

STATUS REPORT OF PINK BOLLWORM ERADICATION IN TEXAS**C. T. Allen****S. E. Herrera****L.E. Smith****L.W. Patton****Texas Boll Weevil Eradication Foundation****Abilene, TX****Abstract**

The Texas Pink Bollworm (PBW) Suppression/Eradiation program has been operating under the supervision of the Texas Boll Weevil Eradication Foundation (TBWEF) to suppress/eradicate this damaging pest of western cotton for seven years in the El Paso/Trans Pecos (EP/TP) zone. A total of 1,278,330,749 red dyed sterile moths were released in 2008 and 2,255,878 were recaptured in traps. Only 14 unmarked and potentially native moths were captured. Six unmarked moths were caught after September 8. Morphologically these moths more closely resembled sterile moths than native moths. The late season unmarked moth captures are suspected of being sterile moths which had survived long enough for the red dye to degrade to undetectable levels. No pink bollworm larvae were found in 35,000 blooms and bolls inspected during the year.

PBW was suppressed to below economically damaging levels in the EP/TP zone at the end of 2001, the first year of program treatments. As of the end of 2008, PBW moth populations have been suppressed by over 99.99 percent from 1999 population levels. It is very likely that larval infestations have been eliminated.

Introduction

The PBW was first found in the U.S., in Robertson County, TX about 1917. It quickly became the key cotton pest in western areas of the U.S. Cotton Belt. The National Cotton Council estimates the pink bollworm has cost cotton producers in the western U.S. approximately \$21.6 million annually in prevention, control and yield losses. In Texas, crop damage from PBW was seen annually in the Rio Grande River Valley near El Paso and in cotton fields along and west of the Pecos River. Periodic infestations have occurred in southern areas of the Texas High and Rolling Plains. Prior to 1996 cotton producers west of the Pecos River relied on an insecticide based strategy to limit PBW damage. This approach required intensive management, was expensive and was continually in danger of failure due to insecticide resistance. In addition, the insecticide based control strategy made the crop more vulnerable to outbreaks of secondary pests such as aphids or whiteflies.

When Bt cotton became available in 1996, growers began to utilize the technology to control PBW populations and damage. The Bt toxin has been a very effective control measure against PBW. However, using the Bt technology adds to production costs. And the technology is not available in the Pima varieties preferred by many of the growers in the region. The grower level insecticide/Bt cotton based PBW control program which developed after 1996 was more robust than the earlier insecticide based strategy because two complimentary control technologies were used, but it was limited because growers approached PBW control on a field by field basis, not an area-wide basis. Some growers worked diligently to control PBW populations on their farms but others did not. Without a consistent area-wide program on all farms, growers in the region could not sustain PBW population reductions year after year and move to a PBW free production system. The lack of a unified, area-wide approach to detection and control allowed PBW populations to persist as a threat to the cotton industry in the region.

The concept of areawide PBW suppression was developed in a successful program conducted in Parker Valley, Arizona from 1990-95 (Antilla et al. 1996). The Arizona program including mapping, trap triggers, pheromone mating disruption technology, and insecticide applications. It differed from the early years of the Texas program in that it did not use Bt cotton and it had area-wide treatments made by the program in the spring but relied on grower treatments for PBW control in the fall. Sterile PBW moth releases further strengthened the Texas program after 2005. Sterile moths were not used in the 1990-95 Arizona program.

In March of 1999, cotton producers in the El Paso/Trans Pecos (EP/TP) zone passed, with an 80 percent favorable vote, a referendum to begin boll weevil eradication and PBW suppression/eradication in the fall of that year. Conducted by the Texas Boll Weevil Eradication Foundation (TBWEF), the program in the EP/TP zone began with a boll weevil eradication program and a two year PBW trapping program. The treatment phase of the PBW program

began on 46,621 acres of cotton in 2001. The program was improved and continued on the zone's 41,652 acres of cotton in 2002 and on 37,962 acres of cotton in the zone in 2003. In March of 2003 a retention referendum was held and 89 percent of the growers voted to continue the program. In 2004 and 2005 program operations continued on 42,134 and 43,405 acres of cotton, respectively. In June 2005 a referendum was held to continue boll weevil eradication, move from a PBW suppression program to a PBW eradication program and extend the number of years an assessment can be collected to pay for the program. The referendum passed by with over 95 percent of the growers voting in favor of the changes. In 2006, 2007 and 2008 the program operated with 42,290, 39,312 and 34,816 acres, respectively.

