Southern Plant Board
The Southern Plant Board, a regional member of the National Plant Board, is a non-profit organization of the plant pest regulatory agencies of each of the states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Member agencies must be members in good standing of the regional plant board in which their state or commonwealth is located.

Organizational Structure
President-Gene Cross
Vice-President-Sancho Dickinson
Secretary/Treasurer-Harry Fulton

Contact Information for the SPB:
c/o Gene Cross, President
NCDA&CS-Plant Industry Division
1060 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1060
Phone: 919-733-3933, Ext. 218
Fax: 919-733-1041
Email: Gene.Cross@ncagr.gov
Sunday, April 19, 2009

2:00 pm-6:00 pm  SPB Meeting Registration—Mezzanine
6:00 pm-8:00 pm  SPB Opening Reception—Gold Ballroom
8:00 pm-11:00 pm SPB Hospitality Room—Francis Marion Suite

Monday, April 20, 2009

7:00 am-3:00 pm  SPB Meeting Registration—Mezzanine
7:00 am-8:00 am  Continental Breakfast (Provided as part of SPB registration)—Mezzanine
8:00 am-8:45 am  SPB Opening Session—Gold Ballroom
Call to Order: Gene Cross, NC
Roll Call: Harry Fulton, MS
General Meeting Announcements and Introductions: Christel Harden, SC
Welcome to South Carolina: Dr. Neil Ogg, Associate Vice-President, Clemson University, Public Service Activities; Director, Regulatory Services
Welcome to South Carolina: Commissioner Hugh Weathers, S.C. Department of Agriculture
Opening Comments: Gene Cross

8:45 am-9:10 am  Phytophthora ramorum Presentation and Discussion
Tim McNary, USDA, APHIS, PPQ-Western Region Office [PPT]

9:10 am-9:35 am  Citrus Health Response Plant Presentation
Pat Gomes, USDA, APHIS, PPQ [PPT]
9:35 am-10:00 am Light Brown Apple Moth Presentation and Discussion
Craig Southwick, USDA, APHIS, PPQ [PPT]
10:00 am-10:30 am Break
10:30 am-11:00 am Preemption Presentation and Discussion
Calvin Schuler, USDA, APHIS, PPQ
11:00 am-12:00 pm USDA Special Needs Exemption Process Presentation and Discussion
Paula Henstridge, USDA, APHIS, PPQ and Wayne Dixon, FL [PPT]
12:00 pm-1:00 pm Lunch (Provided as part of SPB registration)—Poinsett Ballroom
1:00 pm-2:30 pm New Technology and Innovations: Presentations and Discussion
• Ian Winborne, USDA, APHIS, Center for Plant Health Science and Technology [PPT]
• Gene Cross, NC [PPT]
2:30 pm-3:00 pm Break
3:00 pm-4:00 pm Firewood Regulations Panel and Discussion
Panel Members:
• Phillip Bell, USDA, APHIS, PPQ [PPT]
• Harry Fulton, MS
• Paul Merton, USDA, Forest Service, Forest Health Protection [PPT]
Tuesday, April 21, 2009

7:00 am-3:00 pm  SPB Meeting Registration—Mezzanine

7:00 am-8:00 am  Continental Breakfast (Provided as part of SPB Registration)—Mezzanine

8:00 am-11:00 am  South Carolina Industry-BMW Plant Tour

11:30 am-12:15 pm  Lunch (Provided as part of SPB Registration)—Poinsett Ballroom

12:15 pm-1:15 pm  Presentation and Discussion of 2008 Farm Bill Implementation Plan for Section 10201-Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention  
Matt Royer, USDA, APHIS, PPQ [PPT]

1:15 pm-2:15 pm  Official Control Presentation and Discussion  
Diane Schubel, USDA, APHIS, PPQ [PPT]

2:15 pm-2:45 pm  Break

2:45 pm-3:45 pm  Compliance Agreement Presentation and Discussion  
Tim McNary, USDA, APHIS, PPQ, Western Region Office [PPT]

3:45 pm-4:45 pm  Pest Risk Committee Panel Presentation and Discussion  
Panel Members:  
• Calvin Schuler, USDA, APHIS, PPQ-Eastern Regional Office  
• Kevin Haringer-Customs and Border Protection  
• Jeanetta Cooper, OK

4:45 pm-5:00 pm  CAPS-Executive Briefing  
Brian Kopper, USDA, APHIS, PPQ-Eastern Regional Office [PPT]

5:00 pm-5:15 pm  SPB Meeting Accomplishments and Overview  
Gene Cross, NC and Christel Harden, SC

6:00 pm-7:00 pm  Focus Session for SPROs only—Phytophthora ramorum—Gold Ballroom  
Dinner: On your own

8:00 pm-11:00 pm  SPB-Hospitality Room—Francis Marion Suite

Wednesday, April 22, 2009

7:00 am-8:00 am  Continental Breakfast (Provided as part of SPB registration)—Mezzanine
8:00 am

Southern Plant Board Business Session—Gold Ballroom
Call to Order: Gene Cross, NC

Agency Reports
Western Region Briefing: Phil Garcia, USDA, APHIS, PPQ-WR Director
Eastern Region Briefing: Vic Harabin, USDA, APHIS, PPQ-ER Director
Southern Plant Diagnostic Network: Amanda Hodges [PPT]
HISSC Update: Janet Lensing, KY [PPT]

Plant Board Reports
National Plant Board Report: Gray Haun, NPB President
Southern Plant Board Report: Gene Cross, NC [PPT]

SPB Business Session (Open to SPB Members/Representatives)
SPB Meeting Minutes: Harry Fulton, MS
SPB Treasurer’s Report: Harry Fulton, MS [PPT]

SPB Committee Reports
Awards and Necrology: Frank Fulghum/Larry Nichols, VA
Audit: Benny Graves, MS
Nominating: Mike Evans, GA
Policy and Resolutions: Sancho Dickinson, OK
Recap and Follow-up on 2008 SPB Resolutions
2009 Policies and Resolutions Discussion [website]
Other Discussion and Reports
2010 Meeting Location-Alabama, Dennis Barclift

Meeting Adjourned

8:30 am-12:00 pm

CAPS Morning Session (Concurrent Session)-Includes attending State Survey Coordinators and Pest Survey Specialists—Francis Marion Meeting Room

8:30 am

USDA, APHIS, PPQ Meeting (Concurrent Session)—Palmetto Meeting Room

2009 Meeting Sponsors and Support

Financial Contributions:
- Monrovia Nursery
- S.C. Peach Council
- USDA, APHIS, PPQ

Meeting Supporters
- Department of Plant Industry, Clemson University
- USDA, APHIS, PPQ-South Carolina State Plant Health Director’s Office
- S. C. Forestry Commission
- Mast General Store
- Llyn Strong Jewelers
- The Barkery Bistro
- SKY at Blue Ridge
- The Cook’s Station
- O. P. Taylor’s Toy Store
- Titan Farms
History of Phytophthora ramorum Positive Nurseries in the Eastern Region Since 2004

As of December 31, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Host Nurseries Certified</th>
<th>Non-Host Nurseries</th>
<th>TF Nurseries</th>
<th>TB Nurseries</th>
<th>Others &amp; State Surveys</th>
<th>Positive Sites</th>
<th>Negative Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai`i</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3, 1R</td>
<td>886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. ramorum Positive sites – Years Compared Western Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2004 Eastern Region (ER) National Survey**

Positive Detections (in red)

- **51 Positive Nursery Sites - 11 States**
  - CT (3)
  - PA (2)
  - NJ (1)
  - MD (3)
  - VA (2)
  - TN (2)
  - NC (9)
  - AL (3)
  - GA (16)
  - SC (4)
  - FL (6)

**2004 ER Positive Site Summary**

State (number of sites) - suspect source

- **CT (3) - TF from Hines, OR**
- **PA (2) - TF from Specialty Plants, CA (indoor Bonsai plants)**
- **NJ (1) - National Survey**
- **MD (3) - 2 National Survey; 1 TF from Hines, OR**
- **VA (2) - 1 TF from Monrovia, CA; 1 National Survey**
- **TN (1) - TF from Monrovia, CA**
- **NC (9) - TF from Monrovia, CA**
- **AL (3) - National Survey**
- **GA (16) - 2 TF from Monrovia, CA**
- **SC (4) - 2 TF from Monrovia, CA; 2 National Survey**
- **FL (6) - TF from Monrovia, CA**

**2005 Eastern Region (ER) National Survey**

Positive Detections (in red)

- **6 Positive Nursery Sites - 3 states**
  - TN (1)
  - GA (4)
  - SC (1)

**2006 Eastern Region (ER) National Survey**

Positive Detections (in red)

- **9 Positive Nursery Sites - 8 States**
  - ME (1)*
  - CT (1)
  - PA (1)
  - IN (1)*
  - MS (1)*
  - AL (1)
  - GA (1)
  - FL (2)
*First time found in this state
2006 ER Positive Nursery Site Summary
State (number of sites) - suspect source

- ME (1) - TF from Leo Gentry, OR.
- CT (1) - CNP follow-up. Likely reintroduction, not residual.
- PA (1) - National Survey.
- IN (1) - TF from Leo Gentry, OR.
- MS (1) - National Survey.
- AL (1) - National Survey.
- GA (1) - TF from Leo Gentry, OR.
- FL (2) - CNP follow-up.

