STATE OF CALIFORNIA—OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

NOTICE PUBLICATION/REGULATIONS SUBMISSION

EMERGENCY

(See instructions on reverse)

For use by Secretary of State only

STD. 400 (REV. 01-09)

OAL FILE NUMBERS	NOTICE FILE NUMBER	REGULATORY ACTION NUMBER	EMERGENCY NUMBER
	Z-		2010-0329-01E

For use by Office of Administrative Law (OAL) only

2010 MAR 29 AM 9:07

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

NOTICE | REGULATIONS

AGENCY WITH RULEMAKING AUTHORITY: Food and Agriculture

AGENCY FILE NUMBER (If any): PH10028

A. PUBLICATION OF NOTICE (Complete for publication in Notice Register)

1. SUBJECT OF NOTICE	TITLE(S)	FIRST SECTION AFFECTED	2. REQUESTED PUBLICATION DATE

3. NOTICE TYPE	4. AGENCY CONTACT PERSON	TELEPHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER (Optional)
☐ Notice re Proposed Regulatory Action ☐ Other			

OAL USE ONLY	ACTION ON PROPOSED NOTICE	NOTICE REGISTER NUMBER	PUBLICATION DATE
	☐ Approved as Submitted ☐ Approved as Modified ☐ Disapproved/ Withdrawn		

B. SUBMISSION OF REGULATIONS (Complete when submitting regulations)

1a. SUBJECT OF REGULATION(S): Light Brown Apple Moth Interior Quarantine

1b. ALL PREVIOUS RELATED OAL REGULATORY ACTION NUMBER(S):

2. SPECIFY CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE(S) AND SECTION(S) **(Including title 26, if toxics related)**

SECTION(S) AFFECTED (List all section number(s) individually. Attach additional sheet if needed.)

ADOPT:

AMEND: 3434(b)

REPEAL:

TITLE(S): 3

3. TYPE OF FILING

- ☐ Regular Rulemaking (Gov. Code §11346)
- ☐ Resubmittal of disapproved or withdrawn nonemergency filing (Gov. Code §§11349.3, 11349.4)
- ☒ Emergency (Gov. Code, §11346.1(b))
- ☐ Certificate of Compliance: The agency officer named below certifies that this agency complied with the provisions of Gov. Code §§11346.2-11347.3 either before the emergency regulation was adopted or within the time period required by statute.
- ☐ Resubmittal of disapproved or withdrawn emergency filing (Gov. Code, §11346.1)
- ☐ Emergency Readopt (Gov. Code, §11346.1(h))
- ☐ File & Print
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Changes Without Regulatory Effect (Cal. Code Regs., title 1, §100)
- ☐ Print Only

4. ALL BEGINNING AND ENDING DATES OF AVAILABILITY OF MODIFIED REGULATIONS AND/OR MATERIAL ADDED TO THE RULEMAKING FILE (Cal. Code Regs. title 1, §44 and Gov. Code §11347.1)

5. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CHANGES (Gov. Code, §§ 11343.4, 11346.1(d); Cal. Code Regs., title 1, §100)

- ☐ Effective 30th day after filing with Secretary of State
- ☒ Effective on filing with Secretary of State
- ☐ §100 Changes Without Regulatory Effect
- ☐ Effective other (Specify) _____

6. CHECK IF THESE REGULATIONS REQUIRE NOTICE TO, OR REVIEW, CONSULTATION, APPROVAL OR CONCURRENCE BY, ANOTHER AGENCY OR ENTITY

- ☐ Department of Finance (Form STD. 399) (SAM §6660)
- ☐ Fair Political Practices Commission
- ☐ State Fire Marshal
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

7. CONTACT PERSON	TELEPHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER (Optional)	E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional)
Stephen S. Brown	(916) 654-1017	(916) 654-1018	sbrown@cdfa.ca.gov

8. **I certify that the attached copy of the regulation(s) is a true and correct copy of the regulation(s) identified on this form, that the information specified on this form is true and correct, and that I am the head of the agency taking this action, or a designee of the head of the agency, and am authorized to make this certification.**

For use by Office of Administrative Law (OAL) only

SIGNATURE OF AGENCY HEAD OR DESIGNEE: N Dechoretz

DATE: 3/26/10

TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNATORY: Nathan Dechoretz, Deputy Secretary for Administration and Finance

In Title 3, Division 4, Chapter 3, amend subsection 3434(b) to read:

Section 3434. Light Brown Apple Moth Interior Quarantine.

