Tracking Fire Blight: Fighting Disease with Disease Forecasting

Daniel R. Cooley, Jon M. Clements, Elizabeth Garofalo and Arthur Tuttle Stockbridge School of Agriculture and Center for Agriculture, Food, & the Environment, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

While we can see insects, weeds and other kinds of pests, the microbes that cause disease usually can't be seen. We see the impact of diseases, symptoms such as cankers, rots, wilts and other damage, but that is long after the microbes have arrived and infected. To manage diseases effectively, we need to know when they will start to build up to dangerous levels before infection, then stop them. Using traps, pheromones or other insect pest management monitoring tools won't work for microbes. Instead we monitor those elements that drive pathogen growth and infection, particularly the weather. Weather data, particularly temperature, rain and humidity can be used to predict plant disease risk. To do this, weather data are entered into models that calculate risk. To get a good disease risk estimate, we need good weather data and a good model.

Fortunately, there are good fire blight models that can forecast pathogen growth and the risk of infection in apples. Knowing the risk of fire blight enables more accurate and effective spray decisions. Forecast models for streptomycin or other sprays are not the whole answer to fire blight management. Other tactics are required as described in "An Annual Fire Blight Management Program for Apples: An Update" in *Fruit Notes*, Spring 2015, but using a forecast model is a critical component. Fire blight models give growers a way to "watch" bacteria build up in an orchard without actually seeing them. Increasingly, pest management models, automated weather collection and weather forecasts, plus related treatment recommendations come bundled in computer-based decision support systems (DSSs).

In this article, we look at some common DSS options used for fire blight in the Northeast. These include NEWA (the Network for Environment and Weather Applications) managed by the New York State IPM Program, Ag-Radar managed by the University of Maine Extension, and the commercial product SkyBit (ZedX, Inc.). We will look at how each of these decision support systems work, and compare their performance at the University of Massachusetts Cold Spring Research and Education Center at Belchertown, MA in 2014.

Weather Data and Forecasts

There are basically two ways to collect weather data for a fire blight model: purchasing on-site equipment, or subscribing to a site-specific weather monitoring and forecast service that does not require an on-site weather station, so-called "virtual weather". While having a physical weather station on your property rather than using a virtual one may seem more reliable or accurate, this is not the case. Comparisons of virtual weather data to onsite weather stations used for disease forecasting indicate they perform equivalently (Gleason et al., 1997; Magarey et al, 2006; Cooley et al, 2011).

Weather station equipment. The most efficient weather station equipment is electronic and automated (Figure 1), recording data which is then routed to a computer that runs pest management models, such as a fire blight model. Alternatively, data may be downloaded to a computer manually, but it is more convenient to automate that process. Typically, weather data are collected at regular intervals and used in forecast model calculations.

There are several manufacturers of electronic weather stations, but stations need to be matched to the computer system and model that will process the weather data in a given DSS. NEWA is set up to accept data from Rainwise (Trenton, ME; <u>http://www.rainwise.com</u>) and Onset (Bourne, MA; <u>http://www.onsetcomp.com/corporate</u>) weather stations. NEWA also uses data from publically available stations at airports. Other weather stations, such as Davis (Hayward, CA; <u>http://www.davisnet.com/weather/index.asp</u>) and Spectrum Watchdog (Aurora, IL; <u>http://www.specmeters.com/brands/watchdog/</u>), cost less and are integrated with pest management software that can be run on individual personal computers, but we have not evaluated these



DSSs.

The Rainwise and Onset stations used by NEWA generally cost from approximately \$2,000, depending on the manufacturer and sensors purchased. Electronic weather stations require regular maintenance, need to be calibrated annually, and over time require repairs and sensor replacement. In our experience, parts costs for a station average \$100 to \$200 per year, though there is a wide range. Some stations function for several years with no replacement parts, others have required replacement parts within a year of being set up.

Weather stations should be calibrated annually, at least, to maintain data quality. Weather stations do not provide quality control; they simply report values. The accuracy of disease risk forecasts depends on the accuracy of weather data, so the level of quality control for weather data makes a difference to how good a disease forecast is. When a weather station fails, it may be immediately clear if the data are being monitored for quality. However if data are not being monitored, errors may go undetected for some time, leading to inaccurate risk forecasts.

In our experience, stations may break down for periods of a few hours to a week or more. NEWA automatically monitors weather stations, and if a weather station stops transmitting data the person in charge of the station is notified by email. However, detecting inaccurate data is more difficult. We have had cases where critical data such as temperature or the length of a wetting period has been inaccurately measured for long periods, leading to inaccurate disease forecasts. Maintaining continuous high-quality data from onsite weather stations requires significant effort and technical knowledge of the equipment.

Weather forecasts. On-site stations only provide weather observations. Weather forecasts are arguably more important for effective disease management, since chemical treatments generally are most effective if applied before infection. This is particularly true of fire blight management. While streptomycin is active within a 24-hour window after infection, it is most effective as a preventive treatment. In addition, post-infection chemical treatments are more likely to select for resistant strains of a pathogen than preventative treatments. In practice, users need to combine both past and forecast weather to evaluate risk

and determine the need to spray.