2007 Eastern Region (ER)
Positive Detections (in red) as of April 10, 2007

- FL (1)
- MS (1)
- 2 Positive Nursery Sites - 2 States

2007 ER Positive Nursery Site Summary
State (number of sites) - suspect source

As of April 13, 2007

- FL (1) - CNP follow-up.
- MS (1) - CNP follow-up.
- 2 Positive Nursery Sites - 2 States

2008 Eastern Region (ER)
Positive Detections (in red) as of Dec. 31, 2008

- FL (2)
- MS (1)
- NC (1)
- SC (2)
- 6 Positive Nursery Sites - 4 States
Presently in 2009

Positive Nursery Sites (3):

- Alabama (1)
- Georgia (1)
- New Jersey (1)

Other 2009 P. ramorum initiatives

2. CPHST’s Assessment Team for a Mississippi retail nursery.
3. Farm Bill’s appropriation for P. ramorum work in the east. Focused on nursery survey in targeted states.
2009 CHRP Update

Patrick Gomes  
National Coordinator  
USDA APHIS PPQ  
April 20, 2009

CHRP Goals

- Preventing introduction & spread of citrus pests
- Early detection & response
- Promote best management practices = Recovery
- Maintain markets by ensuring requirements for shipment are met

Program Activities

- Surveillance
- Diagnostics
- Regulatory
- Investigation & Enforcement
- Emergency response
- Research & Development
- Outreach/Education

Disease Surveillance

- Citrus Commodity Surveys
- High risk areas (Hot zones)
- Special surveys
- Training on pest recognition

Citrus Surveys

- Alabama
- Arizona
- California
- Florida
- Guam
- Hawaii
- Louisiana
- Puerto Rico
- Texas

2008 Citrus Survey
Major Pests Threats

- Citrus canker
- Citrus greening = Huanglongbing (HLB) – 3 strains
- Asian & African citrus psyllids
- Citrus leprosis virus
- Citrus Variegated Chlorosis (CVC)

Citrus Canker

- Xanthomonas citri ssp. citri
- Water soaked "Halo" effect
- Bacterial lesions on leaves, fruit, twigs, branches, trunk

Citrus Greening

- "Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus"
- Blotchy mottle symptoms
- Small lopsided fruit, columella staining, bitter taste

Asian Citrus Psyllid

- Diaphorina citri
- Insect vector of Citrus Greening

Citrus Leprosis Virus (CiLV)

- Mite vector
- Brevipalpus spp.
Citrus Variegated Chlorosis (CVC) caused by Xylella fastidiosa is transmitted by the Glassy-winged sharpshooter, Homalodisca vitripennis. Some key threats include:

- Variability in titer
- "Not detected" ≠ "Not present"
- Detected ≠ Live

Plant pathogens:
- Some key disease threats cannot be cultured
- Symptoms non-specific
- Uneven distribution of pathogen within host
- Diagnostics lack sensitivity and specificity
- Latency of symptom expression
- Easy uptake and transmission by vectors

Diagnostics:
- Support services
- Accreditation
- Methods development
- Policies
- Research

Response Capability:
- Incident Command System
- New Pest Response Guidelines
- Action Plans
- Task Force/Action Committees
- Training on Pest Recognition & Diagnostics

Enforcement:
- Smuggling, Interdiction & Trade Enforcement (SITC)
- Investigative & Enforcement Services (IES)
- State road stations
- End point & terminal inspections

Enforcement:
- Investigative & Enforcement Services (IES)
- State road stations
- End point & terminal inspections
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BACK TO TOP
Citrus canker

Interstate Movement of Citrus Fruit

- Asymptomatic fruit only
- Packinghouse inspection
- Treatment with approved disinfectant
- Limited Permit must accompany shipment
- Movement limited to non-citrus producing areas
- Movement permitted for immediate export

Packinghouse Stats

2007/2008 Season (mid Nov – June)
- Lots inspected – 38,140
- Total canker finds – 247
- % lots infected – 0.65

2008/2009 Season (through 3/31/09)
- Lots inspected – 34,120
- Total canker finds – 309
- % lots infected – 0.91

Highlights

- No shipments have been rejected for canker
- Shipments moving to EU uninterrupted
- Shipments moving overland to Canada
- No detections of citrus canker during citrus surveys outside Florida
- New scientific findings regarding epidemiological significance of symptomatic fruit

Citrus Greening

- 2005 – First detection in Florida
- 2008 - Infected trees found & removed in Orleans & Washington Parishes, Louisiana
- 2009 - Infected trees found on 2 properties in Charleston, SC
March 24, 2009 - Plant tissue samples with symptoms collected from a lemon tree located on residential property in the City of Charleston.
March 30, 2009 - Samples tested at PPQ Regional lab.
April 2, 2009 - Findings confirmed by PPQ Molecular Diagnostics Lab in Beltsville, MD.
April 14, 2009 - MDL confirms 2nd tree infected same property.
April 17, 2009 – MDL confirms grapefruit tree infected at a second property.

Citrus Greening in South Carolina

Photos by Brett Laird, LDAF. March 2009
Pathways & Sources

- Movement of propagative material
- Movement of fresh cut foliage
- Incidental movement of plant debris
- E-commerce sale of plants
- Hobbyists/gardeners
- Domestic & foreign sources

A major contributing cause to pest introduction is a lack of awareness by the general public and affected industry of the threat.
Outreach/Education

- Public awareness & involvement
- Grower/Caretaker education
- Educating others – Master gardeners, extension agents, scouts

National Campaign

- Stop spread caused by movement of infected plants from areas under quarantine.
- Disrupt purchase of plants over the Internet using banner ads
- Create a “micro-site” that contains simple message – Don’t risk citrus; Don’t move citrus
- Create greater public awareness of the problem
  - Understanding the threat
  - Where is disease present; Areas under quarantine
  - High risk activities associated with spread of disease
  - Where to go for more information

Regulation changes underway

- 7CFR301.75 – Citrus Canker Regulations
- Interim Rule – Citrus Greening & Asian Citrus Psyllid
- Proposed Rule – Citrus Nursery Stock
**New Nursery Requirements**
- Insect resistant enclosures
- Host free buffers
- Nursery environment surveys
- Controlled access
- Monthly inspections
- Reporting requirements & audit controls

**Rule-making Process**
- Pest risk assessment
- Risk management analysis
- Environmental assessment
- Economic analysis
- Public comment

**R&D Component**
- Methods Development
- Basic Research
  - Identify research needs/priorities & monitor progress
  - International coordination

**Research**
- Major investments in basic & applied research by Florida and California producers
  - National Academies of Science enlisted to review proposals & develop a strategic plan
- ARS & CSREES increasing their efforts
  - ARS SWAT Assessment – April 2008

**Center for Plant Health Science & Technology**
- Identifying critical needs & priorities
- Developing & validating diagnostics
- Evaluating ways to control ACP
- Convening Technical Working Groups
- Conducting pilot projects

**Technical Working Groups**
- Citrus greening/Asian citrus psyllid – January 2006
- Detection of CG positive psyllids – March 2007
- Production of disease-free Citrus nursery stock – September 2007
- Response to early detection of Citrus greening and/or Asian citrus psyllid – August 2008
- Systems approach to disease-free production of Citrus nursery stock – October 2008
- Area-wide Control of Asian citrus psyllid – February 2009
Over 400 participants from 26 countries
Research underway in key areas
Priorities & needs discussed
Proceedings will be published by APS

Contact Information
Patrick.J.Gomes@aphis.usda.gov
(919) 855-7313

Key APHIS Websites
http://www.aphis.usda.gov
http://www.saveourcitrus.org

Thank you for your attention!
Questions?

New Response Guidelines
- Citrus Greening – updated April 2008
- Citrus Variegated Chlorosis – Draft under review
- Citrus Leprosis – Draft under review
- ARS/NPRDS – APS Recovery Plan
  - Citrus Greening – Plan developed
  - Citrus Variegated Chlorosis – Plan in preparation

Louisiana Program Statistics: June 2008 - March 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louisiana Properties Surveyed</th>
<th>Total Sites Inspected</th>
<th>Cumulative Samples by Location</th>
<th>Cumulative Positive Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insect</td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Residences</td>
<td>6,393</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Groves</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Areas</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Confirmed Citrus Greening infected plants.
Collaboration with Mexico

- Technical exchange
- Diagnostic training & support
- *Operation Psyllid Watch* detected ACP in Tijuana, Tecate & Mexicali
- Coordinating survey & suppression activities with Mexican Government

**International Cooperation**

- Many pathogens can only be studied at their origin
- Technical exchange vital in developing detection & control strategies
- Addressing the pest at source can mitigate risk of spread & introduction
- Helps gain acceptance of practices & establishment of international standards

![Table](image)

**Properties Surveyed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cumulative Location Totals</th>
<th>Cumulative Positive Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Residence</td>
<td>8,748</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Groves</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Baja California, Mexico**

- **Properties Surveyed**
  - Nursery: 9
  - Private Residence: 8,748
  - Citrus Groves: 8
  - Public Areas: 10

**Traps Serviced**

- Total: 3,373
- Tijuana: 883
- Tecate: 212
- Ensenada: 1,934
- Mexicali: 224
- Rosarito: 1,026

Trapping density is 5 traps/sq mi. Density within 1 mile buffer along US border is 25 traps/sq mi.
Light Brown Apple Moth

1. General Update
2. Regulatory Framework
3. Challenges

Overview
- Update on LBAM detections and National Survey
- Description of Regulatory Framework
- Challenges and Future
- Questions and Discussion

Latest detection in a new County is in Yolo County, just across the border from Solano

Regulatory Framework
- APHIS PPQ quarantines by County by Federal Order
- The California Department of Food and Agriculture regulates areas within 1.5 miles of an LBAM detection

2008 National Survey
Quarantine Requirements depend on Type of Regulated Material

- Green Waste Handlers
- Community Gardens
- Harvested Commodities

Quarantine Requirements also depend on distance from any LBAM detections

- Producers that ship and are less than 1.5 miles from an LBAM detection are within the state interior quarantine
- Producers in a Federally regulated county are regulated under the Federal Order

Nursery Inspections

- 100% Inspection of all nursery products moving off the site

Commodity Inspections

- Risk based fruit and vegetable inspections
- Coolers primary inspection point for commodities

Retail Inspections

- 30 day inspections

What are we doing to limit movement of the LBAM?