(b) Area Under Quarantine.

(1) In the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma: Beginning at the intersection of Cascade Drive and Whites Hill Preserve; ... then, starting westerly along said drive to its intersection with Laureles Grade Road; then, starting southeasterly along Laureles Grade Road to its intersection with 36.529486 latitude and -121.751994 longitude; then, southeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with an unnamed creek at 36.499852 latitude and -121.716591 longitude; then, starting southeasterly along said creek to its intersection with ~~the Carmel river at 36.483637 latitude and -121.744811 longitude; then, starting northwesterly along said river to its intersection with Las Gazas Creek at 36.492339 latitude and -121.750530 longitude; then, starting southwesterly along said creek to its intersection with 36.474681 latitude and -121.785862 longitude; then, southeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with the boundary of Garland Ranch Regional Park at 36.473522 latitude and -121.781768; then, southeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with an unnamed creek at 36.453986 latitude and -121.778558 longitude; then, starting southeasterly along said creek to its intersection with 36.447146 latitude and -121.773442 longitude~~ 36.496903 latitude and -121.716808 longitude; then, southeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with an unnamed creek at 36.476109 latitude and -121.688232 latitude; then, starting southerly along said creek Chupines Creek at 36.456662 latitude and -121.986179 longitude; then, southwesterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with Turner Creek at 36.436967 latitude and -121.778808 longitude; ...

(2) In the County of Los Angeles, in the Long Beach area: Continued

(3) In the County of Monterey:

(A) In the Greenfield area: Continued

(B) In the Gonzales area: Beginning at the intersection of US Highway 101 and 5th Street; ... then, starting southwesterly along said road to its intersection with an unnamed road at 36.414197 latitude and -121.460898 longitude; then, northwesterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with

Sanchez Road at 36.446808 latitude and -121.472804 longitude; then, ~~starting northeasterly along said road to its intersection with River Road; then, southeasterly along River Road to its intersection with 36.468684 latitude and -121.460786 longitude; then, northeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with 36.474911 latitude and -121.455471 longitude; then, northwesterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with 36.479337 latitude and -121.455868 longitude; then, northeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with an unnamed road at 36.483389 latitude and -121.445203 longitude; then, northwesterly along said road to its intersection with an unnamed road at 36.484913 latitude and -121.445907 longitude; then, northeasterly along said road to its intersection with 36.490825 latitude and -121.427036 longitude; then, northeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with US State Highway 101 at 36.491488 latitude and -121.426117 longitude~~ starting northwesterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with an unnamed road at 36.473326 latitude and -121.509986 longitude; then, starting northeasterly along said road to its intersection with River Road; then, northwesterly along said road to its intersection with 36.489253 latitude and -121.491687 longitude; then, northeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with 36.494117 latitude and -121.482966 longitude; then, southeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with 36.493446 latitude and -121.481123 longitude; then, northeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with 36.495541 latitude and -121.477878 longitude; then, northeasterly along an imaginary line to its intersection with a four-wheel drive road at 36.499885 latitude and -121.474533 longitude; then, southeasterly along said road to its intersection with an unnamed road 36.499451 latitude and -121.474317 longitude; then, northeasterly along said road to its intersection with an unnamed road at 36.504779 latitude and -121.466637 longitude; then, southeasterly along said road to its intersection with 36.502923 latitude and -121.463991 longitude; then, northeasterly along said road to its with an unnamed road at 36.506632 latitude and -121.458146 longitude; then, southeasterly along said road to its intersection with Gonzales River Road; then, northeasterly along said road to its intersection with Alta

Street; then, northwesterly along said street to its intersection with 5th Street; then, northwesterly along said ~~highway~~street to the point of beginning.

