Imminent Threat or Tempest in a Tea Pot?

Assessing the current and future implications of the Q biotype on whitefly management in the US.

QTAC Symposium and Meeting

Lance Osborne

April 3, 2006

Not Another CHICKEN LITTLE Presentation

Troop Leader Tim Says:

IMMINENT

- The Ornamental Industry considers Q and the B biotypes to be major but manageable threats.
- Only a matter of time before it is found in the field.
  - The Q was found in a University vegetable transplant house on mint.
  - The Q was found on tomato transplants in a large retail outlet.

THE ORNAMENTAL INDUSTRY HAS DONE THE FOLLOWING

- Propagators have organized and begun the development of BMPs for the management of whiteflies offshore.
- Published Alerts and articles in ALL major ornamental trade magazines.
- Talks have been presented at almost every ornamental trade show.
- Research has been funded (more than 12 efficacy trials conducted on 4 Q isolates).
- The industry has developed 2 management plans which have been distributed to more than 10,000 growers.

THE ORNAMENTAL INDUSTRY HAS DONE THE FOLLOWING

- Submitted the preponderance of whitefly samples for biotyping (not all of which were the Q).
- Determined that multiple introductions have probably taken place (McKenzie, Boykin, Bethke, Byrne, and Shatters.)

Cont.

Management Program for Whiteflies on Propagated Ornamentals

with an Emphasis on the Q-biotype

Each of the shaded boxes below represents a different stage of propagation and growth. Start with Stage 1: Propagation Misting Conditions and then work your way through each box to the growth stage of your crop. Then refer to the tables (A – E) for suggested products. There are also three tables (F, G, and H) summarizing the efficacy data generated in 2005.

Stage 1: Propagation Misting Conditions

1a Mist on . . . . . Go to **Stage 2**

1b Mist off . . . . . Go to **Stage 3**

Stage 2: Rooting Level after Propagation

2a Cuttings are newly stuck and not anchored in the soil . . . . . Go to Table A

2b Cuttings are anchored in the soil and able to withstand spray applications . . . . . Go to Table B

Stage 3: Development after Transplanting

3a Roots are well established in the soil and penetrating the soil to the sides and bottom of the pots . . . . Go to **Stage 4**

3b The root system is not well developed . . . . . Go to Table C

Stage 4: Plant Growth

4a Plants are in the active growth stage ……..Go to Table D

4b Plants are showing color or they are nearing the critical flowering stage . . . . . ……Go to Table E

Table A. Cuttings are Not Anchored in Soil

Suggested Products	IRAC Class	Data on Q
Foggers and aerosol generators	Many	No efficacy data are currently available for any pesticides while plants under mist

Table B. Cuttings Able to Withstand Sprays

Suggested Products	IRAC Class	Data on Q
Foggers	Many	No efficacy data are currently available for any pesticides while plants under mist
Avid (abamectin) Sometimes used with acephate or a pyrethroid	6	
Beauveria bassiana	n/a	
Neonicotinoid spray with translaminar and systemic activity	4	

* IRAC Class 9B exhibits cross resistance with IRAC Class 4

Table C. Undeveloped Root System

Suggested Products	IRAC Class	Data on Q
Aria (flonicamid)	9C	Yes
Avid (abamectin)	6	Yes
Azadirachtin	23	No
Beauveria bassiana	n/a	Yes
Distance (pyriproxyfen)	21	Yes
Endeavor (pymetrozine)	9B *	Yes
Endosulfan	2	No
Enstar II (kinoprene)	7A	Yes
MilStop (potassium bicarbonate)	n/a	Yes
Sanmite (pyridaben)	21	Yes
Talus (buprofezin)	16	Yes
Tank Mixes:		
Abamectin + bifenthrin	6 + 3	Yes
Pyrethroids + acephate	3 + 1	Yes
Pyrethroids + azadirachtin	3 + 26	No