- Orders, Regulations, and Agreements
  - Federal Order
  - California State Regulations
- LBAM Program
  - Detection Trapping
  - Regulatory Compliance
  - Regulatory Inspections
  - Regulatory Treatments
- National surveys (to verify program is working)
Challenges

- Court Rulings in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties have effectively halted area wide eradication strategies pending environmental documentation
- Even the most effective regulatory framework does nothing to stop natural spread

Future

- Environmental documentation is being produced
- Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) shows promise. A rearing facility in Moss Landing, CA is producing adults
- SIT targeted area demonstrations are being planned for this year

Links

- USDA APHIS PPQ’s LBAM Page
- CDFA’s LBAM page
  http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/phpps/pdep/lbam/lbam_main.html
Ordinarily, under section 436 of the PPA (7 U.S.C. 7756), no State or political subdivision of a State may regulate the movement in interstate commerce of any article, means of conveyance, plant, biological control organism, plant pest, noxious weed, or plant product in order
1) to control a plant pest or noxious weed;
2) to eradicate a plant pest or noxious weed; or
3) to prevent the introduction or dissemination of a biological control organism, plant pest, or noxious weed if the Secretary has issued a regulation or order to prevent the dissemination of the biological control organism, plant pest, or noxious weed within the United States.

There is now an amendment of the domestic quarantine regulations which established a process by which a State or political subdivision of a State could request approval — to impose prohibitions or restrictions on the movement in interstate commerce of specific articles that are in addition to the prohibitions and restrictions imposed by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

This map depicts the areas of the United States currently regulated for Phytophthora ramorum. The three states regulated are the western-most states of the continental United States: Washington, Oregon, and California. As there is limited infestation, we have quarantined the 14 orange or more darkly shaded counties near the coast of California as well as a part of Curry County in the southwest corner of Oregon and have restrictions on the movement of nursery stock, forest products and soil. Due to detections limited to the three states of California, Oregon and Washington, only follow-up testing exists, we regulate the movement of nursery stock only.

Approximately 330 shipments (5,540 host plants) were sent to 4 provinces in Canada and 8,450 shipments (292,450 host plants) sent to 39 U.S. states 2004.
The light brown apple moth (LBAM), *Epiphyas postvittana* (Tortricidae), is a native pest of Australia and is now widely distributed in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Ireland, and New Caledonia. Although it was reported in Hawaii in the late 1800s, a recent LBAM detection in California is the first on the United States mainland. USDA confirmed the detection of LBAM in Alameda County, California on March 22, 2007.

**Host Range**
LBAM has a host range in excess of 150 plant genera in over 70 families, including nursery stock, cut flowers, stone fruit (peaches, plums, nectarines, cherries, and apricots), pome fruit (apples and pears), grapes, and citrus.

**Damage**
There are generally three generations of LBAM per year in southern Australia and two to four in New Zealand. Eggs are deposited in masses on the upper surface of leaves of apple, pear, apricot, citrus, and other smooth-leaved host plants. Pupation occurs within these rolled leaf sites.

Damage is caused by larval feeding on the foliage, buds, shoots, and fruits of host plants.

**Risk Map**
The LBAM Host Map and the LBAM NAPPFAST Map (1-5 generations) were added together to obtain the final Risk Map for LBAM. The final risk map has 8 classes with 2 being the lowest relative risk and 9 the highest. A high risk level indicates that there are high levels of host commodities present and conditions consistently present for development of the pest organism.

**National Survey 2008**
State Risk Categories and Maximum Trap Numbers
Eastern Region States with 350 or 200* traps
- Alabama
- Florida
- Georgia
- Kentucky
- Mississippi
- North Carolina
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- Virginia
- Pennsylvania *
- West Virginia **
and not an eradication tool. There are huge problems even with the use as a control tool. Never in the history of insect eradication has a pheromone ever been used for any eradication program, much less been successful in eradicating any insect population.

1. An effective eradication tool. Mating disruption pheromone is a "control" tool and not an eradication tool. There are huge problems even with the use as a control tool. Never in the history of insect eradication has a pheromone ever been used for any eradication program, much less been successful in eradicating any insect population.

2. A monitoring system for delineating the full extent of the infestation at the beginning of the program as well as for identifying small populations in scattered pockets at advanced stages.

3. Strong public support so that ground crews deploying controls can have full access to private property over a sustained period.

Because LBAM is not known to occur in the continental United States, it does not have any natural enemies to keep its population in check. It is considered highly likely that LBAM will become permanently established in the United States if eradication measures are not implemented. The consequences of its establishment for the United States agricultural and natural ecosystems were judged to be severe. California's climate will support a continuous breeding population that could lead to its permanent establishment in the state.

The history of eradication programs in which an exotic insect is as widespread as LBAM is to California suggests that we have little if any chance of success because several key preconditions for conducting a successful eradication program are untenable. These include having:

1. Adequate monitoring and surveillance to detect and localize the infestation.
2. Full access to private property over an extended period.
3. Adequate population to cause economic damage.
4. Full access to private property over a sustained period.

ECONOMIC IMPACT:

The impact on production costs for LBAM hosts could top $100 million. It was estimated for Australia that LBAM caused AUD1.1 million annually in lost production and control costs, or about 1.3% of gross fruit values for apples, pears, oranges and grapes (Sutherland 2006). Applying this percentage to the 2006 gross value of these same crops in California of $6.4 billion (USDA NASS 2006), the estimated annual production costs would be $70.2 million.

This estimate does not include economic costs to the nursery industry nor to other significant host crops in California, such as avocados, kiwifruit, peaches and strawberries. If the same level of costs were applied as for the previous four crops, the estimated costs would be $63.1 million, based on their 2005 gross value of $4.9 billion.

Therefore, the total lost production and control costs in California could be $133 million for all of the crops mentioned above.

Under the Plant Protection Act, section 436 (7 U.S.C. 7756(b)(2)), States may request restrictions and prohibitions that are in addition to restrictions and prohibitions imposed by our Federal regulations if there is a special need for a higher level of protection for that State or political subdivision. APHIS requires that that wish to request additional restrictions or prohibitions under the Plant Protection Act, make a special need request under the Plant Protection Act.
1. A State that requests additional restrictions or prohibitions based on a special need must show that the pest of concern does not exist in the State. Therefore a request should include current data showing that a scientifically sound detection survey was performed in the State, and the pest was not found.

2. The pest should be a true concern for the State, which would be documented with a pest risk assessment or other scientific data showing that the pest could enter the State and become established.

3. The pest should be of significant concern for the State, in that it would harm or injure the environment, and/or cause economic harm to industries in the State. The request should contain direct information about what harm or injury would result from establishment of the pest in the State.

4. The State should list characteristics that make it particularly vulnerable to the pest, such as unique plants, diversity of flora, historical concerns, or any other special basis for the request for additional restrictions or prohibitions.

Regulated articles may not be moved into or within the petitioning States from the following areas except as outlined hereafter:

A. Prior notification for Epiphyas postvittana host plant material is required. The shipper shall send by mail, facsimile or e-mail a copy of the State Phytosanitary Certificate to the respective state regulatory offices. The phytosanitary certificate must list the type and quantity of plants, the shipper’s address, the recipient’s name and address, and contact number(s) of the shipper and recipient. Commodities shipped in violation of the requirements may be returned to their point of origin or destroyed at the expense of the owner.

B. A Phytosanitary Certificate is required for interstate shipments of plant material as opposed to the current Quarantine Compliance Certificate. The former provides a higher level of inspection efforts by the state regulatory authorities. Proof of insecticide treatment must accompany the phytosanitary certificate.

Thank you to:
Richard Gaskalla Gene Cross Christel Harden
Craig Roussel John Obrycki Harry Fulton
Dennis Barclift Terry Walker Larry Nichols
Stephen Schmidt Sancho Dickinson
David Padilla Velez Mike Evans

For signing the Special Need Request for LBAM as a Multi-State Petition to the USDA APHIS PPQ
VA, SC, PR, OK, NC, MS, LA, KY, GA, FL, AK, AL.

And to the USDA for providing a mechanism to better respond to pest risks.
Special Need
Request under the Plant Protection Act

Key Literature:

Economic analysis: risk to US apple, grape, orange and pear production from the light brown apple moth, Epiphyas postvittana (Walker). USDA APHIS PPQ PERAL. G. Fowler, L. Garret, A. Neely, B. Borchert and B. Spears. 2007

Currently, 14 states require advance notification of shipment from California

Noteworthy Host Plants

Allium: Leek, Onion spp non-native
Apple: malus, M. pumila
Apricot: Prunus armeniaca
Avocado: Persea americana
Beans: broad Yusa jalo
Blackberry: Rubus fruticosus
Blueberry: Vaccinium spp.
Chrysanthemum: Garden Chrysanthemum x maritimum
Citrus: Citrus spp.
Choke: Triplochin spp.
Common Currant: Ribes spp.
Current Ribes spp
Eucalyptus: Eucalyptus spp.

The only exceptions to this prohibition are when a State or political subdivision of a State imposes regulations which are consistent with and do not exceed the regulations or orders issued by the Secretary, or when the State or political subdivision of a State demonstrates to the Secretary, and the Secretary finds, that there is a special need for additional prohibitions or restrictions based on sound scientific data or a thorough risk assessment.
A Possible Solution for Verification and Traceback of Agricultural Commodities

Ian Winborne
USDA APHIS
Center for Plant Health Science and Technology
Treatment Quality Assurance Unit
ian.C.Winborne@aphis.usda.gov

The Problem:

• APHIS officials do not have a quick and efficient way to verify fruit identity in the field.
  – The current system requires access to databases that are not generally available in the field.
  – Frequently, fruit does not have any identifying marks that could aid in traceback and verification.
  – Industry does not generally see that the costs of stickering fruit outweigh the benefits.
• We are especially interested in this for irradiated products.

Possible Solutions

• Radio Frequency Identifiers (RFID)
• Special inks
• “Human Readable” – current system
• Barcodes

2D Barcodes: A Solution We Have Been Exploring

• While we are still very much in the ‘idea’ phase, and have not excluded any technology, we think 2D barcodes have a lot of potential.
• 2D barcodes are:
  – Easy to produce
  – Store a lot of data
  – Can be easily read
  – Can be small enough to fit on a fruit label
  – Inexpensive

What is a Barcode?