DSSs that use on-site weather stations must also incorporate forecasts from some source. NEWA, for example, uses data from the National Digital Forecast Database, NDFD (<u>http://www.nws.noaa.gov/ndfd/</u>).

Site-specific virtual weather. Rather than setting up a weather station in an orchard, growers or consultants can subscribe to a service that generates virtual weather data for that orchard. Virtual data are created by combining different sources of actual weather observations (e.g. National Weather Service) with proprietary mathematical techniques which basically interpolate from the actual observations to estimate weather for locations distant from weather stations. In addition to being a substitute for station observations, site-specific virtual weather forecasts can be made. The most popular virtual weather subscription in the Northeast is SkyBit, which sells E-Weather service products. SkyBit offers an "AgWeather IPM Apple Disease Product" that includes virtual weather data and predictions of fire blight risk, as well as other diseases. Users can begin a subscription by calling in the geographic coor-

System	Risk Ratings
NEWA	 Low - bactericides probably unnecessary. Caution - check the 5-day forecast, expect infection if warm weather continues (60°F or higher) and a wetting event occurs. High - expect infection if there is a wetting event, even a heavy dew. Extreme - the blossoms should be protected with streptomycin.
Ag-Radar Eastern Fire Blight Model	No FB Infection Infection Risk Severe Infection Risk!
Ag-Radar CougarBlight	Low Caution High Extreme! Exceptional!
SkyBit	- not active ++ infection

dinates and elevation of an orchard and a starting date for the service. Alternatively, users can subscribe online (http://www.skybit.com/). Within one day, users will begin receiving weather and disease products via email or fax. Growers have the option of calling in a bloom date to improve the accuracy of the fire blight model used to make disease predictions, or may simply rely on the model's bloom estimate.

A subscription service can be activated only for

those months when decisions will be made for pest control. Virtual stations require a subscription fee of approximately \$200 to \$400 for a growing season, depending on the length of time and types of products purchased. They come with quality control as part of the service.

Fire Blight Models

Models that analyze weather data to estimate fire blight risk follow generally understood relationships between the bacterial pathogen *E*. *amylovora*, the seasonal growth of apple hosts, and weather. As early as the 1950's, the plant pathologist William Mills at Cornell recognized a relationship between warm, humid weather and blossom blight, and suggested that streptomycin should be sprayed on blossoms when temperatures above 65° F and rain or high humidity were predicted. In the next 60 years, this basic approach has been significantly refined.

The primary focus for fire blight management is preventing blossom infections. Open flowers give *E*. *amylovora* a way to get into the tree where they produce toxins and destroy tissue (Figure 2). During the bloom



Figure 2. Pistils (green) and anthers (yellow) of an apple flower. Bacteria must be washed down the pistils to the base of the flower to infect (Photo: Penn State Univ. Extension)

System	Weather Record Source	Weather Forecast Source	Model
NEWA	electronic weather station	Natl. Digital Forecast Database	CougarBlight
Ag-Radar Eastern Fire Blight Model	SkyBit virtual weather	SkyBit virtual forecast	MaryBlyt modification
Ag-Radar CougarBlight	SkyBit virtual weather	SkyBit virtual forecast	CougarBlight
SkyBit	SkyBit virtual weather	SkyBit virtual forecast	MaryBlyt modification

Table 2. Comparison of different weather data sources for fire

blight models.

period, fire blight models estimate the reproduction of fire blight bacteria carried into open flowers, primarily by insects. Reproduction is driven by temperature, and heat unit accumulation is well correlated with fire blight infection potential. From 60° F to 70° F the bacteria grow slowly. They grow moderately between 70° F and 75° F, and rapidly between 75° F and 93° F. When temperatures are between 82° F and 90° F bacterial populations can explode, going from a few cells on each flower stigma

to millions in a matter of hours. This rapid bacterial growth makes fire blight epidemics "appear out of nowhere".

Reflecting this explosive growth potential, fire blight models estimate bacterial populations based on degree **hours** or hourly heat units, NOT degree **days**. When sufficient heat has accumulated, the models estimate that there are enough bacteria in flowers to infect. A couple of days with temperatures in the 70's and 80's easily reach model thresholds. A single stigma in an apple blossom can support a million *E. amylovora* bacteria, far more than the minimum needed for infection.

Once the population of *E. amylovora* on pistils is high enough to cause infections, bacteria must be washed down to nectaries at the bottom of the flower,

where they can move inside apple tissue. That requires water, such as rain. Other sources of moisture, such as heavy dew or the amount of water in a high volume orchard spray application may be sufficient to initiate infection, though this has not been definitively demonstrated.

CougarBlight and MaryBlyt. Two forecasting models or variants based on them are widely used in the Northeast: CougarBlight developed by Tim Smith in Washington state; and MaryBlyt originally developed by Paul Steiner in Missouri and Maryland, and modified by Alan Biggs in West Virginia. In addition to predicting blossom infections, MaryBlyt also predicts when the first appearance of different types of fire blight symptoms will occur,

including blossom blight, shoot blight, canker blight and trauma blight. CougarBlight is a "blossom blight only" model. Both models require input on tree development, particularly open flowers, and environmental data, specifically temperature and rain. CougarBlight also asks for the history of fire blight in an area to adjust infection thresholds. If blight is in an area in the current growing season or was active the previous year, thresholds are lower than if there has been no blight in an area within



			ng the Cou	garblight n	nodel begin	n at first bl	ossom ope	n.
	Firs	t blossom	open date	: 5/10/2	014			
First blosso Enter the actual dat	m open da te for block	te above is e s of interest	and the moo and che moo accu	sed on deg del will calcu irately.	ree day acc late the pro	umulations o tection perio	er user input d during blo	om more
Orchar	rd Blight	History:	Fire blight o	occurred in	your neighb	orhood last	year. ‡	
The orchard bli	ight history	above is the	e NEWA def	ault. Select	the actual b	light history	for your orch	ard
	Diese	om Die	ht Sum	marry	Concor	hlight		
	DIUSS	om bug	ut Sum	mary -	Cougar	ongni	Famarat	
	Past	Past	Current	Б	Fo	recast Det	ails	
Date	May 10	May 11	May 12	May 13	May 14	May 15	May 16	May 17
4-day DH	-	161*	457*	464*	540	491	276	313
Risk Level	-	Caution*	High*	High*	Extreme	High	Caution	High
etness Events								
Rain Amount	NA	0.04	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.65	1.11
Rain Prob (%) Night Day			-1-	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Dew 🔽	NA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Leaf Wetness (hours)	NA	6	0					
Low - bactericide higher) and wettin Caution - check t and a wetting eve High - expect info	es probab ng events the 5-day ent occurs fection if	forecast, of there is a voluble pro-	expect info wetting ev	k the 5-da ection if w ent, even ith strepto	ay forecast varm weat a heavy de mycin.	t for warm her contin ew.	weather (ues (60°F	60°F or

the past year.

These models can be run using daily high and low temperatures, and some simple tool such as a rain gauge to collect wetness data. For MaryBlyt, data may be entered into a personal computer on a day to day basis. CougarBlight does not require a computer, but simple calculations and a set of tables that indicate heat units and risk, though using a spreadsheet version of the model simplifies the process. Both MaryBlyt and CougarBlight are available on line. MaryBlyt 7.1 can be downloaded from West Virginia University's Kearneysville Tree Fruit Research and Education Center, http://www.caf.wvu.edu/kearneysville/Maryblyt/ . It runs only on the Windows OS. CougarBlight is available from the Washington State University Chelan-Douglas Extension site, where there are links to Excel spreadsheets in Fahrenheit and Celcius, http://county. wsu.edu/chelan-douglas/agriculture/treefruit/Pages/ Cougar Blight 2010.aspx. These sites also have excellent discussions of fire blight and its management, and instructions on use of the models.

It is easiest to use both models with automated weather data collection and forecasts. Both models have been adapted to different DSSs. In the Northeast, the most commonly used pest management DSSs that have fire blight models are NEWA, Ag-Radar and SkyBit.

NEWA. NEWA uses the CougarBlight model. Growers in Northeastern states can purchase a weather station and link to NEWA (<u>http://newa.cornell.edu/</u>). NEWA may also be used without a weather station in the orchard if there is a NEWA site nearby. But keep in mind, the further from an orchard a site is, the more difference there will be in weather and therefore in estimated fire blight risk. This difference can be the determining factor of whether or not conditions are met to allow blossom infection. (Figure 3)

Using NEWA to track fire blight risk is relatively easy. On the NEWA site, the orchard location, the crop and the disease of interest need to be identified through a series of

selection steps. In the example here, a weather station at the UMass Cold Spring Orchard in Belchertown, MA has been selected to evaluate the risk of "Fire Blight" on Apples on May 12, 2014. NEWA automatically tracks weather data, so users do not need to enter it. Clicking the "Calculate" button will generate a table showing "Fire Blight Risk Predictions" for the location, in this case, Belchertown.

NEWA will ask you to enter the date of first bloom. This should always be the date that the first flowers of any variety in the orchard open. Since bloom is critical, and one day can make a big difference in fire blight risk, monitor trees closely for the beginning of bloom. (Figure 4) NEWA will also ask for "Orchard Blight History" as one of three options:

- No fire blight in your neighborhood last year.
- Fire blight occurred in your neighborhood last year.

	DIOSS	om bug	nt Sum	mary -	Cougar	ongni				
	Past	Past	Current	Blossom Blight 5-Day Forecast Forecast Details						
Date	May 10	May 11	May 12	May 13	May 14	May 15	May 16	May 17		
4-day DH	-	161*	457*	-	75*	188*	269*	313		
Risk Level	-	Caution*	High*	-	Low*	Caution*	Caution*	High		
Vetness Events		and the second								
Rain Amount	NA	0.04	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.65	1.11		
Rain Prob (%) Night Day			- -	-1-	- -	- -	- -	- -		
Dew <table-cell></table-cell>	NA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Leaf Wetness (hours)	NA	6	0							

Figure 5. The predicted impact on fire blight risk of a streptomycin spray applied on May 13 to the Belchertown orchard as estimated by NEWA.

• Fire blight is now active in your neighborhood.

This is a way of estimating inoculum levels. We recommend that growers be conservative and not use the lowest level, "no blight in the previous year".

The NEWA CougarBlight model shows past, current and forecast risk on one of four levels by day. In this example, risk is currently High. Based on the 5-day weather forecast for Belchertown, NEWA also predicts that fire blight risk will be High on May 13 and for the next 2 days. Based on this, this grower should apply a streptomycin spray as soon as possible.

NEWA also shows the effect of a streptomycin spray on fire blight risk (Figure 5). If streptomycin is applied on May 13 in the example, the forecast risk for the next 3 days ranges from Low to Caution, returning to High on May 17. A second streptomycin application may be needed at that time, depending on actual weather on May 13 through May 16.

The NEWA model can indicate when symptoms from a possible

infection should first appear (Figure 6). In this example, to find out when symptoms from a May 12 infection should show up, lower down on the same page the "Infection Event Date" can be entered, and the first date of predicted symptom appearance will be calculated. In this example, symptoms from a May 12 infection should begin to show on May 25.

The same section of the NEWA screen also allows users to estimate when an infection occurred by entering a date when symptoms were first seen. In the example, suppose symptoms were seen on some trees for the first time on May 28. That date



E-WEA For:	MA-1	R SER BELCH	ERTOWN	I-HOI	RTRES	CENTE	R			AGWEA	гны		a API Date	: Tue May	13, 2014
						AP	PLE	SCA	в	FI	RE I	BLIG	T	SOOTY	BLOTCH
		WE	ATHER				1404	414			140	512			
	тмх	TMN	PREC	ARH	LW	ASM	AW	TW	PW	ADH	AW	TW	PW	ALW	PW
Date	F	F	in	8	hr	8	hr	F		65F	hr	F		hr	
BASED	ON	OBSE	RVATIO	ONS											
0501	65	44	1.01	88	24	2	50	47	++	-	-	-	-	-	-
0502	63	47	0.00	56	8	2	58	48	++	-	-	-	-	-	-
0503	64	44	0.00	58	0	3	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
0504	58	48	0.00	58	0	3	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
0505	61	47	0.00	56	0	4	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
0506	61	41	0.00	50	0	5	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
0507	65	36	0.00	45	0	6	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
0508	64	42	0.00	67	0	8	0	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
0509	58	53	0.11	87	23	10	23	56	++	-	-	-	-	-	-
0510	78	58	0.55	78	20	14	8	65	++	-	-	-	-	-	-
0511	77	54	0.00	39	5	19	13	63	++	-	-	_	-	-	-
0512	83	50	0.00	47	0	26	0	-	+	170	0	_	-	-	-
BASED	ON	FORE	CASTS		-										
0513	60	49	0.00	61	0	31	0	-	+	170	0	_	-	-	-
0514	69	46	0.00	68	õ	37	ő	_	+	188	ō	_	_	-	-
0515	71	58		79	10	46	10	64	++	225	10	64	++	-	-
0516	71	61		83	22	55	22	66	++	225	22	66	++	_	_
0517	67	57		86	24	63	46	64	++	225	46	64	++		_
0518	67	53		74	24	70	70	62		225	70	62	11	_	_
0519	63	48		70	11	75	81	61	++	225	81	61	4	_	_
0520	63	47		71	<u></u>	80	ⁿ	-	4	225	ñ	-	÷.	_	_
0521	65	47		70	õ	84	ő	_	+	225	ő	_	_	-	-
0522	66	48		69	õ	87	ŏ	_	+	225	ŏ	_	_	_	-
Gree Blos Peta	som	IM Ip Da Date All D	PORTAN	NT: - is - is - is	Chec used used used	k the for for for for	dat Appl Fire Soot	tes a le So e Bl: ty B	at t cab ight lotc	he top h	of	eac	n col	lumn. ***	*****
ASM ADH ALW AW TW PW	= A $= A $ $= P$	ocumu ccumu ccumu verag est W	TION:	deg: lea: wet: berai atch, Plea	ree-h f wet hess ture /Warn	nerces ness hours during ing:	from hour for g th + = ++ =	n blo rs fi r the not act pos	osso rom e mo ost t ac tive ssib	m date petal : st severe tive but no le info	up fal: ere eve b in ect: s (1	to a even ent. ion a 1-800	a ma: te. ht. tion & dar 0-454	x of 225. mage 4-2266) **	*****
Pleas Bloss dates	um, are	ail 1 and s rep	-800-4 Petal orted	Fall acci	2266 L. Yo irate	to rep our pro-	port oduc han)	t you ct w: k you	ar b ill a.	NOT be	co	es fo rrec	br Gi t un	reen Tip, less these	

is entered in "Symptom Occurrence Date", and NEWA

estimates an approximate infection date of May 15.

Spring Orchard delivered on May 13, 2014.

SkyBit. As described above, SkyBit uses virtual weather

stations to provide weather to its fire blight model, a modification of Mary-Blyt. In the example from Belchertown last year, we show the data received in an email for May 13 (Figure 7). Information is arranged in columns. The first column is the date. Columns 1 to 5 give weather information: maximum temperature (TMX F) and minimum temperature (TMN F), the amount of rainfall in inches (PREC in), relative humidity (ARH %), and the number of hours leaves were wet (LW hr).

The remaining columns give infor-

mation for three apple diseases: apple scab, fire blight and sooty blotch. There are four columns of fire blight information. The number at the top of the column, 140512, is the blossom date, May 12, 2014. Growers need to supply the bloom date to SkyBit by calling a toll free number.

The first FIRE BLIGHT column shows accumulated degree hours over 65°F (ADH 65F), starting at bloom. The second FIRE BLIGHT column is the accumulated wet hours during the most severe infection event (AW hr). The third column shows the average temperature during the event (TW F). The fourth column indicates fire blight risk (pest wait/watch/warning, PW) as one of three levels:

- A minus symbol (-) meaning no risk or not active
- A single plus symbol (+) indicating blossoms are open and the minimum number of degree hours have been accumulated but infection has not occurred
- A double plus symbols (++) indicating risk of infection is high.

In the example, SkyBit indicates risk

of infection on May 15. Based on this, an application of streptomycin would be recommended on May 14. SkyBit is relatively simple. It is not interactive, does

Range of open blossom dates for common apple cultivars	CougarBlight Heat Units, Inches Rain, & Leaf Wet Hours	I - No active FB within one mile this year or last two years	II - FB active within one mile of orchard within last two years, but not this year	III - FB active within one mile of orchard this year.	Dates blossom blight (& shoot blight) symptoms apparent if infection occurred
Early King Bloom Mon, May 12	307 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	
Tue, May 13	312 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	
Wed, May 14	340 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	
Thu, May 15	405 HU, 0.12", 9 hrs	Caution	EXTREME!	EXCEPTIONAL!	June 2, (June 12)
Fri, May 16	121 HU, 1.88", 24 hrs	Low	Caution	HIGH	June 3, (June 13)
Sat, May 17	139 HU, 0.0", 11 hrs	Low	Caution (if dew)	HIGH (if dew)	June 3, (June 14)
Sun, May 18	122 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	
Mon, May 19	68 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	
Tue, May 20	96 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	
Wed, May 21	126 HU, 0.0", 0 hrs	Low	Low	Low	

Figure 8. Ag-Radar output for the CougarBlight model at the UMass Cold Spring Orchard for mid-May, 2014.

	June 12.	
	FBP = Fire blight bacteria potential.	In absence of rain, 3 or more hours of leaf wetness is counted as possible dew conditions for adequate wetting, which may overstate risk on such days. See Cougarblight model for additional comments.
	100% = minimum threshold level for infection.	Eastern Fireblight Model Infection Requirements:
	% FBP,	65F),
Range of open blossom	Leaf Wet Hours, &	+ > 0" rain, or > 0.1 inch rain on previous day,
dates for common cultivars.	Avg. Temperature	+ Average temp. on wetting day >= 60F
Early King Bloom Mon, May 12	86%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 68F	No FB infection
Tue, May 13	58%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 56F	No FB infection
Wed, May 14	70%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 58F	No FB infection
Thu, May 15	102%, 0.12", 9 hrs., 66F	INFECTION RISK
Fri, May 16	106%, 1.88", 24 hrs., 65F	INFECTION RISK
Sat, May 17	59%, 0.0", 11 hrs., 62F	No FB infection
Sun, May 18	48%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 57F	No FB infection
Mon, May 19	48%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 56F	No FB infection
Tue, May 20	45%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 61F	No FB infection
Wed, May 21	68%, 0.0", 0 hrs., 61F	No FB infection
Figure 9. Ag-Rada (MaryBlyt) at the U	r output for the Ea IMass Cold Spring	stern Fire Blight model Orchard for mid-May, 201

not predict symptom development, or the impact of a streptomycin application.

Because NEWA and SkyBit use different sources of weather data, and different models, the output from the two systems may differ. In our example, NEWA predicted a high risk of infection on May 12 and 13, and extreme risk on May 14, while SkyBit did not predict any risk until May 15.

Ag-Radar. Ag-Radar (<u>http://exten-sion.umaine.edu/ipm/programs/ap-ple/pestcasts/</u>) currently uses virtual weather data purchased from SkyBit, but could use data from any source that provides automated delivery of quality-controlled data to run versions of both CougarBlight and MaryBlyt. (Ag-Radar calls its version of Maryblyt "The Eastern Fire Blight Model"). Ag-Radar works best when growers provide observed dates for first open bloom. These dates are then entered into the system to influence model estimates.

