


# *Phytophthora ramorum* Program Past, Present and Future Direction



National Plant Board  
Annual Meeting  
Denver, CO  
August 7-11, 2011



Presented by:  
Scott Pfister, Director  
Forest Pest Programs  
USDA APHIS PPQ

## *Phytophthora ramorum* Program: Past, Present and Future Direction

- *P. ramorum* has been a very difficult issue causing concern among stakeholders for a number of years
- Multiple regulatory and scientific meetings, reviews, analysis, consultations with stakeholders, were conducted for the past few years
- Concept paper : Proposed future direction of the *P. ramorum* Program that takes into account all of the information learned during the past several years

**Federal Quarantine Status for  
*Phytophthora ramorum***



## Quarantined Counties (pink)

- Trigger is disease in the environment
- All pathways are regulated


## Regulated Counties (orange)

- No triggers exist
- Only nursery stock is regulated

# 2010 Regulatory Survey - Regulated

| State      | Total Nurseries surveyed | Host Nurseries Surveyed | Host Nurseries positive for <i>P. ramorum</i> (%) | Non-host Nurseries Surveyed | Non-host Nurseries positive for <i>P. ramorum</i> |
|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| California | 2070                     | 634                     | 7 (1.1%)  | 1436                        | 0   |
| Oregon     | 1334                     | 644                     | 9 (1.4%)  | 690                         | 0   |
| Washington | 261                      | 142                     | 6 (4.2%)  | 119                         | 0   |
|            | 3665                     | 1420                    | 22 (1.5%)   | 2245                        | 0   |

Trends were similar in 2007, 2008 and 2009



# Counties with Positive Interstate Shippers since 2003

| State        | Total number of Counties in the State | Number of Counties with <i>P. ramorum</i> detections in interstate shippers | Number of Counties with no <i>P. ramorum</i> detections in interstate shippers |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| CA           | 58                                    | 15 (26%)  | 43 (74%)   |
| OR           | 36                                    | 7 (19%)   | 29 (81%)   |
| WA           | 39                                    | 7 (18%)   | 32 (72%)   |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>133</b>                            | <b>29 (22%)</b>   | <b>104 (78%)</b>   |

# Regulatory Survey – Non Regulated


- In 2010, *P. ramorum* stand alone or enhanced survey conducted in 469 nurseries in the non-regulated states and over 3530 plant, 414 water and 63 soil samples tested
  - 9 nursery foliar positives, 2 nursery soil positives, 1 nursery water positives
  - Positive Interstate Shippers (trace forward or only water)
- CAPS surveys also conducted in 11 non-regulated states.

# Sudden Oak Death Pathogen Found in Eastern Streams

Steve Oak<sup>1</sup>, Ed Yockey<sup>1</sup>, and Borys Tkacz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>USDA Forest Service, Southern Region-FHP, Asheville, NC <sup>2</sup>USDA Forest Service, Washington Office-FHP, Washington, D.C.


Risk projections show eastern forest ecosystems are at risk for Sudden Oak Death



Rhododendron leaf baiting of high risk streams draining infested nurseries has been employed in national early detection surveys since 2006.



*P. ramorum* Stream Survey Eastern Locations 2006-2010



| Region (States)           | Year      |            |            |           |                 | Streams Surveyed |                     |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
|                           | 2006      | 2007       | 2008       | 2009      | First Half 2010 | Total            | Unique <sup>1</sup> |
| Northeast (9)             | 24        | 37         | 29         | 15        | 15              | 120              | 91                  |
| North Central (6)         | 0         | 20         | 15         | 0         | 2               | 37               | 30                  |
| South (10)                | 33        | 64         | 71         | 78        | 73              | 319              | 210                 |
| <b>Eastern Total (25)</b> | <b>57</b> | <b>121</b> | <b>115</b> | <b>93</b> | <b>90</b>       | <b>476</b>       | <b>331</b>          |

<sup>1</sup>Many streams baited in more than one year

## Are streams acting as pathways for spread of *P. ramorum* into terrestrial forest ecosystems?

2007

1

2008

1 1 1

2009

1 4 1

2010

1 3 1 1

(first half of 2010 baiting season only)

The number of streams in states with *P. ramorum* detections are shown by year. Once positive, no streams have reverted to pathogen-free status for an entire year.

A 2008 streamside survey in MS detected positive forest plants, but no established infection center.

