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Characteristics of Pathway Analysis

- Characterize the movement of things between locations
- In plant protection, they describe the means of pest entry or spread (FAO, 2008)
- Because they involve pest movement in space and time, predictive mapping can be used to inform them
Types of Pathway Analysis

1) Qualitative
   - Results are expressed in non-numeric terms, e.g. low, medium, high

2) Semi-Quantitative
   - Results have a qualitative and associated quantitative component, e.g. Low (1)

3) Quantitative
   - Results expressed in numerical terms, e.g. years until first occurrence
   - Often use simulation models and stochastic processes, e.g. the binomial

Binomial Process (Vose, 2000)

- Trials
- Negative Binomial
  - $n$
- Successes
  - Binomial
  - $s$
- Probability of Success
  - Beta
  - $p$
Example 1: Predictive Mapping in Qualitative Pathway Analysis
Pathway Assessment: *Geosmithia sp. and Pityophthorus juglandis* Blackman movement from the western into the eastern United States

Leslie Newton, Glenn Fowler, Alison Neeley, Robert Schall and Yu Takeuchi
Introduction

- *Geosmithia morbida*, causes Thousand Cankers Disease (TCD) in Walnut (Kolarik et al., 2010; USDA-NAL-NISIC, 2010)
- Is vectored by the walnut twig beetle (WTB), *Pityophthora juglandis* (Kolarik et al., 2010)
Introduction Continued

- TCD was detected killing black walnut in the western United States in 2001 and may have killed trees there in the 1990s (Cranshaw and Tisserat, 2008).
- Newton et al. (2009) generated a pathway analysis that characterized the likelihood of TCD moving into the eastern United States via human mediated pathways and natural spread.
- Used predictive mapping and other evidence to estimate the approach rates, rank the pathways in terms of importance and characterize uncertainty.
- Used qualitative ratings for the pathway approach rates, e.g. negligible, low and moderate.
- http://www.thousandcankers.com
Predictive Mapping for the Natural Spread Pathway

- WTB flies 1 to 2 miles (1.7-3.2 km) (NPAG-Archives, 2008) and the Great Plains may be a barrier inhibiting natural spread.
- Walnut grows along rivers (Baker, 1999) and this may provide a corridor for WTB movement across the Great Plains.
Predictive Mapping for the Natural Spread Pathway

- Generated a composite map of TCD affected counties, hardwood forests and rivers to identify at-risk areas for WTB movement and TCD introduction.
- Given the natural barrier and limited flight distance, the approach rate for the natural spread pathway was assigned a “Low” rating.
- Areas of uncertainty include: affect of prevailing wind currents on beetle flight distances and the unknown amount of planted walnut trees in the Great Plains.
# TCD Qualitative Pathway Approach Rates (Newton et al., 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Estimated Approach Rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td>Low to Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPM</td>
<td>Low to Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Stock</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scion Wood</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Spread</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also provided justifications and described uncertainty*
Example 2: Predictive Mapping in Semi-Quantitative Pathway Analysis

Pathway-Initiated Risk Assessment: Asian Gypsy Moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae: *Lymantria dispar* (Linnaeus)) from Japan into the United States on Maritime Ships

Glenn Fowler, Yu Takeuchi, Ron Sequeira, Gary Lougee, Weyman Fussell, Michael Simon, Andrea Sato, and Xu Yan
Introduction

- Asian gypsy moth (AGM) can move on ships
- This assessment was part of a pest risk analysis that characterized the risk AGM poses to the United States from Japanese maritime shipments
- Was used to provide justification for Japan maintaining a pre-shipment inspection program
- Used the USDA Guidelines for pathway-initiated pest risk assessments (USDA-APHIS-PPQ, 2000)

- Guidelines have 3 sections that use semi-quantitative risk ratings
  1. Consequences of Introduction: Low (5-8); Medium (9-12); High (13-15)
  2. Likelihood of Introduction: Low (6-9); Medium (10-14); High (15-18)
  3. Pest Risk Potential: Low (11-18); Medium (19-26); High (27-33)
Introduction Continued

- Likelihood of Introduction section characterizes the pathway and has 6 semi-quantitative sub-elements whose sum generate the risk rating:
  1. Quantity Imported Annually
  2. Survive Post-harvest Treatment
  3. Survive Shipment
  4. Not Detected at Port of Entry
  5. Moved to Suitable Habitat
  6. Contact with Host Material

- All except sub-element 1, which is based on the import volume, are scored:
  - Low (1) = < 0.1%
  - Medium (2) = 0.1% to 10%
  - High (3) = >10%

http://www.asiangypsymoth.org/
Predictive Mapping for Sub-Element 6: Contact with Host Material

