

BIOLOGY AND ECOLOGY OF THE GLASSY-WINGED SHARPSHOOTER IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

Project Leaders:

Kent M. Daane
Division of Insect Biology, Dept. of Environmental
Science, Policy and Management
University of California,
Berkeley, CA 94720

Marshall W. Johnson
Dept. of Entomology
University of California
Kearney Agricultural Center
Parlier, CA 93648

Cooperators:

Glenn Yokota
Division of Insect Biology
University of California
Berkeley, CA

Jennifer Hashim
University of California CE
Kern County
Bakersfield, CA

Elaine Shapland
Division of Insect Biology
Univ. of California
Berkeley, CA

Alexander Purcell
Division of Insect Biology
University of California, Berkeley, CA

James Hagler
USDA-ARS, WCRL
Phoenix, AZ

Valerie Fournier
University of California, Berkeley
(at the USDA-ARS, WCRL)

Russell Groves
USDA-ARS, PWA, SJVASC
Parlier, CA

Robert Luck
Dept. of Entomology
Univ. of California
Riverside CA

Youngsoo Son
University of California
KAC, Parlier, CA

Reporting Period: The results reported here are from work conducted from November 1, 2002 to October 1, 2004.

ABSTRACT

We followed glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS) preference and age structure on ornamental host plants in Bakersfield, California. Results of an urban survey showed GWSS host utilization varied greatly. This was especially true during the growing season when the mobile GWSS nymphs and adults would frequently shift amongst abutted host plants. While host plant utilization was dynamic, yet there were clear seasonal patterns. In late-fall through mid-winter, GWSS were most commonly found on privet, oleander, and citrus. In late-winter through spring, the preferred hosts were *Xylosma*, photinia, and flowering pear. In summer, host utilization was most dynamic and often dependent on host condition (such as irrigation). Nevertheless, GWSS adult and nymph summer and early-fall populations were consistently found on *Xylosma*, photinia, oleander, star jasmine, and Crape myrtle. Controlled experiments with potted host plants found similar results and highlight differences in GWSS feeding and oviposition preferences. Throughout all studies, we sampled the numbers of predators and parasitoids. Emerged parasitoids show *Gonatocerus ashmeadi* and *G. triguttatus* were reared from egg masses collected on most host plants, and accounted for a large percentage of summer GWSS mortality. Predators were present, especially spiders, and often observed feeding on GWSS. However, our data has not yet found any one predator species to be consistently associated with GWSS or with a reduction in GWSS densities. Collected predators are being analyzed using immunologically-based assays that employ pest-specific monoclonal antibodies (MAbs) to help identify the key predators of GWSS. During the urban surveys, we collected plant material (e.g., potential vector host plants) and potential insect vectors to determine the incidence of *X. fastidiosa*. This material was processed in the laboratory using "immunocapture DNA extraction" to determine the presence of *X. fastidiosa*. Results show that GWSS collected in urban regions often (>10%) carry *Xylella fastidiosa*, however, it is not the strain that cause PD.

INTRODUCTION

The primary focus of this research is the description of glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS), *Homalodisca coagulata*, GWSS preference, egg deposition, age structure, population dynamics and levels of natural regulation on different host plants in the urban / agricultural interface in the San Joaquin Valley (SJV). Currently, such a description of GWSS biology and ecology in the SJV is lacking. The developed information from this research will help understand GWSS seasonal movement and infestation foci. Of primary concern to regional control programs is whether or not untreated urban GWSS populations serve as an inoculum source for either the insect vector or the bacterial pathogen, *Xylella fastidiosa* (Xf).

To develop a more complete description of host plant influence on GWSS age structure and natural enemy impact, we conducted both urban surveys and manipulative experiments. Specifically, we sought to determine the potential of common plant species used in residential landscaping to either reduce or increase GWSS densities. We further screened common plants and GWSS collected for the presence of *Xylella fastidiosa*. When completed, information on the abundance, host plant use, and seasonal dispersal patterns of GWSS and natural enemies in urban better enable researchers to determine GWSS movement and host plant succession in the SJV, and the data may be useful for modification of surrounding vegetation, such as trap crops, to suppress GWSS movement into a vineyard.