(C) In the Soledad area: Continued

(4) In the County of San Joaquin:

(A) In the Manteca area: Continued

(B) In the Stockton area: Continued

(C) In the Tracy area: Continued

(5) In the County of San Luis Obispo:

(A) In the Los Osos area: Continued

(B) In the Arroyo Grande area: Continued

(6) In the County of Santa Barbara, in the Santa Barbara area: Continued

(7) In the County of Solano, in the Fairfield area: Continued

(8) In the County of Sonoma:

(A) In the Healdsburg area: Continued

(B) In the Kenwood area: Continued

(9) In the Counties of Yolo and Solano, in the Davis area: Continued

(10) In Yolo County, in the Woodland area: Continued

(c) Regulated Area.

The entire counties of San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Cruz.

(d) Articles and Commodities Covered. Continued

(e) Restrictions. Continued

Note: Authority cited: Sections 407, 5301, 5302 and 5322, Food and Agricultural Code.
Reference: Sections 407, 5301, 5302 and 5322, Food and Agricultural Code.

March 23, 2010

FINDING OF EMERGENCY

The Secretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture finds that an emergency exists, and that the foregoing adoption of a regulation is necessary for an immediate action to avoid serious harm to the public peace, health, safety or general welfare, within the meaning of Government Code Section 11342.545 and Public Resources Code Section 21080. The Department does not have a record of any person requesting a notice of regulatory actions under Government Code Section 11346.4(a)(1). Therefore, the provisions of Government Code Section 11346.1(a)(2) do not appear to be applicable to this emergency action as no one has requested such notice. The Secretary also believes delaying this emergency action by providing five days notice to allow public comment would be inconsistent with the public interest, within the meaning of Government Code Section 11349.6(b).

Description of Specific Facts Which Constitute the Emergency

The light brown apple moth (*Epiphyas postvittana*) was first detected in California on February 27, 2007 in Alameda County and on March 7, 2007, the light brown apple moth (LBAM) was first detected in Contra Costa County. Through the deployment of delimiting detection traps, numerous additional adult male moths were trapped in both counties. As a result, the Department adopted an emergency regulation, Section 3591.20, which became effective on March 21, 2007. The Department continued to deploy detection traps in additional counties. As a result of multiple detections of LBAM, the Department amended Section 3591.20 to add the counties of Marin and San Francisco (effective April 3, 2007); Santa Clara County (effective April 20, 2007); Monterey, San Mateo and Santa Cruz counties (effective April 23, 2007); and, Napa County (effective June 5, 2007). The Department also proposed the emergency adoption of Section 3434, Light Brown Apple Moth Interior Quarantine (effective April 20, 2007). Emergency amendments to Section 3434 were subsequently made adding portions of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, San Benito, San Mateo and Santa Cruz counties (effective June 6, 2007) and Napa County (effective June 7, 2007).

On May 2, 2007, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) issued a federal order regulating the interstate movement of host material from the infested areas of California and all of Hawaii. Another federal order issued was on April 28, 2008 and included Sonoma and Santa Barbara counties.

On June 21, 2007, emergency amendments to the State regulation were effective adding portions of Alameda, Monterey and Santa Cruz counties; and, including all harvested fruits and vegetables as regulated commodities. On July 18, 2007, emergency amendments were effective adding portions of Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Marin, Monterey, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz and Solano counties. On August 21, 2007, emergency amendments were effective adding additional portions of the counties of Alameda, Monterey, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz and Solano. On September 28, 2007, emergency amendments were made, primarily to merge some of the regulated areas of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties into one regulated area. On November 8, 2007, an emergency amendment became effective which increased the regulated areas of Half Moon Bay and Pescadero, San Mateo County; and, the jointly regulated areas of Monterey and Santa Clara counties. Emergency amendments were made adding (San Mateo and Santa Clara counties) and removing areas (Los Angeles, Marin, Monterey, Napa and Santa Clara counties - effective November 29, 2007); removing an area (Oakley, Contra Costa County - effective December 3, 2007); and, on December 21, 2007, several expansions became effective for areas in Contra Costa, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. Subsequent emergency amendments were made expanding or removing existing regulated areas which were effective on February 4 and 8, March 12, 17, and 21, April 8 and 18, May 2 and 7, 2008 and establishing the Sonoma area of Sonoma County (effective May 2, 2008).