• Barcodes are graphical representations of data that can be read by optical scanners.
  – We are all familiar with grocery store barcodes like the one below.
  – These don’t store much data, just a few numbers.
  – This is called a one dimensional barcode because the information is stored along one axis.

What is a 2D Barcode?

• 2D barcodes are graphical representations of data that store data along two axes.
• This arrangement of the data greatly increases the storage capacity.
• The 2D barcode below contains the URL for the SITC website – Lots of Data!
  http://www.aphis.usda.gov/international_safeguarding/sitc/index.shtml
How Can We Read a 2D Barcode?

• Most new camera phones can read 2D barcodes!

How Are People Using Cell Phones and 2D Barcodes?

• A 2D barcode is placed on a product or advertisement.
• A consumer takes a picture of the barcode with their camera to get more info about the product.
• The phone software reads the barcode.
• The data in the barcode is a website URL.
• The phone’s browser opens the website and displays the content that relates to the barcode.

Examples of Use

• Advertisements — Take a photo of the advertisement with a camera phone and the website for the movie will open.

Examples of Use

• Traceback and consumer information in Taiwan and Japan.
• Consumers can take a picture of the barcode with their camera phone and see where the produce was grown and what pesticides were applied.

How Can APHIS Use 2D Barcodes?

• 2D barcodes could be put on documents (like 203s), boxes of fruit, and/or individual fruit.
• The barcodes would have a URL for a tracking website and an encrypted ID number.
• A SITC officer scans the barcode with their blackberry camera.
• The URL opens in the blackberry browser and the officer logs in.
• Traceback or verification information that relates to the encrypted ID is displayed on their blackberry.

APHIS Example

• A 2D barcode label created from IRADS and is put on a box of mangoes in Thailand.
  — The barcode has the IRADS URL and an encrypted ID number that relates to the IRADS treatment number.
**APHIS Example**

- The box of mangoes ships and arrives in Long Beach, clears customs, and enters commerce.
- A SITC officer finds the mangoes displayed in their boxes and takes a picture using their blackberry phone.

**APHIS Example**

- The software on the blackberry decodes the barcode.

**APHIS Example**

- The software decodes the IRADS URL and directs the blackberry’s browser to open IRADS.

**APHIS Example**

- The officer enters his login credentials in IRADS and a report like the one below opens in IRADS that shows information about the box of fruit.

**How Can this System be Implemented?**

- Equipment costs are low. Everything used to create the examples in this presentation was already in the office:
  - In many cases, existing databases could be inexpensively modified to produce 2D barcodes.
  - Barcodes can be printed with conventional printers.
  - Camera phones are common. Users without cameras on their blackberries could be inexpensively upgraded.

**Benefits to Industry**

- Dynamic targets allow the 2D barcodes to work for industry and government.
- The government users of this system can have a special “cookie” in their blackberries that tell the system to take them to the official tracking site.
- If a member of the public without this “cookie” takes a picture of the barcode with their phone, it can take them to another site.
- These public sites could contain coupons, fruit information, or other promotional materials.
Public Site Options

- The public site that users are taken to can depend on the packinghouse, the country, the treatment facility, or importer.
- So when the average shopper takes a picture of a barcode on…
  - …a Mexican guava their phone might open www.MeGustaGuavas.com and see guava nutritional facts, recipes, pictures of the groves in Aguascalientes, etc.
  - …a commodity that is being recalled might open a recall website that gives instructions on how to safeguard and return the commodity.

Summary

- 2D barcodes can store a large amount of data and can be read by most camera phones.
- 2D barcodes are currently used for traceback in other countries and could be used by APHIS.
- The equipment and infrastructure needed to implement this system is “off the shelf” and inexpensive.
- Industry can benefit if dynamic targets are implemented.

Some Resources on the Web

- ScoringAg has a commercial 2D barcode system: www.scoringAg.com
- SEICA is the Japanese traceback system using 2D barcodes. Use the Google translator to open http://seica.info/default.aspx
- NeoReader makes software for phones that reads barcodes: http://www.neoreader.com/home.html
- This site has a barcode generator: http://www.bcmaker.com/demos/datamatrix.php

Examples to Try

- If you have a camera phone or know someone that does, get them to try out scanning the barcodes in the next few slides.
- The phone needs an internet connect and must have software to decode the barcode.
  - One software package is NeoReader, it can be downloaded from http://www.neoreader.com/
  - You can scan the barcode from the computer screen, just take a picture of the screen with the camera phone.

National Plant Board

APHIS website
Charting New Technologies:

“A New World is at Hand”

The Westin Poinsett
Greenville, SC
April 19-22, 2009

Purpose: Explore new technologies that might assist SPROs in tracking and monitoring the movement of regulated articles.

Expected Outcomes:
- Develop an understanding of some of these potential new technologies.
- Determine if these new technologies might be incorporated into daily work.
- Is there interest from SPB membership in exploring a pilot project?

MEGATrends in the Green Industry

Fact: The Green Industry in the U.S. represents $148 billion in economic impacts and two million jobs nationally.

Fact: Nursery and floral production still represent one of the fastest growing sectors in the agricultural arena—however, there is a trend toward a maturing market.

- Structural Changes in the Industry—Box store chains have exposed consumers to a diversity of nursery and floral products, thus increasing the size of the pie.
- Buyers are more sophisticated.
- Competition is producing a greater emphasis on cost and service.

Source: Crop Insurance Today, November, 2008

Implications of Making Food (and other stuff) Easier to Track......

Recent References:
- Recent difficulties in tracing spinach and Taco Bell e-coli outbreaks have resulted in increased costs to producers and threatened the health of consumers.
- Despite decades of steady progress, the safety of the nation’s food supply has not improved over the past three years. According to Dr. Stephen Sundlof, Director, FDA Food Center—“As the supply chains get longer and longer, there’s more opportunity to introduce contaminants that have a public effect.”
- Tracking Fido—Positioning Animals Worldwide (PAW) utilizes a small rectangular box that attaches to the pet’s collar that connects with satellites and cell phone towers to provide a GPS location for the pet at all times. The system sends a text message to alert you that the pet is out of bounds and provides its location.

NCD&CS-Plant Conservation Program-Plant Marking Program

Ginseng and Venus Flytrap are designated as Special Concern Species (These species are unlawful to distribute, sell or offer for sale, except as provided for in regulations.)
Venus Flytrap
*Principal populations are found in North and South Carolina.
*Currently found in 11 counties in NC.
*General monitoring indicates a severe decline of the species statewide.

Ginseng
*In 2007, the price topped at $1,000/pound.
*As such, the demand and request for permits to collect on federal lands tripled.
*Most biologists feel the populations are declining.

Ginseng
*In 2007, the price topped at $1,000/pound.
*As such, the demand and request for permits to collect on federal lands tripled.
*Most biologists feel the populations are declining.

Plant Marking Program
- Program Initiated in 1996 to address the illegal collection of ginseng.
- Program is now utilized in 13 states and three countries for marking various items including hay, pumpkins, artifacts, petrified wood and endangered animals and plants.

How is the Marking Program Implemented?
- Phase I: The program began with coded inserts.
- Phase II: Utilized a fluorescent dye mixed with a silicon coded chip to identify location.
- Phase III: Utilizes a DNA marking system with a distinctive marker (by location), a dye and scent marker for K-9s.

Tracking the Program’s Success
- In the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, ginseng was being poached at record rates.
- At the outset of the program in 1996, 80 individuals were prosecuted in both state and federal courts.
- With the program implemented, only 6 individuals are currently being prosecuted and subject to active prison sentences.

Monitoring the Program’s Success
- At the outset of the program, 16 five-acre plots were set up for monitoring on a yearly basis.
- Additionally, there are 29 non-intensive plots monitored every three years.
- Based on monitoring results, reproductive populations have rebounded. At one site:
  - 1996: 300 plants
  - 2006: 1,524 plants

Hawaii RFID Traceability and Food Safety Pilot Project
Project Goal: Develop and pilot test a relatively limited and simple high technology (passive RFID) food traceability system that adds value to fresh produce marketing efforts.
RFID Project Sponsors: USDA (CREES) and DoD, Economic Development Alliance of Hawaii, Federal State Marketing Improvement Program, and Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation.
Project Objectives:
- Introduce Hawaii’s food producer, processor, distributor and shipping supply chain players to high technology tagging and capabilities using RFID.
- Provide Seal of Quality and fresh produce buyers with the assurance that the product they buy is directly traceable to the Hawaiian farm or processor.
- Assure that Hawaii’s farmers are supported through supply chain efficiency, accountability and security as a key competitive marketing strategy.
- Provide the state’s farmers with a unifying, easy to use and cost effective means of collecting and preserving quality and safety data.
- Reduce the financial and health exposure to DoD and public retailers, farmers and the buying public in the event of a product recall.

DVD: Hawaii’s Food Safety System
From Traceability to Certification
EAB is devastating but is not the only risk associated with firewood?

Firewood can spread a number of forest pests and diseases:

- Beech bark disease
- Dutch elm disease
- Emerald Ash Borer
- Gypsy moth
- Hemlock woolly adelgid
- Oak wilt
- Sudden oak death
- Sirex woodwasp
- Redbay ambrosia beetle

Firewood - Before EAB – Firewood was like any other regulated article
- Firewood movement played a significant role in determining quarantine resolution, CA stipulations, treatment options
- Thought to be the most effective mode of spread (especially stochastic anthropogenic dispersal)
- Harmonized regulation of Firewood with CFIA

Firewood – All hardwood firewood regulated
- Firewood of all hardwood (non-coniferous) species § 301.53-2
- Four (4) main modes of movement
  - John Q. Public (non-commercial) no logic
  - Producers - bulk sales for 1st and 2nd home heating – transportation limited (150 mi)
  - Big Box distribution – often brokered – moved large distances – labeling issues
  - By-product – usually cash and carry from mill, arborists, municipalities

Firewood - Treatment options
- 1) Removal of bark and an additional ½” of wood
- 2) Kiln-Drying (max. thickness of wood is three inches)
- 3) Fumigate
- 4) Heat treatment

Firewood - Quality Assurance
- Monitoring schedule
- OFW - Weekly monitoring
- HT - Weekly monitoring
- Safeguarding - Monthly monitoring

Firewood - Compliance agreements templates are in place for producers and distributors
- Only treatment used, until just recently, was removal of bark and underlying wood
- With approval of HT and KD we are working with CPHST to approve facilities
- Firewood CAs listed on PPQ web site
Challenge for commercial operations?