OBJECTIVES

1. Determine glassy-winged sharpshooter biology and ecology throughout the season, particularly its age structure on and utilization of the different host plants that represent common breeding or dispersion refuges for glassy-winged sharpshooter in the San Joaquin Valley.
2. Determine the contribution of resident natural enemies on glassy-winged sharpshooter mortality and whether natural enemy abundance or species composition varies significantly on different GWSS host plants or ecosystems in the San Joaquin Valley.
3. Determine the presence of *Xylella fastidiosa* in glassy-winged sharpshooter collected from different host plant species and in selected ecosystems in the San Joaquin Valley.

RESULTS

Objective 1 - Survey.

GWSS numbers, age structure and natural enemies were surveyed in residential areas in Bakersfield, California. In the 2003-2004 season, six residential sites were sampled. Each site was selected for its combination of different GWSS and *Xf* host plants; most of the sampled sites had 3-8 individual plants of each plant species, with 3 or more GWSS host plant species in close proximity. Host plants surveyed included: carob, rose, star jasmine, Chinese elm, flowering pear, apple, escallonia, pink lady, ivy, nectarine, photinia, citrus, gardenia, privet, euonymus, hibiscus, agapanthus (lily of the Nile), grape, crape myrtle, eucalyptus, mock orange, oleander, *Xylosma* and Wheeler's dwarf. Each month, samples were taken for GWSS and natural enemies. We also recorded plant condition. From April 2003 to October 2004, we made >3000 plant samples (sample plant \times sample date).

A thorough analysis of this data set will be made at the end of the residential survey (April 2005) when we project to have >5000 samples, each with information on host plant species, condition and phenology; GWSS density and age structure; and potential natural enemies present. An initial analysis shows strong host plant preferences GWSS adults and nymphs, especially towards oleander, crape myrtle and *Xylosma* during the spring and summer months (Figure 1). Host plant preference for adult and nymph feeding sites was not always the same as those preferred for egg deposition – especially with respect to oleander, as reported by other researchers.

The seasonal population dynamics showed a strong spring GWSS population on all hosts followed by a summer decline, which is largely attributed to egg parasitism of the summer brood. We believe that the winter period is critical for GWSS population dynamics as this period represents the low point in the population density. Oleander and privet may be the most important overwintering hosts in the urban regions. In contrast, host plants as crape myrtle and crabapple are dormant throughout winter and, according to our samples, play no role in the GWSS overwintering. However, they are excellent hosts for oviposition and nymphal development during late spring and summer time. For some host, GWSS are confined to specific sections. For example, the flowering pear trees break dormancy early in the year and start blooming by the first week of February. GWSS adults have been found on the twig tips in the middle of the winter in these trees. It is unknown whether they survive the entire winter in this plant or the early physiological activity of the flowering pear attracts the GWSS. We also found GWSS overwintering exclusively on the “suckers” of the following tree species: eucalyptus, carob tree, Chinese elm, and olive.

