production.

Some commenters stated that the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. and related genera should be regarded as normal trade, and therefore not subject to an OWP but rather treated equivalently to cuttings or in-vitro material from other admissible plant commodities, which are not subject to an OWP requirement.

The commenters misunderstand the manner in which the initial notice was developed. As long as CWR remained of quarantine significance, the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. and related genera from CWR-affected countries remained subject to CWR-specific restrictions and prohibitions.

Based on the findings of our EE, we determined that CWR should no longer be considered of quarantine significance. This allowed for possible analysis of the plant pest risks associated with the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. and related genera other than those posed by CWR, and predicated on the possible removal of CWR-specific restrictions and prohibitions. This, in turn, made other sections of the regulations operative.

Section 319.37–20 of the regulations provides restrictions on the importation of specific types of plants for planting. As described in this section, changing the import status of taxa involves pest risk analysis and measures related to the pests found. The PRA identified several pests which require specific mitigations that must be adhered to within the exporting country in a standardized manner that aligns with the CIED. Based on this information, APHIS found that a systems approach program, subject to an OWP, is required to ensure that every grower adheres to the requirements outlined in the CIED.

On the other hand, commenters in support of the systems approach stated that CWR needs to move from a quarantine and eradication phase to a management phase. Supporters noted that the systems approach focuses on high phytosanitary standards to prevent infection, with appropriate auditing and inspection by APHIS, as well as pathogen prevention and control on part of the U.S. grower. Others noted that

they have confidence in the industry's ability to safely manage the importation of the cuttings and plantlets under the systems approach. The commenters also noted that both domestic and offshore growers have access to new and effective fungicides with systemic activity, capable of controlling CWR and other pathogens. It is their belief that CWR falls into the management category and should no longer be considered a pathogen of quarantine concern.

APHIS agrees with these commenters. The systems approach recommended is in accordance with the integrated pest risk management measures (IPRMM) in § 319.37–21 of the regulations. To that end, APHIS is confident that the systems approach of moving CWR to a management phase is appropriate for the reasons described in the CIED.

Some commenters raised issues with source cuttings from a third country subsequently sold or finished in the United States. It is general APHIS policy that all third-country origin chrysanthemum are required to meet the same requirements when re-exported from outside the United States as they would directly into the United States. Below, we discuss different scenarios related to this issue.

For clarity, shipment among approved facilities is permissible under the systems approach, pursuant to certain conditions. Production that entails movement of the commodity among approved facilities within the same country is permissible because, if the chrysanthemums are from within the same country, the pest mitigations would be the same for all facilities. On the other hand, facilities in different countries are not guaranteed to have the same pest risk profile. In these situations, APHIS would consider requests to ship between countries with APHIS-approved facilities growing *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa on a case-by-case basis through the OWPs for the receiving countries. This would include identifying appropriate pest mitigation strategies to ensure the phytosanitary security of the plants moving between approved facilities in the different countries.

Though Canada currently restricts chrysanthemum import from countries other than the U.S., in the future if that status changes, APHIS would consider allowing Canada to re-export chrysanthemum to the United States if the plants met U.S. requirements when they entered Canada and the plants are shipped to the United States through the GCP.

Pest/Pest List Comments

Some commenters noted issues with specific pests and the PRA. One commenter stated that the supporting documents are insufficient and not ready for implementation. Specifically, the commenter stated that the proposed changes to the current chrysanthemum cuttings regulations will increase disease risks beyond CWR. The commenter further stated that there is a potential increase in two key viroid diseases, *Chrysanthemum Stunt Viroid* (CSVd) and *Chrysanthemum Chlorotic Mottle Viroid* (CChMVd), which are both mechanically transmissible and can spread easily through vegetative propagation.

CSVd is not a candidate for risk management because it occurs in the U.S. and is not under official control and CChMVd does not occur in any of the countries assessed.

Another commenter noted specific concerns about pest risk. The commenter requested the removal of the two lepidopterans, *Mamestra brassicae* and *Phlogophora meticulosa*, stating that they were not associated with the *Chrysanthemum* spp. and related genera and are also visually identifiable.

APHIS has determined that there is evidence that chrysanthemum and related species are hosts for *Mamestra brassicae* and *Phlogophora meticulosa*, as cited in the pest list document. So long as *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa propagative material are a potential pathway for the two lepidopterans to enter the U.S., APHIS is unable to remove the pests from the pest list as requested. Furthermore, the ability of a pest to be visually identified on a host commodity may impact the assigned risk rating; however, it has no impact on whether it is a pest of concern.

