

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

**EASTERN PLANT BOARD**  
**83<sup>rd</sup> ANNUAL MEETING AGENDA**  
Charleston, West Virginia

**Meeting Summary**

**TUESDAY**  
April 1, 2008

**WELCOME**

Purpose: to discuss issues important to the EPB

Expected Outcomes: varied and specific to each agenda item

Ground Rules

1. Turn off electronic devices
2. Minimize disruptions
3. Be present
4. Respect each other
5. Start on time and end on time

**CAPS**

Purpose: to help EPB members understand the CAPS, including the national program leader's vision for the program

Expected Outcomes:

- An understanding of the national program
- An understanding of how to work with and influence the program

John Bowers – National CAPS Coordinator

Mission and vision statements

National CAPS Committee (NCC)

- By-laws – Posted on CAPS Website
- Revised survey guidelines
- NAPIS is the CAPS database
- Quality surveys and quality data
- Commodity-based surveys – no new commodities added until further evaluation and planning
- Pest lists
- Negative data – need valid data, e.g. EWB/BBtrap/lure combination  
*National Program will provide guidance*
- Taxonomic support guidelines
- Outreach
  - Tier 2 funding for outreach to support survey activities
  - PPQ Branding
  - Leveraging opportunities
- Volunteers

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

- National program role would be support, guidance, training
- Work plan submission Website – for standardization
- Work plan monitoring tool
- Traps/lures procurement process – documentation, succession planning
- NAPIS – guidelines
- National CAPS meeting, Dec. 2-4, 2008 – dynamic working meeting

*John Bowers stated that meeting participants could contact CAPS staff with suggestions for improving the program.*

Vicki Smith – SPRO rep. on NCC

- EPB representative
- Need input for topics for CAPS meeting
- SPRO role is communication

Steve Knight – ER SPHD rep. on NCC

- ADODR for IL
- Does current funding jeopardize high risk pest surveys? Need to align CAPS with PPQ's desire to detect new pests through target pest surveys. How can all pest detection surveys complement each other?

Discussion:

- Request for input for National meeting to SCC's? Each NCC rep. would communicate to their group.
- Define "Quality" surveys? Valid data that will stand up, e.g. to an audit.
- Commodity-based surveys important to trade – What about old data? consensus data? Maps will only display data for the past 3-5 years on public site; GPDD may be another tool to evaluate data
- National meeting – need to address needs of different components, roles and responsibilities of players with regard to accountability, have a workshop with agreements staff
- Quality of data –historic participation in development of survey methods with Survey methods are clearly spelled out and posted on NAPIS Website; What happened to regional committees? Needed consistency between regions for accountability requirements. Encourage SPHD/SPRO communication. Regional SCC's can coordinate meetings, calls. Communicate through NCC reps. to develop method for regional communication.
- Why are commodity based surveys on hold? Need to decide how to manage, i.e. can't do every commodity every year, build capacity for identification.
- Volunteer program – CAPS wants active surveys conducted by best means possible with resources available; will be developed at state level; need overall

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

guidance as to how to build a program, learn from experiences, successes, failures, avoid liabilities; work with sister agencies, e.g. CSREES; consider chain of custody

- Need access to risk data analyses and guidance on how to use data if overall goal is to survey smarter
  - State/port risk committees can contribute information from databases, need to analyze risk, not just operational issues  
*Ron Weeks will handle data structure and interpretation*
  - Will states have access to CBP information? Only need to know that data is there as a resource and can request project-based information through SPHD

*Calvin Shuler stated that meeting participants could contact ER staff for help with data analysis.*

PPQ Contacts:

- John Bowers - National Survey Coordinator - [John.Bowers@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:John.Bowers@aphis.usda.gov) - (301) 734-3658
- Brian Kopper - ER Regional Program Manager - [Brian.J.Kopper@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Brian.J.Kopper@aphis.usda.gov) - (919) 855-7318
- Kristian Rondeau - WR Regional Program Manager - [Kristian.C.Rondeau@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Kristian.C.Rondeau@aphis.usda.gov) - (970) 494-7563

PPQ Contacts:

- Calvin Shuler - ER Senior Regional Program Manager - [Calvin.H.Shuler@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Calvin.H.Shuler@aphis.usda.gov) - (919) 855-7326
- Ron Weeks - ER Regional Program Manager - [Ron.D.Weeks@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Ron.D.Weeks@aphis.usda.gov) - (919) 855-7297

**WEDNESDAY**  
April 2, 2008

**FIREWOOD**

Purpose: to discuss and identify the issues around firewood that impact EPB states

Expected Outcomes:

- Identify state efforts to regulate firewood
- Identify existing outreach materials
- Identify how present efforts are being measured

Possible Next Steps:

- Determine if existing measures are effective

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

State Efforts to Regulate Firewood

- PA has a quarantine, but it's difficult to enforce
- Some PA state parks have policies that ban bringing firewood into them
- NY outreach may be combined with financial penalties
- MD used media buzz around EAB eradication program to educate consumers/handlers
- MD state parks ban bringing firewood into them - "Buy it where you burn it"

Existing Outreach Materials:

- The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has outreach material
- Individual states have outreach material

Possible Next Steps:

