

Breakout – Enhanced Analysis and Surveys

Group 1

Comments:

- Need to prioritize pest/diseases within a particular commodity. Risk and economics needs to be examined at the same time so that we can rank and prioritize our pests. Consequences alone do not give the full picture.
- Need a way to measure if we are spending the money in the right places for survey. Cost/benefit analyses are needed.
- Need to weigh the benefit to the industry as well as the cost of doing the survey. As a performance measure.
- High priority needs to be on pest detection whether it is CAPS, traps, dog teams, mail, etc.
- Survey needs to be scientifically based and should reflect the impact of the risk this pest poses.
- Currently the system lacks pest-spread model for all pests.
- Don't want to lose ability for early detection of new pests moving to U.S.
- Look at production loss vs. market loss (cumulative loss?). Impacts on trade.
- Glad to see that survey methodologies looked at non-traditional pathways.
- FB money looks like it targets big states w/ lots of ports.

Questions:

- What does high-risk really mean? Lowest threshold for infestation or for introduction?

Recommendations:

- To develop a standardized economic and pest spread model for commodities of high economic value for pest prioritization and mitigation.
- Fully fund the pest detection efforts of high priority pests.
- Enhanced analysis and survey needs to dovetail with the CAPS program (avoid parallel play).
- Performance measures: Pests found (over time) vs. total work conducted.
- Surveys need to look at non-traditional pathways (not just ports).
- Take advantage of invasion biology literature and incorporate into prediction model analysis where possible.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

Group 2

Comments:

- To have a good program there needs to be a good infrastructure. Private industry can play a role in this (IPM PIPE). Utilize crop consultants. How to get industry information used as “official” information so that it can be used by PPQ.
- Problem that survey data cannot be accepted from private sources.
- Cannot accept negative data from non-regulatory officials.
- Indemnification has been brought up in the past with RMA.
- When seeds grown in other countries – need to know the risk.

Questions:

- If labs can be certified why not private industry?
- How do you handle organisms where the pest threat has not been recognized?

Recommendations:

- Set up an accreditation system for private industry so that they can participate in official surveys.
 - Develop standards for accepting positive and negative data from certified third parties through permits, IPM PIPE, etc.
- Enhance a communication structure so that private industry can report (and allow validation) new invasive species to dept. of ag.
- Fully fund highest priority surveys (including trapping).
- APHIS needs to accept samples submitted anonymously – may need to look at recommending changes to applicable laws.
- Indemnification should be considered so growers would voluntarily submit data.
- Need to focus more funding (e.g., CBI, parameter approach, OPIS, etc.) and information gathering (e.g., with third parties) on offshore pests.
 - Build capacity for pest analysis
- Need to educate offshore growers on what pests are a threat to the U.S.
- Performance measures: Actual pests intercepted and violations of existing quarantines. Negative data against level of effort.
- Need to identify highest risk nodes (choke-points) in high-risk pest pathways.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

Group 3

Comments:

- CAPS data, extension data, and others all collect data in separate databases but the databases don't communicate. Compiling at the state level then moving to the Federal system would make a more robust system.
- Need to find high-risk pathways that are not obvious.
- There are privacy issues with collecting data on businesses and personal information.

Questions:

- How does PDIS figure into PPQ?
- Is there a way to geocode all the factories with commodities so that we can focus our survey efforts?
- What are the downsides of having one of these mega databases (too much PII)?
- What is the response if something is found in a survey?

Recommendations:

- Develop a mechanism that would allow data sharing among currently discrete data sets. Eventually solicit other states data sets into a regional or national basis.
- Identify and target high risk pest pathways. Look above and beyond what we traditionally do (look at non-traditional locations such as ethnic markets, flea markets, beehives, etc.).
- USDA needs to formalize data sharing with state agencies. Need to address policy restrictions on sharing data.
- Create regional commodity surveys using sentinel sites.
- Need to know what the response is going to be once we find a high-priority, target pest.
- Enhance (more effort) high-risk surveillance programs (to aid in delimitation).

Group 4

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

Comments:

- The process should be improved through the farm bill.
- Each state should be evaluated based on risk (pathways, traffic, etc.) so that we have a better understanding of resource needs to address those risks. Use data among states to prioritize effort among states.
- Each state is interested in understanding the risks that they are exposed to and need to know how they were evaluated.
- National or regional situational awareness. Understanding the landscape at a particular level based on science and other factors.
- The CAPS program is very important but we need to be aware of the cost difference to do surveys in different states. Need to cost-out survey activities (particular for CAPS).

Questions:

- Do we evaluate the feasibility of eradication if pests are found?
- What are the boundaries (scope) of 10201? How can we make the whole process better? Is it feasible to establish 2010 criteria for surveys in advance?
- Is there higher deference being paid to specialty crops? Not really but they are now included where they were not in the past.

Recommendations:

- Look at the feasibility of if the pest can be eradicated if it were found.
- See continuation of the state evaluation process so that it is transparent to the states. Understanding the assumptions that are being used to evaluate the states. Continue risk assessment continuum. Regionalized. States part of the process. Greater transparency. Need annual evaluation of the process. Determine survey costs for each state and make sure funds are allocated based on actual costs.
- Need analysis to make sure that the survey practices represent the latest knowledge and will increase effectiveness. Are the right criteria used in decision process?
- Need some kind of formula to find balance between spending on surveys and public outreach.

Group 5

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

Comments:

- Don't over analyze pathway analysis at the expense of survey.
- Weighting of models must reflect how exotic species move. Ground truth and validate models with actual data.
- Be cautious of third-party assessments. Apple growers would prefer APHIS inspection.
- The model of risk is only as good as the least understood biological variable.

Questions:

- none

Recommendations:

- Emphasize survey over analysis.
- Need APHIS-run risk analysis (and continual monitoring) before foreign markets are allowed to ship to the U.S.
- Opposed to third-party data on domestic side without Reg. agency certification.
- Fully fund highest priority surveys and trapping.
 - Pests come into urban areas and feeder communities. Surveys need to be updated to reflect these changes in where people live.
 - Utilize "Hot Zone" concepts in these areas.
- Performance measures: Agreed upon standards are met (established protocols are followed) and results are reported. Trapping during the appropriate season. All trapping service intervals are completed on time.
- Weighted measures that prioritize the known / expected epidemiology of pests that are detected.

Group 6

Comments:

- The implementation plan does not reflect risk-based language in the Farm Bill.
- Nursery stock is the most important pathway for introducing forest pests. Need effort to survey for this pathway.
- Need to address quality of survey activities. Need commitment and expertise to conduct some surveys well.
- Need to know the sensitivity of the survey. Probability of a false negative.
- It's not just how many samples you take but also where and when you take them.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- CAPS has used Hot Zone technique very well.
- There is not a statically valid method for knowing what pests are coming in, volume, types of pests, etc.
- A lot of data is organized by type of pest. Need info that is searchable by crop-type.

Questions:

- What can we do to pick-up on pests that we don't yet know about?
- How do we id potential threats when they are in other countries?