One commenter had concerns regarding the implementation and timeline of the program. Specifically, the commenter questioned how the OWP would be created, implemented and enforced; whether the plan would be incorporated into the existing Offshore Greenhouse Certification Program (OGCP); whether growers will be permitted to grow chrysanthemums in the same greenhouse as other genera; and whether media sterilized by steaming or other sanitation methods will be allowed.

Due to the systems approach requirements, *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa plants will not be

eligible for the OGCP, which operates under different requirements, and APHIS has no intentions to incorporate the OWP into the existing OGCP.

OWPs are created with the NPPOs for each country as requested. The OWP must describe the parties responsible for implementation and enforcement pursuant to § 319.37–21 of the regulations. Currently only plants that are generally admissible are eligible for the OGCP. *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa are not eligible for the OGCP due to being restricted taxa.

Next, more than one commodity may be grown in the same greenhouse provided that all import restrictions are met for all taxa being grown. This has no impact on the requirements in the CIED, specifically requirement 6, which states that “plants must be grown in approved greenhouses used solely for plants grown in compliance with the requirements outlined in the OWP.” The Agency’s intent is to address the requirements for growing other taxa in the greenhouse in the OWP on a case-by-case basis, as opposed to a general restriction. The language “plants in the greenhouse” refers to the plant listed in the OWPs, in this case *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa plants. Finally, growing media is not permitted if previously used; however, some sterilization methods may be considered, if requested, and would need APHIS’ approval and inclusion in the OWP.

A few commenters provided technical comments for the CIED. Some commenters mentioned concerns with quarantine-designated pests that conflict with international standards. Commenters stated that data for *Puccinia horiana*, *Liriomyza huidobrensis*, and *Thrips palmi* do not fulfill all criteria required to be designated as quarantine pests under international standards, which require the pest either to not be present in the United States or be present only in limited distribution and under official control. Specifically, they argued that *Puccinia horiana* is no longer considered a regulated pest for the U.S. and therefore no phytosanitary measures or additional declarations should be required. Furthermore, they argued that *Liriomyza huidobrensis* and *Thrips palmi* are not expected to follow the *in vitro* plant propagation pathway and therefore should be removed from the list of pests to be regulated for *in vitro* plants.

In the pest list, APHIS provided the reasons for the inclusion of the pests. *Pucciana horiana* was included to capture its quarantine significance at the time the pest list was finalized and prior to this deregulation. Contrary to the commenters' concerns, APHIS determined that there is a reasonable likelihood of *Liriomyza huidobrensis* and *Thrips palmi* following the *in vitro* plant propagation pathway from the countries those plant pests have been reported in as listed in the pest list. The comments suggesting the removal of *Liriomyza huidobrensis* and *Thrips palmi* do not meet the criteria for removal.

APHIS acknowledges that there are historic records of the presence of *Liriomyza huidobrensis* in California. However, molecular analysis³ shows that *L. huidobrensis* was misidentified, and only *L. langei* occurs there. APHIS found no other substantiated references for the presence of this pest in the U.S.; therefore, no changes to the pest list are needed.

Finally, *Thrips palmi* remains a quarantine pest for the United States and is therefore actionable at ports of entry. *Thrips palmi* is on the regulated pest list and is captured in the web-based database, the Agricultural Risk Management (ARM) system, which is used by APHIS and Customs and Border Protection to track agricultural imports, inspections, and pest quarantines. Currently, APHIS has no intention to change, and the scientific literature and port-of-entry pest interception used in formulating the Pest List do not warrant a change in, the status of the *Thrips palmi*. Additionally, the mitigations listed in the CIED would remain the same with the removal of *Thrips palmi* provided that the mitigations would apply to other arthropod pests on the pest list.

The Colombian NPPO raised an issue with regard to *Macronellicoccus hirsutus*. Their concern was that the pest is widespread in the United States and not under official control. Additionally, they noted that *M. hirsutus* has not been recorded affecting chrysanthemum production systems in Colombia and therefore should be removed from the list of pests to be regulated for trade in chrysanthemum propagating material of Colombian origin.

Other commenters noted concerns with the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs); specifically, ISPM No. 1 and ISPM No. 5. One commenter stated that in accordance with the principle of

transparency established in ISPM No. 1, since *M. hirsutus* is only present in the state of Florida, the detailed distribution of this pest in the U.S. should be included. Another commenter stated that *M. hirsutus* should not be a quarantine pest according to ISPM No. 5, which defines a quarantine pest as "a pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled."

As stated above, *M. hirsutus* is a quarantine pest and is therefore regulated at ports of entry. APHIS reviewed the States and references that were sent and determined that we are unable to confirm establishment of this species in many of the referenced States. However, APHIS agrees the distribution of *M. hirsutus* in the U.S. is likely wider than in the previous version of the pest list. To that end, APHIS revised the pest list to include additional States in the description of the distribution of *M. hirsutus* in the U.S.

With regard to the Colombian NPPO's comments about its absence in Colombia, there is evidence of *Chrysanthemum* and related species as hosts of *M. hirsutus* cited in the pest list document. Regardless of whether *M. hirsutus* has been reported on *Chrysanthemum* in Colombia, *Chrysanthemum* propagative material is still a potential pathway for *M. hirsutus* to enter the United States from other countries covered by the provisions of the revised CIED.

Other commenters, including the Netherlands, stated that there are viruses that are classified as quarantine pests in the CIED but are currently absent in their territory. The viruses mentioned were Carnation Italian Ringspot Virus (CIRV), Chrysanthemum stem necrosis virus (CSNV), and Tomato leaf curl New Delhi virus (ToLCNDV).

While addressing the comment from the Netherlands on CIRV, APHIS reevaluated the evidence of chrysanthemum as a host of this species. In 2015, a viral species termed CIRV was identified,⁴ however, this species had only 88% identity to a reference isolate of CIRV, which is below the 95% threshold normally used for considering isolates. As a result, we considered the association between CIRV and chrysanthemum to be tenuous and removed CIRV from the pest list.

For those viruses that are classified as quarantine pests in the CIED but absent in a territory, specifically CSNV and ToLCNDV, the pest list describes which

of the 21 countries where the pest is present. For example, CSNV is only listed as being present in Brazil and Belgium and ToLCNDV is only listed as being present in Spain and Tunisia. Accordingly, testing for CSNV will only be required for parental stock used in Brazil and Belgium and testing for ToLCNDV will only be required for parental stock plants used in Spain and Tunisia as specified in the NPPO's respective OWPs.

Finally, some commenters noted some economic concerns with the proposed deregulation. One commenter stated that foreign imports should be capped at current levels to mitigate oversupply. Another commenter stated that the costs of the current eradication policy outweigh the economic consequences.

APHIS' authority under the Plant Protection Act, as amended 7 U.S.C. 7701, *et seq.*, to prohibit or restrict imports is limited to when the Secretary determines that the prohibition or restriction is necessary to prevent the introduction or dissemination of a plant pest or noxious weed in the U.S., APHIS' authority does not extend to the control for market supply. To that end, APHIS agrees with the latter commenter in that the costs associated with deregulating CWR outweigh any economic consequences.

Therefore, in accordance with paragraph (e) of § 319.37–4 and paragraph (c)(2) of § 319.37–20, we are announcing that APHIS is revising conditions governing the importation of *Chrysanthemum* (= *Dendranthema*) spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa cuttings (stems, leaves) from Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Germany, Guatemala, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Spain, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Kingdom, and Vietnam into the continental United States in accordance with conditions specified in the final CIED that accompanies this notice. Additionally, we are providing public notification that we are no longer considering CWR a pest of quarantine significance either domestically or on imported products.

Congressional Review Act and Executive Order 12866

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs designated this action as not a major rule, as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2). This action has been designated not significant pursuant to Executive Order 12866.

³ For more information on the analysis see journal article here: <https://doi.org/10.1603/EC13279>.

⁴ For more information on the first report of CIRV see journal article here: <https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-03-15-0267-PDN>.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1633, 7701–7772, and 7781–7786; 21 U.S.C. 136 and 136a; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 29th day of September 2026.

Kelly Moore,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2026–20631 Filed 10–7–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

AGENCY: Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Announcement of public briefings.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission), and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), that a public briefing of the Alaska Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will hold a series of public briefings via Zoom. The purpose of the public briefings is to gather testimony on the Committee's chosen topic.