The initial objective of the program was to reduce PBW populations and damage across the zone to below levels at which economic damage occurred. This objective was reached in 2001, the first year suppression operations. With the first objective met, neighboring areas of New Mexico and Chihuahua, Mexico became interested in the program and the objective changed to continuing and intensifying the suppression program in the EP/TP Texas zone and working with cotton producers in adjacent areas to expand the program throughout the region. In 2002 producers in the state of Chihuahua, Mexico, and in south central New Mexico initiated programs similar to the Texas program. With the entry of Chihuahua and New Mexico into the program, the regional effort had three separate programs working together to eliminate PBW. These programs were mutually supportive and shared information and technology. They provided cost reductions to cotton growers through controlling populations and suppressing PBW migration into neighboring program areas. In 2004, the Texas program began receiving limited sterile PBW moths for release in the Pecos work unit. From 2005 through 2008 sterile moths were supplied by USDA-APHIS in sufficient quantity to become the first level of suppression used by the programs in the EP/TP zone, the South Central New Mexico program and the program in the Juarez region of the state of Chihuahua, Mexico. From 2006 through 2008 program expansion into Arizona and the Sonora and Baja California, Mexico increased the cotton acreage in the Southwestern Region under PBW eradication.

Materials and Methods

El-Lissy et al. (1997) provided a detailed description of the boll weevil eradication methods from which the methods used to map and trap fields were adapted.

Mapping

Use of Bt transgenic cotton varieties was encouraged in the Texas program (and subsequently in other programs) by reducing the assessment cost to growers on acres planted to Bt varieties. Immediately after seedling emergence, all cotton fields were mapped using differentially corrected GPS technology (Geo II and III and Pathfinder Software, Trimble Navigation). The presence or absence of the Bt toxin was determined by randomly selecting seedlings from all cotton fields in the El Paso/Trans Pecos zone and testing them using ELISA test procedures for the presence of Bt toxin. Field maps were constructed using Map Info software. Field maps were color coded to indicate Bt transgenic cotton, non-Bt cotton, and sensitive site fields (those near houses, schools, etc.). Producer data, field numbers, and other information were electronically associated with each field.

Detection

Delta sticky traps (Scentry Biologicals) baited with gossyplure (pink bollworm sex pheromone) were deployed around all fields at a density of approximately 1 trap per 5-10 acres (minimum of 2 traps per field) between seedling emergence and the appearance of pinhead squares. Each trap was bar coded which allowed the trap data to be electronically associated with a physical location on the map. From deployment to the time fields were harvested and no longer hostable, traps were checked weekly and replaced at least every two weeks (every week in most areas). Trap capture information, crop stage and other data were recorded weekly. Traps with pink bollworm captures were removed weekly and replaced with new traps and pheromone lure. The traps were taken to the office/laboratory where the adult moths were inspected to determine if they were red dyed sterile moths or undyed native moths. All moths were counted and the data was entered into the PBW database.

Control

Several PBW control technologies were used. Plant testing for the presence of the Bt toxin in 2008 showed that 16,410 acres of the zone's 34,816 acres, or 47 percent, was Bt cotton. This was up from 11,960 acres of Bt cotton in the zone (or 29 percent Bt cotton) in 2007. Since the inception of the program Bt cotton acreage has averaged 38 percent of the cotton acreage in the zone. Bt cotton percentages varied in each work unit. In the Pecos work unit the percentage of cotton acreage planted to Bt cotton was 95 percent in 2008, up from 79 percent in 2007. In the Fort

Hancock work unit 30 percent of the cotton planted in 2008 was Bt cotton, up from 24 percent in 2007. A similar trend was seen in the El Paso work unit where 25 percent of the cotton acres were planted to Bt transgenic varieties, up from 11 percent in 2007. Bt and non-Bt acres were treated only as needed and in compliance with U.S.E.P.A.'s Bt cotton refuge requirements.

Several pheromone mating disruption products were used in the PBW Eradication Program in the EP/TP zone. High dose, hand applied gossyplure dispensers (PB-ROPE L, Pacific Biocontrol Corporation) were used at an application rate of 100-200 dispensers per acre on 3,198 acres of cotton in 2008. Ninety-nine percent of the acres treated with rope were in the Fort Hancock work unit. The use of long duration pheromone rope was up 14% from the 2,738 acres were treated with rope in 2007. However, it was down 86 percent from 2003, the peak year for rope use in the zone. Local labor contractors were hired to apply the pheromone rope dispensers.