- Employee turn-over
- Quality Assurance

Firewood – Non Commercial

- Highlights agency’s lack of appropriate deterrent for non-commercial movement violations.
- Over 80 stipulations of $250.00 assessed.
- Because this product involves movement by the general public extensive outreach is continuous as part of the program.
- Highlights need to reform States’ authorities for agricultural penalties
Driving a 30 by 60 mile square on roads leading to the raceway, a few days prior to the race, 42 event firewood sales locations were found. 21 were residential and 21 were business of some sort.

Don't Move EAB at NASCAR Speed!

Risk Assessments & Pathway Analysis

Great Smoky Mountains Regulatory Outreach Operation
Bristol, TN (August, 2006 and 2008)

- 6 TN counties (at least) cater to race fans
- 77 Campgrounds listed on Speedway website
- Plates from 40 different states observed
- One camp near Speedway holds 2000 campers
What is the risk at parks and campgrounds?

One and two day drives from EAB quarantine

Fear of moving hitchhiking pests by firewood has prompted states to adopt Firewood policies

Besides education and outreach how do we deter non-commercial movement of firewood?

• Due to the high level of risk associated individual’s moving firewood the EAB program, in cooperation with IES, has developed a table of penalties for non-commercial violations of domestic quarantines. Since this development numerous stipulations of $250 and up have been issued for non-commercial firewood violations. PPQ is exploring spot penalty process for violations.
Questions

Art maybe, but still firewood, needs to be treated or mitigated for movement.
Movement of Firewood and Invasive Species

Southern Plant Board Meeting
April 20, 2009
Paul Merten-USDA Forest Service Forest Health Protection

Resolutions by Partners

- USDA,APHIS and Forest Service
  "develop, in cooperation with the National Plant Board and the national Association of State Foresters, a national education and outreach program with a clear national message that is consistent and uniform across state lines." (NPB Resolution #2, 2007)

- Resolutions by Partners
  "USDA is encouraged to move expeditiously to provide a standardized treatment and certification procedure for interstate movement of all firewood for the purpose of controlling the spread of destructive forest pest and diseases." (NASF Resolution #2007-3)

- Resolutions by Partners
  "Strong outreach and educational campaigns are essential. Surveys have shown the public to be generally supportive of such measures if they adequately understand the reasons behind them. Import regulations based on international phytosanitary standards for the proper treatment of wood products are already in place. Regulations are urgently needed for inter-state commerce, particularly with regard to firewood. (FHTF PP08-1)

Forest Service Actions

- Forest Service Actions
  At this time we are not proposing a national policy on the movement of firewood on to, or off of, National Forest Systems (NFS) lands. We are however, encouraging Regions to stay current and aware of the issue and implement local guidelines and policies as necessary and commensurate with threats from major forest insect and disease invasive pests. Regions should also coordinate and consult with State regulatory agencies and the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), who have primary responsibility for regulating the movement of items that may harbor pests, such as firewood. (Dept. Chiefs S&PF and NFS, November 2008)

- Forest Service Actions
  Currently the Forest Service does not have a national firewood movement policy.

- Forest Service Actions
  Some National Forests have firewood restrictions to slow the spread of pests and diseases - Superior and Allegheny

- Forest Service Actions
  Some Regions/Areas have launched don't move firewood campaigns producing informational material and holding conferences.

BACK TO TOP
Forest Service Actions

- The Western Wildland Environment Threat Assessment Center has a fellow looking at “Pathways and Risk Assessment of Emerald Ash Borer Movement Into and Within the Western United States”
  - Exploring major pathways including firewood
  - Report still in draft

- Summer 2008 Robert Haack et al. from the NRS conducted a survey of the confiscated firewood collected from the Mackinac Bridge in Mackinaw City, MI
  - Examined and split 1045 pieces of firewood from 21 genera, 26 species
  - Determined that 64% of the pieces had current or past borer activity

(Haack et al. unpublished data)

Efforts of FHP and Cooperating State Forestry Organizations

- Developing Information and Educational material in several media platforms explaining the potential spread of invasive species through movement of firewood
- Collecting information on policies of firewood movement in the Southeast US
- Implementing the message of firewood movement and potential invasive species spread in various public awareness efforts (emerald ash borer, laurel wilt, gypsy moth)
- Support the Don't Move Firewood website administered by The Nature Conservancy

Questions for Discussion

- Can/should FHP do more?
- What is the role/responsibility of the Forest Service as compared to APHIS?
- Should the Forest Service develop a national firewood policy including the resolutions supported by the NASF and NPB? If so, what does it cover?
The primary purpose of the NCPN is to develop and support a network of facilities that cooperate to diagnose and treat high-value specialty crop germplasm (e.g. grapes, pomes, stone fruits, berries, citrus, etc) and establish pathogen-free stocks available to nurseries and growers for propagation, including through state certified nursery systems.

NCPN Farm Bill 2008 Funding - Update
- $5 million each year for 4 years
- FY 2009 – 2012 ($20 million total)
- Funds are ‘No-Year’ – Available Until Expended
- OMB Apportionment to APHIS – April 17, 2009

NCPN Program Funding Logistics
- Competitive Cooperative Agreements Program
- Request for Proposals Anticipated June/July 2009
- Cooperator Access to Funds >>> August/September 2009
- Funding Distribution
  - Operation > 60%
  - Methods > 10%
  - Extension > 10%
  - Governance > 10%
  - Audits/Evaluations/Improvements > 10%

NCPN Business Plan
- Mission, Goals, Performance Measures, and Funding Plan
- Cleared by APHIS, ARS, CSREES, OBPA, and OMB
- Distributed at NCPN General Meeting (March 25-26)
  - Stakeholder Feedback Requested
- Final Anticipated in May 2009

NCPN General Meeting - 2009
- Purpose
  - NCPN Updates
  - Discuss Business Plan
  - Propose Program Funding Model
- Concluded March 25-26
  - US Nat’l Arboretum, Washington, DC
- About 60 Stakeholders
  - Representing Grapes, Fruit Trees, Citrus, Hops, Other Specialty Crops
- Highlight > 3 USDA Agency Administrators Sign NCPN MOU
NCPN MOU

- Lays NCPN Foundation at Federal Level
  - Program Goals and Governance
  - 3 Agency Partners >>> APHIS / ARS / CSREES
- Signed at NCPN General Meeting
  - US Nat’l Arboretum
  - March 26, 2009

Dr. Meryl Broussard, CSREES
Mr. Kevin Shea, APHIS
Dr. Edward Knipling, ARS

NCPN Governance – April 2009

- NCPN Nat’l Governing Body
- Tier 1
- Tier 2
- Tier 3

- Others
- Pending

- Fruit Tree CPN Governing Body
- Grape CPN (GCPN) Governing Body
- Eastern GCPN
- Western GCPN

NCPN Governance – Plant Board Connection

- NCPN is Stakeholder Driven
- NCPN Advisory Bodies:
  - National
  - Specialty Crop Commodity
  - Local
- Gov. Bodies Counsel NCPN on:
  - Policies
  - Procedures
  - Funding Issues
- National NCPN Members – NPB
  - Wayne Dixon (Florida)
  - Ken Reuter (Michigan)
  - Tom Wiesse (Washington)
- Specialty Crop NCPN Members – NPB
  - Mike Colon (California) – Grapes
  - Cindy Harden (South Carolina) – Fruit Trees
  - Jan Hedberg (Oregon) – Grapes
  - Darrell Holliday (Nevada) – Grapes
  - Dave Johnson (Missouri) – Grapes
  - Nancy Oakley (Oregon) – Fruit Trees
  - Ruth Witter (Pennsylvania) – Fruit Trees

Specialty Crop Commodities in NCPN

- Specialty Crop Groups Must Form Networks
  - Membership >>> States, Universities, Nurseries, Growers
- Current Networks (2009):
  - Grapes
  - Fruit Trees (Pomes and Stone Fruits)
- Pending Networks (2010/2011)?
  - Citrus
  - Berries
- Pending Networks (2012)?
  - Hops
  - Others

Upcoming NCPN Issues – Plant Board Interests

- Establishing GRAPE Foundation Blocks in Eastern USA
  - Discussion
- Exploring NCPN Possibilities for a CITRUS Program
  - Discussion
- Establishing FRUIT TREE Foundation Blocks in Eastern USA
  - Discussion
NCPN – Fruit Tree Network - Purpose

Goals:
1. Develop stratagem to preserve functionality of existing programs
2. Provide platform for sustainable activities

Action Items:
1. Formalize Tier 2 commodity committee
2. Develop charter
3. Develop vision of the fruit tree network
4. Develop FTCPN certification guidelines
5. Review testing protocols and requirements

NCPN – Fruit Tree TIER 2 Voting Members

- Industry representatives:
  - Lynnell Brandt, Brandt’s Fruit Trees, Parker, WA
  - Phil Baugher, Adams County Nursery, Aspers, PA
  - Robert Wroolley, Dave Wilson Nursery, Hokitika, CA
  - Chalmers Carr, Titan Farms, Ridge Spring, SC

- State regulatory representatives:
  - Christel Harden, South Carolina
  - Nancy Osterbauer, Oregon
  - Ruth Welliver, Pennsylvania

- University research representatives:
  - Simon Scott, Clemson University, Clemson, SC (Vice-Chair)
  - Ken Eastwell, Washington State University, Prosser, WA (Chair)

- University extension representative:
  - Steve Hoving, Cornell University, Hudson Valley, NY