Recommendations:

- Initiate domestic monitoring of nursery stock for pests on woody ornamentals.
- Monitor botanical gardens and arboreta abroad for pests of N.A. plants.
- Establish forecasting for potential natural spread of exotic pests (e.g., Soybean rust).
- Supplement CAPS funding utilizing tools to identify risk areas (risk-based approach). Increase our efforts to develop a more robust, scientifically defensible survey for high-risk pests focusing on sentinel areas. Group discussion (not voted on)
- Look at known pathways and focus on those instead of identifying new pathways.
- Figure out a way to engage industry (growers, warehouses, brokers, etc.) in Pest Detection and don't penalize them for reporting exotics. Engage industry in a positive way.
- APHIS develops a list of high risk states using criteria based on section 6 of the Farm Bill.
- Expand OPIS to include more crops and ornamentals and ensure data on pests existing overseas is captured and analyzed for risk. Build partnerships with industry and agronomics to share information.
- Coordinate pest detection priorities with NAPPO partners.
- Engage retired entomologists to survey for pests.

Breakout – Domestic Inspections

Session 1

- Funding for 2010 should come from NPB and other state key stakeholders. Have a scope meeting to have recommendation from all states. Provide more detailed recommendations
- Funding to SITC initiative in mail for online sales.
- Identify other cost effective methods for pest detection. Critically evaluate canine program to determine if it is valuable to expand and/or continue the program. Provide that information to stakeholders.
- Assign additional personnel to mail and inland express carrier facilities (Fed Ex, UPS) to perform x-ray inspections
- FY09 Funding decision have potentially obligated for future funding.
- Prioritize strategies
- Let each state decide how they want to set Official control.
- Create criteria on what should be on official control
- Identify the scope of what Domestic Inspection is
- Suggest NPB meet with states officials to create a written proposal on how to spend funding for 2010
- Do not fund additional dog teams unless they are justified, evaluated
- Expand dog teams to other states

Session 2

- Increase inspections in states shipping and receiving. Focus on activities like training “weigh station” blitzes
- Use canine teams on initiatives/inspections other than express carrier inspections
- Transparency on what is placed under Official Control. Let other states know about Official Control. Transparency on regulated actions
- Initiate and support activities for Official Control

Session 3

- Expand canine teams for all states

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Improve communication and data share between CBP, PPQ, and states. Communicate the legality of PPQ and states staff on what information can be shared. Harmonize rules of Farm Bill and Trade Secret Act
- Fund surveys to support official control and baseline of information
- Increase levels of inspection on interstate movement

Session 4

- Expand dog teams where they are already in place and into other states as well. Assess the need for canine teams in other states to establish priorities. Identify and address other issues so dog teams can work without legal boundaries
- Create mechanisms to share data between USDA and all states (e.i. SITC Blitzes, involved federal agencies).
- Provide funding to increase interstate movement inspections
- Collect data that can justify methods of methods of pest detection.
- Identify what has to be done under each strategy to decide how to allocate funds

Session 5

- Develop audits for compliance agreements on facilities.
- Expand dog team programs to other states and to activities other than mail and express carrier (i.e. surveys, interstate movement)
- Create an economical analysis on the benefits of using dog teams and identify criteria to keep/continue with canine programs

Session 6

- Expand canine program based on the Farm Bill criteria to other states, starting with the high risk states
- Re-examine to amend the definition of when commodities become domestic (when the articles become domestic after cleared by CBP).
- Increase interstate movement inspections
- Evaluate if Official control support is needed
- Define the criteria to measure the success of the Official Control program

Questions

- Can USDA regulate/re-inspect commodities after cleared by CBP?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- When articles become domestic? When do they legally enter commerce?
- What inspections are canine teams performing?
- Where canine teams are working; what type of inspections?
- Are canine teams targeting the largest facilities in California?

Main 5 Recommendations

- Expand canine program where they are already in place and to other states as well
 - a. Based on the Farm Bill criteria to other states, starting with the high risk states
 - b. Create an economical analysis on the benefits of using dog teams and identify criteria to keep/continue with canine programs
 - c. Use for activities other than mail and express carrier (i.e. surveys, interstate movement)
 - d. Assess the need for canine teams in other states to establish priorities
 - e. Address other issues so dog teams can work without legal boundaries
 - f. Critically evaluate canine program to determine if it is valuable to expand and/or continue the program. Provide that information to stakeholders.
- Identify other cost effective methods for pest detection
- Provide funding to increase interstate movement inspections
- Identify the scope of what Domestic Inspection is (when do the articles become domestic after cleared by CBP?); and amend the definition.
- Evaluate if Official control support is needed and define the criteria to measure the success of the Official Control program

Breakout – Enhance Pest Identification and Technology

1. Improving aspects of early detection resources:

- Rapid Response: In terms of control, increase identification capabilities. Industry needs to know who the experts are. And there should be screening aids for identification.
- Adhere to statute: Early activities to find pests before established and before infestation too large and costly to eradicate.
- Detection needs from industry: easy & inexpensive
- Look at a list of important pests and look at pests that are labeled “visual” and don’t have a trapping mechanism and have a better way to identify them (using pheromones or DNA)
- Develop traps and lures for high priority pests.
- Traps need to be expanded for line item pests
- We need alternates to sticky traps and efficacy to those alternatives to Lepidoptera traps.
- Research and development for traps and lures to catch target pests (collaborative with other agencies, like ARS).
- Prioritize and development of new trapping strategies for exotic pests.
- PPQ needs to have more interaction with industry about what is important
- Threat information with prioritization needs to be provided to states/industry
- Who is point of contact? Industry needs to know who to contact
- Develop, improve and collaborate an online resource for inspectors with lucid and dichotomous keys and should be accessible to partners.
- Increase funds for molecular diagnostics in collaboration with others (international level, stakeholders, etc).
- Use molecular diagnostics that we have and use them for new and existing programs, like Barberry.
- APHIS to reexamine relative priority for implementation as compared to diagnostics (renew efforts to support and enhance methods of identification).
- Database for receiving transportation pathways and truck distribution centers.
- Develop a National Plan to use industry and public for effective early pest detection.
- Increase special for pest models (micro climate)
- Method to utilize public reporting for early detection (process, point of contact, verification, media, extension office)
- Involve industry more often in interceptions
- Funding towards improving sampling techniques and strategies (timelines, attracting pests)
- Cost analysis of methodology of traps and lures
- where to invest (in technology or implementation strategies)

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Pilot information exchange program from other countries – “pest interpolate” (point of origin)

2. Enhance pest screening expertise and taxonomic capacity:

- Identify where taxonomic expertise is, and then determine a funding structure.
- Synthetic Organic Chemistry: finding the right people to do the job\
- There needs to be more certified diagnostic labs
- Academic certification through USDA
- Surge capacity
- Training materials targeted for growers/extension/consultants on exotic, high risk pests and pathogens.
- Pursue accreditation with private institutions (there is a wealth of knowledge out there that need to be tapped)
- Recruit nursery industry as partners in surveillance
- Looks for taxonomic expertise outside of APHIS (universities, etc)
- Need a center for screening insects from surveys for states that do not have capacity or expertise to perform the task, including developing reference collections and training materials.
- Assistantships send students to study pest in country of origin (exotic pest)
- Screeners/taxonomist capability: provide support to universities etc. state diagnostic labs.
- National strategic plan for outside entities for bios-securities. (helpful for expertise, universities prioritize hires, research priorities with other agencies, roles and responsibilities for federal and state).
- Increase training and networking capacity of screeners with test samples and quality control.
- Leverage NPDN to help identification

3. Increase deployment of molecular diagnostic tools:

- Develop an “offender” database that has “points of origin” information
- Ramp up diagnostic capabilities
- Improve detection methodology and diagnostic technology for key pathogen groups.
- Develop world class culture collections
- Fund programs that support molecular diagnostics and morphology.
- We need an integrated approach (molecular and morphology) and diagnostic tools for identification.
- Turn around time of existing diagnostics needs to be examined and time decreased
- Find another way of completing tests
- Look at the capacity of the system

