

Citrus Research Board Office

CRB/CPDPC Joint Operations Committee Meeting
CRB Conference Room
217 N. Encina Street
Visalia, Ca 93291
Minutes of Meeting
September 5, 2012 10:00 a.m.

A Meeting of the Citrus Research Board/Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee Joint Operations Committee was called to order by Chairman Dan Galbraith at the Citrus Research Board Office, