

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.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

### Federal Agency Collaboration With State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Governments; Request for Comments

**AGENCY:** Administrative Conference of the United States (ACUS).

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of the Chairman of ACUS is requesting public input on Federal agency approaches and processes for collaborating with State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments when administering Federal programs. ACUS is accepting written comments. Responses to this request may inform an ongoing ACUS project, “Federal Agency Collaboration with State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Governments” which, if warranted, may recommend best practices for agencies to use.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received no later than 10 a.m. (ET) July 28, 2025.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit written comments by email to [info@acus.gov](mailto:info@acus.gov) (with “Federal Agency Collaboration with State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Governments” in the subject line of the message), or by U.S. Mail addressed to Federal Agency Collaboration with State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Governments, Administrative Conference of the United States, Suite 706 South, 1120 20th Street NW, Washington, DC 20036. ACUS will ordinarily post comments on the project web page (<https://www.acus.gov/projects/federal-agency-collaboration-state-local-tribal-and-territorial-governments>) as they are received. Commenters should not include information, such as personal information or confidential business information, that they do not wish to appear on the ACUS website. For the full ACUS public comment policy, please visit <https://www.acus.gov/policy/public-comment-policy>.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Becaja Caldwell, Attorney Advisor, Administrative Conference of the United States, 1120 20th Street NW, Suite 706 South, Washington, DC 20036; telephone (202) 480–2081; email [bcaldwell@acus.gov](mailto:bcaldwell@acus.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Administrative Conference Act, 5 U.S.C. 591–596, established the Administrative Conference of the United States. The Conference studies the efficiency, adequacy, and fairness of the administrative procedures used by Federal agencies and makes recommendations to agencies, the President, Congress, and the Judicial Conference of the United States for procedural improvements (5 U.S.C. 594(1)). For further information about the Conference and its activities, see [www.acus.gov](http://www.acus.gov).

### Federal Agency Collaboration With State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Governments

State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments (SLTTGs) play a critical role in administering many Federal programs. Approximately 81 percent of Federal statutes include provisions that contemplate some kind of collaboration—formal or informal—between Federal agencies and SLTTGs. When governments collaborate, they work together to produce more public value than they could produce on their own, promoting greater accountability, transparency, and innovation in the administration of Federal programs.

Such intergovernmental partnerships are critical for administering a wide array of Federal policies in myriad contexts.<sup>1</sup> For example, the Army collaborates with State and local environmental agencies when constructing water navigation projects.<sup>2</sup> Under the Affordable Care Act, States are responsible for implementing certain insurance-exchange provisions which the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) oversees.<sup>3</sup> In the law enforcement context, HHS and the Department of Justice are responsible for coordinating Federal, State, and local

law enforcement programs to control fraud and abuse with respect to health plans,<sup>4</sup> while the Drug Enforcement Administration pursues its enforcement efforts under the Controlled Substances Act with the help of State and local task forces.<sup>5</sup> The Federal Highway Administration and Bureau of Indian Affairs work in partnership with Tribal governments to facilitate Tribal transportation planning on Tribal lands.<sup>6</sup> Finally, the Department of Homeland Security oversees a National Network of Fusion Centers, in coordination with SLTTGs and other Federal partners, to facilitate threat-related information sharing among such entities.<sup>7</sup> These are just some examples of the many ways in which Federal agencies and SLTTGs partner to more effectively and efficiently deliver public services.

For these partnerships to be successful, officials must coordinate and cooperate effectively across government. However, there is limited research on how Federal agencies and SLTTGs work together to achieve successful partnerships. Through this project, ACUS is seeking to learn more about the laws and policies that govern and shape intergovernmental partnerships; the frequency and scale of Federal collaboration with SLTTGs; practical considerations that policymakers evaluate in structuring, implementing, and maintaining such partnerships; and challenges that administrators face in managing them. The project will result in a set of recommended best practices that Federal agencies can use to coordinate and collaborate more effectively with SLTTG partners.

<sup>4</sup> 42 U.S.C. 1320a–7c; see also Dep’t of Just. & Dep’t of Health & Hum. Servs., Annual Report of the Departments of Health and Human Services and Justice: Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program FY 2023 (2024), <https://oig.hhs.gov/documents/hcfac/10087/HHS%20OIG%20FY%202023%20HCFAC.pdf> (discussing the ways in which both departments worked together with State and local governments to combat health care fraud and abuse in Fiscal Year 2023).

<sup>5</sup> 21 U.S.C. 873; see also *State and Local Task Forces*, Drug Enf’t Admin., <https://www.dea.gov/state-and-local-task-force> (last visited May 20, 2025).

<sup>6</sup> 23 U.S.C. 201–202.

<sup>7</sup> See *Fusion Centers’ Support of National Strategies and Guidance*, U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., <https://www.dhs.gov/topic/fusion-centers-support-national-strategies-and-guidance> (last visited May 20, 2025).

<sup>1</sup> Pamela J. Clouser McCann, *The Strategic Use of Congressional Intergovernmental Delegation*, 77 J. Pol. 620 (2015).

<sup>2</sup> 33 U.S.C. 2233.

<sup>3</sup> 42 U.S.C. 18031; see also 42 U.S.C. 18041 (describing State flexibility in the operation and enforcement of health benefit exchanges).

**Specific Topics for Public Comment**

ACUS welcomes views, information, and data on all aspects of strategies and approaches that agencies are using or might use to collaborate with State, local, Tribal, and/or territorial governments in administering Federal programs. ACUS also seeks specific feedback on the following questions related to agencies' collaboration efforts:

1. What has been your experience regarding collaboration with a Federal agency to carry out a program?
2. If you have been involved in an intergovernmental partnership, who are (or were) your intergovernmental partners?
3. In your experience, what makes a collaboration successful? Are there practices that Federal and SLTTG officials could adopt to facilitate more productive collaborations?
4. In your experience, what challenges do Federal officials experience when interacting with SLTTG partners? What strategies have Federal and SLTTG officials used (or do use) to address these challenges? Were any strategies particularly effective or ineffective? Why or why not? Are there any lessons learned, policies, or practices that could be implemented to enhance intergovernmental partnerships?
5. In your experience, how do (or did) intergovernmental partners communicate with each other and with other interested persons? Has technology changed this dynamic, and, if so, how?

6. In your experience, to what extent do Federal agencies and SLTTG partners develop policies that govern their relationships? To what extent are such policies made publicly available?

7. To what extent are Federal officials and SLTTG partners aware of the laws governing their collaboration?

Dated: May 20, 2025.

**Shawne McGibbon,**

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 2025-09373 Filed 5-23-25; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6110-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE****Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service**

[Docket No. APHIS-2021-0081]

**Deregulation of Chrysanthemum White Rust and the Importation of Chrysanthemum spp. Cuttings, and In Vitro Plantlets, and Synonymous Genera From Certain Countries Into the Continental United States**

**AGENCY:** Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** We are reopening the comment period on a notice making available an economic evaluation relative to regulating chrysanthemum white rust as a quarantine pest, as well as a pest risk analysis regarding the importation of *Chrysanthemum* spp. and synonymous genera cuttings and *in vitro* plantlets into the United States. Based on comments received on an initial notice, we have revised the pest risk analysis. This action will allow interested persons time to review the revised documents and submit comments.

**DATES:** The comment period for the notice published on April 17, 2023 (88 FR 23390-23391) is reopened. We will consider all comments that we receive on or before June 26, 2025.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Enter APHIS-2021-0081 in the Search field. Select the Documents tab, then select the Comment button in the list of documents.
- *Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery:* Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS-2021-0081, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 2C-10.16, 4700 River Road, Unit 25, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) or in our reading room, which is located in room 1620 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799-7039 before coming.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Heather Coady and Ms. Shannon Jarman, Regulatory Policy Specialists, Plants for Planting Policy, Plant

Protection and Quarantine, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, 5607 Sunnyside Ave., Beltsville, MD 20705; phone: (240) 935-1598; email: [PPQ.NAPPRA@usda.gov](mailto:PPQ.NAPPRA@usda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Chrysanthemum white rust (CWR) is a fungal disease caused by the basidiomycete *Puccinia horiana*, Henn. The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) considers CWR a quarantine pest. Under international standards, a quarantine pest is defined as "a pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered by it and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed there and being officially controlled."<sup>1</sup>

Because CWR is considered a quarantine pest, APHIS' policy<sup>2</sup> has provided that any CWR detection domestically triggers an eradication protocol requiring complete destruction of symptomatic plants and those nearby. The policy also has required fungicidal treatments be applied to asymptomatic plants. Affected growers or entities have borne the eradication expense for CWR.

APHIS has also placed regulatory restrictions and prohibitions on the importation of host material for CWR to prevent its introduction into the United States through such importation. The regulations in 7 CFR 319.37-1 through 319.37-23 govern the importation of plants for planting into the United States. Section 319.37-4 of the regulations provides that certain taxa of plants for planting are not authorized for importation into the United States pending pest risk analysis (NAPPRA) to prevent the introduction of quarantine pests into the United States.

Accordingly, unrooted cuttings and *in vitro* plantlets of *Chrysanthemum* spp., *Leucanthemella serotina*, and *Nipponanthemum nipponicum* and synonymous taxa (*Dendranthema* spp.) 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 have been NAPPRA or required post entry quarantine and additional entry requirements. These restrictions are in place due to the risk that such importation may pose of introducing CWR. Additionally, unrooted cuttings, *in vitro* plantlets, and plants with roots of the same taxa from Canada have had

<sup>1</sup> See International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures No. 5, "Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms" found at <https://www.fao.org/3/mc891e/mc891e.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> See [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant\\_health/plant\\_pest\\_info/cwr/downloads/cwrplan.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/cwr/downloads/cwrplan.pdf).