- Yu Takeuchi mapped at-risk ports that had forest within AGM’s flight range
- 89.8% of the ports met this criteria indicating that AGM would likely find host material
- Because this was greater than 10%, Sub-element 6 was scored High (3)
# Pest Risk Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Sub-Element</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Imported Annually</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survive Post Harvest Treatment</td>
<td>Medium (2*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survive Shipment</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Detected at Port of Entry</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Host Material</td>
<td>High (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk Rating</td>
<td>High (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Element</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of Introduction</td>
<td>High (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Introduction</td>
<td>High (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Risk Potential</td>
<td>High (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pre-shipment inspection program

“High: The pest is a significant threat; therefore specific phytosanitary measures are recommended. Normal port of entry inspections will not provide phytosanitary security” (USDA-APHIS, 2000)
Example 3. Predictive Mapping to Directly Inform Quantitative Pathway Analysis

Quantitative pathway initiated pest risk assessment: risks to the southern United States associated with pine shoot beetle, *Tomicus piniperda* (Linnaeus), (Coleoptera: Scolytidae), on pine bark nuggets, logs and lumber with bark and stumps from the United States quarantined area

Glenn Fowler, Barney Caton, Lisa Jackson, Alison Neeley, Leon Bunce, Dan Borchert, and Rob McDowell
Introduction

- The pine shoot beetle (PSB) was discovered in the U.S. in 1992 and subsequently spread into the Northeast and North Central States (Haack and Poland, 2001)
- PSB introduction results in quarantines on at-risk timber commodities
A probabilistic pathway analysis was generated to estimate the likelihood of PSB introduction into the Southern United States associated with at-risk timber articles if deregulated.

Objective was to inform regulatory policy by identifying at-risk timber pathways for PSB colonization in the South.
For example, predictive mapping was used to identify:

1. Quarantined counties that were at-risk for shipping potentially infested trees into the southern United States based on a 150 mile shipping radius (Howell pers. comm., 2005)
2. The total number of timber mills that could receive potentially infested timber from these counties
3. The number of timber mills in the southern United States that could receive potentially infested timber from these counties

Could then calculate probability of potentially infested timber being shipped into the southern United States

A binomial could then calculate the amount of potentially infested timber shipped into the southern United States.
## Summary risk table for the years until colonization in the South in the event of pathway deregulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bark Nuggets</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring/Fall/Winter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>2,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logs and Lumber with Bark</td>
<td>Spring/Annual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumps</td>
<td>Spring/Annual</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>3,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>299,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark Nuggets and Stumps</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>2,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark Nuggets and Logs and Lumber with Bark</td>
<td>Spring/Annual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark Nuggets, Stumps and Logs and Lumber with Bark</td>
<td>Spring/Annual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumps and Logs and Lumber with Bark</td>
<td>Spring/Annual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 4. Predictive Mapping to Indirectly Inform Quantitative Pathway Analysis

Quantitative Pathway Analysis: Asian Gypsy Moth (Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae: *Lymantria dispar* (Linnaeus)) from Japan into the United States on Maritime Ships

Glenn Fowler, Yu Takeuchi, Ron Sequeira, Gary Lougee, Weyman Fussell, Michael Simon, Andrea Sato, and Xu Yan
Introduction

- A second component of the pest risk analysis used to provide justification for Japan maintaining a pre-shipment inspection program.
- Constructed a probabilistic model estimating the annual approach rate of AGM infested ships from Japan to the United States.
Predictive Mapping to Determine AGM Flight Periods around At-Risk Japanese Ports

- Used a degree day model and predictive climate mapping to model the start of AGM flight around at-risk ports (Sheehan, 1992; NAPPFAST, 2008 (out of service))
- Assumed a 2 month flight window (Wallner et al., 1994)
- Queried the Llloyds of London Maritime Intelligence Unit database to determine the number of ships that called at ports during the flight period (Informa plc, 2008)
- This represents the number of trials in the binomial process
Predictive Mapping to Determine AGM Flight Periods around At-Risk Japanese Ports

- Modeled the probability of a ship that called at a Japanese port being infested based on Customs and Border Patrol interception data (USDA-APHIS, 2008)
- Could then run the binomial to model the annual number of infested ships coming to the United States from Japan

![AGM Infested Ships from Japan](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 9.3

Source: P&D, 2012a,b, PPQ, 2013a,b, QPA, 2008
Japan implemented a pre-shipment inspection program in 2007 which has been maintained (POP, 2013)