In 2001 rope was used on those fields that were difficult to treat with aircraft. In subsequent years the effectiveness and lower cost of rope compared with season-long fiber treatment were justification for increased use of rope. After 2005, when sufficient sterile insects became available for application season-long on all EP/TP cotton acres, fields targeted for rope applications were those in which wild-type moths had been caught and/or those identified with larval infestations the previous year. No rope was used in the Pecos work unit in 2006 through 2008. High dose rope dispensers have provided PBW population suppression almost season-long from a single application.

No sprayable mating disruption treatments were applied in 2008. Checkmate MEC (Suterra Inc.) was used in 2007 and No-Mate Fiber was used in previous years, either alone or tank mixed with insecticides. Sprayable pheromone treatments were initiated at pinhead square stage. These treatments were reapplied when traps around a field caught native PBW moths. Positive trap catches of native moths around a field indicated the presence of native PBW moths and low concentration of pheromone and/or sterile moths in the field. These fields had potential to develop larval PBW populations. The peak year for sprayable pheromone use was 2001 when 142,842 cumulative acre treatments were made.

No insecticide applications were made in 2008. In previous years fields in which more than one moth was caught per week received applications of insecticides. Lock-On 2E, Tombstone (Loveland Products, Inc.) or Battery 2.5 EC (Agrilience, LLC.) were applied at mid-label rates. These treatments were applied with and without sprayable pheromone (dual treatments). Forty seven thousand eight hundred ninety-seven acres were treated in 2001, the peak year for insecticide use.

Sterile moths were released from aircraft over all EP/TP cotton acreage for the first time in 2005. Sterile moth releases in 2008 were initiated the first week of May and continued through the week ending October 11 (166 days). For the year, 1,278,330,749 sterile moths were released. The average number of sterile insects released per acre per day during the release period was 233 in 2008 compared with 198 in 2007, 152 in 2006 and 200 in 2005. The moths were reared in the USDA-APHIS PBW rearing facility in Phoenix, AZ. They were put on commercial aircraft the afternoon of each scheduled shipping day and delivered to El Paso that night for release the next day. They were shipped in specially designed cooler/shipping/distribution boxes (USDA-APHIS) which were held overnight in a refrigerated cooler. The following morning, the distribution boxes were mounted into a Cessna 206 aircraft fitted with release equipment (USDA-APHIS). The sterile PBW moths were then metered onto cotton fields from a height of about 500 feet. The average ratio of sterile moths recaptured to native moths captured season-long was 161,134:1.

Quality control of sterile moths was monitored by assessing the longevity of the moths, the response of sterile males to pheromone traps, moth weight, by tracking the temperature of the shipping containers and by other means. This information was used to improve the quality of the sterile insects being applied to the cotton fields.

The primary technologies used to suppress/eradicate the PBW in the EP/TP zone have changed as the program as progressed. In the initial year of the program (2001), the main technologies used were Bt cotton and sprayable pheromone mating disruption products. Long duration, hand applied pheromone mating disruption rope and insecticide treatments were also used. In 2002 and 2003, Bt cotton remained a primary control component, but pheromone rope was used in lieu of sprayable mating disruption on many acres. Sprayable mating disruption and insecticides were also used. In 2004, sterile insect application was introduced to the program, joining Bt cotton and pheromone rope as the primary control technologies. Sterile insect availability was limited, however and only the Pecos work unit received season-long sterile moth applications. Sprayable mating disruption pheromone and insecticides were used on a small number of acres in 2004. In 2005 sterile moths and Bt cotton were the primary

technologies relied upon. Long duration rope was used on limited acreage. Use of sprayable pheromone mating disruption and insecticides were the least used of the technologies. Growers in the EP/TP zone planted fewer acres of Bt cotton in 2006. Sterile insect releases and Bt cotton were the primary control technologies used in 2006; but rope, sprayable pheromone and insecticide were used at similar levels as were used in 2005. In 2007 Bt cotton and sterile insects were the primary controls used over most of the zone, but hand applied and aerially applied mating disruption products and insecticides were used heavily on a relatively small, hot spot area which developed near the Rio Grande at Acala, TX. In 2008, pheromone rope and sterile moths were the only control technologies used.

PBW Population Monitoring

PBW populations were monitored by trapping and bloom/boll inspection. Trapping data has been collected since the fall of 1999. The 1999 and 2000 trap catch information provided a baseline against which populations in later years have been compared. Sterile moth recapture provided information about the numbers and responsiveness of the sterile insects. The ratio of sterile to native insects captured provided the basis for triggering fields for other treatments. Field personnel collected PBW infested traps and returned them to the field offices where moths were identified, separated as sterile or native and counted. Sterile insects were marked with dye placed in their diet in the USDA-APHIS rearing facility at Phoenix, Arizona. Trapping information was used to direct sterile moth drops so that at least, a ratio of 60:1 sterile to native moths could be maintained on fields.