NCPN – Fruit Tree Tier 2 Non-Voting Members

- CWG representatives
  - APHIS (Quarantine), ARS (Research), CSREES (Extension)

- NCPN National Coordinator:
  - Erich Rudyj, NCPN Coordinator, USDA-APHIS

- National Clonal Germplasm Repository (NCGR) representative:
  - Vacant

- USDA-APHIS (PPQ) representative:
  - Margarita Licha, USDA-APHIS-PPQ, Beltsville, MD

- American Nursery & Landscape Assn. representative:
  - Mark Teffeau, ANLA/HRI, Washington, DC

- Subject matter experts:
  - Invited ad hoc by Tier 2 voting members

WA State Univ. Initiative, 2008
Stone Fruit and Pomes

Program Name:
• National Virus Tested Fruit-Tree Program (NRSP-5) - WSU Prosser

Program Importance:
• Primary source for virus tested Stone and Pome fruits in the USA
• Reason for APHIS support
• Existing CSREES funding source set to expire soon
• Maintaining high degree of Stone/Pome Fruit national disease-free status
• Test at least 100 new plant accessions annually
• Provide technical support for ongoing USDA-Citrus Program

APHIS Funding for FY 2008
$225,000

Clemson Univ. Initiative, 2008
Stone Fruit and Pomes

Program Name:
• Southeastern Budwood Program; Clemson Univ., South Carolina

Program Importance:
• Locally recognized and respected authority in disease management
• Maintaining high degree of Stone/Pome Fruit national disease-free status
• Test at least 40 blocks of budwood trees for certain viruses

APHIS Funding for FY 2008
$48,980

Eastern Fruit Tree Mother Blocks
An Identified Need

- Issue:
  - SE USA has a recognized need for ‘local’ fruit tree mother blocks

- Specialty Crop:
  - Peaches, possibly other fruit trees

- Reason:
  - Varietal differences; Seasonal variations; Locally applicable techniques

- Support:
  - NCPN National Governing Body
  - Fruit Tree Clean Plant Network (FTCPN) – Tier 2 National Group

- Next Steps?
  - Discussion

Clemson Fruit Tree Clean Plant Center Site Visit
  - Late April 2009 (South Carolina)

NCPN Recent or Upcoming Meetings and Site Visits

- Nat’l Assn. of State Depts. of Agriculture (NASDA) – April 6, 2009
  - Eastern Plant Board – April 7-9, 2009 (Raleigh, NC)
  - Southern Plant Board – April 19-21 (Greenville, SC)
  - Clemson Fruit Tree Clean Plant Center Site Visit – Late April 2009 (South Carolina)

- National Grape & Wine Initiative (NGWI) – April 27, 2009 (Washington, DC)
  - NCPN National Governing Body Meeting – May 12-14, 2009 (Washington, DC)
  - NCPN Citrus Concept Meeting – Late June, 2009 (Florida)
2008 Farm Bill: Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention Provision

Dr. Matt Royer
Director, Pest Detection
Emergency and Domestic Programs

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 Sec. 10201

Section 10201: Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention.

Secretary is to make available Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) funds for early detection and rapid response of pest threats.

The 5-year Farm Bill specifies that these funds are to be made available incrementally, starting with $12 million in FY09, $45 million in FY10, and $50 million in FY11 and thereafter.

In consultation with the National Plant Board and other interested parties, to enter into a cooperative agreement with each State department of agriculture ...

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 Sec. 10201

To establish a threat identification and mitigation program to determine and address threats to the domestic production of crops.

Develop risk assessments of the potential threat to the agricultural industry of the United States from foreign sources, collaborate with the NPB, and implement action plans for high consequence plant pests and diseases.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 Sec. 10201

To provide funds and technical assistance ... for audit-based certification systems and nursery plant pest risk management systems, in collaboration with the nursery industry, research institutions, and other entities to address plant pests.
July 29-31, 2008
APHIS convened a meeting, in Frederick, MD, with the National CAPS Committee (includes National Plant Board representatives), US Forest Service and the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service.

December 17, 2008
Implementation Plan was approved by the Department for release to the public. Plan was sent to NPB and others.

February 17, 2009
Section 103 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Stimulus Bill) modified the 2008 Farm Bill to allow a portion of the CCC funding provided (for Sections 10201 and 10202) for administrative costs.

Additions/revisions to the plan since December 2008:
- Benefit to small producers (98% of farms have annual revenue < $250k)
- 2009 “Stimulus Bill” allows use of the funds for salaries and related administrative expenses, including technical assistance, to implement the plan (est. 10%).
- Performance Measures/Milestones (there will be additional ones)
- Changed Goal addressing “response” to “mitigation”

10201 Implementation Plan Goals
(Developed subsequent to the July 2008 meeting)

1. Enhanced Analysis & Survey
2. Domestic Inspection
3. Technology Enhancement
4. Safeguarding Nursery Production
5. Outreach and Education
6. Enhance Mitigation Capabilities

10201 Implementation Plan Goals
(Developed since the first meeting, July 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>APHIS Team Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhanced Analysis &amp; Survey</td>
<td>Dan Borchert, CPHST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Domestic Inspection</td>
<td>Tim McNary, PPQ-WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Technology Enhancement</td>
<td>Dan Fieselmann, CPHST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Safeguarding Nursery</td>
<td>Erich Rudyj, PHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outreach and Education</td>
<td>Heather Curlett, LPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhance Mitigation Capabilities</td>
<td>John Canaday, EDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To enhance gathering and analyzing all available data to efficiently and effectively make informed decisions, and to deploy resources to detect pests as early as possible.

**Performance Milestone**

Development of a high-level, on-line decision support tool for targeting areas for survey by January 2010.

### Implementation Plan Goal #2

#### 2. Domestic Inspection

To target domestic inspection activities at vulnerable points in the safeguarding continuum that result from the movement of products and commodities potentially carrying pests of regulatory significance.

**Performance Milestone**

Identify major commercial distribution locations that receive imported products in the 15 highest-risk States by January 2010. (evaluating the commodities produced and resources present, as well as the pathways, including ports of entry and volume of imports, in each State.)

**Performance Measures**

- Percent of major commercial distribution locations inspected each year.
- Number of canine teams trained for domestic inspection activities.
Implementation Plan Goal #2

2. Domestic Inspection

Examples:
- FF- in CA
- K9 teams

Implementation Plan Goal #3

5. Technology Enhancement

To provide training and deploy survey procedures and tools that will improve our ability to rapidly detect and accurately identify pests of regulatory significance.

Performance Measure
Percent of traps, lures, and other high quality survey supplies delivered to project survey sites within expected timeframes.

Examples:
- PHIS- T&L component
- T&L national coordinator
- T&L bulk procurement, stockpile

Implementation Plan Goal #4

4. Safeguarding Nursery Production

To develop science-based best management practices (BMPs) and risk mitigation practices to exclude, contain, and control regulated plant pests from the nursery production system.

To develop and harmonize audit-based Nursery Certification Programs (harmonize different certification programs, audit and inspection training for cooperators, and launching the program).

Performance Milestone
Establishment of an audit-based nursery certification program.

Performance Measure
Percent of nurseries certified under the audit-based nursery certification program.
**Implementation Plan Goal #4**

4. Safeguarding Nursery Production

**Performance Measure**
Percent of nurseries per region that produce Phytophthora ramorum host material that are contacted and engaged in the process of standardizing best management practices.

**Implementation Plan Goal #5**

5. Outreach and Education

**Performance Measure**
Number of volunteers trained.

Examples:
- CSREES- outreach i.e. small producers
- Communication Specialist position?

APHIS will provide $100,000 of the funds under the Outreach and Education Strategy each year that funds are authorized by the Farm Bill to CSREES to ensure that small producers are aware of and engaged in these activities.
Implementation Plan Goal #6

6. Enhance Mitigation Capabilities

To provide an unencumbered mechanism to determine the most suitable response and deploy resources quickly to mitigate potential economic and environmental damage and further spread of a detected pest of regulatory significance when deemed appropriate.

Performance measure

Percent increase in the number of participants exercised in PPQ's national preparedness training program.

Examples:

- ACP - N. Mexico, Baja
- PPV - NY
- FF - CA

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 Sec. 10201

Next Steps

3/30/2009 - Full Implementation Plan is posted on the APHIS website, as well as an updated timeline in the summary version as a "white paper."

3/30/2009 - The public may register via the Stakeholder Registry to receive updates and provide comments.

3/30/2009 - APHIS provides a transparent process of engaging stakeholders. Planning begins for a working meeting June 8-9, 2009 in Riverdale, MD with an objective of developing detailed plans for outyears with stakeholders' input.

4/2/2009 - Meeting with the SCFBA Implementation Team - Horticulture/APHIS.


TBD - APHIS may begin spending CCC funds after the apportionment is received from OMB.

By 9/30/09 - Priorities are identified and funds disbursed to cooperators.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 Sec. 10201 Proposed Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Analysis &amp; Survey</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Inspection</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Enhancement</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Nursery Production</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Education</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Mitigation Capabilities</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Useful Links:

- [10201 Farm Bill website](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/pest_detection/farm_bill.shtml)
- [Federal Grants/Agreements](http://www.usaspending.gov)
- [AMS - Specialty Crops list](http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/ams.fetchTemplateData.do?template=TemplateN&navID=DefinitionofSpecialtyCrops&rightNav1=DefinitionofSpecialtyCrops&topNav=&leftNav=CommodityAreas&page=SCBGPProcedures&resultType=&acct=fvgrnt)
- [AMS - Specialty Crop Block Grant Program](http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/ams.fetchTemplateData.do?template=TemplateN&navID=SpecialtyCropBlockGrantProgram&rightNav1=SpecialtyCropBlockGrantProgram&topNav=&leftNav=CommodityAreas&page=SCBGP&resultType=)
- [ERS:](http://www.ers.usda.gov/FarmBill/2008/Titles/TitleXHorticulture.htm#peststanddiseasemgmt)

Meetings:

[http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/!ut/p/_s.7_0_A/7_0_1OB?contentidonly=true&navid=FARMBILL2008&contentid=farmbill_meetings.xml](http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/!ut/p/_s.7_0_A/7_0_1OB?contentidonly=true&navid=FARMBILL2008&contentid=farmbill_meetings.xml)

All Farm Bill Topics:

Official Control 101

Southern Plant Board Meeting
Greenville, South Carolina
April 21, 2009
Diane Schuble
National Coordinator for Official Control
USDA APHIS PPQ
Emergency and Domestic Programs (EDP)
Riverdale, MD

What is Official Control?