DATES:

Wednesday, October 21, 2026, from 10:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m. AKDT.

Tuesday, October 27, 2026, from 10:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m. AKDT.

ADDRESSES: The meetings will be held via Zoom.

- *October 21st Registration Link (Audio/Visual):* https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_jj5RU2S4Sbm4RzpXQDEHoA.

- *Join by Phone (Audio Only):* 1–833 435 1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: 165 748 4967.

- *October 27th Registration Link (Audio/Visual):* https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_jHFQQJYwQY2hC-IeTridVg.

- *Join by Phone (Audio Only):* 1–833 435 1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: 165 886 4405.

Agenda: <https://usccr.app.box.com/s/5bjsvzads12cnev37248zm13geu2cib>.
(Note: a final briefing agenda will be available prior to the briefing date).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kayla Fajota, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) at kfajota@usccr.gov, or (434) 515–2395.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This virtual committee meeting is available to the public through the registration link above. Any interested member of the public may join at the link to listen

to this meeting. An open comment period will be provided to allow members of the public to make a statement as time allows. Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, public minutes of the meeting will include a list of persons who are present at the meeting. If joining via phone, callers can expect to incur regular charges for calls they initiate over wireless lines, according to their wireless plan. The Commission will not refund any incurred charges. Callers will incur no charge for calls they initiate over land-line connections to the toll-free telephone number. Closed captioning is available by selecting “CC” in the Zoom meeting platform. To request additional accommodations, please email Angelica Trevino, Support Services Specialist at atrevino@usccr.gov at least 10 business days prior to the meeting.

Members of the public are entitled to submit written comments; the comments must be received within 30 days following the meeting. Written comments may be emailed to Kayla Fajota, Designated Federal Officer at kfajota@usccr.gov. Persons who desire additional information may contact the Regional Programs Coordination Unit at (434) 515–2395.

Records generated from this meeting may be inspected and reproduced at the Regional Programs Coordination Unit Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Records of the meetings will be available via the file sharing website: <https://usccr.app.box.com/folder/315009541404?s=4jyyw1lvvkvtldqp3sas9h0d3kdgkssi> as well as at: www.facadatabase.gov under the Commission on Civil Rights, selecting the Advisory Committee of interest. Persons interested in the work of this Committee are directed to the Commission's website, <http://www.usccr.gov>, or may contact the Regional Programs Coordination Unit at the above phone number.

Dated: October 6, 2026.

David Mussatt,

Supervisory Chief, Regional Programs Unit.

[FR Doc. 2026–20662 Filed 10–7–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting of the Oklahoma Advisory Committee

AGENCY: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

ACTION: Announcement of virtual business/briefing meetings.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Commission) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) that the Oklahoma Advisory Committee (Committee) to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will hold virtual business/briefing meetings via ZoomGov on Thursday, October 22nd from 3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. CT, Thursday, December 3rd from 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m. CT, Monday December 7th from 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m. and Thursday December 17, 2026 from 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m. CT. For the purpose of planning their upcoming panels on the death penalty and hearing from Panel IV and V.

DATES: The meetings will take place on Thursday, October 22, 2026 from 3:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. CT; Thursday, December 3, 2026 from 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m. CT, Monday, December 7, from 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m. CT and Thursday, December 17, 2026 from 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES:

Thursday, October 22, 2026 (Business Meeting)

Registration Link (Audio/Visual): https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_pEAM1frzQYqyf9p7D5KcmA.

- *Join by Phone (Audio Only):* 1–833–435–1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: #165 642 7696.

Thursday, December 3, 2026 (Briefing Panel IV Meeting)

Registration Link (Audio/Visual): https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_CcYfBW_5Sqi6xqwDj3oJZA.

- *Join by Phone (Audio Only):* 1–833–435–1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: #165 788 6924.

Monday, December 7, 2026 (Briefing Panel V Meeting)

Registration Link (Audio/Visual): https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_i5bvke_WRSySL2IptE0zLQ.

- *Join by Phone (Audio Only):* 1–833–435–1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: #165 761 4803.

Thursday, December 17, 2026 (Business Meeting)

Registration Link (Audio/Visual): https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_syB-8aHxTCu32QjyphBmw.

- *Join by Phone (Audio Only):* 1–833–435–1820 USA Toll Free; Webinar ID: #165 630 8536.

Agendas: (note: final meeting agendas will be available prior to the meeting dates)