Objective 1 – Manipulative Experiments

To categorize GWSS age structure, ecology, and resident natural enemies (particularly predators) on different host plants common in urban areas, potted (6.6 L) plants were used to provide a replicated array of similarly-conditioned (e.g., age, size, irrigation) GWSS host plant species. These preference studies were conducted in an unsprayed, GWSS infested citrus orchard, and two unsprayed residential areas in Bakersfield, California. Perennial species included ivy, photinia, citrus, gardenia, privet, euonymus, hibiscus, agapanthus (lily of the Nile), grapevine, crape myrtle, eucalyptus, and oleander. Annual (or weed) species included prickly lettuce, little mallow, annual sowthistle, coast fiddleneck, common groundsel, London rocket, fox tail brome, lambsquarters, blue grass, and shepherd purse. Both perennial and annual species were set in a randomized block design. Results show GWSS seasonal-long densities were influenced by host plant species, with a significant difference (ANOVA, $P < 0.001$) among host plants, for both perennial and annual categories (Daane et al. 2003, 2004a). Results are provided for perennial host plants in the citrus orchard (Figure 2), which shows a 20-fold difference in the number of GWSS on ivy, the least preferred host plant tested, and grape, the most preferred. We found a relatively similar pattern in the 2002/03 and 2003/04 seasons. Interestingly, GWSS egg mass density was not related to adult or nymphal densities ($P = 0.25$, $r^2 = 0.03$; $P = 0.35$, $r^2 = 0.01$, respectively). As with the urban survey, we conclude that GWSS adults have oviposition preferences that may be different from the nymphal feeding preference. We believe this difference is a result of both GWSS adults and nymphs switching among host plants, and to a disparate level of predator and parasitoid activity.

In a second experiment, we manipulated combinations of GWSS host plant species in cages. Four plant species have been planted in different combinations (e.g., citrus only, citrus and oleander, oleander only, oleander, citrus and crape myrtle), with a total of 7 plant species (4 replicates). Initial progress was slowed by the difficulty we encountered in transferring field-

collected GWSS material to the experimental site – basically, many of the GWSS nymphs died or left the tested host plant almost immediately after being transfer. We are currently improving inoculation techniques.

Objective 2 – Natural Enemies

During the surveys of GWSS population dynamics in non-agricultural regions, described previously, we collected information on GWSS natural enemies, using sampling techniques such as GWSS egg mass collections (>100 leaves per perennial plant species per collection) and potential GWSS predator collections (beat and sweep samples). As in all studies, we recorded host plant species and seasonal period. We found *Gonatocerus ashmeadi* and *G. triguttatus* (Triapitsyn et al. 1998) comprised about 95 and 4%, respectively, of collected parasitoids. As has been suggested, these parasitoids kill >90% of the summer GWSS population. Parasitoid numbers drop during the winter, when most GWSS are in the adult stage – although large nymphs were present as well. No egg masses or recently hatched nymphs were found from November through February. The first fresh egg masses were collected in April (2003) and March (2004), and we found parasitized eggs within as soon as April (2004). Our results suggest that egg parasitoids are the primary biological control factor. Combined with the winter / spring area wide insecticide control programs (which dramatically reduce the over-wintered population on citrus, the primary GWSS host plant during this period, and lower the overall GWSS population levels in the SJV) the egg parasitoids reduce the GWSS population in the urban regions to such an extent that GWSS can be difficult to find in large numbers in late summer samples.

Predators may play a small role controlling GWSS nymphs. Spiders were the most common predator found, and there was a significantly positive relationship between the number of spiders found and the number of GWSS egg masses ($P < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.28$). Still, there has not yet been any concrete evidence that links these generalist predators with the regulation or suppression of GWSS. During the GWSS urban surveys, predators were collected, identified to family or genus, and stored at -80°C. These specimens have been shipped to the Western Cotton Research Laboratory, where the predator gut content is being assayed with immunologically-based assays that employ pest-specific monoclonal antibodies (MAbs) for the presence of GWSS egg protein using the ELISA by Drs. Hagler, Fournier and Leon (Hagler et al. 2003). These studies will provide direct evidence of predation by generalist predators.

Objective 3 - Xylella

How important are glassy-winged sharpshooter populations in the urban regions as vectors of *Xf* in nearby agricultural areas? First, GWSS population densities have been relatively low in the SJV urban centers, as previously described. Second, GWSS has a relatively low *Xf* transmission efficiency. Together, the low density and poor transmission efficiency would suggest few GWSS would have *Xf* in their mouthparts and play any role in the movement of the pathogen. We tested adult GWSS collected from ornamental plants in Bakersfield and, to our surprise, found *Xf* in GWSS (mouthparts) collected from oleander, *Xylosma*, and Chinese elm. The positive results do not necessarily mean that the GWSS acquired the *Xf* from the plants that they were collected on as the adults move between host plants often.

