

**CAPS Survey Report**

<b>Year:</b>	FFY 2012
<b>State:</b>	Louisiana
<b>Cooperative Agreement Name:</b>	Sudden Oak Death (SOD) Survey
<b>Cooperative Agreement Number:</b>	12-8422-1323-CA
<b>Project Funding Period:</b>	July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013
<b>Project Report:</b>	<b>CAPS Survey Report</b>
<b>Project Document Date:</b>	August 22, 2013
<b>Cooperators Project Coordinator:</b>	State Survey Coordinator (SSC)
<b>Name:</b>	J. Brett Laird
<b>Agency:</b>	Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry
<b>Address:</b>	P.O. Box 3596
<b>City/ Address/ Zip:</b>	Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3596
<b>Telephone:</b>	985-543-4024
<b>E-mail:</b>	brett_l@daf.state.la.us

Quarterly Report	<input type="checkbox"/>
Semi-Annual Accomplishment Report	<input type="checkbox"/>
Annual Accomplishment Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- A. Write a brief narrative of work accomplished. Compare actual accomplishments to objectives established as indicated in the work plan. When the output can be quantified, a computation of cost per unit is required when useful.

The Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry (LDAF) entered into a Cooperative Agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) in FY 2012 to conduct a visual and water baiting survey for *Phytophthora ramorum*. LDAF conducted this survey according to survey guidelines set forth by the USDA, APHIS, PPQ in 2012. LDAF's Agriculture and Environmental Science (AES) division is divided into 7 districts across the state and each district is being utilized to conduct this survey. Funding was late getting approved for this survey which forced LDAF to miss the Spring time window for survey work. LDAF began this survey in the Fall of 2012 and concluded this survey in June of 2013. LDAF inspectors conducted 33 Sudden Oak Death (SOD) inspections including 6 locations where an environmental survey was performed due to their previously positive status. Inspections began in late September, 2012 and continued into October, 2012. There were 79 tissue samples submitted to Dr. Nick Singh's lab at Louisiana State University (LSU). Seventeen of the 79 tissue samples tested ELISA positive. DNA was extracted from the 17 ELISA positive samples using Dneasy Plant Mini Kits by Dr. Singh and then were forwarded to Dr. Craig Webb's lab at Kansas State University for further testing. Dr. Webb determined all samples were negative on November 7, 2012 by real-time PCR (ITS & ELICITIN) with all controls performing as expected.

LDAF inspectors also conducted the water baiting portion of this survey at 5 high risk locations in Louisiana's nursery production areas. There were 10 water baiting traps (bags) deployed in 5 different retention ponds in 4 different parishes. These traps were baited with camellia leaves taken from the SSC's residence in St. Tammany parish. There were 44 water baiting samples submitted (including the 4 control samples) to Dr. Singh at LSU for analysis. Thirty two of the 44 samples tested ELISA positive and were later determined negative, morphologically, by Dr. Singh.

LDAF conducted a *Phytophthora ramorum* training on September 25, 2012 in Alexandria, Louisiana. The training was for LDAF inspectors involved in the Sudden Oak Death survey. Thirty inspectors were present, as well as, 6 presenters.

<u>Speaker:</u>	<u>Title:</u>	<u>Topic:</u>
Brett Laird	State Survey Coordinator	SOD inspections, numbers, water baiting, New federal form, outreach
Dr. Nick Singh	Diagnostician, LSU	Sample submission and procedure, History, life cycle, symptoms
Tad Hardy	Director, state entomologist LDAF	Systems approach to nursery certification (SANC)
Devin Boudreaux	LDAF AES Inspector	SANC training report
Mark Earl	LDAF AES Inspector	SANC training report
Ansel Rankins	LDAF Assistant Director	SOD symposium report
Richard Miller	LDAF Adm. Coordinator Quarantine Programs	Quarantine Program update

**USDA APHIS PPQ SPHD, Mr. Bill Spitzer was also present for the SOD training. This SOD training was a very informative and educational experience for our inspectors. While our inspectors are all very knowledgeable of SOD and its symptoms, it is always helpful to review and introduce new strategies for this program.**



**In the Spring of 2013, LDAF AES inspectors conducted 30 more Sudden Oak Death inspections. There were 50 tissue samples submitted to Dr. Singh's lab at Louisiana State University (LSU). Four of the 50 tissue samples tested ELISA positive. DNA was extracted from the 4 ELISA positive samples using Dneasy Plant Mini Kits by Dr. Singh and forwarded to Dr. Craig Webb's lab at Kansas State University for further testing. Dr. Webb determined all samples were negative on May 8, 2013 by real-time PCR (ITS & ELICITIN) with all controls performing as expected.**

**Totals for Sudden Oak Death Survey FY 2012:**

- 63 inspections
- 129 tissue samples
- 44 water baiting samples
- Covered 18 different parishes
- 53 ELISA positive samples
- 25 or 40% of inspections were interstate shippers.

Funding Amount	Total Number of Traps	Cost Per Unit
Proposed = \$25,000.00	Proposed = n/a	Proposed= n/a
Actual =\$50,000.00	Actual = n/a	Actual = n/a

**1. Survey methodology (trapping protocol):**

	Common Name	Scientific Name
<b>Pest:</b>	Sudden Oak Death	Phytophthora ramorum

	Proposed	Actual
<b>Sites (Locations):</b>	60	63
<b>Traps:</b>	10	10

<b>Number of Counties:</b>	18
<b>Counties:</b>	Beauregard, Bossier, Caddo, Calcasieu, East Baton Rouge, Iberia, Jefferson, Lafayette, Lafourche, Orleans, Ouachita, Rapides, St Charles, St. Landry, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa, Union, Washington

**2. Survey dates:**

	Proposed	Actual
<b>Survey Dates:</b>	July, 2012 to June, 2013	July, 2012 to June, 2013

**3. Benefits and results of survey:**

	Positive	Negative	Total Number
<b>Traps</b>	0	10	10

**4. Database submissions:**

All negative data was entered into the NAPIS database at the conclusion of the survey by Brett Laird (SSC, Louisiana). Data was also entered into the IPHIS database by Karen Jenkins (PSS, Louisiana) at the conclusion of the survey.

**B. If appropriate, explain why objectives were not met.**

**The SOD Survey performed as expected and all objectives were obtained or exceeded.**

**C. Where appropriate, explain any cost overruns or unobligated funds in excess of \$1,000.**

**The SOD survey budget seemed to be right on target with \$2.00 having to be deobligated at the end of the survey.**



---

*\*indicates information is required per 7 CFR 3016.40 and 7 CFR 3019.51*

**Approved and signed by**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Cooperator**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**ADODR**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_