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Utilize bio-security labs for exotic pest research for traps and lures.
- Support (proficiency testing & certification) for lab accreditation and enhance to a broader range of pests
- streamline process

4. Develop and implement a comprehensive Traps & Lures Management Program:

- USDA should maintain trapping supplies for all detection and response programs
- Have APHIS fund traps directly so that states can put more funds directly to staff to set/monitor traps. Use this as a way to free up CAPS money to expand funding of state infrastructure needs.
- There needs to be field testing for quality assurance
- On the ground training
- All traps and lures managed in 1 location for ALL PROGRAMS – not just for 10201 interest/priorities

5. Pursue offshore initiatives to optimize early detection programs:

- Get ahead of curve on pathway analysis – sharing protocols
 - Increase staff (human impact on work) for validation protocols. If it's already been done, why are we taking so long to validate and use the protocols? (For example, if a protocol was used in another country, why does it take over a year to start using it here in U.S.?)
- Initiate an expatriate plant monitoring program
- Better understanding of... or improve and increase off shore initiatives.
- Look at better ways to link information - Ago business for off shore information.
- Support off shore Caribbean Basin Safeguarding Initiatives to look for other regional opportunities to enhance overall offshore pest information
- Analyze pathways so that once the pest is here we know how to handle it better – using technology.
- Develop a database that identifies what industry is finding and identifying overseas.
- Use 10201 money for risk assessment of pests in other countries that could potentially survive if they come here (U.S) (add or improve... filter information to stakeholders and partners
- Improving data collection overseas.
- Develop survey methodology and tools offshore utilization
 - Also with development of traps and lures
 - Pheromones to attract pests
- Identify offshore pest threat locations (early detection, exclusions, mitigation strategies)

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Comprehensive system – pest risk analysis and pest identification (covers everything from vertebrates to molds)
- International pathways: more attention
- Understanding of risk pest diseases correlated with the Trade Association.

Outreach & Education:

- Link outreach efforts with pest identification improvements
- Tie “pest screening expertise and taxonomic capacity” and “improvements of early pest detection” into the regulatory curriculum.
- Encourage universities to know what we are looking for
- Fund fellowships, system-ships, and bring in more people.

General

- Examine host and how those technologies can be utilized by growers/partners
- Succession planning
- Use Trade Association as a resource for pathways and threats.

Comments:

- There seems to be less emphasis on training systematic in entomology.
- There is a struggle to maintain entomology expertise
- Offshore initiatives to optimize early detection programs is important – we need to stop “them” before they get here.
- Strategy #5 should be changed to “Pursue effective offshore initiatives...”
- We can strengthen linkages to information on offshore threats by linking them to prevention, especially Q37.
- Farm Bill offers opportunity for pest screening and taxonomic capacity; we need to work with ARS for their expertise in diagnostics
- Needs to be more availability of diagnostic tools to growers
- Early detection and rapid response: need to focus more on fungi. More emphasis/component that “teases” out fungi in conjunction with current state.
- Emphasis needs to be placed on identification of geographical areas and hosts that are a high risk
- Need proper lure combination for Copitarsia.
- We need to think about how distinctions are made about pest collections.
- Offshore detection is important and is a high leverage activity.
- Need to identify adequate controls
- Inspect prior to shipping
- We need to look at risk assessments and models to focus attention
- Those models will be the “new” technology

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- More attention needed for offshore initiatives.
- The department's recommendation to reduce funds is counter-productive to reaching its goal
- Improving early detection; inventory system: Traps and lures should be bar-coded/radio-tagged to monitor the traps and lures in the field. It should be demanded from the manufacturer and placed in the statement of work.
- Domestic mollusk Identifier position needed for PPQ
- We don't have cart blanche to develop all these data systems without doing analysis.
- Taxonomists are decreasing. There is a potential gap in the workforce in this area of expertise.
- Technology enhancement efforts for control and balancing of those resources is important.
- There is a need to better trap to catch target pests.
- Traps and Lure Management Programs are important.
 - Funding
 - Getting them out on time
- Lack of entomologists is a problem
- Exclusion at the ports is important

Questions:

- Will money go towards sampling techniques and application?
- Is sampling statistically defensible?
- Is there a national list of experts (taxonomic capability)
- Lab accreditation: what is the plan in relation to deployment of molecular diagnostics?
- Can we develop professional development & training opportunities for experts (domestic or abroad)? This was a question about how to increase taxonomic capability.
- What are the restrictions to spending this 10201 money outside of the U.S.? (restrictions on our pest detection methodology abroad)
- Why are entomologists leaving the field? Why aren't people studying systematic?
- Whose responsibility is it to determine techniques (CPHST, APHIS?)
 - Technology enhancements
 - Priorities
 - Processes
 - Molecular markers
- How does USDA communicate with International (Australia, for example) to coordinate offshore detection
- Is USDA providing/taking over the supply of all traps and lures?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Are traps and lures standardized or specific from state to state?
- Can larger stakeholder group rank the priorities?
- Are technologies and molecular diagnostics emerging in FY10 and is this the tool for others to make identifications even if it isn't there specialty?
- Is DNA research a part of goal #3 (pest id and technology enhancement)?
- Are the traps and lures only for CAPS or are they for line items as well?
- Why is the Farm Bill money going towards traps of current programs and not towards new pests of interest?
- Where does the prioritization of #5 (offshore initiatives to optimize early pest detection programs) go? How does this trickle down?
- What is the scope of the Traps and Lures Management Program? Will there be a warehouse where states and cooperators can draw from?
- Will there be any field testing for quality assurance? (whole system from pheromones to people running traps)
- Is this the part of the program that develops research for pests we don't have traps for?

Recommendation Themes:

- Information sharing with Stakeholders for early detection resources: (including State Agriculture, Growers, etc) in regards to important pests/threats of regulatory significance. Information would provide priority pests/threats, points of origin, points of contact (SME). Including a National plan to use the industry and public in effective early pest detection. Connecting the dots...
- Taxonomic Capacity: There is a need to look for taxonomic expertise outside of APHIS. The entomology, plant pathology, identification disciplines field is decreasing and there will be a need to partner with universities and other stakeholders for the expertise. We need unique ways to increase the taxonomic capacity. Multiple strategies: Growing our own, succession planning, professional development opportunities, funding fellowships.
- Traps and & Lures Management Program should be managed in 1 location for ALL programs, not just the Farm Bill priorities and interests. A one stop shop
- Early Detection Resources: Methods development of traps and & lures to catch target pests, especially those that do not have a trapping mechanism at this time (methods to attract the pests, pheromone research for example) survey strategies, statistical sampling, cost benefit, etc. Improve field kits for pathogen detection.
- Offshore initiatives: Get the problem solved before it gets here. Communication about what is going on needs to be passed to stakeholders. Industry wants to be a part of the solution. Work on pests abroad – understanding their biology, trapping, mitigations, etc – before they get here.