Since 2001, 25 blooms and later 25 bolls were sampled in each of four quadrants of 20 randomly selected fields in each of 3 work units each week. The 60 fields chosen for sampling stayed constant during the year and locations have remained constant from year to year.

Results

Sterile Moth Quality

The response of sterile moths to pheromone traps is an indicator of their competitiveness with native moths. The ratio of recaptured moths to released moths each year 2005 -2008 is shown in Figure 1. The 2x higher recapture rate obtained in 2007 and 2008 indicated that the program was benefiting by improved quality in the sterile moths being released.




Figure 1. Ratio of sterile PBW moths captured in pheromone traps to sterile moths released.

Trap Data

The results of the PBW trapping are shown in Figures 2. and 3. From 2000 forward 65,000 to 142,000 traps were inspected in the zone each year. Captures of native PBW moths have declined each year since the treatment phase began in 2001. Using native moths per trap inspection as a standard for comparison, PBW populations have declined 99.99 percent from 1999 to 2008. And since 2005, native moth captures per trap inspected have declined 99.8 percent. Figure 2. shows the number of native moths captured per trap inspection since 1999.




Figure 2. Year-end average number of native pink bollworm moths captured per trap inspection.

Shown in Figure 3 are the totals of the native moths captured each year since 2000. Comparison of the total native moths caught data from 2000 to 2007 indicates a population reduction of 99.90 percent. The change in total native moth captures from 2005 to 2007 indicates a population reduction of 88.6 percent. Only 14 unmarked PBW moths were caught in 2008.




Figure 3. Year-end totals of native moths captured in pheromone baited, delta sticky traps operated by the PBW eradication program in the El Paso/Trans Pecos zone.

Eight of the native moths captured in 2008 were caught before mid-July. They were caught in the small area “hot spot” area located near the Rio Grande River south of Acala, TX in which PBW adults and larvae had been found in 2007. Six unmarked moths were caught scattered along the 75 mile-long cotton growing area at the Texas-Mexico border late in the season. One was caught in early September, three in late October and two in early November. Morphologically, these insects resembled sterile moths, but they had no detectable dye in their bodies. They are believed to have been sterile moths which had metabolized or otherwise lost the dye over time. Aging tests on sterile moths held in a growth chamber have shown that the dye becomes increasingly difficult to detect as moths age. The last release of sterile moths was the week ending October 12. Therefore, if the five undyed moths caught in October and November were steriles, they had been in the field for at least two to four weeks with their dye marker degrading during that time. Also, cooler fall temperatures may have contributed to extended sterile moth survival and associated loss of dye.

Boll Sampling Data

Boll infestation data are not available for the years prior to the start of the treatment phase of the program. However, prior to the inception of the program, larval infestations of from 20 to 50 percent were commonly seen in late set bolls. Even with timely treatment, PBW larvae typically infested 10-20 percent or more of the top bolls. Boll infestations the first year of the program dropped to 4.5 percent, in part, due to areawide boll weevil eradication applications of malathion. Since then, PBW infested bolls season-long has to been reduced to undetectable levels (Fig 4). In 2007, infested bolls were found only in the small “hot spot” area near Acala. In 2008 no pink bollworm larvae were detected in over 35,000 fruit inspections.




Figure 4. Average number of larvae per boll from randomly selected “historical fields” by year.

During the course of the program, Bt cotton strongly reduced PBW larval infestations. In the early years of the program there was concern among some that the intensive pressure on PBW populations during eradication might trigger Bt resistance in PBW. Three small PBW larvae were discovered in Bt cotton blooms and bolls in 2004 (14,985 Bt cotton blooms and bolls sampled). Larval sampling in Bt cotton fields since that time have not resulted in the discovery of a single PBW larvae in Bt cotton.

Conclusions

The treatment phase of the PBW program in the EP/TP zone was initiated in the spring of 2001 and has been conducted successfully since that time. Aggressive monitoring and treatment protocols have been used. The need for grower treatments for PBW control was eliminated in 2001 and none have been made since that time.

Native moth trap catches have been reduced each year of the program and captures have been reduced by 99.99 percent since the program began. Only 14 undyed moths were captured in over 66,000 traps inspected in 2008.

Extensive boll sampling indicated that larval infestations and boll damage were reduced to very low levels in 2007 and no larvae were detected in 2008.