The Ag-Radar CougarBlight fire

blight risk assessment for mid-May 2014 is similar to SkyBit's (Figure 8). Risk of infection is low until May 15, at which time it increases. Like NEWA, the Ag-Radar implementation of CougarBlight uses three levels to estimate the amount of initial inoculum though the prompts are different:

- No active fire blight within 1 mile of the orchard in last two years.
- Fire blight was present within 1 mile of the orchard within last 2 years, but not currently active in the area this year.
- Active fire blight cankers within 1 mile of the orchard this year.

Ag-Radar gives users the accumulated degree hours for the previous four days ("Heat Units"), inches of rain, and hours of leaf wetness. It also estimates dates for the first appearance of blossom symp-

Barte Fink Copy Fink Same Scheller is image Fink origin Date Phenology Max Temp (F) Min Temp (F) Wetness (n) rc Avg Temp (F) EIP BHWTR 5/8/2014 PK 57.6 53.5 0.03 55.6 - - 5/10/2014 PK 77.6 53.5 0.04 65.0 - - 5/12/2014 PK 76.6 53.5 0.00 69.8 97 ++++M 5/13/2014 BL 66.5 48.8 0.00 57.6 97 ++++M 5/13/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 +++H 5/15/2014 BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 55.2 61 +++H 5/12/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 +-++M 5/19/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 +-++M 5/12/2014 BL <th>Conv 🤗 Dacte 🖂 Save Screen</th> <th>mage 📭 View Granh</th> <th>-</th> <th>Add or M</th>	Conv 🤗 Dacte 🖂 Save Screen	mage 📭 View Granh	-	Add or M
Date Phenology Max Term (F) Min Term (F) Wethess (n) r Avg Temp (F) EIP BHWTR 5/9/2014 PK 57.6 53.5 0.03 55.6 - - 5/10/2014 PK 77.6 53.5 0.03 55.6 - - 5/10/2014 PK 76.6 53.5 0.04 68.6 - - 5/12/2014 BL 85.2 54.5 0.00 69.8 97 ++++M 5/13/2014 BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 #+++H 5/15/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 +++H 5/15/2014 BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 55.2 61 ++++M 5/13/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 54.2 12 #+++M 5/13/2014 BL 73.8 49.5 0.00 62.1 73 #+++M 5/12/2014	Inputs	mage III view oraph		Add of W
5/9/2014 PK 57.6 53.5 0.03 55.6 - - 5/10/2014 PK 79.0 58.3 0.38 68.6 - - 5/10/2014 PK 79.0 58.3 0.38 68.6 - - 5/11/2014 PK 76.6 53.5 0.04 65.0 - - 5/12/2014 BL 85.2 54.5 0.00 69.8 97 ++M 5/12/2014 BL 66.5 48.8 0.00 55.0 121 ++M 5/12/2014 BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 +++H 5/15/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 +-++H 5/15/2014 BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 +++H 5/15/2014 BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 54.2 12 ++H 5/12/2014 BL 73.8 46.5 0.00 61.2 36 ++H 5/22/2014 PF 61	enology Max Temp Min Temp V (F) (F)	ness ra Avg Temp (F)	EIP BHWTR	BBS
$p_{11}/2014$ PK 79.0 58.3 0.38 68.6 - - $p_{11}/2014$ PK 76.6 53.5 0.04 65.0 - - $p_{11}/2014$ BL 85.2 54.5 0.00 69.8 97 +-++M $p_{11}/2014$ BL 66.5 48.8 0.00 57.6 97 ++M $p_{11}/2014$ BL 72.4 45.5 0.00 59.0 121 ++-+M $p_{11/2014}$ BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 ++++H $p_{11/2014}$ BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 +++H $p_{11/2014}$ BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 +-+H $p_{12/2014}$ BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 +H $p_{12/2014}$ BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 61.2 36 ++M $p_{12/2014}$	PK 57.6 53.5	03 55.6		250
Syl1/2014 PK 76.6 53.5 0.04 65.0 - Syl1/2014 BL 85.2 54.5 0.00 69.8 97 $+\cdots + M$ Syl1/2014 BL 66.5 48.8 0.00 57.6 97 $+\cdots + M$ Syl1/2014 BL 72.4 45.5 0.00 59.0 121 $+\cdots + M$ Syl1/2014 BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 $++++M$ Syl1/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $++++H$ Syl1/2014 BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 55.2 61 $+\cdots + M$ Syl1/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 $+\cdots + M$ Syl1/2014 BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 $+\cdots + M$ Syl2/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.8 - - Syl2/2014 PF 64.8	PK 79.0 58.3	38 68.6		-
Sp12/2014 BL 85.2 54.5 0.00 69.8 97 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp13/2014 BL 66.5 48.8 0.00 57.6 97 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp13/2014 BL 72.4 45.5 0.00 57.6 97 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp13/2014 BL 72.4 45.5 0.00 59.0 121 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp15/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $+ \cdots + H$ Sp15/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $+ \cdots + H$ Sp15/2014 BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 55.2 61 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp15/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 62.1 73 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp12/2014 BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 $+ \cdots + M$ Sp12/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.8 - - Sp2/2/2014	PK 76.6 53.5	04 65.0		-
Syl12/2014 BL 66.5 48.8 0.00 57.6 97 $+ + - L$ Syl14/2014 BL 72.4 45.5 0.00 59.0 121 $+ + - M$ Syl14/2014 BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 $+ + + H$ Syl12/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $+ + + H$ Syl12/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $+ + + H$ Syl12/2014 BL 66.3 31.8 1.44 60.0 85 $+ + + M$ Syl22/2014 BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 54.2 12 $+ - + M$ Syl22/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 $+ - + M$ Syl22/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 62.1 73 $+ - + M$ Syl22/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - Syl22/201	BL 85.2 54.5	69.8	97 ++M	
Sp14/2014 BL 72.4 45.5 0.00 59.0 121 $++-\cdot M$ Sp15/2014 BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 $++++I$ Sp15/2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $++++I$ Sp17/2014 BL 66.3 51.8 1.44 60.0 85 $++++H$ Sp17/2014 BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 55.2 61 $++++H$ Sp17/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 $+-+H$ Sp17/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 $+-+H$ Sp12/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - Sp22/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 57.8 - - Sp22/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 60.2 - - Sp22/2014 PB 79.3<	BL 66.5 48.8	00 57.6	97 +L	- in the second se
SyltS2014 BL 75.7 59.4 0.12 67.6 170 $\bullet + + \pm \pm$ SyltS2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $\bullet + + \pm \pm$ SyltS2014 BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $\bullet + + \pm \pm$ SyltS2014 BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 $+ + + \pm \pm$ SyltS2014 BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 54.2 12 $\bullet - + \pm$ SyltS2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 $+ - + \pm$ SyltS202014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 62.1 73 $+ - + \pm$ SyltZ2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 $ -$ SyltZ2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 $ -$ SyltZ2014 PF 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 $ -$ SyltZ2014	BL 72.4 45.5	59.0	121 ++M	-