On May 15, 2008, a new regulated area was established in the Martinez area of Contra Costa County; and, areas were expanded in the Vallejo area of Solano County, the

Mountain View, Palo Alto and San Jose areas of Santa Clara County and the Belmont, Redwood City and San Carlos areas of San Mateo County. Subsequent emergency amendments were made effective May 23, June 11 and 16, July 11 and 28, August 13, 18 and 26, September 10 and 23, October 14 and 20, November 12, December 12, 2008; January 14, February 27; March 5, 10 and 30; April 27, May 20 and 26; June 1, 15, 22 and 30; July 24, August 5 and 13, and September 3 and 24; November 10 and December 31, 2009; and January 25, March 10 and 15, 2010.

In late October 2007, the USDA established a new regulatory protocol which was distributed to county agricultural commissioners as "Phytosanitary Advisory No. 31-2007." This regulatory protocol was adopted based upon the recommendations of the LBAM Technical Working Group (TWG). The purpose of the protocol is to determine when it is appropriate to initiate or remove interstate regulatory restrictions pertaining to LBAM in response to new detections or the elimination of incipient LBAM populations. A key component of this regulatory protocol is the revision of the triggers for initiating a regulated area. Under the recommendations of the TWG, a single detection (trapping) of a male LBAM more than three miles from another male LBAM, no longer warrants a quarantine response. This is contingent upon the deployment of LBAM traps at the appropriate delimitation levels in buffer areas surrounding the single detection. Prior to this regulatory protocol, the detection of a single LBAM was the agreed upon trigger for initiating a quarantine area. The Department reviewed and concurs with this new protocol and is applying the same criteria contained in it to initiate or remove LBAM regulatory restrictions pertaining to the intrastate movement of regulated articles and commodities.

The Department uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping programs to plot the locations of all the detections of LBAM. As a result, based upon the criteria contained in the USDA regulatory protocol, the Department determined that there are new infestations of LBAM requiring the expansion of regulated areas.

On February 9, 2010 (PDR #1536396), an adult male LBAM was trapped in the Carmel Valley area of Monterey County. The Department determined that do its location, it would not expend the resources to delimit this find. This meets the regulatory protocol for expanding the quarantine area in this area of Monterey County. On January 7 (PDR #5056985) and February 18 (PDR# 5062691), 2010, adult male LBAM were trapped in the Gonzales area of Monterey County. These LBAM were trapped within three miles of each other and within one life cycle. This meets the regulatory protocol for expanding the quarantine area in this area of Monterey County.

LBAM is a highly polyphagous pest that attacks a wide number of fruits and other plants. Hosts occurring in California that are of significant agricultural or environmental concern include, but are not limited to: alder, alfalfa, apple, apricot, avocado, blueberry, blackberry, broccoli, cabbage, camellia, cauliflower, ceanothus, chrysanthemum, citrus, clematis, clover, columbine, cottonwood, currant, cypress, dahlia, ferns, fir, geranium, grape, hawthorn, honeysuckle, kiwi, lupine, madrone, mint, oak, peach, pear, peppers, persimmon, poplar, potato, raspberry, rhododendron, rose, sage, spruce, strawberry, walnut and willow. It is an insect species that feeds upon over 250 species of native and ornamental plants. The general area of infestation contains numerous sensitive plant species and habitats. There is a threat for adverse consequences to some of these sensitive species if LBAM becomes permanently established in California.

Prior to the infestations here, this species had a relatively restricted geographic distribution, being found only in portions of Europe, Oceania and Hawaii. The pest is native to Australia but has successfully invaded other countries. The likelihood and consequences of establishment by LBAM have been evaluated in pathway initiated risk assessments. LBAM was considered highly likely of becoming established in the United States and the consequences of its establishment for United States agricultural and natural ecosystems were judged to be severe. The United States Department of Agriculture, Animal Plant and

Health Inspection Service (USDA, APHIS) estimated that approximately 80 percent of the continental United States may be climatically suitable for LBAM.

