

2008 Farm Bill: Section 10201

Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention

**Stakeholder Meeting
June 8-9, 2009
Riverdale, Maryland**

Reports by Facilitators of Break Sessions

The most important or recurring issues are presented to all participants during this last session.

It was followed by brief questions and answers, but was intended to give everyone a broad overview of the outcome, with commitment by APHIS to keep everyone engaged for planning FY2010.

Enhanced Analysis and Survey

Comments

- Risk-based approach – breakdown by state
- Pathways – known vs. new
- CAPS is important to states
- Industry data may be helpful – work out objections
- Cost-benefit of survey vs. analysis

Enhanced Analysis and Survey

Recommendations

- **Fund high-priority surveys**
- **Focus on traditional pathways – balance looking at new pathways**
- **Invasion biology in pest risk prioritization**
- **Know the response if surveying for a particular pest**
- **Figure out use of third-party data**

Domestic Inspection

- **Expand canine program where they are already in place and to other states as well**
 - Based on the Farm Bill criteria to other states, starting with the high risk states
 - Create an economical analysis on the benefits of using dog teams and identify criteria to keep/continue with canine programs
 - Use for activities other than mail and express carrier (i.e. surveys, interstate movement)
 - Assess the need for canine teams in other states to establish priorities
 - Address other issues so dog teams can work without legal boundaries
 - 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**

Technology Enhancement

- Information sharing with Stakeholders for early detection resources:
 - important pests/threats of regulatory significance.
 - Information would provide priority pests/threats, points of origin, points of contact (SME).
- Taxonomic Capacity:
 - There is a need to look for taxonomic expertise outside of APHIS
- Traps and & Lures Management Program :
 - Traps and lures should be managed in 1 location for ALL programs, not just the Farm Bill priorities and interests. A one-stop-shop.

Technology Enhancement

- **Early Detection Resources (traps & lures):**
 - Methods development of traps and & lures to catch target pests,
 - Improve sampling strategies, look at statistical sampling, timelines, cost analysis of technology investment or implementation investment
- **Offshore initiatives:**
 - Get the problem solved before it gets here. Communication needs to be passed to stakeholders. Industry wants to be a part of the solution.
 - Analysis of pests abroad – understanding their biology, trapping, mitigations, etc – before they get here.

Safeguarding Nursery Production

- **Comments**
 - **BMPs need to be industry driven and validated scientifically**
 - **Clarify (standardize) the language**
 - **Holistic approach**
 - **Need for clear research plan and timeline.**

Safeguarding Nursery Production

- **Recommendations**
 - **Cost benefit analysis**
 - **Industry buy in (incentives/seal of approval)**
 - **Scalable (size of the producers)**
 - **Umbrella approach (broad spectrum approach)**
 - **Collaboration and communication**
 - **Continued meetings with stakeholders**

Enhance Mitigation Capabilities

- **Timely feedback is important after an outbreak, so that all stakeholders can see what worked well and what did not work well.**
- **There is a need for more clarity on when it would necessary to use 10201 mitigation funds verses when it would be necessary to go to CCC.**
- **The Interstate Pest Control Compact (IPCC) is an excellent potential source of emergency funding for an outbreak IF it could receive monetary support from another source (such as APHIS).**
- **There is a need to make it more transparent how APHIS determines it is necessary to initiate a pest outbreak response.**
- **Pests are not APHIS problems, Forestry Service problems, or state problems. Instead, they are USDA and stakeholder problems. It is important to see all who are impacted and who have a role in pest outbreaks.**

Enhance Mitigation Capabilities

- **Develop transparent criteria for how 10201 mitigation money will be used.**
- **Empower the Interstate Pest Control Compact to be better positioned to help fund a response.**
- **Create a protocol where an outside/independent review panel evaluates an emergency response, determining what worked, what did not work, and recommendations for future outbreaks.**
- **Create an on-the-job training program for state stakeholders. This program would bring people from states that have not experienced a certain pest to a state with an active program, so they can gain real life experience in managing (or eradicating) the pest. Elements of this program would include information on liability, salary options, and logistics so that each state would not need to repeat this work.**
- **Directly involve IR-4 in the determination of pesticide registration and rapid screening.**



Open Questions and Answers

Closing Remarks

Paul Eggert