SyltA(2014) BL 66.7 62.4 0.05 64.6 73 $+ \cdot + + H$ SyltA(2014) BL 68.3 51.8 1.44 60.0 85 $+ \cdot + + H$ SyltA(2014) BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 $+ \cdot + H$ SyltA(2014) BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 $+ \cdot - H$ SyltA(2014) BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 61.2 36 $+ \cdot - H$ SyltA(2014) BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 61.2 36 $+ \cdot - H$ SyltA(2014) PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 $ -$ SyltA(2014) PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.7.8 $ -$ SyltA(2014) PF 64.8 50.8 0.02 60.2 $ -$ SyltA(2014) PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 60.2 $ -$ SyltA(BL 75.7 59.4	12 67.6	170 + + + + I	
5/17/2014 BL 68.3 51.8 1.44 60.0 85 $+++H$ $5/18/2014$ BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61.1 $+-+-M$ $5/18/2014$ BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61.1 $+-+-M$ $5/18/2014$ BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 61.2 36 $+-+-M$ $5/12/2014$ BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 $+-++M$ $5/22/2014$ PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 $ 5/22/2014$ PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 $ 5/22/2014$ PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 $ 5/22/2014$ PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 $ 5/25/2014$ PB 79.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 $-$	BL 66.7 62.4	64.6	73 + - + + H	10 a
5/18/2014 BL 67.3 43.1 0.00 55.2 61 $+++M$ $5/19/2014$ BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 54.2 12 $+-++M$ $5/19/2014$ BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 $+-++M$ $5/20/2014$ BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 $+-++M$ $5/22/2014$ PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 $ 5/22/2014$ PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 $ 5/2/2/2014$ PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 $ 5/2/2/2014$ PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 60.2 $ 5/2/2/2014$ PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 $ 5/2/2/2014$ PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0	BL 68.3 51.8	44 60.0	85 + - + + H	16 a
Sylp/2014 BL 66.1 42.3 0.00 54.2 12 ++++L 5/20/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 ++++M 5/20/2014 BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 ++++M 5/20/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - 5/22/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - 5/22/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 - - 5/22/2014 PF 67.8 58.8 0.05 57.8 - - 5/22/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 66.2 - - 5/26/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - 5/27/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - 5/28/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 <	BL 67.3 43.1	00 55.2	61 + - + - M	19 a
5/20/2014 BL 73.8 48.5 0.00 61.2 36 + - + M 5/21/2014 BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 + - + M 5/21/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - 5/23/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 - - 5/23/2014 PF 64.8 50.8 0.05 57.8 - - 5/25/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 66.2 - - 5/25/2014 PF 73.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - 5/25/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - 5/25/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - 5/25/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - 5/25/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 <t< td=""><td>BL 66.1 42.3</td><td>54.2</td><td>12 +L</td><td>22 a</td></t<>	BL 66.1 42.3	54.2	12 +L	22 a
5/21/2014 BL 77.3 46.9 0.00 62.1 73 +···+M 5/22/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - 5/22/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - - 5/22/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 - - 5/2/2/2014 PF 64.8 50.8 0.05 57.8 - - 5/25/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 66.2 - - 5/26/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - 5/26/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - 5/26/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - 5/26/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - 5/26/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00<	BL 73.8 48.5	61.2	36 ++M	30 a
5/22/2014 PF 61.9 52.8 0.53 57.4 - 5/23/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 - - 5/23/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 - - 5/23/2014 PF 64.8 50.8 0.05 57.8 - - 5/25/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 60.2 - - 5/26/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - 5/26/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - 5/28/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - 5/28/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - 5/30/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - 5/31/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6	BL 77.3 46.9	62.1	73 ++M	39 a
\$723/2014 PF 65.6 51.8 0.49 58.7 - - \$724/2014 PF 64.8 50.8 0.05 57.8 - - \$725/2014 PF 64.8 50.8 0.02 60.2 - - \$725/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 66.2 - - \$726/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - \$727/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - \$728/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 490.0 - - \$728/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$729/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$730/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6 - -	PF 61.9 52.8	53 57.4		42 a
\$724/2014 PF 64.8 50.8 0.05 57.8 - \$725/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 60.2 - - \$725/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$7/27/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6 - -	PF 65.6 51.8	49 58.7		46 a
\$725/2014 PF 72.8 47.5 0.02 60.2 - \$726/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - \$727/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - \$728/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - \$729/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$729/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 49.0 - - \$729/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$731/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6 - -	PF 64.8 50.8	05 57.8		50 a
\$5/26/2014 PB 78.1 52.9 0.06 65.5 - - \$5/27/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - \$5/27/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - \$5/28/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$5/29/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$5/30/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$5/31/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6 - -	PF 72.8 47.5	60.2	× *	56 a
\$7/27/2014 PB 79.3 49.7 0.05 64.5 - - \$7/28/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - \$7/28/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - \$7/28/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$7/30/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$7/31/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6 - -	PB 78.1 52.9	65.5		67 a
\$728/2014 PB 51.5 46.6 0.02 49.0 - - \$729/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 55.0 - - \$730/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$731/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6 - -	PB 79.3 49.7	05 64.5		77 a
\$7/29/2014 PB 69.9 40.2 0.00 \$55.0 - - \$7/30/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 - - \$7/31/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 \$7.6 - -	PB 51.5 46.6	02 49.0		77 a
5/30/2014 PB 72.6 48.5 0.07 60.6 5/31/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6	PB 69.9 40.2	00 55.0	2 2	82 a
5/31/2014 PB 66.3 49.0 0.00 57.6	PB 72.6 48.5	60.6	9 B	88 a
	PB 66.3 49.0	57.6	a a	92 a
6/1/2014 PB 76.2 43.2 0.00 59.7	PB 76.2 43.2	59.7		100 a
6/2/2014 PB 81.2 53.2 0.00 67.2	PB 81.2 53.2	67.2	2 2	-