In its native habitat of Australia, LBAM generally completes three generations annually. More than three generations can be completed if temperatures and host plants are favorable. In southeastern Australia where it is warmer, four generations can be completed. In contrast, two generations occur in Tasmania, New Zealand and in Great Britain. In Australia, generations do not overlap, but they do in Great Britain. As the population builds, LBAM is more abundant during the second generation. Therefore, the second generation causes the most economic damage as larvae move from foliage to fruit. The size of the third generation is typically smaller than the previous two due to leaf fall (including attached larvae) as temperatures decline in autumn. LBAM does not diapause and its continued development is slowed under cold winter temperatures. In cold climates, the pest overwinters as larvae. Because LBAM causes damage in a wide range of climate types in Australia, pest status is not dictated by climate.

LBAM causes economic damage from feeding by caterpillars, which may:

- destroy, stunt or deform young seedlings;
- spoil the appearance of ornamental and native plants; and
- injure deciduous fruit-tree crops, citrus and grapes.

Based upon losses in Australia, annual losses in California are expected to be much higher as the agricultural sector is larger and more variable. Additionally, LBAM, if not eradicated, will cause economic damage to California's export markets due to the implementation of quarantines by foreign and state governments.

Where it occurs, LBAM is difficult to control with sprays because of its leaf-rolling ability, and because there is evidence of resistance due to overuse of the same insecticides. Conifers are damaged by needle-tying and chewing. Larvae have been found feeding near

apices of Bishop Pine seedlings where they spin needles down against the stem and bore into the main stem from the terminal bud. LBAM constructs typical leaf rolls (nests) by webbing together leaves, a bud and one or more leaves, leaves to a fruit, or by folding and webbing individual mature leaves. During the fruiting season, they also make nests among clusters of fruits, such as grapes, damaging the surface and sometimes tunneling into the fruits. During severe outbreaks, damage to fruit may be as high as 85 percent.

Egg masses are most likely to be found on leaves. The larvae are most likely to be found near the calyx or in the endocarp; larvae may also create "irregular brown areas, round pits, or scars" on the surface of a fruit. Larvae may also be found inside furled leaves, and adults may occasionally be found on the lower leaf surface.

LBAM is an actionable pest for the USDA, APHIS and requires the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service to take corrective actions to prevent this pest from being associated with apples, citrus, pear fruits and other host commodities being exported to the United States. Host fruit exported from New Zealand faces similar restrictions by USDA, APHIS and the New Zealand Ministry of Forestry and Fisheries is responsible for any corrective actions at origin. Any host commodity arriving in the United States that is infested with or contaminated by LBAM is issued a Federal Emergency Action Notice and must be either destroyed, reexported or undergo an appropriate quarantine treatment prior to its release into the United States commerce. Canada and Japan also treat LBAM as a quarantine action pest. The People's Republic of China requires all host fruit imported to originate from orchards that are free from LBAM.

Wherever LBAM occurs in association with vineyards, it is considered to be a very important agricultural pest. Unless properly managed, LBAM causes substantial risks to crop yield and quality by causing both direct and indirect damage. Emerging larvae in the spring may feed upon both the flowers and newly set fruitlets causing a direct loss in yield. Later in the year, LBAM larvae feeding on maturing fruit can cause indirect loss by

introducing botrytis infections into the grape bunches. As an example, in 1992 in Australia, 70,000 larvae per hectare were documented and caused a loss of 4.7 tons of Chardonnay fruit. Damage in the 1992-93 Chardonnay season at Coonawarra, southern Australia, cost $2,000 per hectare.

In South Australia, LBAM is also a significant pest of apricots and can attack other stone fruit. Peaches are also damaged by feeding that occurs on the shoots and fruit.

The first generation (in spring) causes the most damage to apples while the second generation damages fruit harvested later in the season. Some varieties of apples such as 'Sturmer Pippin' (an early variety), 'Granny Smith' and 'Fuji' (late varieties) can have up to 20 percent damage while severe attacks can damage up to 75 percent of a crop.