- The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) defines official control as:
  - The active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests.
  - This refers to regulated pests in an importing country that are present but not widely distributed.

How does the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) prevent the spread & introduction of plant pests, and promote appropriate measures for their control?

- Adopts International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs)
  - The guideline for the interpretation and application of the concept of Official Control is found in ISPM No. 5, Supplement No. 1

What Does This Have to Do with States?

Official Control can be conducted on the national or sub-national level

Federally Regulated Official Control (FROC)
Plant pest programs run by APHIS PPQ, such as:
- Karnal Bunt
- Gypsy Moth
- Imported Fire Ant
- P. ramorum
- Federal Noxious Weeds

State Managed Official Control (SMOC)
Plant pests that APHIS PPQ does not regulate, but States may.
This is the focus of the APHIS PPQ Official Control Program.

Why Does APHIS PPQ Wish to Establish This Official Control Program?

- Since APHIS PPQ does not have the resources to regulate every pest of limited distribution, Official Control gives States the opportunity to have their qualifying programs recognized.
- Official Control is structured to require non-discriminatory phytosanitary action for a given pest in foreign and domestic trade. This will formalize our compliance with the IPPC.

If APHIS PPQ Doesn’t Have the Resources, How Can States Be Expected to Provide Them???

- States may, depending on the pest, leverage existing resources/programs to be in compliance with the IPPC, such as:
  - General Nursery Survey
  - Warehouse Survey/Distribution Ctr Inspections
  - Discretionary Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Funding
  - Border Inspections
What Would States Be Expected to Do?

- Establish legislation for a target plant pest
- Collaborate with interested States and agree to a common program
- Petition to APHIS PPQ for recognition of that program
- Survey for, contain/eradicate target pest, and report results to APHIS PPQ, including exclusionary activity.

What Information is Required for a Petition?

- Evidence the pest is present or absent in the State
- Evidence the pest could enter and become established
- A reasonable argument the pest could cause economic and/or environmental harm
- A maintenance plan
- Quarantine regulations

What Would States Receive from APHIS PPQ?

- Protection at Ports of Entry from pests under official control when destined to States where that pest is under official control
- Phytosanitary actions equivalent to those imposed by States in interstate commerce to be applied to foreign imports

What Would States Receive from APHIS PPQ?

- Action from APHIS PPQ if a pest under official control is found in a State where that pest is under official control when originating in foreign commerce

Important Definitions

- Pest - Any species, strain, or biotype of plant, animal, or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products.
- Quarantine Pest - 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.
- Regulated Non-Quarantine Pest - A non-quarantine pest whose presence in plants for planting affects the intended use of those plants with an economically unacceptable impact and which is therefore regulated within the territory of the importing contracting party.

Let’s look at some examples:

- Could these pests qualify for Official Control?
  - Hemlock Wooly Adelgid (Adelges tsugae)
  - Soybean Rust (Phakopsora pachyrhizi)
  - Sweet Potato Weevil (Cylas formicarius)
  - Africanized bees

Not the best choices.
Why Wouldn't They Be Good Candidates?

Hemlock Wooly Adelgid – States would not get the return for their effort to qualify. This pest is not seen at ports of entry.

Soybean Rust – It is not possible to contain this wind-borne disease. Approach it as a Management Program.

Why Wouldn't They Be Good Candidates?

Sweet Potato Weevil – States would not get the return for their effort to qualify. Protection at ports of entry is already in place. Sweet potatoes are only enterable from Canada, where the pest does not occur.

Africanized Bees – All bees, by-products and their equipment fall under Federal Regulation (7CFR 322).

How About These Pests for Official Control?

- Red-Banded Whitefly (Tetraleurodes persae) – Present in CA
  - Threat to avocados?

- Brown Marmorated Stink Bug (Halyomorpha halys) – Present in PA, NJ, DE, MD, SC, WV, OR
  - Threat to citrus, fruit trees, ornamentals?

- Painted Bug (Bagrada hilaris) – Present in CA
  - Threat to crucifers, cotton, papaya?

Why?

- They are present somewhere in the United States
- There is an import pathway
- A technically sound containment/eradication program is possible, including prohibition in a State where that pest is not present

What if YOUR State has an established pest that others plan to put under official control?

- Join the petition if you can contain/eradicate the pest from your State
- Decline to join the petition if you are unable to contain/eradicate the pest from your State
- Meet the requirements of another State’s external quarantine, as well as maintaining your own quarantine intrastate
- Meet the requirements of another State’s external quarantine

This already occurs!

What if YOUR State declines to join a petition for a pest that is or is not present there?

That pest will not be actionable at ports of entry when destined to your State.

Can you change your mind if you later decide the pest does have an adverse economic impact in your State?

YES!
Official Control PPQ Steering Committee

Diane Schuble, Leader

From Emergency and Domestic Programs (EDP):
- Alan Dowdy
- Matthew Royer

From Plant Health Programs (PHP):
- Joseph Covey
- Matthew Rhoads
- Dorothy Wayson
- Evelia Sosa
- C. Frederic Mann
- Nancy Klig
- Julie Aliaga
- Shirley Wager-Page (until Feb 2009)

- Robert Griffin, Center for Plant Health Control & Technology
- Tim McNary, Western Region
- Billy Newton, Eastern Region
- Loney Campbell, Eastern Region

Advisors:
- Robert Bailey, Western Region
- Todd Schreader, EDP
- Eric Nichols, APHIS, Intl Services
- Anna Rinick, Policy & Program Development

Also Consulted:
- Mark Dagro, PPQ Prof Devel Ctr
- Scott Sanner, SITC
- Robert Huttenlocker, APHIS, IES
- Kevin Harriger, US Customs
- Dorthea Zadig, CA Dept Food & Ag
- Gene Chase, NC Dept Ag & Consumer Ser

Thank you for your attention!

I’ll do my best to answer your questions, today and in the future.

Diane Schuble
National Coordinator for Official Control
Riverdale, Maryland
Diane.L.Schuble@aphis.usda.gov
301.734.8723
Domestic Compliance Agreements

Southern Plant Board
April 21, 2009

USDA-PPQ/NPB Joint Committee looking at federal and state...

- Certificates
- Limited permits
- Compliance agreements

Committee Members:

PPQ
- Phil Garcia
- Tim McNary
- Jeff Grode
- Gary Clement
- Todd Schroeder
- Jane Levy
- William Newton
- Paul Hornby
- Vicki Wohlers

Plant Boards
- Robin Pruisner
- Tom Durkis
- Courtney Albrect
- Ken Rauscher
- Geir Friisoe
- Gray Haun

Three major issues identified by the Compliance Agreement Committee:

- Input from receiving states.
- Appropriate notification.
- Authority to collect user fees to cover monitoring of CA’s or product shipments.

- Workgroups formed to look at each -
Three major issues identified by the Compliance Agreement Committee:

- Input from receiving states.
- Appropriate notification.
- Authority to collect user fees to cover monitoring of CA's or product shipments: PPQ ET agrees
  - PPQ will look into user fee authority associated with CA's, certificates, and limited permits

Compliance Agreements, Certificates, and Limited Permits

Next Steps

- EDP Staff Position assigned - Charlie Brown
- Plans include looking into
  - Past (e.g. how do we learn about compliance?)
  - Present (e.g. where are the main issues?)
  - Future (e.g. PHIS and other "fixes")
- Clearly the continued communication and collaboration between PPQ and NPB will be necessary to move these issues forward.
Cooperative Agriculture Pest Survey (CAPS):
An overview of and developments since the national CAPS meeting

Brian Kopper, Ph.D.
USDA-APHIS-PPQ

Phoenix CAPS Meeting
Working meeting designed to meet two major goals:
• Allow CAPS management and the field to discuss the program
• Develop a series of recommendations for improvement

Breakout Sessions
• Surveys
  • Survey types (Commodity, Risk & Commodity-like)
  • Survey Methodology and Guidelines
• Managing Cooperative Agreements at the State Level
• Analytical Tools to Conduct CAPS Business
• Appropriate Data to Collect and Record

Surveys
• A need to re-evaluate the commodity surveys
  • What is working? What is not?
• Are the guidelines clear?

The message heard:
• Commodity surveys can be too restrictive
Surveys

• Solution:
  • Keep 75/25 split but expand the commodity survey to include pathways and high risk areas (needs to be justified).
  • Keep guidelines (and templates) as same as possible.

