

# NEWS

F R O M   T H E   N A T I O N A L   A C A D E M I

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE  
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING  
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE  
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

## [Read Full Report](#)

Date: Sept. 14, 2009  
Contacts: Jennifer Walsh, Media Relations Officer  
Alison Burnette, Media Relations Assistant  
Office of News and Public Information  
202-334-2138; e-mail <news@nas.edu>

### FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

#### CLASSIFYING LIGHT BROWN APPLE MOTH FOR ERADICATION, QUARANTINE IS JUSTIFIABLE IN DRAFT RESPONSE BY APHIS TO PETITIONERS

WASHINGTON -- A new report from the National Research Council finds that the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) is within its broad regulatory authority to classify California's invasive Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) as an "actionable" pest, which the agency asserted in a draft response document to two petitions questioning the classification. However, the Research Council report says that APHIS would benefit greatly from referencing more robust science to support its position, as its draft response did not adequately explain the moth's most likely future geographic distribution in the United States or the level of economic harm it could cause.

APHIS has classified the light brown apple moth -- originally from Australia and confirmed in California in 2007 -- as an "actionable quarantine significant pest" and has applied its authority to implement a program of quarantine restrictions and eradication, which has been met with some public resistance. Prior research in other countries where the moth has invaded has shown that it can damage seedling plants in nurseries; inflict aesthetic damage on ornamental plants; and injure tree fruit, citrus, and grapes. At the time the Research Council committee wrote the report, the moth had been found in 17 California counties.

In late 2008 and early 2009, the U.S. secretary of agriculture received two petitions, from the Pesticide Action Network North America and three private citizens, to reclassify LBAM as a "non-actionable pest" based on the argument that the moth is not a significant pest economically and can be controlled by means other than eradication. In February APHIS asked the Research Council to evaluate the scientific justification of the draft response APHIS wrote to answer the two petitions.

The committee found APHIS met the minimum standard within its broad regulatory powers to declare that the moth is of potential economic importance and is actionable. Nevertheless, APHIS has not communicated its justification in a

scientifically rigorous way or with sufficient clarity. To improve the draft response to the petitions, APHIS should define terms relating to pest status explicitly and clearly. Independently of the draft response, it should consider the development of guidelines to quantify when damage can objectively be considered of "economic importance," the report says.

Moreover, the biological data presented in the draft response to support the invasive nature of LBAM, its history in California, and its potential geographic distribution in the United States are problematic and in some cases not based on sound science. In particular, the prediction of the potential geographic distribution of the moth in the United States and all of the economic analyses based on this distribution are questionable and need reassessment. The committee recommended that APHIS consider more biologically realistic and validated modeling approaches to predict the potential geographic range.

The committee also said that the draft response does not accomplish the goal of a balanced economic analysis. It shows the greatest potential damage that might occur under extreme -- and presumably unlikely -- trade restriction scenarios. A more appropriate goal would detail a range of geographic distributions, affected commodities, and the expected success of eradication.

Lastly, the APHIS draft response focused entirely on the regulatory status of LBAM and did not address the current eradication strategy, which was an important issue for petitioners. The committee noted that although APHIS was within its regulatory purview in limiting its draft response to addressing only classification status, the agency missed an opportunity to clarify the difference between the classification of the pest and the means of controlling it and to justify its actions to stakeholders and the general public.

The report was sponsored by APHIS. The National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, and National Research Council make up the National Academies. They are independent, nonprofit institutions that provide science, technology, and health policy advice under an 1863 congressional charter. Committee members, who serve pro bono as volunteers, are chosen by the Academies for each study based on their expertise and experience and must satisfy the Academies' conflict-of-interest standards. The resulting consensus reports undergo external peer review before completion. For more information, visit <http://national-academies.org/studycommitteprocess.pdf>. A committee roster follows.

Copies of [REVIEW OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE \(APHIS\) RESPONSE TO PETITIONS TO RECLASSIFY THE LIGHT BROWN APPLE MOTH AS A NON-ACTIONABLE PEST](#) are available from the National Academies Press; tel. 202-334-3313 or 1-800-624-6242 or on the Internet at [HTTP://WWW.NAP.EDU](http://WWW.NAP.EDU). Reporters may obtain a copy from the Office of News and Public Information (contacts listed above).

# # #

[ This news release and report are available at [HTTP://NATIONAL-ACADEMIES.ORG](http://NATIONAL-ACADEMIES.ORG) ]

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL  
Division on Earth and Life Studies  
Board on Agriculture and Natural Resources

COMMITTEE ON REVIEW OF U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S ANIMAL  
AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE (APHIS) RESPONSE TO  
PETITIONS TO RECLASSIFY THE LIGHT BROWN APPLE MOTH AS A NON-  
ACTIONABLE PEST

MAY R. BERENBAUM \* (CHAIR)  
Swanlund Professor of Entomology  
University of Illinois  
Urbana-Champaign

THOMAS E. BUNDY  
Deputy Assistant General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
U.S. Department of Agriculture (retired)  
Unionville, Va.

SEAN B. CASH  
Faculty Associate  
Department of Consumer Science  
School of Human Ecology  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison

RACHAEL E. GOODHUE  
Associate Professor  
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics  
University of California  
Davis

VINCENT P. JONES  
Professor of Entomology  
Tree Fruit Research and Extension Center  
Washington State University  
Wenatchee

NICHOLAS J. MILLS  
Professor  
Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management  
University of California  
Berkeley

L. JOE MOFFITT  
Professor  
Department of Resource Economics  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst

JERRY A. POWELL  
Director Emeritus  
Essig Museum of Entomology  
University of California  
Berkeley

DANIEL S. SIMBERLOFF  
Professor of Environmental Science  
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville

ROBERT C. VENETTE  
Research Biologist  
Northern Research Station  
U.S. Forest Service  
St. Paul, Minn.

RESEARCH COUNCIL STAFF

KARA LANEY  
Study Director

\* Member, National Academy of Sciences