Table D. Plants are Actively Growing

Suggested Products	IRAC Class	Data on Q	Notes
Neonicotinoid Soil Drench: Celero (clothianadin) Flagship (thiamethoxam) Marathon (imidacloprid) Safari (dinotefuran)	4	Yes	After drenching, apply foliar sprays as needed if whiteflies are present. Avoid repeated application with a single mode of action (products with the same number in the attached chart). **If plants have received a neonicotinoid drench, DO NOT spray with a neonicotinoid during this phase, if at all possible. If absolutely necessary, make only a single spray prior to shipping.** Tank mixes of pyrethroids with abamectin, azadiractin, or acephate may provide a suitable way to manage Q whiteflies when other pests need to be managed at the same time. * IRAC Class 9B exhibits cross resistance with IRAC Class 4
Foliar Applications:			
Aria (flonicamid)	9C	Yes	
Avid (abamectin)	6	Yes	
Azadirachtin	23	No	
Beauveria bassiana	n/a	Yes	
Celero (clothianadin)	4	Yes	
Distance (pyriproxyfen)	21	Yes	
Endeavor (pymetrozine)	9B *	Yes	
Endosulfan	2	No	
Enstar II (kinoprene)	7A	Yes	
Flagship (thiamethoxam)	4	Yes	
Horticultural Oil	n/a	Yes	
Insecticidal Soap	n/a	Yes	
Judo (spiromesifen)	23	Yes	
Marathon (imidacloprid)	4	Yes	
MilStop (potassium bicarbonate)	n/a	Yes	
Safari (dinotefuran)	4	Yes	
Sanmite (pyridaben)	21	Yes	
Talus (buprofezin)	16	Yes	
TriStar (acetamiprid)	4	Yes	
Foggers and other products whose use is not restricted by the label	Many	No	

Table E. Plants in Flower or Ready for Shipping

NOTE: Control of whiteflies during this time is difficult due the difficulty of achieving effective under leaf spray coverage, lack of labeled products, concerns about phytotoxicity or residue on final product. Therefore, pest management efforts should be concentrated before this phase. Drenches are slower acting and should probably not be within 7 days of shipping.

Suggested Products	IRAC Class	Data on Q
Neonicotinoid Soil Drench: Celero (clothianadin) Flagship (thiamethoxam) Marathon (imidacloprid) Safari (dinotefuran)	4	Yes
Foliar Applications:		
Avid (abamectin)	6	Yes
Flagship (thiamethoxam)	4	Yes
Judo (spiromesifen)	23	Yes
Safari (dinotefuran)	4	Yes
Sanmite (pyridaben)	21	Yes
TriStar (acetamiprid)	4	Yes
Foggers and other products whose use is not restricted by the label	Many	No

Table F. Summary of clip cage efficacy trials conducted in California by Jim Bethke against Q-Biotype whiteflies on poinsettia in 2005.

Trade Name	Common Name	IRAC Class	Rate per 100 gal	Application Method	Relative Efficacy
Avid 0.15EC + Talstar GH (0.67F)	Abamectin + Bifenthrin	6 + 3	8 fl oz + 18 fl oz	Foliar	100%
Judo 4F	Spiromesifen	23	4 fl oz	Foliar	100%
Safari 20SG	Dinotefuran	4	24 oz (4 oz solution per pot)	Drench	100%
Safari 20SG	Dinotefuran	4	8 oz	Foliar	100%
Avid 0.15EC	Abamectin	6	8 fl oz	Foliar	>95%
Sanmite 75WP	Pyridaben	21	6 oz	Foliar	>95%
TriStar 70WSP	Acetamiprid	4	4 pkt (1.6 oz ai)	Foliar	>90%
Flagship 25WG	Thiamethoxam	4	4 oz (1/3 pot volume per pot)	Drench	80 – 90%
Celero 16WSG	Clothianidin	4	4 oz per 2000 6" pots	Drench	70 – 90%
Marathon II 2F	Imidacloprid	4	1.7 fl oz per 1000 6" pots	Drench	60 – 95%
Dursban ME	Chlorpyrifos	1	50 fl oz	Foliar	80%
Flagship 25WG	Thiamethoxam	4	4 oz	Foliar	80%
Celero 16WSG	Clothianidin	4	4 oz	Foliar	70%
Marathon II 2F	Imidacloprid	4	1.7 fl oz	Foliar	70%
Talus 70WP	Buprofezin	16	6 oz	Foliar	60%
Talstar GH (0.67F)	Bifenthrin	3	18 fl oz	Foliar	50%
Aria 50SG	Flonicamid	9C	4.3 oz	Foliar	45%
Tame 2.4EC	Fenpropathrin	3	16 fl oz	Foliar	42 – 70%
Enstar II	S-Kinoprene	7A	10 fl oz	Foliar	38%
Endeavor 50WG	Pymetrozine	9B cross w/ 4	5 oz	Foliar	35%
Distance IGR	Pyriproxyfen	21	8 fl oz	Foliar	30 – 95%
MilStop (85S)	Potassium bicarbonate	n/a	2.5 lb	Foliar	26%
Discus	Imidacloprid+Cyfluthrin	4 + 3	25 fl oz	Foliar	22%
Orthene TT&O	Acephate	1	4 oz	Foliar	18 – 30%

Table G. Summary of whole plant efficacy trials conducted in Georgia by Ron Oetting against Q-Biotype whiteflies on poinsettia in 2005.