A similar pest risk analysis was generated for China (Fowler et al., 2009)

China implemented a pre-shipment inspection program in 2011 (POP, 2013)

http://www.asiangypsymoth.org/
Summary and Conclusions

- Pathway analyses are dynamic and can be tailored to specific situations
- Have geospatial and temporal components
- Predictive mapping is a useful tool for increasing their precision and utility
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Aquatic Invasive Species: Basin-wide threat
Aquatic invasive Species: Basin-wide impacts
AIS THEORY OF CHANGE

Unified Policies
Great Lakes jurisdictions are willing to develop regional or national AIS laws and policies.

Prevent
Invasion pathways are understood, detection tools and solutions are developed, and future invasions prevented.

Detect & Contain
Effective surveillance programs are set up to detect early incursions, contain, and then eradicate.

Manage & Control
Cost effective AIS management/control methods that enable ecological recovery are developed at sites and scaled across the Basin.

Recovery of Great Lakes Ecosystem Health
Four major pathways of introduction

- **Shipping**
- **Canals**
- **Trailered boats**
- **Commercial Trade in Live Plants and Animals**
Live trade= aquarium/ornamental/pet releases (gray) & bait fish release (white)
Regulations only as strong as weakest link

Peters and Lodge, Fisheries, 2009
Great Lakes states or provinces

No. of prohibited/restricted animals

IL  IN  MI  MN  NY  OH  ONT  PA  QBC  WI
Number of state or provincial jurisdictions listing individual species
No. of species:

- Established: 37
- Not established: 7
- Uncertain: 1

Great Lakes States or Provinces
The Nature Conservancy

INcredible by Any MEASURE...THE GREAT LAKES

No. of species

Established Great Lakes Basin | Established Great Lakes Jurisdiction | Not established

No. of species

0 | 5 | 15
Common criteria used to assess risk

• Probability of introduction

• Environmental suitability – can species establish, reproduce and spread (climate, and habitat suitability)

• Evidence of impacts
  – history of invasiveness elsewhere
  – competition
  – predation
  – disease
  – economic impacts
  – or human health
Existing risk assessment information in GLB

- **Expert panel approach** (e.g. MN, OH, MI)
- **Detailed literature reviews** (e.g. WI DNR, DFO Canada, GLANSIS, Lacey Act Listed Injurious sp. & USDA noxious species listing, Invasive Species Specialist Group (*ISSG*))
- **Questionnaire** -score based risk assessment tools (e.g. USAWRA, *Gordon et al 2013*, NY Plant risk assessment method)
- **Statistical tools** (USFWS model  [*Hoff in review*], Kolar and Lodge 2002, Keller et al 2007)
## Assessing strength of evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence</th>
<th>Risk Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stronger</td>
<td>Identified by multiple peer reviewed risk assessments &amp; expert panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaker</td>
<td>Identified by a peer reviewed assessment and expert panel(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified by a peer reviewed risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified by multiple expert panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified by one expert panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing strength of evidence

- Scored each species on basis of **cumulative evidence** for regulating
- Expert panel approach (Score 0.3 per expert panel)
- Detailed literature reviews (Score 1 point per process)
- Questionnaire -score based risk assessment tools (Score 1 point per process)
- Statistical tools (Score 1 point per process)
Weight of evidence (animals)

![Graph showing the relationship between weight of evidence score and number of jurisdictions prohibited. The equation of the line is y = 0.4049x + 2.1576 with R² = 0.4516.]
Animals – slow progress

### Graph 1
- **2008**
  - (N=27)

### Graph 2
- **2012**
  - (N=47)
Weight of evidence (plants)

\[ y = 0.8666x + 0.9256 \]
\[ R^2 = 0.4003 \]
Plants – substantial progress

Reason for progress = Adoption of risk assessment methods
- Indiana and Illinois – (GL) AWRA
- New York – Plant Risk assessment method

Number of Jurisdictions

Frequency listing 2008
(N=30)

Frequency listing 2012
(N=37)
Opportunity for adoption of common risk assessment data?

NY invasiveness ranks
(* - requires further evaluation)
Conclusions- informing risk management

- Current prohibited species lists appear to be reactive
- Variety of risk assessment methods used across basin collectively provide evidence to support broader prohibition of the majority of listed species
- Agreement between some comprehensive risk assessment methods suggests potential for adoption of consistent and scientifically defensible risk assessment method for GLB jurisdictions (e.g. MI PA 537 of 2014)
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