Breakout – Safeguarding Nursery Production

Breakout Session #1

- Is the future focus on domestic commerce or international trade (export)?
 - Reply >>> Primary focus is to address risk of moving pests through the USA
- Are we looking at regulated or non-regulated pests?
 - Reply >>> essentially both, but priority always on regulated pests.
- State vs. Federal regulatory systems >>> exercise caution so as not to unwittingly preempt State authorities. State systems have been in place for long time and work.
- Federal Certification Standards >>> required or voluntary
 - Reply >>> voluntary
- RECOMMENDATION
 - Engage NPB early in discussions over future directions
 - Examine current certification systems to see what's in place.
- Definitions and terminology needs to be addressed – much confusion possible unless we agree on terms.
 - What's defined as nursery stock?
- Determination needs to be made re the status of current State certification systems
 - We need to know baseline before we propose modifying or raising standards.
- What is the appropriate Federal role in nursery certification? This questions needs to be asked. Feds should facilitate actions. How's the current system(s) working?
- 3 issues permeate this discussion
 - The P. ramorum nursery
 - The US Nursery Certification Program (USNCP)
 - Domestic movement concerns (e.g. fruit trees, Nat'l Clean Plant Network)
- Issue >>> how do we 'tee-up' industry to engage in needed conversations in areas of suggested change?
- More information and dialogue is needed
 - How do existing certification programs interface with proposed new activities?
 - Why should States and nurseries change?
- Incentive to join certification programs include:
 - Crop insurance if enrolled in program and a 'failure' happens
- Some 'desires'
 - 1 overarching certification system to address Standards

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Be mindful and avoid confusion when talking to different ‘tiers’ of government at the State level
- Ideally 1 system for both domestic and international trade (this ideally would also include flexibility to connect with ‘smaller’ actions such as the NCPN).
- Requirements for State nursery certification systems (harmonized)
 - Cost effective
 - Implementable
 - Fair east coast to west coast
- Industry concerns – Ideas to make certification systems work
 - Create buy-in with States and industry
 - Explore broad program applications
 - Make sure that the program is not an added burden to the States and industry
 - Create incentives for going into the program
 - IMPORTANT (recurring theme) >>> have meetings to talk >>> Communicate
- Don't we already have nursery certification harmonization?
 - Reply >>> No, not really
- Risk mitigation vs. BMP's >>> Van BMP's be done at a good cost to industry?
 - Note – under a BMP process, industry shoulders the burden and is audited by government
- USNCP stats >>> program is 2 years old >>> 6 nurseries involved
 - What nurseries need to engage in the program?
 - Buy-in
 - Incentives
 - Education
- USNCP – Stakeholder feedback
 - It's a good program; has clarity of vision
 - LACKING??? Its impact needs to be measured; it needs validations (what will this take). The validation might be done by an outside entity, validating the experience.
 - Validation should ask ‘what works and what doesn't’
 - Note >>> ANLA would like to be part of this process.
- How can nursery certification programs be improved?
 - Buy-in >>> more scientific proof facilitating the movement of plants
 - Information >>> scoping sessions w/States, industries, regions
 - Alignment among programs, w/States, etc >>> Lacking
 - Process >>> Discussions and meeting w/States and cooperators needed.
- Primary tasks/goals for future work in nursery certification
 - Establish BMP's
 - What are incentives to protect stakeholders (establishments)
 - Indemnities and insurances?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

Breakout Session #2

- What's the difference between BMP's and audit based certification system?
 - Reply >>> nurseries develop BMP's and audit based systems (gov'ts) verify
- What's the relationship between nursery certification program (10201 proposed) and USNCP)
 - Reply >>> similar, except that USNCP would also handle export issues
- Question >>> at what point would 10201 (nurseries) funding come to the States?
 - Reply >>> Unsure just yet >>> Note >>> could take 5-10 years for program (State Certification) to harmonize! Yikes!!!
- Possible FY 2009/2010 activity
 - Bring States together to look at what State nursery certification programs have in common
 - Note >>> some States don't have nursery certification systems
 - Some States >>> system is legislation
 - Other States >>> system is policy
 - GOAL > develop a nursery certification program that other States agree with
- Remember >>> nursery industry is complex
 - Different commodities
 - Nursery sizes vary
 - Operation complexity varies
- Incentives are important – growers need incentives to participate
 - Can a nursery ship to all (or many) of the States?
- Cost/Benefit Analysis (recurring g theme – IMPORTANT)
 - Nursery certification program is missing cost/benefit analysis
- Pilot programs!
 - Many of them out there (Federal/State) but nobody clear as to what they are, where, and their purpose
 - What are the costs
 - Benefits?
 - Measures or 'metrics' for evaluating success
- USNCP >>> Question >>> Is this program voluntary or mandatory
 - Reply >>> voluntary
- Question >>> Does 10201 (Farm Bill) 'require' State certified nursery system?
 - Reply >>> no; the Farm Bill 'encourages' but does not require
- Important industry requirement!
 - Industry needs 'time' and a 'mechanism' for engagement/enrollment in nursery certification programs

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- This is a 'change management' issue for nurseries; they'll need help navigating
- How should we spend FY 2010 (+) monies?
 - Stakeholders need a 'scoping' session(s).
 - What's the current state of the State re existing programs?
 - Participants should include Regulators, NPB, NASDA , and APHIS at least
- Terminologies / Definitions >>> these need to be well established and agreed to
- Education/Outreach
 - The VS NAHMS program is a good 'outreach' example
 - Problem >>> how can we 'outreach' when OMB has requested funding rescission? This may have to wait till more surety over funding
 - Hold 'field sessions' information w/stakeholders
 - What we'd like to see!!! Ongoing training re current/extant programs and information on new opportunities.
- Incentives >>> ID the incentives for States and nurseries to participate in programs (esp. for nurseries and industry)
- Incentives >>> what are they???
 - Good visibility for industry to be associated with programs like the USNCP
 - Makes interstate and international shipping easier
 - Fewer phytos?? (1 overarching program instead of separate phytos)
 - Note >>> incentives might be reduced as nurseries get smaller
 - Make plans easier for smaller entities (e.g. NCPN cooperators or small nurseries)
 - Nursery certification manuals??? Make them easier/smaller as entities get less complex or are smaller
- Grower Incentives
 - Recognition (USDA Gold Seal of Approval)
 - If problems happen >>> how might a cooperator be treated differently if they are in a program??? Treated in a way that facilitates them getting back 'on-line' as quickly as possible
 - Compensation >>> product destruction compensation
- Cost/Benefit studies
 - Find ways to get this do w/o much \$\$\$ burden to the program
- Nursery Certification program pilots
 - Develop pilots that are ready to go
 - Measure success in areas that are practical
 - Put together a task-force to look at what's doable
 - Note >>> some programs or components are already 'in play' >>> programs already exist.
- Existing Program??? Study existing programs for success or challenges. Identify the metrics
 - The Oregon GAAP program

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- The USNCP at Monrovia
- Cost/Benefit Analysis >>> If c/b analysis is done and results not ideal what happens?
 - Do not trash the program
 - Note that many benefits are intangible
- Grower Tactic to be encouraged >>> Build relationships w/regulators in the good times (incentives to participate) as this will help industry when times get tough
- Incentive >>> Nursery Certification Program participation >>> lets nurseries put a 'Gold Star' next to their products
- Phyto's Issue >>> for now, the way that plants move is under authority of a phyto
- Incentive >>> if a 'Gold Star' Nursery has a problem; provide this service:
 - SWAT team arrives to do immediate analysis and support of program and nursery
 - Activities are validated so as not to necessarily assume failure of nursery to comply
 - Nursery allowed to get on-line as soon as possible