In 2002 neighboring cotton producing areas in Chihuahua, Mexico and in the Mesilla Valley of New Mexico began pink bollworm eradication programs. No native moth captures were reported from South Central New Mexico and eleven native moths were caught in the Juarez zone in 2008. The cohesive multi-national and multi-state pink bollworm eradication effort has virtually eliminated PBW populations from the region. Program expansion has brought all southwestern US and all northwestern Mexico production into the program. Only cotton in Durango and Coahuilla states in Mexico (the Laguna area near Torreon) and cotton production in southeast New Mexico and the generally sub-economic populations in southern areas of the Texas High and Rolling Plains remain outside the program. It is notable, however, that very low, but detectable PBW populations have been documented from many other areas of Texas as well.

Pink bollworm eradication programs, built on a foundation of thorough pheromone trapping and using multiple control technologies, have produced very promising results. Bt cotton, long duration pheromone rope, sprayable pheromone mating disruption products, insecticides and sterile moths used in programs of this type can achieve eradication of well entrenched pink bollworm populations.

Movement of PBW moths into the EP/TP eradication zone from neighboring zones (in Texas and eastern New Mexico) not currently in eradication or suppression programs is a concern. Program expansion into these areas would eliminate this threat. However, it is difficult to justify the cost in areas in which PBW is sporadic pest. The availability of sterile moths to complete eradication and maintain areas free from reproducing PBW populations post eradication is critical. Elimination of reproducing PBW populations will greatly reduce treatment costs and allow trap density reductions. This will result in program cost reductions. Trapping programs to detect immigrating native PBW moths, continued availability of Bt cotton and continued availability of sterile moths are needed. These and other detection/control technologies will be needed to insure that immigrating native PBW moths do not develop reproducing populations in eradicated zones.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the growers and steering committee members in the El Paso/Trans Pecos zone for supporting this program through the referendum process, payment of their assessments, and the program guidance and direction they have provided. We recognize and appreciate the leadership of Mr. Jim Ed Miller and Mr. Bill Lovelady during the course of this program.

We would like to thank the Texas Boll Weevil Eradication Foundation Board of Directors for program guidance, oversight and direction.

We wish to thank the National Cotton Council Pink Bollworm Action Committee, the National Cotton Council Pink Bollworm Technical Advisory Committee, the Pink Bollworm Eradication Coordinating Committee and the Texas Boll Weevil Eradication Foundation's Technical Advisory Committee for providing information to assist program personnel in conducting the program in the most technically effective manner possible.

We recognize and appreciate the contributions of Mr. Larry Turnbough to Texas eradication programs. Mr. Turnbough served as a member of the EP/TP Steering Committee, the TBWEF Board of Directors and the National Cotton Council Pink Bollworm Action Committee. He has spent countless hours in support of boll weevil and pink bollworm eradication in Texas.

We thank our state and federal legislators for monetary support for this program. Also we thank USDA-APHIS for their critical support of the program. APHIS has provided sterile PBW rearing and shipment, funds administration and technical program support.

We wish to thank the many USDA and state university research entomologists for their work in developing the technology used in this program.

The authors also thank Mr. Larry Antilla, Mr. Mike Whitlow, Dr. Bob Staten, Mr. Frank Meyers and their many co-workers in Arizona and California that pioneered use of these technologies in an area-wide PBW suppression program.

We wish to thank the Texas Department of Agriculture for providing assistance and oversight to the PBW eradication program in Texas.

We thank Dr. Tim Dennehy and Dr. Bruce Tabashnik for their work in assessing Bt tolerance in PBW populations. Their work in monitoring the West Texas population and PBW populations in other regions for changes in susceptibility to Bt toxins during the course of the program has been very valuable and their assistance with Bt resistance issues on a national basis has been extremely valuable to the Texas program and to the larger program in U.S. and Mexico.

Finally, we wish to thank the many TBWEF employees who, through dedication and hard work, made it possible to achieve success in this program.

References

Anonymous. 2001. Pink Bollworm Eradication: A Window of Opportunity. National Cotton Council of America. 6pp.

Antilla, L., M. Whitlow, R.T. Staten, O. El-Lissy and F. Meyers. 1996. An integrated approach to Areawide Pink Bollworm Management in Arizona. *In* Proc. Beltwide Cotton Conf., National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN. 1083-5.

El-Lissy, O., F. Meyers, R. Frisbie, T. Fuchs, D. Rummel, R. Parker, D. Dippel, E. King, G. Cunningham, F. Carter, J. Boston and J. Hayes. 1997. Boll weevil eradication update - Texas, 1996. *In* Proc. Beltwide Cotton Conf. National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN. 973-9.