Fiugre 10. MaryBlyt output using data from an on-site weather station at the UMass Cold Spring Orchard for mid-May to early June, 2014.

toms and the first shoot blight symptoms.

Ag-Radar also lets users choose the Eastern Fire Blight Model (EFB) based on MaryBlyt (Figure 9). In this example, the EFB infection risk estimate is similar to that of CougarBlight, with an "Infection Risk" on May 15 and 16. The model reports Fire Blight Bacteria Potential (FBP) as a percent of the minimum number of degree days needed for infection. In addition, inches of rain, leaf wetness hours and average temperature are given.

The Bottom Line

Any of these systems are useful in guiding growers in making a streptomycin applications and in some cases scouting for fire blight symptoms. To successfully manage fire blight, the important thing is to use one of them.

References

- GLEASON, M. L., PARKER, S. K., PITBLADO, R. E., LATIN, R. X., SPERANZINI, D., HAZZARD, R. V., MALETTA, M. J., COWGILL, W. P. & BIEDER-STEDT, D. L. 1997. Validation of a commercial system for remote estimation of wetness duration. *Plant Disease*, 81, 825-829.
- MAGAREY, R. D., SEEM, R. C. & RUSSO, J. M. 2006. Grape canopy surface wetness: Simulation versus visualization and measurement. *Agricultural And Forest Meteorology*, 139, 361-372.
- COOLEY, D. R., ROSENBERGER, D. A., GLEASON, M. L., KOEHLER, G., COX, K., CLEMENTS, J. M., SUTTON, T. B., MADEIRAS, A. & HARTMAN, J. R. 2011. Variability among forecast models for the apple sooty botch/ flyspeck disease complex. *Plant Disease*, 95, 1179-1186.