Managing Cooperative Agreements

• Work plan requirements (burdens) and increased demands from OPM

The message heard:

  • With tight budgets scrutiny has increased
  • Agreements need to be transparent
  • Data needs to be accessible

Managing Cooperative Agreements

Solution:

  • Hard to provide solution given that changes are made at the APHIS level
  • Goal is to streamline and integrate as much as possible to better manage the program

Analytical Tools to Conduct CAPS Business

• Planning: Access available data to determine where to survey for target pests
• Reporting: Simplification of work plan/accomplishment report submission, trap/lure procurement, data reporting, etc

The message heard:

  • Cooperators want more access to PPQ systems
  • Getting data can be cumbersome: The work is getting done but it’s hard to quantify
  • Work plans and accomplishment reports need to be simplified
Analytical Tools to Conduct CAPS Business

- Solution:
  - Prepare to integrate CAPS into PHIS in the coming years
  - Work towards making the whole CAPS “process” easier
    - Template for accomplishment reports
    - Transparent trap/lure procurement process
    - NAPIS and accountability reporting
    - PHIS survey templates and data availability

Appropriate Data to Collect and Record

- What data do we need to record to meet our needs?
  - Natives to regulatory incidents

The message heard:

- The field has very different views regarding what data should be recorded

Summary

- The National CAPS meeting was a success
- It provided “marching orders” for the program
- The NCC continues to make changes to meet the needs of the field & Congress

Appropriate Data to Collect and Record

Solution:

- Set protocols need to be established

CAPS program contacts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bowers</td>
<td>Nat. Survey Coord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Kopper</td>
<td>ER Survey Coord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristian Rondeau</td>
<td>WR Survey Coord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Smith</td>
<td>ER Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny Graves</td>
<td>SPB Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Dahl</td>
<td>CPB Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hilburn</td>
<td>WR Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Brumbaugh</td>
<td>WR SPHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Watkins</td>
<td>ER SPHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Silagi</td>
<td>ER Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Stiers</td>
<td>WR Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Canes</td>
<td>ER Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wallace</td>
<td>ER Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Fieselmann</td>
<td>CPHST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACK TO TOP
**SPDN Program Update**

Amanda Hodges, Ph.D.
SPDN Associate Director
University of Florida, IFAS
Entomology & Nematology Department

---

**Diagnostic Lab Reports-SPDN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>3121</td>
<td>3391</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>5196</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>4628</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>3853</td>
<td>3605</td>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2736</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Total Samples-SPDN**

- April 17, 2009 (Data Information Download)
- 86,743 samples (2004-09)
- National Repository-CERIS at Purdue University
- Direct Data Upload Tool Available, April 2009
- Official NPDN Data Policy, December 2008

---

**First Detector Training**

- Traditional and/or Webinar-Based Training
  - Over 500 Sessions (nationally)
  - Over 9,000 Registered First Detectors
- Training Materials Available to Educators
  - Core Modules (5) and Special Topic Modules (11)
  - Master Gardener Fact Sheets (Under Development)
  - Searchable Catalog of Resources, 2009

http://cbc.at.ufl.edu/
NPDN E-Learning

- System Requirements
  - High-Speed Internet Connection
  - Adobe® Flash Player
- Content Management-Based Authoring Tool
- Post-module quizzes consist of question test banks.
- Design Concept: Interactively Engage Learners

E-Learning, Released April 2008

Chilli Thrips, May 30, 2009

Plenary Session Highlights

- Dr. Clive Brasier, UK Forestry Commission, ‘International Trade: A Threat to Plant Biosecurity’
- Dr. Wayne Dixon, Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services, Division of Plant Industry, ‘Invasive Arthropods in Natural Areas and Agricultural Plant Systems’
- Dr. Jacque Fletcher, Oklahoma State University, ‘The Science and Practice of Forensic Plant Pathology’

Featured Symposia

- ‘New and Emerging Threats’, organized by Dr. Pat Shiel, USDA-APHIS-PPQ, Carolyn Klass, Cornell University, and Fred Warner, Michigan State University
- ‘Genomic Tools and Resources for Pest Identification’, organized by Drs. Phil Berger, Laurene Levy, and Pat Shiel, USDA-APHIS-PPQ
- ‘Novel Techniques for Detection and Surveillance’, organized by Drs. Paul Vincelli, University of Kentucky, and Pat Shiel, USDA-APHIS-PPQ
Workshops

- ‘Technology Tools and the NPDN’ organized by Dr. Amanda Hodges, University of Florida

SPDN Advisory Council

- Advise SPDN Governance:
  - The Advisory Council will meet at least twice annually by conference call.
  - Additional conference calls will be scheduled with the group on an as-needed basis.
- SPDN Governance:
  - SPDN Governance will consider the recommendations of the SPDN Advisory Council when developing the priorities of the region and in the operation of the network.

SPDN Advisory Council

- **Plant Pathology Department Chairs**: John Sherwood (GA), Dave Appel (TX)
- **State SPDN Subcontract PIs**: Clayton Hollier (LSU) (Council Chair), Rick Cartwright (AR)
- **State Plant Regulatory Officers**: Gray Haun (TN), Christel Harden (SC)
- **Entomology Working Group Members**: Eric Day (VA), Frank Hale (TN)
- **Land Grant University Diagnosticians**: One vacant seat, Clarissa Babalian (MS) (Council Secretary)

Questions??

Amanda Hodges, Ph.D.
Assistant Extension Scientist
Associate Director, SPDN
Entomology & Nematology Department
University of Florida, IFAS
Gainesville, FL
schodges@ufl.edu
(352) 392-1901 x. 199
**HISSC - 2008**  
**Lexington, KY**

**Day 1**
- Post Entry Quarantine  
  - Jose Ceballos, National PEQ Training Coordinator  
  - First training for new training  
  - History  
  - Goals  
  - Paperwork!  
  - Scenarios  
  - Certification

**Day 2**
- Horticulture at Gainesway Farm  
  - Ryan Martin, Director of Hort.  
- Top 10 Nursery & Landscape Pests  
  - Dr. Dan Potter, UK  
- Tour
Day 3

- Bees
  - Phil Craft, KY State Apiarist
- Current Issues in Plant Pathology
  - Julie Beale, UK Plant Diagnostic Lab
- Citrus Nursery Clean Stock Program
  - Stacey Simmons, FL Dept of Plant Industry
- Invasive Pests of Concern: EAB & HWA
  - Dr. Lee Townsend, UK

2009 Meeting

Sept 15-17, 2009
Hot Springs, AR
Highlights:
  - Day 1 – WPS
  - Day 2 – EAB, Dogwood Anthracnose, Phorid Fly for fire ant
  - Day 3 – Herbicide damage on ornamentals

$85 registration & $70 room rate
2009 Southern Plant Board Meeting

The Westin Poinsett
Greenville, SC
April 19-22, 2009

Special Thanks To Tennessee for Hosting the 2008 Meeting

SPB Horticultural Tour to Holtkamp Greenhouses, April, 2008

Special Thanks To Our NPB Leadership

Gray Haun and Carl Schulze-Our Washington Duo!
Will our nation’s Capitol ever be the same?

Putting the Year in Perspective...

Financial Crisis and Budgetary Issues:
It has been noted that 45 of our U.S. states and territories are experiencing financial issues—Who are the other five?

“One of the secrets in life is to make stepping stones out of stumbling blocks.”  
- Jake Penn

Southern Plant Board Resolutions/Support Letters

Refresher on 2008 Resolutions:
- Phytosanitary Fee Collection by States
- Honey Bee Imports
- National Honeybee Pest Survey and Quick Methods for Pest Identification

Southern Plant Board Resolutions/Support Letters

Refresher on 2008 Support Letters:
- Centralize compliance agreements
- Funding for the GM STS Program
- Survey and tree removal program for Plum Pox Virus
- Funding for the CHRP in Florida
- Comprehensive review of *P. ramorum*
Southern Plant Board Issues

Making stepping stones out of stumbling blocks

- Understanding the need for firewood regulations and education pallet and firewood issues
- Implementation of Official Control
- Special Needs Exemptions for *P. ramorum* and LBAM
- Citrus Health Response Plan—Clarify federal order
- Implementation of Farm Bill
- Compliance agreement systems
- Plant Health Information System (PHIS)
- USDA, BRS: Pilot project—additional states—FL & NC

Southern Plant Board Plant Pest Concerns

- Plant Pest Threats—
  - *Sirex* Woodwasp—Shift in USDA direction and potential need for state regulations.
  - LBAM Continuing concerns for introduction and spread.
  - Pea Leaf Miner—NPB fully supports regulating imported commodities for pea leaf miner into all states.
  - *P. ramorum*—Continued focus on comprehensive review, closing down known existing pathways and increased emphasis on regulatory pathways.

Southern Plant Board Plant Pest Concerns

- *Redbay* Ambrosia Beetle and Laurel Wilt—Impacts on *Redbay*, potentially *Sassafras*, and federally protected species such as *Lindera*. Potential issue with movement of firewood.
- *Africanized honey bee* introductions

Development of SPB statement and service statements.

SPB strategic and proactive planning.

How will SPB member states deal with diminishing resources?

Web 2.0 Technology (Social Media Tools—Use of new technologies to communicate, share information and network).

Southern Plant Board Committees

Audit Committee: Benny Graves, Chair, Joe Collins, Dennis Barclift, Harry Fulton, Advisor.

Resolutions Committee: Sancho Dickinson, Chair, Christel Harden, Richard Gaskella, Steve Schmidt.

Nominations Committee: Mike Evans, Chair, Terry Walker, Craig Roussel.

Awards/Necrology Committee: Frank Fulgham and Larry Nichols, Co-chair, Shashank Nilakhe, Jeanetta Cooper.

Southern Plant Board

Continue to make stepping stones out of stumbling blocks

Special thanks to the 2009 Hosts

Department of Plant Industry, Clemson University

BACK TO TOP
2009 Expenses
April 1, 2008 To Date

- NPB Dues $12,600.00
- Registration Reimbursements for 2008- $ 200.00
- Nashville Expenses $20,419.22
- HISSC 500.00
- Ball Game (Greenville) 800.00
- The Westin Poinsett 19,733.15
- Buses in Greenville 1,200.00
- BMW Tour 278.65
- Name Tags, etc. 269.32
- Other Reimbursements to Negar ?????
- **TOTAL** $55,955.02

2009 Income
April 1, 2008 To Date

- SPB Dues $10,725.00
- Registration $16,805.00
- Industry Sponsorships 1,750.00
- USDA Sponsorship 5,828.00
- Interest on Checking Through March 280.85
- **TOTAL** $27,530.00

2009 Meeting Expenses

- Hotel (Room Rental, Catering, etc.) $19,733.15
- Tour (Buses and BMW Tickets) 1,424.00
- Ball Park Outing 800.00
- Other 278.65
- Other ?????
- **TOTAL** $22,215.8

THE BOTTOM LINE
April 22, 2009

- Cash on Hand $18,742.13
- CD (Matures in July) 14,569.87
- Dues Still Owed (Two members) 2,925.00
- Outstanding Debt
- **TOTAL ASSETS** $36,237.00