Session #3

- NORSDUC is a good idea; much needed, about time
- Some stakeholders not thrilled at idea
 - Reasons
 - Funds should not be so concentrated
 - Funds should be used to address wider community pest issues
- USNCP Recommendation
 - Funding should be used to determine quality of the program
 - Fund research to determine the pest status of material coming out of the USNCP
- Clean stock programs
 - USDA should not be in clean stock programs except they should lead to establish same (such as ala NCPN) but that the burden should remain w/industry
 - Programs that are stakeholder driven (e.g. NCPN) are good things – stakeholder supported. Needed for a long time.
- BMP's – can on set 'fit all'? Problem is that many differing pests have essentially different requirements.
 - Reply >>> no, BMP's can be made generic, but then modified to address specific pest concerns.
- CONCERN >>> Goal 4 too large given the limited resources made available
 - Note >>> NORSDUC intended to be self supporting in time
- Is certification voluntary or mandatory? Voluntary

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Question/Discussion >>> can a voluntary program be effective???
 - System is too much of a patchwork
- Is certification program 'commodity' or 'pest' based?
 - Reply >>> neither >>> its is broader based.
 - Standards are not set to '0' they are based on procedures not just numbers.
 - They're systems based under which procedures are used to ensure pest exclusion
- Recommendation:
 - Convene meetings to look at how we'll develop nursery based certification systems. Hold a national 'summit' if needed
- Incentives needed to entice cooperators into nursery certification systems
 - Easy market access
 - Less needed inspections
 - Self reporting (you're validated by gov't that you follow the system)
 - Self issue of phytos or appropriate paperwork
 - Lower insurance premiums
 - NOTE >>> these incentives work better w/larger than smaller nurseries
- Outreach/Education – important
 - Note >>> consider using county extension services
- Research >>> needed to show growers that nursery certification programs are beneficial to them.
 - Need >>> check to see how we're allotting 10201 research dollars.
- P. ramorum BMP's
 - Some are standard; but only some are validated; more work needed on this
 - Cost/benefit analysis needed
 - How will this be done?
 - APHIS (we have facility, we have some BMP's)
 - The experimental nursery will give the answers
- Other pests?
 - Start w/P. ram then build other BMP's for other pests
- Integrate systems
 - Clean stock programs w/certification systems
- Other Phytophthora's?
 - Consider also doing research on others
 - Note >>> NORSDUC (because of location) can only work on pests in the quarantine area
- FY 2010 activities
 - BMP's for P. ram in California is good start
 - Does HASP analysis to determine and address critical control points

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- P. ram genetics research??? How is pathogen population genetics affected by nursery conditions?
 - Question >>> Is such work appropriate for 10201 funds!
- Recommendation:
 - HASP analysis >>> what are the critical points in the audit process that have associated record-keeping that can be assessed?
 - Test/pilot programs needed to determine what works and what growers can commit to.
 - Note >>> record-keeping multiplicity is problematic to growers
- 2010 Timelines and Deadlines needed to get NORSDUC up and running
 - Develop a clear research plan
 - Provide a small amount of 'dedicated funding' or seed money to attract cooperators not using the nursery and supporting research there (Chum money)

- End Day 1 -

Breakout Session #4

- NORSDUC – there's no connection between Dominican U and the UC system
 - Concern >>> no UC enthusiasm in working at the facility
 - Is this program well thought through?
 - Will the facility ultimately be well utilized
- Is NORSDUC redundant?
 - Could this work have better been done at an existing commercial facility
 - Note >>> Santa Clara Co. indicates at least 2 nurseries that might have cooperated
- Is NORSDUC a process by which government establishes BMP's for nurseries?
 - Shouldn't nurseries establish their own BMP's
 - Gov't should assist but not necessarily lead
- ANLA observation >>> California has participated in BMP development but some other states did not want to go along.
- Before building nursery from scratch, better communication desired w/CA County Ag Commissioners
- USDA response but no responses from o the NORSDUC discussion
 - USDA spent 4 years seeking a cooperator in CA, a facility, but only Dominican U responded
 - University nursery is an appropriate response; commercial nurseries are not
 - Any nursery infected w/P. ram as a research site would need to be 'paved-over' once work completed due to infections latent in soils. Soil might have to be removed if site needed use again as a nursery
- Generally; meeting participant agree that this research nursery needs doing

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- How do we proceed in 2010 re Experimental Nursery?
 - Note >>> it's an Ornamental Research Site; not a production nursery
 - Consider logistics and procedures and funding needs
- Concern >>> can \$1m do it?
- A NORSDUC steering committee and structure is in place or being formed
- NORSDUC gives eastern industry some piece of mind >>> Is there a value in this? Yes
- Recurring Question >>> who should be paying for this?
 - Farm Bill \$\$\$ to 'Prime the Pump'
- What is NORSDUC capacity/scale? NORSDUC can accommodate research of ½ - 3 acres in size as there is expansion on sites that it can utilize.
- This nursery question has been around for 4 years now – NORSDUC is a start
- Recommendation >>> look for alternative funding? Note, 10201 is not paying for research, only to establish the facility
- We need more clarity around terminology
- BMP's – for Federally regulated pests, BMP's need to be 'required' for interstate movement of nursery materials
 - Federal regulations should require BMP's
- Nurseries would work w/State regulators to require BMP's; they would then be incorporated by the Feds for use in regulatory development for international movement and interstate commerce
- Note >>> some continued disagreement on the use of 10201 funds for nursery activities if surrounding the development of BMP's
 - Statement - 10201 funds might better be used for 'Pest Detection'
- Nursery Certification Program
 - USNCP – locally based for now; not nationally vetted >>> needs Nat'l vetting. Evaluation must be by an independent entity; a validation of the process. USNCP motivated by the desire of Oregon to ship to Canada
 - OR GAP program is another nursery certification system
- What changes in how we utilize resources for 2010 (and beyond)
 - There's a need for BMP's to be regulatory; States need to help to form BMP's into regulatory systems
 - Training in nursery systems may be pre-mature until existing and perhaps new systems are better evolved
 - Work to gain industry support
 - Maintain integrity of nursery stock
 - Nursery buy-in of certification programs should be pursued in order to facilitate their ability to ship
- Concern >>> as Farm Bill funds increase to the \$45-50m level; does this mean that the nursery portion shall also increase from \$1.3m to about \$6 m for the experimental nursery due to need for continued development and support?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- BMP 'implementation' but not their development (an industry function) is what should be supported
- How should 10201(d) funds be used; do we need a shift in priorities? E.g. research to certification?

Breakout Session #5

- ASTA has produced a Quality Development Guide that carries materials from product development through commercialization (A HASP approach)
 - This is an industry and Assn developed product
 - A quality management guide (ownership is ASTA)
 - It adds a seed phytosanitary piece
- Invasive species moving from the USA into the Caribbean
 - Much US nursery trade into the islands
 - US export inspections are OK but material is handled differently once it progresses on journey to/thru the islands; material becomes contaminated
 - Desire is to build capacity between partners for better phytosanitary international trade throughout all phases of the plant movement system
- Nursery Certification Program
 - Fine idea, but must be built on nursery practices (BMP's)
 - Question >>> is this for domestic movement of material or for international trade?
 - Definitions needed
- Farm Bill funding >>> wasn't this suppose to be for 'new' pests in focus (primarily)?
 - How do we handle good opportunities to impact things such as gladiolus rust or chrysanthemum rust?
- BMP's >>> Feds should not help develop them, but should assist in their implementation
 - Build certification programs on industry input and their practices
 - Let industry develop the BMP's
 - Enable States to have BMP oversight
 - Should be developed by industry but then validated by the regulators
- 10201(d) – approach this holistically
 - Develop both domestic and international movement processes
- Issue/Concern >>> what happens at 'Lower Levels' in the trade/exchange process >>> pests are moving by hobbyists
- Incentives – there must be both incentives and consequences in order to have grower support for nursery certification
 - What incentives are there for industry to participate
 - Can incentives be made 'scalable' to address industry capacity or size
- Nursery Certification needs to be defined; parameters need to be added