How important are GWSS nymphs in the movement of *Xf* among ornamental plants and to vineyards? Nymphs shed the lining of their gut with each molt before adulthood, loosing any *Xf* living there and therefore provide a better indication of acquisition. The initial screening of GWSS nymphs used a “presence” or “absence” of groups of nymphs collected and therefore data are presented as such, rather than a percentage. In the initial collections, *Xf* was found only in GWSS nymphs collected from oleander (in the Bakersfield region). It is also important to note that all GWSS samples testing positive for *Xf* were analyzed for bacterial strain differences and analyses showed that the bacteria present are not of the PD type, but could be oleander, almond, oak, peach or plum. Most likely the *Xf* is oleander strain, which does not pose an immediate threat to nearby vineyards because this strain does not cause PD in grapes

CONCLUSIONS

We have described GWSS population density and age structure on ornamental plants common in residential landscaping in the SJV. We have further described natural enemy presence. This research can be added to information collected in Riverside and Ventura counties to help predict GWSS movement and develop control programs. The research has broader implications for use of ornamental landscape and riparian plants within agricultural settings (e.g., landscaping around farm buildings and homes). Plants which act as preferred hosts for both vector and pathogen can be target for control. By testing GWSS for the presence of *Xf*, researchers will identify potential sources of the pathogen, thereby preventing potential epidemic spread of Pierce’s disease causing *Xf* throughout a reservoir of ornamental host plants. To see a list of host plants, for both *Xf* and GWSS) go to: <http://nature.berkeley.edu/xylella>.




Figure 1. The seasonal average for host plant preference GWSS adults and nymphs was clearly towards oleander and Xylosma at this sampling site. Data of the seasonal average are skewed by the large spring GWSS population density.




Figure 2. Average densities (\pm SEM) of GWSS (nymphs and adults) were significantly different among perennial host plants, Tukey's HSD at $P < 0.05$. Data are seasonal averages, and biased towards host species preferred in June and July, when GWSS densities were the highest.

REFERENCES

- Hagler, J., K. Daane, and H. Costa. 2003. Progress on the development of a monoclonal antibody specific to glassy-winged sharpshooter egg protein: a tool for predator gut analysis and early detection of pest infestation. In M. Athar Tariq et al. [eds.], Proceedings, Pierce's Disease Research Symposium. Calif. Dept. Food and Agricul., Digital Logistix, Sacramento, CA.
- Daane, K. M., M. W. Johnson 2003. Biology and Ecology of the glassy-winged sharpshooter in the San Joaquin Valley In M. Athar Tariq et al. [eds.], Proceedings, Pierce's Disease Research Symposium. Calif. Dept. Food and Agricul., Digital Logistix, Sacramento, CA.
- Daane, K. M., M. W. Johnson, T. Ruiz, T., and J. Hashim. 2004a. Research shows GWSS have their urban preferences. Kern/Tulare GWSS Update. March 5, 2004.
- Daane, K. M., E. Shapland, T. Ruiz, M. W. Johnson, and J. Hashim. 2004b. Identifying the role of weeds in the overwintering of *Xylella*. Kern/Tulare GWSS Update. April 20, 2004.
- Shapland, E., K. M. Daane, G. Y. Yokota, A. H. Purcell, C. Wistrom, M. W., Johnson. 2004c. Researchers follow *Xylella* pathways. Kern/Tulare GWSS Update. August 6, 2004.
- Triapitsyn S. V., R. F. Mizell III, J. L. Bossart, and C. E. Carlton. 1998. Egg parasitoids of *Homalodisca coagulata* (Homoptera: Cicadellidae). Fl. Entomol. 81: 241-243.

FUNDING AGENCIES

Funding for this project was provided by the CDFA Pierce's Disease and Glassy-winged Sharpshooter Board.