In Australia, when insecticides are not applied, typically between five to 20 percent of fruit is damaged, but this can exceed 30 percent. In New Zealand, damage to unsprayed crops commonly reaches 50 percent (Wearing et al., 1991). More information regarding potential economic impact in California may be found in the environmental assessment prepared by USDA at www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/ea/downloads/lbam_ea_sc.pdf. In 10 of California's affected counties, it is estimated that LBAM could cause $160 to $640 million in losses. These estimates were derived from the agricultural impacts in Australia and New Zealand. This estimate does not include economic costs to the nursery industry nor to other significant host crops in California such as apricots, avocados, kiwifruit, peaches, etc., grown in other counties.

Exact economic impacts on international and domestic exports are uncertain at this time. California is the nation's leader in agricultural exports and in 2003 shipped more than $7.2 billion in both food and agricultural commodities around the world. Some countries have specific regulations against this pest, and many others consider it a regulated pest that would not be knowingly allowed to enter. Additional measures, such as preharvest

treatments and postharvest disinfestation, would likely have to be taken to ensure that shipments to these countries are free from LBAM. In addition, LBAM is an exotic pest, i.e., it is not established in the continental United States, and therefore other states within the United States would likely impose restrictions on the movement of potentially infested fruits, vegetables and nursery stock. These restrictions could severely impact the domestic marketing of California agricultural products.

The majority of California does have a climate which would favor the LBAM. Additionally, LBAM may have seven or more generations under some California climatic conditions. If unchecked, this would enable LBAM to build higher population levels in California. Given the known economic damages occurring in LBAM's present range, its potential damage to California's environment and agricultural industry could be devastating, especially without adequate control measures.

A portion of contiguous quarantine area in the counties of Marin and Sonoma counties would be expanded by approximately 50 square miles. A new quarantine area of approximately 21 square miles would be established in the Stockton area of San Joaquin County. A new quarantine area of approximately 16 square miles would be established in the Woodland area of Yolo County. The Los Osos area of San Luis Obispo County would expand by approximately four square miles. The quarantine area in Kenwood, Sonoma County would expand by approximately eight square miles.

This would result in a total of approximately 4,530 square miles under regulation within the State. The effect of this proposed change to the regulation will be to establish authority for the State to perform quarantine activities against LBAM (*Epiphyas postvittana*) in these additional quarantine areas.

Unless the State's LBAM regulation is substantially the same as the LBAM federal regulation and orders, the USDA cannot regulate less than the entire State. As an

example, on January 11, 2008, the USDA issued a Federal Order that expanded its citrus greening (CG) quarantine to encompass the entire State of Florida. This action was a result of the USDA confirming detections of CG in two new Florida counties: Lake and Hernando. Following discussions with the State of Florida, the USDA determined that parallel quarantine actions proposed by the State of Florida were not adequate and, therefore, it was necessary to impose statewide restrictions on the movement of all live host plants and host plant parts from Florida.

Therefore, as there are commercial agricultural industries located within the proposed regulated area, this emergency amendment to Section 3434 is also necessary to ensure the State's regulation continues to be substantially the same as the federal order issued April 28, 2008, which includes the October 2007 regulatory protocol. For this reason, delaying this emergency action by providing five days notice to allow public comment would be inconsistent with the public interest, within the meaning of Government Code Section 11349.6(b).

To prevent the spread of the LBAM to non-infested areas in order to protect California's agricultural industry and environment, it is necessary to begin quarantine activities against the LBAM immediately. Therefore, it is necessary to amend this regulation as an emergency action.

The Department also relied upon the following documents for this proposed rulemaking action:

> Federal Domestic Quarantine Order, *Epiphyas postvittana,* (Light Brown Apple Moth), DA-2009-46.
>
> Federal Domestic Quarantine Order, *Epiphyas postvittana,* (Light Brown Apple Moth), DA-2008-17.

Federal Domestic Quarantine Order, *Epiphyas postvittana,* (Light Brown Apple Moth), DA-2007-42.