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Nat'l nursery certification program such as USNCP is supported; it's needed for export and can facilitate domestic movement
- RSPM 24 – Plants for Planting
- Would nursery certification programs be holistic?
 - Could be broad
 - Must establish national standards for free movement
 - Could a holistic system also apply to nursery certification? Issue >>> dealing with regulated non-quarantine pests as well.
- FY 2010 Funding – How best utilized
 - Definitions needed >>> a plan to administer and implement voluntary programs (how many programs; domestic vs. international)
 - Note domestic vs. international >>> we can't have 2 separate programs; these are ideally combined
 - Define audit and other terminologies
 - Virus free certification programs should be pursued; incl. nematodes
 - Economic analysis to back up participation in nursery certification programs (cost/benefit analysis)
 - Social networking
 - Build on industry practices

Breakout Session #6

- Question – How do small, non-regulated nurseries fit into the regulated scheme?
 - Note >>> if they ship interstate, they must be inspected
 - Casual nurseries need to be included in the plan
- Question – How will certified nurseries be coordinated with compliance agreements >>> coordination of the compliance agreement process w/BMP's (e.g. the gypsy moth program)
 - Note >>> is the Compliance Agreement system broken? It puts issues out of site and out of mind
- USNCP >>> Nat'l umbrella over all state systems
 - It supports an interstate movement of states; free movement
 - Provides commonality and uniformity
 - Provides increased level of mitigation against spread of pests thru systems
 - Program is now voluntary
 - Incentive >>> if you want to ship internationally or interstate; this is an incentive to be in the program
- USDA 'Seal of Approval' (Golden Seal)
 - Discussion needed to determine how 'seal' and compliance agreements would work together. Would compliance agreements disappear?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Recommendation
 - Industry should review/develop BMP's >>> gov't can collaborate with them in this process
- Golden Seal of Approval
 - Would it travel w/pests thru the system
 - Mechanism for tracking movement of certified commodities
 - Part of a clean plant program (define what a seal means; incl. auditing program for quality)
- BMP's >>> Nat'l BMP's might be considered
 - But recognize industry and state specific differences
 - Note >>> Nat'l standards not meant to replace state activities but rather each serves to support the other
- BMP umbrella
 - Several commodities (complexity) can be included under such umbrellas
 - Could cover procedures (incl. license issuances and displays)
 - WE prefer to use BMP's developed by industry and adopted by the States and signed-off on by the Feds
- Food industry parallels
 - Look at food safety parallels for use in what we're doing
 - Food safety matters are not state-by-state matters but rather have an overarching federal mandate
- Nursery Certification programs
 - Coordination w/other countries also needed
 - Coordinate and have a traceability component if products in case problems occur
- Fund use for 2010 and beyond
 - Is the audit-based certification program a 'pilot' program
 - Who would conduct an 'audit'? >>> is audit a joint venture?
 - Audits can be done by industry themselves but need to have both state and federal oversight
- Harmonization >>> this is difficult/hard to do, but we're on the right track w/this
- Auditing >>> States and Feds need more resources
 - Avoid redundancy in auditing
 - State auditing is OK >>> private auditing might be multiplicative and / or duplicative
- GAP >>> Good Agricultural Practices (Administered by AMS???) An audit and certification inspection system
 - Both scheduled and unscheduled audits
- For 2010
 - Look also at the needs of other nursery products and other commodities; such as the Florida insect resistant nurseries concept (need >>> all screen houses are being done differently)

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Technology transfer
- Consider size and scale of activities vs. capability of industry and nurseries

Breakout – Outreach and Education Programs

Suggestions and Comments:
Outreach and Education Programs

From Participants in Round 1

- Is the idea to create a national outreach tool for local groups to use? How could we work together on this? Create a model/template (like the pest alerts) that others can use. Then, all information coming out looks similar, but it can be developed on the local rather than national level.
- Do outreach through a wide group of people. Use the citizen scientist concept to educate and to gather information.
- Use educational materials created by the State Departments of Agriculture. For example, California has an educational unit on the basic concept of invasives.
- Outreach to the public. People hear a lot of messages; we have to find a way to get through or to stand out. Fact sheets are “throw-aways” for many. We need to use people in the know about marketing.
- We have more than one audience. There is the population at large, both the general population and specific groups. Then, there are the growers. Each group needs a different message.
- Extension and industry should work together. Information should go both ways. Industry can help disseminate information and can be the eyes on the ground.
- Using extension is not new. What can we do differently? The public is willing to help, but they need to know what to do. If people truly understand the invasive species concept, they can apply the concept and make a difference.
- Use the existing networks. Use youth and summer interns who are working in some other role (assisting with a research project for example). Provide these folks with some information and they can look for invasives while they go about their regular summer project or hobbies.
- Create national tools. Create guidelines on when to use which marketing tools, for which type of message, which audience, which intent. This would be a kind of marketing guideline for addressing invasives.
- Create a guideline that takes a pest from the first discovery through the control-surveillance-etc steps. This would be a national guideline that could quickly be used on a local level as needed without having to ask each time.
- We need to have a diverse group in the planning of outreach and education efforts.
- Define the audience in planned outreach and education efforts. Ensure that those audiences fit the goals in the Farm Bill.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Have a variety of ways to gather information from the public. Have a way to monitor that input. Gathering information from the public is a whole area to look at and figure out.
- How can we control which group's information comes up or is accessed on the web.

From Participants in Round 2

- We need more training in the first detector area (industry, etc) and to do more work with agricultural produces to educate them. However, the aim of the Farm Bill is to reach those who have not been reached yet. Compromise: Work with the new groups, but keep the growers informed/share with them.
- How should we convey the message? The pest affects the way we address the problem and the way we educate the audience. Look to New Zealand for their approach to invasives. They have been very creative. In outreach and education, are we looking at knowledge transfer for changing people's behavior – different ways to do outreach and education depending on the goal? We need public buy-in for both short-term goals and long-term goals. We can join the green effort – keeping out invasives saves the environment, helps us eat local, etc.
- There are many different messages out there. How can we get our message heard? How can we help people have a more balanced view?
- Build coalitions with other groups, including bringing in those who are protesting or against our efforts. An example was given of delaying a message and compromising by pulling out some of the most-opposed language in the interest of getting most of the message out with the opponents onboard rather than having the opponents derail the entire effort.
- Measure the effort of our efforts. This could be in the form of pledges, blogs, etc in addition to the traditional counts of web hits and phone calls. Each effort needs a different set of measures. Be sure to state the expectation of a particular outreach effort.
- Provide those with access to the public with information to use. For example, CBP could be better informed; they need training.
- Focus on the younger generation. There is more hope of shaping their views than of changing the views of adults. We can make more change for the same amount of money.
- Get experts on advertising and marketing. Fact sheets alone won't make it.
- We should do consensus building. However, when this consensus building gets close to shaping the political agenda, this makes some uncomfortable. Bullet #1 is a concern – what is intended by this point?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Make use of those who already doing a specific job and have a captive audience. Provide them with material so that they could expand their educational efforts.
- Use knowledge from social science in designing our outreach and education efforts.
- We would like to see the plan for outreach and education with priorities spelled out. At minimum, share that with the Plant Board.