Trade Name	Common Name	IRAC Code	Rate per 100 gal	Application Method	Adult Mortality	Immature Mortality
Safari 20SG	Dinotefuran	4	24 oz (4 oz solution per pot)	Drench	89%	100%
Avid 0.15EC + Talstar GH (0.67F)	Abamectin + Bifenthrin	6 + 3	8 fl oz + 20 fl oz	Foliar	98%	98%
TriStar 70WSP + Capsil	Acetamiprid	4	2.25 oz	Foliar	88%	98%
Botanigard ES	*Beauveria bassiana*	n/a	64 fl oz	Foliar	0%	97%
Judo 4F	Spiromesifen	23	4 fl oz	Foliar	71%	97%
Naturalis L	*Beauveria bassiana*	n/a	64 fl oz	Foliar	92%	87%
Marathon II 2F	Imidacloprid	4	5.4 oz	Drench	57%	84%
Flagship 25WG	Thiamethoxam	4	3 oz	Foliar	0%	81%
Sanmite 75WP	Pyridaben	21	6 oz	Foliar	88%	81%
Distance IGR	Pyriproxyfen	21	8 fl oz	Foliar	28%	77%
Orthene TT&O + Tame	Acephate + Fenpropathrin	1 + 3	5.33 oz + 16 fl oz	Foliar	24%	74%
Celero 16WSG	Clothianidin	4	6.3 oz	Drench	57%	60%
Aria 50SG	Flonicamid	9C	120 g	Drench	57%	59%
MilStop (85S)	Potassium bicarbonate	n/a	2.5 lb	Foliar	42%	58%

Table H. Summary of whole plant efficacy trials conducted in New York by Dan Gilrein against Q-Biotype whiteflies on poinsettia in 2005.

Trade Name	Common Name	IRAC Code	Rate per 100 gal	Application Method	Immature Mortality
Judo 4F	Spiromesifen	23	4 fl oz	Foliar	100%
Safari 20SG	Dinotefuran	4	8 oz	Foliar	97%
Flagship 25WG	Thiamethoxam	4	2 oz	Foliar	63%
Marathon II 2F	Imidacloprid	4	1.7 fl oz	Foliar	43%
Distance 0.86EC	Pyriproxyfen	21	8 fl oz	Foliar	25%

***For an explanation of the what the various numbers mean under the "IRAC Code" heading please visit the following site: Insecticide Resistance Action Committee Mode of Action Classification v 5.1 (2005) Revised and re-issued (September, 2005) (http://www.irac-online.org/documents/moa/MoAv5_1.doc)**

Details of the experiments referred to in Tables F-H can be obtained by going to the Bemisia Website (the address is on the last page of this document.

We highly recommend that no more than 2-3 applications be made during the entire growing season of compounds belonging to any IRAC-Mode of Action Group and especially those in Group 4 (see tables). Talus and Distance should not be used more than twice during a crop cycle. We also recommend that growers utilize, as often as possible, non-selective mortality factors such soaps, oils and biological controls (i.e., pathogens and parasitoids).

Whitefly Resistance Management

The greater the number of whiteflies present when a pesticide application is made the greater the chance that at least one individual might possess the ability to survive the treatment.

The more frequently a given pesticide or mode of action is used, the greater the potential for developing a problem. Along those same lines, the longer the residual activity the greater the "selection" pressure on a resident whitefly population.
Older recommendations stated that "Insecticides should be applied a minimum of two times at a **five to seven day** interval to allow for egg hatch between applications so that both adults, nymphs and individuals that hatch from eggs are killed. This is not appropriate for many of the new pesticides that have residual activity of one week or greater. If the insecticide is properly applied and is not providing control, change to another material with a different mode of action because whitefly populations have the propensity to develop resistance. This is why scouting weekly and especially after a pesticide application is critical.