# Soil, Water, Media: Non-Regulated States

| State | County      | Nursery | 2004  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
|-------|-------------|---------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| AL    | Jefferson   | HNH*    | P     | -    | P    | -    | -    | P+W  | P+   | -    |
|       | Shelby      | JDRL*   | -     | -    | -    | -    | -    | P+W  | -    | -    |
|       | Jefferson   | ANDCN*  | P     | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| GA    | Gwinnett    | PEXTB   | -     | -    | -    | P+SM | -    | -    | -    | -    |
|       | Fulton      | JDRLA   | P(Tr) | P+S  | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
|       | Forsyth     | JDRLCU* | -     | P    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| MS    | Hinds       | LKYG*   | -     | -    | P+W  | P+WM | P    | P+W  | -    | -    |
| NC    | Mecklenburg | GOT*    | -     | -    | -    | -    | P+S  | P+M  | P+S  | -    |
| NY    | Suffolk     | BST     | -     | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | W    | -    |
| PA    | Delaware    | MTGN    | -     | -    | P+WS | P+WS | -    | -    | -    | -    |
| SC    | Greenville  | SPN     | -     | -    | -    | -    | P    | -    | P+S  | S    |
|       | Greenville  | GOTL    | -     | -    | -    | -    | P+SM | P+S  | P+S  | -    |
| VA    | Hanover     | JRN     | -     | -    | -    | -    | -    | -    | S    | -    |
| FL    | Gadsden     | ESPH*   | -     | -    | -    | -    | P+SW | -    | -    | -    |
|       | Leon        | ESPT    | P(Tr) | -    | P+SW | P    | P+M  | -    | -    | -    |

P: Plant; S: Soil; W: Water; M: Potting Media; Tr: Trace forward detection, Nursery Stream detections\*

# Consistent Themes

- The direction set forth in the White Paper is a culmination of all the input we have received over the past several years.
- Some of the clear messages we have heard include:
  - Regulate the pathogen, not just the disease.
  - Program needs to address *P. ramorum* in water
  - Risk based strategic use of resources to address *P. ramorum* movement in nursery stock nationally
  - Implement a system of voluntary / mandatory BMP's in positive nurseries, especially in repeat positives

# Three Major Concepts Proposed

First Concept: Maintain the regulatory status of areas currently quarantined for SOD

- 14 Counties in CA and Curry County, OR
- Would clearly establish triggers for regulating and deregulating



## Second Concept

- Regulate the interstate movement of host plants from nurseries that use water that has tested positive for *P. ramorum* as determined through official regulatory samples
  - Based on current data this would potentially impact a few nurseries in CA, OR, WA, MS, AL, GA, FL, NC and NY
  - The regulatory focus would be on “treatment options” of irrigation water.

## Third Concept

- Regulate nationally only those nurseries that ship interstate and are also confirmed for the presence of *P. ramorum* in plants, water, soil, or on any related articles
  - Would clearly establish triggers for regulating / deregulating nurseries
  - Detection of *P. ramorum* not only on plants, but also in soil and/or water would be a trigger

## Third Concept (*continued*)

- Only positive nurseries in the US would be regulated
- The majority of currently regulated nurseries (host & non-host) in CA, OR and WA where *P. ramorum* has never been detected (data 2003-2011) would be deregulated
- Repeat positive nurseries would be required to implement BMP's options based on Critical Control Points identified by a regulatory assessment team

# Advance Notification Update

- FO in effect since March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011
- Nurseries in the regulated States of California, Oregon and Washington must provide advance notification to the non-regulated States when they ship high-risk (*Rhododendron*, *Camellia*, *Pieris*, *Kalmia*, *Viburnum*) plant genera
- Inter-state shippers in 37 (out of 137) counties in CA, OR and WA, with one or more previous positive detections in an inter-state shipping nursery, are affected by the FO
- The main objectives of the FO is to facilitate rapid response, provide traceability in case of a trace incident and prioritize resources

# Advance Notification Update

- **Benefits, Issues, Concerns, Suggestions**
  - Most of states viewed the requirement as adding an additional safeguard
  - FO has increased ability of the states to prioritize resources and provide direct traceability of incoming shipments and assisted in their surveys.
  - Additionally, the FO has assisted receiving states track a number of unlicensed establishments in their states
  - Industry has expressed the FO has not hindered inter-state shipments of host plant nursery stock


# Advance Notification Update

- **Benefits, Issues, Concerns, Suggestions (continued)**
  - Initial concern about missing faxes, incomplete information, lack of standardization, erroneous shipment dates (working out the kinks)
  - Concern that APHIS is no longer compiling trace forward data after six months, making it difficult to verify the completeness of notifications
  - Concerns from states over burden, resources, authority and liability
  - Notifications should go to SPHD's as well so that they can maintain data

# Advance Notification Review Process

- At the end of the shipping season the *P. ramorum* program intends to review the process through
  - Verifying the compliance by shipping states and recording violations if any
  - Verifying how the receiving states have stored/filed / utilized the notifications received
  - Obtain feed-back from both the industry and receiving states on the lessons learned, benefits and /or constraints
- Review to be complete prior to the spring 2012 shipping season.

# APHIS PPQ *Phytophthora ramorum* Regulatory Program Contacts



**Dr. Prakash Hebbar, PPQ  
National Program Manager for  
the *Phytophthora ramorum*  
Regulatory Program**

**Anthony Man-Son-Hing  
Eastern Regional  
Program Manager**

**Stacy Scott  
Western Regional  
Program Manager**