From Participants in Round 3

- How long can we commit to doing this? If this is only a short-term effort there is no point. We can just go on doing things the way that we have been doing them.
- We should not keep doing what we've always been doing – that's not working. The old way is press releases and fact sheets when we encounter a problem. That just results in more resistance. The goal should be behavioral change. The new way should be a long-term investment for change to occur further down the road. Target school-age and young adults; they are more amenable to change than those who are older. Focus on the concept of invasive species and the impact. Address the issue of chemical usage. Connect the effect with the people who caused the problem (not a blaming, just how they acted in ignorance – in other words, tell a story. Look for success stories and tell those.
- Who is the audience?
- We should target the message to the audience.
- We need to reach/train the younger generation to see a balance, see the whole, realize that there are many issues out there, that they shouldn't just jump on the belief. We need to get people to evaluate the message rather than just swallow it. How can we do that? Tell the story of what can happen if a pest gets in.
- SME question to group: Does economics play a role? Will costs to industry, costs to control a problem and so on effect behavioral change? Response from the group: For some that is a method that works; for others, it's not.
- Connect in with current/local beliefs/campaigns to have a stronger effect or at least an entry point. For example, we could connect in with the "buy local" movement and show the effect that an invasive species would have on that goal.
- There is a problem with the perception of pesticides. In California, a local vocal anti-pesticide group that derailed the efforts, threatened the organic growers that they'd be put out of business if they did not agree with the anti-pesticide group's views. How do we address the negative effects of a small vocal group? How also do we address the general accepted belief that all pesticides are bad at all times?
- Use a marketing firm or partner with those who know marketing. Also, partner with those who are already doing things, see what outreach/education efforts

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

they have done and at the least be informed and at best, join there efforts or let them to the speaking.

- How are we measuring success? We need to first articulate our end point or goal of our outreach/education effort. Then, we need to measure the degree of success that we had in reaching the goal of the effort. When articulating our goal, consider whether we want to change behavior or provide information.
- Get a respected, well-known person to address an issue. Use the same dissemination methods as alarmists (social networks, etc).
- Provide factual information that people can use to repudiate widely believed claims. Many don't believe the claims, but they do not have the knowledge to argue against statements made (e.g., all chemicals are bad all the time).
- It's a heavy lift to change public perception.

From Participants in Round 4

- Don't start from scratch. Connect with others. Many are doing a lot of the outreach and education already; use those efforts.
- APHIS should not try to keep any hotlines. Farm those out. Those responding to the hot line and weed out the 95% of calls that are not important to regulating and controlling an invasive and then quickly pass the important calls up to APHIS. The hotline should be at the state level and feed into to national level, because the pests differ across the US.
- Create an invasive species interagency group to create a communication plan for connecting to all those working in the invasive arena. This group can provide overall planning as well. Who or which groups should be on that planning group? [Names of individuals/groups were collected and given to Heather.] A sub-group within the planning group can work on how to best address a specific audience.
- Education for the average citizen is the goal of the Farm Bill. Should we focus on education of the general population or target specific groups that have the most potential of introducing an invasive? Given the limited money, focus on the latter.
- 2 million is woefully insufficient.
- Be sure to assess the effects of the outreach and education efforts. Turn to extension not only for help with outreach and education efforts, but also for ideas on assessing our efforts. They have years and years of experience in this area; make use of that experience. To measure the impacts we need good evaluation.
- Education and outreach should focus on the basic message about invasives. Build modules for use in K-12 and focus on long-term impact. National Agricultural Association (?) will help in this effort. Also, Planting Sciences and the Entomology Association all have K-12 focused material and could be contacted for more modules with the message we need.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- There are too many activities on the list. Stay true to the Farm Bill. Pare down. Do fewer things, but do them very well.

From Participants in Round 5

- We need “In-Reach”, connecting and working with those among us who are working on projects.
- We need to communicate the good that we’ve done
- Our outreach efforts will go further if we target specific groups that have the potential for bringing in invasives. Suggested that we target movement: travelers, the airline industry (short video clip to show while waiting in lines), and those who convey material. All of these are in the category of “conveyors” – they convey products, people, themselves and in the process can convey unwanted species.
- 2 veins of outreach and education: prevention and early detection. Prevention needs to become a focus, become a common word/goal.
- Bring in the social scientists and the marketing experts to help us plan the best ways to match the message (in format, depth, and selling point) to the audience when we are doing our outreach and education efforts. Also bring in industry in the planning stage – find a way to have them desire to link with our message instead of begging them to include our message. (What could be in it for industry as well as us? What resources do they have?) Utilize the communication officer in the State Departments of Agriculture; they have a lot of connections and know what is already happening out there in outreach and education.
- Focus on younger generation – change the future.
- Bring all the stakeholders in at the start. Realize that special interest groups have a right to their concerns. Bring them into the conversation early, rather than trying to deal with a negative reaction they have to an action taken without their knowledge that it’s going to happen.
- Use the same communication tools of the objectors. If the objectors use a specific communication tool and we do not, then the public that gets their information via that information tool only hears one side of the message. In general learn to use new technologies for communication.
- Start working on plans for the next pest. Use outreach and training efforts to teach the basics of invasives. Once people are aware of the process by which invasives enter the country and the potential negative repercussions (monetary, loss of your own trees, loss of local/international markets) invasives can cause if they do enter, prevention should increase. Also, once the process is understood, information on specific pests can follow when needed without having to educate on the basics.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Get out the success stories. Need to evaluate effectiveness of efforts to get those success stories.
- We need a face, a champion, a well-know person, a Smokey the Bear to lead the effort. We need both a national champion and local champions. For the latter, use local growers, farmers, nurseries, citizens to tell their story or the stories of others.
- We have a big problem with the media scaring people.
- Include trade implications in the message.
- Question on bullet #1: How can APHIS do that given that they cannot lobby? What does bullet #1 mean? In bullet 1, if we can do this, make sure that the legislators hear the success stories of APHIS efforts; show congress cost-benefit numbers, performance measures, ROI.

From Participants in Round 6

- Piggy-back on the efforts of those already in the field doing outreach and education. Provide those people with information on our efforts that they can add to their teaching venues. They have the connections to the people; they just need the message.
- Build on the concept of the citizen-scientist. Use volunteers to help gather information and to serve as conduits for information out to the community. An example of this is Sky Watch. Another example is a site that gathers information about the location of certain plants whose pollen triggers allergic reactions. The group of volunteers is trained in the types of information that is needed (an opportunity to learn what is of interest to a specific group) – they then can report solid information that is needed by others. These volunteers can be trained in local chapters, where they network, share information, connect to a group with a shared interest. The data is submitted (including location and a picture of the plant in the case of the pollen site) and checked within 24 hours and uploaded to the site/online map. If such a type of site were designed for invasives, those who check the information could also forward something that seemed like it was an invasive to the proper authorities. These volunteers or citizen-scientists perform the surveillance work because it is of interest to them and they enjoy the networking around a common interest.
- We can download information to an I-phone or cell phone that will help us identify a tree. We should be able to do the same with invasive species. The phone can also then be used to take and upload pictures of suspected invasives.
- Use modern media formats.
- APHIS/government has an image problem. We come and destroy your plants. How can we change this? Should we have others give the APHIS message so

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

it'll be more palatable? Can we change the image that the public has of APHIS/government?