There are a number of ways to deal with this issue but the bottom line is the fewer applications one makes of materials with a similar mode of action, the smaller the potential for resistance developing. To that end, what can be done? First off, we recommend you develop a list of all the pesticides that are legal to use for whitefly control on the crop you are growing. Next, we suggest that each be evaluated under your particular situation for phytotoxicity. When you are finished you will have a list, hopefully not too short, from which you can develop a management program. The next problem is to review the labels to find restrictions/limitations on how often a material can be applied to a given crop. The plan you put together should be based on all of these points and the fact that growers will have to apply materials to manage other pests. We suggest you target those materials that have demonstrated the highest efficacy and use them during the most critical phases of the crop cycle. For example, treat newly obtained plant material as soon after receiving it as practical and then target the crop just prior to shipping so that you ship the cleanest plants as possible. Scouting is essential to the success of any pest management program and additional guidance will be placed on the Bemisia Website (www.mrec.ifas.ufl.edu/LSO/bemisia/bemisia.htm)

The Whitefly Management Program is our attempt to help with this process and includes many insecticides that are listed according to their IRAC (Insecticide Resistance Action Committee) mode of action classification. Growers must learn from experience which chemicals, when correctly applied, fail to give satisfactory control, and to then try other materials in a different classification. Most of us that have put this program together feel VERY STRONGLY that no more than 2-3 applications of materials should be applied during a given crop cycle. This would mean, for example, that one application of Chemical A from group 4, one of Chemical B from group 4 and one of Chemical C from group 4 would be the limit during the entire crop cycle in your nursery. There will probably be a need to apply other compounds for whiteflies or other pests. These materials should have a different mode of action. There will be times that you will use compounds that may not be as effective as you would like but their use is absolutely critical if you are going to effectively slow the development of resistance in your nursery.

Finally, we will also post on the website (listed above) the names and addresses of qualified entomologists who are willing to review your spray programs if you desire.

LABORATORIES AUTHORIZED TO TEST TO DETERMINE Q-BIOTYPE FROM B-BIOTYPE

There are a number of specifics concerning how one collects a sample and preserves it for evaluation. For these specifics, scheduling and pricing information you MUST contact the individual laboratories.

Judith K. Brown, Ph. D.
Plant Sciences Department
The University of Arizona
Tel.: (520) 621-1230
Tucson, AZ 85721 U.S.A.
Email: jbrown@ag.arizona.edu

Cindy McKenzie, Ph.D.
Research Entomologist
USDA, ARS, US Horticultural Research Laboratory
2001 South Rock Road
Fort Pierce, FL 34945
Tel.: (772) 462-5917
Email: cmckenzie@ushrl.ars.usda.gov

Frank J. Byrne, Ph. D.
Assistant Researcher
Dept of Entomology
University of California, Riverside
3401 Watkins Drive
Riverside, CA 92521
Tel.: (951) 827-7078
Email: frank.byrne@ucr.edu

This program will be updated and posted on the Bemisia website:
www.mrec.ifas.ufl.edu/LSO/bemisia/bemisia.htm

Contributors in alphabetical order:

James Bethke
Luis Canas
Joe Chamberlin
Ray Cloyd
Jeff Dobbs
Richard Fletcher
Dave Fujino
Dan Gilrein
Richard Lindquist
Scott Ludwig
Cindy McKenzie
Ron Oetting
Lance Osborne
Cristi Palmer
John Sanderson

Note: Mention of a commercial or proprietary product or chemical does not constitute a recommendation or warranty of the product by the authors. Products should be used according to label instructions and safety equipment required on the label and by federal or state law should be employed. Users should avoid the use of chemicals under conditions that could lead to ground water contamination. Pesticide registrations may change so **it is the responsibility of the user to ascertain if a pesticide is registered by the appropriate local, state and federal agencies for an intended use.**

This project was partially funded by the Floriculture & Nursery Research Initiative (USDA-ARS, Society of American Florists, American Nursery & Landscape Association) and the IR-4 Project.

If you have questions, concerns or comments please send them to:

Lance S. Osborne
University of Florida, IFAS
2725 Binion Road
Apopka, Florida 32703
407-884-2034 ext. 163
lsosborn@ufl.edu

Updated: 3/27/06

Discussion