

| Host | | Diagnosis | Confidence (to genus) | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive |
| | | This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples | | | | |

Time Period Report for April 29th through May 5th, 2014

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Abies fraseri</i> | Fraser Fir | Scale Insects (Order homoptera) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Begonia</i> sp./spp. | Begonia | Broad Mite (<i>Polyphagotarsonemus latus</i>) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> | Common Boxwood | Boxwood Blight; Leaf and Stem Blight (<i>Calonectria</i> (ana. <i>Cylindrocladium</i>) <i>pseudonaviculata</i> (<i>pseudonaviculatum</i>)) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> | Common Boxwood | Freeze; Frost; Cold Damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> | Common Boxwood | Leaf Blight (<i>Volutella buxi</i>) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Buxus</i> sp./spp. | Boxwood | Mechanical Damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Humulus lupulus</i> | Hops | No Pathogen Found (Identification Analysis) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Humulus lupulus</i> | Hops | Nutrient Imbalance (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Humulus lupulus</i> | Hops | Oedema; Edema (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Juniperus procumbens nana</i> | Japanese Garden juniper | Insect Damage (Unidentified Insect) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Juniperus procumbens nana</i> | Japanese Garden juniper | Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

| Host | | Diagnosis | Confidence (to genus) | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive |
| | | This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples | | | | |
| Juniperus procumbens nana | Japanese Garden juniper | Spider Mites (Family Tetranychidae) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Juniperus procumbens nana | Japanese Garden juniper | Winter Injury (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Malus sp. | Apple | Bird Damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Malus sp. | Apple | Gypsy Moth (<i>Lymantria dispar</i>) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malus sp. | Apple | Lichens (Lichenes) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pachysandra sp./spp. | Pachysandra | Leaf and Stem Blight (<i>Volutella pachysandrae</i>) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pachysandra sp./spp. | Pachysandra | Nutrient Imbalance (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Pachysandra terminalis | Japanese Spurge | Leaf and Stem Blight (<i>Volutella pachysandrae</i>) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pelargonium sp./spp. | Geranium ('cultivated') | Geranium Bacterial Wilt; Bacteria Blight (<i>Xanthomonas hortorum (campestris) pv. pelargonii</i>) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pelargonium sp./spp. | Geranium ('cultivated') | Nutrient Imbalance (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

| Host | | Diagnosis | Confidence (to genus) | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive |
| | | This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples | | | | |
| <i>Picea pungens</i> | Blue Spruce | Nutrient Imbalance (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Rhododendron</i> sp./spp. | Rhododendron | Phytophthora Stem Rot (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Rhododendron</i> sp./spp. | Rhododendron | Root Damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Taxus media hicksi</i> | Hicks Anglojap yew | High Soil Moisture (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Taxus media hicksi</i> | Hicks Anglojap yew | No Pathogen Found (Identification Analysis) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Taxus media hicksi</i> | Hicks Anglojap yew | Root Damage (Abiotic disorder) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Tsuga</i> sp./spp. | Hemlock | Crown and Root Rot (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Tsuga</i> sp./spp. | Hemlock | Trunk Decay; Rot (Unidentified Fungus) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Zea mays</i> | Corn | Goss (Blight; Bacterial) Wilt (<i>Clavibacter michiganensis nebraskensis</i>) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Zea mays</i> | Corn | Stewart's Wilt (<i>Pantoea (Erwinia) stewartii</i>) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.