- Form the message ahead of time to prevent the problem, rather than reacting after the problem has occurred. Explain why something cannot be brought into the country, rather than just saying that you cannot do that. Work with the people instead of policing them. Create a collaboration, rather than an us-them, where each side is trying to outwit the other.
- Play on the good citizen and cooperative aspects. Show people how they can play their part in the security of the nation.
- Find viable alternatives (e.g., now can buy irradiated Indian mangoes so you don't need to smuggle them in) and then educate people on those alternatives. Only come down with the negative consequences (the police attitude) if there is deliberate disregard.
- Have good metrics to evaluate the effect of outreach/education efforts. Articulate the goals or expectations of an outreach/education effort and then measure how well those goals or expectations were met. It's much easier to measure the effect if the goals are clear.

Breakout – Enhanced Mitigation Capabilities

Group 1

- Directly involve IR-4 in the development of pesticide registration and rapid screening for potential outbreaks.
- Develop guidance on how to effectively use volunteers at an outbreak.
- Component 2: strike the word “control.”
- Component 2: add in “exit and after-incident strategies” along with “containment” and “eradication.”
- There is some confusion about where states/AHPIS would go for funds in an outbreak – the 10201 funds or CCC.
- The Federal budget process, and how/when money is used, is not fully clear to stakeholders.

Group 2

- Prioritize offshore pests and prioritize entity pathways.
- Design test control measures for outbreaks.
- Mitigate risks offshore where possible.
- Enhance mechanism of the Interstate Pest Control Compact for pest management.
- Have an outside review panel evaluate the emergency response plan and get it out to appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner.
- Develop mechanism for national buy-in for prioritization on response plans. ITAP is one possible source for assistance with this.
- In a review emphasize what is effective and what is not.
- There is a tension in the Agency between surveillance and control programs.
- It is not well understood by stakeholders how priorities shift within the Agency.
- Posts are not APHIS problems, or Forest Service problems, but USDA problems.
- There is some concern about why the process for developing the mitigation plans are not more self-evident.

Group 3

- Get management dollars to an outbreak quickly.
- Communication strategy to make stakeholders aware of the resources that can be tapped into during an outbreak.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Creation of on-the-job training in outbreaks. This would allow real world experience to people from states without a given disease program or a set of disease programs.
- Increase the training requirement for ICS training to reflect real-life experience.
- Feedback mechanism to evaluate how effective training was in preparing the respondents for the outbreak. This mechanism must be timely and relevant.
- Use of ICS is not always the appropriate response framework for plant disease outbreaks.
- Modified, the basic structure can be useful (for example, uniform terminology).
- In ICS exercises, the “money people” are not always present. They should be since they are such an integral part of a successful response.
- It is important to bring in the public and other stakeholders in the responses.
- It has been observed that state emergency teams are not actively involved in certain exercises.
- In component 2, is the word “control” appropriate to include? It doesn’t reflect the exit strategy inherent to every ICS situation.
- 10201 money is available through September 30. It has to be shifted elsewhere if not used.
- IR-4 Field Program. A possible resource for rapid screening test as well as pesticide registration.
- Need to make the protocol for how APHIS decides to embark on a pest control program more transparent.
- Delimitation needs to be part of the initial response plan.
- Are the historical funding amounts for emergencies (PPQ Regions) adequate for today’s reality?

Group 4

- Develop transparent criteria for how the 10201 mitigation money will be used.
- Communication strategy between Agency and external stakeholders for pest management.
- Produce an OPIS Digest for stakeholders.
- NPRG needs greater resourcing to better apply to the diverse incursions.
- Development an assessment of existing programs in FY 2010.
- Interstate Pest Control Compact is a collection of about 38 states. If APHIS could sponsor the membership of the remaining states, this organization could be a potential source of funds in an outbreak.
- Is the structure of the Agency a barrier to using the 10201 funds for mitigation purposes?
- Apprehension that the outcomes promised by the 10201 funds are not all achievable.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Farm Bill talks about detection, not necessarily response.
- Focus funds on what works before the introduction of a new pest. Figure out what works here.
- 10201 funds could be used to seed a response fund.
- Fund needs to include offshore pest mitigation.
- Has the Plant Board talked with Risk Mgmt Agency about national coordination?
- There is no requirement that a program continue to be funded just because it was funded in FY2009. Each year the programs are evaluated and prioritized (APHIS comment in response to a question about this).
- A thought: create a “Plan B” funds at the end of a fiscal year to use unobligated funds – fund offshore pest control.

Group 5

- Reevaluation of the representation at the workgroups, with particular emphasis on increased transparency and increased stakeholder participation.
- Pilot control programs for pests that are present in the US (include CPHST, industry, other Mission Areas of the USDA, Universities, and state agencies.
- Involve the Plant Board in Mgmt/technical meetings when planning mitigation.
- Increase stakeholder participation in development of the NPRG (guidelines).
- Revisit NPRG (guidelines) and build in flexibility to account for diverse political, economic, geographic circumstances (the “on-the-ground” situation).
- Feedback is very important after an ICS exercise in the states.
- It would be very beneficial to know that the capacity/status of ICS training and functions is in the 50 states.
- We need to consider how, at an incident, the training records of respondents can be accessed in a timely manner.
- It would be beneficial during an outbreak if the respondents’ level of knowledge is evaluated at the onset, since their previous training may or may not be present in their memory or relevant to the current pest.

Group 6

- Pilot project for interagency sharing and coordination. The projects can make improvements on the current system. A possible new role would be to share alerts and information with state and local government (respecting the anonymity of parties involved in trade).
- Increase focus on offshore study of pest management, using the Perimeter Approach and Caribbean Basin as models.

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

- Add one annual meeting between stakeholders and APHIS to discuss priorities, in addition to the three that already occur.
- Development of a response system whereby stakeholders would be able to disseminate targeted information.
- Creation of a task force made up of APHIS and stakeholders that will look at what approaches have worked thus far and what approaches have not been successful.
- Apprehension about allocating money to a pest in a foreign country when we have pests to manage in the US.
- A possible justification for the allocation of money for a pest in a foreign country is a better understanding of the pest management, biology, and epidemiology of a pest to have at the ready in case it enters the US.
- Many countries study the same pest(s), yet there is not a good mechanism for accessing the information from one site to another. A result is that duplication of efforts is likely occurring.
- Transparency is critical to capacity building and developing internet access.
- FY 2009 more reactive than proactive.
- Caribbean Basin initiative and Perimeter Approach are examples of good offshore pest management/studies, and should receive increased resources.
- APHIS needs to get more information to stakeholders and the public, in a more timely fashion.
- Communication plan, both out to the public and soliciting information from stakeholders, needs to be improved.

Enhanced Mitigation: Final Questions

- Of the possible 30 foreign pests entering the country per year, are there certain products or trade patterns that they follow?
- In a future incident, will APHIS recognize the ICS training received by state employees (training not provided by APHIS)?
- Are ICS exercises planned for the states?
- Does a national network of SMEs exist for the different pests, individuals from different venues (Federal, state, academia, industry) who could be quickly assembled for consultation/planning at the beginning of an outbreak?
- What are the triggers that cause APHIS to act on an invasive species?
- What are the boundaries of APHIS' mandate related to research?
- Could any of the 10201 mitigation funds be dedicated to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs?

Farm Bill Section 10201
Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention
Stakeholder Meeting June 8-9, 2009
Comments, Questions, and Recommendations

OPEN Q&A:

- Was this the last opportunity for us to comment?
- Maybe you should be transparent about what you are not doing, so the stakeholders and universities can help to “pick up the slack for USDA.