- Interstate meetings to discuss a regional approach
- Engage other EPB states
- Define "Firewood"
- Establish a minimum standard
- Determine methods for better industry cooperation and compliance – big box stores on board, smaller businesses adversely impacted
- Gather some data to quantify the problem - PA and the Continental Dialogue (TNC) have some data
- Define effective outreach material - What works best?
- PPQ can help coordinate effort - Contact Paul Chaloux - EAB Supervisory PPQ Officer - [Paul.Chaloux@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Paul.Chaloux@aphis.usda.gov) - (301) 734-0917

**EAB**

Purpose: to help EPB members understand the national EAB strategy and develop an EAB position regarding the national strategy

Expected Outcomes:

- An understanding of the national strategy
- An EPB position on the national strategy

National Strategy:

- The national program is moving towards management

EPB State Efforts:

- MD continues eradication effort
- PA surveying

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

- WV conducts visual surveys, uses trap trees, outreach, quarantine - Slow the spread

Possible Next Steps:

- Inventory trees in communities
- PPQ can share their experience with EPB states - Contact Steve Knight - IL SPHD - [SAKnight@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:SAKnight@aphis.usda.gov) - (847) 699-2414

**QUALITY PESTS**

Purpose: to help EPB states understand quality pests (*e.g.*, HVX, daylily rust, and foliar nematodes) management/regulatory practices in the northeast and determine if EPB members are interested in developing and implementing regional strategies for quality pests

Expected Outcomes:

- A list of management/regulatory practices for each quality pest discussed
- A decision on whether EPB states are interested in developing and implementing regional strategies for quality pests

EPB Quality Pests:

- Hosta Virus X
- Daylily Rust
- Lily Leaf Beetle
- Foliar Nematode
- Tobacco Rattle
- Rose Mosaic Virus
- Viburnum Leaf Beetle
- Chrysanthemum White Rust
- Bacterial Leaf Scorch
- Impatiens Necrotic Spot Virus
- Root Knot Nematode

Hosta Virus X:

- Some states stop sale of positively infected plants and destroy them
- Some states conduct visual surveys
- EPB decided that this is a candidate for a regional policy

Rose Mosaic Virus:

- Some states conduct targeted inspections of imported material and destroy positively infected plants.
- Consider consumer and industry protection – get the best plants to the consumer

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

*Representatives of EPB states agreed that they would like to develop regional strategies for some quality pests.*

Possible Next Steps:

- Develop a list of EPB quality pests and inspection protocols for those pests; Circulate the list and protocols among EPB states
- Gather data from EPB states – census of severity and incidence of occurrence
- Gather best management practices for the quality pests of concern
- Conduct a test run on the regional approach with a few quality pests – lily leaf beetle
- Involve the Horticultural Inspection Society (HIS) in future discussions

**THURSDAY**  
April 3, 2008

**ACTIONABLE PEST REPORT**

Purpose: to identify and discuss state issues with actionable or other pests and determine if other EPB states support the issues

Expected Outcomes:

- A list of individual state issues
- A decision on whether the EPB supports issues raised by individual states

Golden Nematode (NY):

- Issue - lack of funding
- ME supports the issue
- NJ supports the issue; they use technology from the golden nematode program for the soybean cyst nematode

Chrysanthemum White Rust (NJ and CT):

- In January, comments from seven EPB states impacted by the 2007 CWR event (CT, DE, MD, ME, NJ, NY, PA) were sent to Billy Newton – waiting for follow up
- Issue - questions the resource drain on individual states
- Issue - need a diagnostic tool for early detection
- Issue - impacts on growers are greater than impacts on retail centers
- NJ is not suggesting deregulation
- CT differs from NJ on deregulation
- Industry/progators support outreach efforts and relaxed regulations
- PCR test is available; It's not the only toll for certification
- PA supports the issue and leans towards deregulation

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

- Need to get everyone (*i.e.*, Industry, States, and Federal Regulators) together for a discussion
- Difficult to trace the origin of infected material

Plum Pox Virus (NY):

- Issue - 500m vs. 50m buffer (*i.e.*, harmonization with Canada)
- Issue - lack of funding
- Present EPB members support the issues

Asian Longhorn Beetle (NY):

- Issues - lack of rapid response and funding
- Issue - goal of program (eradication vs. management)
- ME supports continued discussion
- NJ supports a funding increase
- CT does not have ALB and supports a funding increase for detection surveys in their state
- The EPB needs to build a coalition that would support increased funding

Sirex noctilio (NY):

- Issue - state or federal action - call to base decision on science
- Issue - questions the potential for an abbreviated quarantine that focuses on high risk pathways
- PA supports the issue
- ME supports the issue
- The EPB should comment pending the release of a federal quarantine

**STATE LEVEL COMMUNICATION**

Purpose: to discuss how to improve working relationships between SPHDs and SPROs

Expected Outcomes:

- A list of next steps that may help improve working relationships between SPHDs and SPROs

Possible Next Steps:

- Prioritize items in draft for staggered implementation
- Complete the state pilot program
- Allow SPHDs and SPROs to comment on draft guidelines for discussion between SPHD and SPRO 1/08
- This may be a template for building a relationship with CBP

2008 EPB MEETING  
CHARLESTON, WV

- Actions within each state
  - Regularly scheduled meetings (1x/month)
  - Scoping session outside of office
  - Clarify the “process” from the PPQ side
  - PPQ meet with Commissioners and industry