For Information/Action, DA-2008-02, dated January 11, 2008, to State and Territory Agricultural Regulatory Officials, from Rebecca Bech and its attachments.

"Pest Profile," updated March 16, 2007, Kevin Hoffman, California Department of Food and Agriculture.

"Lightbrown apple moth, Exotic host plants-common," printed March 13, 2007, http://www.hortnet.co.nz/key/stone/info/hostplnt/iba-exo2.htm.

"Lightbrown Apple Moth Life Cycle," printed March 12, 2007, HortFACT.

"Light Brown Apple Moth, *Epiphyas postvittana,*" printed March 12, 2007, Government of South Australia.

"Light brown apple moth development calculator," printed March 12, 2007, NSW Department of Primary Industries.

"Light brown apple moth in citrus," June 2006, Primefact Number: 216.

"Botrytis and the Light Brown Apple Moth," undated, Bayer CropScience.

"Light Brown Apple Moth Procedures for USA Citrus Export Program," updated June 2006.

"China Export Quarantine IPM Guide," January 2006, Steven Falivene, NSW, DPI.

"Mini Risk Assessment, Light Brown Apple Moth, *Epiphyas postvittana* (Walker), [Leptidoptera: Tortricidae], September 21, 2003, Department of Entomology, University of Minnesota.

"Pests and Pest Management, Impact on Climate Change," February 2000, Dr. Robert W. Suthherst, CSIRO Entomology.

Letter dated August 3, 2009, from Robert Lilley to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated July 13, 2009, from Scott Hudson to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated May 19, 2009, from Rick Landon to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated April 28, 2008, from Lisa Correia to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated March 17, 2008, from William D. Gillette to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated July 12, 2007, from Kurt E. Floren to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated July 11, 2007, from Jearl D. Howard to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated June 1, 2007, from David R. Whitmer to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated May 25, 2007, from Ken Corbishley to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated May 24, 2007, from Paul J. Matulich to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated May 4, 2007, from Eric Lauritzen to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated May 4, 2007, from Gail M. Raabe to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated April 11, 2007, from Greg Van Wassenhove to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated April 4, 2007, from Scott T. Paulsen to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated April 3, 2007, from Edward P. Myer to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated April 2, 2007, from Dennis F. Bray to A.G. Kawamura.

Letter dated March 30, 2007, from Stacy Carlsen to A.G. Kawamura.

Authority and Reference Citations:
Authority: Sections 407 and 5322, Food and Agricultural Code.
Reference: Sections 407 and 5322, Food and Agricultural Code.

Informative Digest

Existing law provides that the Secretary is obligated to investigate the existence of any pest that is not generally distributed within this state and determine the probability of its spread and the feasibility of its control or eradication (FAC Section 5321).

Existing law also provides that the Secretary may establish, maintain and enforce quarantine, eradication and other such regulations as he deems necessary to protect the agricultural industry from the introduction and spread of pests (Food and Agricultural Code, Sections 401, 403, 407 and 5322).

Section 3434. Light Brown Apple Moth Interior Quarantine.

This proposed change would affect a portion of the contiguous quarantine area in Monterey County which would be expanded by approximately 14 square miles. The Gonzales area of Monterey County would expand by approximately eight square miles. This would result in a total of approximately 4,552 square miles under regulation within the State. The effect of this proposed change to the regulation will be to establish authority for the State to perform quarantine activities against LBAM (*Epiphyas postvittana*) in these additional quarantine areas.

Mandate on Local Agencies or School Districts

The Department of Food and Agriculture has determined that Section 3434 does not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts, except that an agricultural commissioner of a county under quarantine has a duty to enforce it. No reimbursement is required under Section 17561 of the Government Code because the affected county agricultural commissioners requested that these changes to the regulation be made.

Cost Estimate

The Department has also determined that the regulation will involve no additional costs or savings to any state agency because initial funds for state costs are already appropriated, no nondiscretionary costs or savings to local agencies or school districts, no reimbursable savings to local agencies or costs or savings to school districts under Section 17561 of the Government Code and no costs or savings in federal funding to the State.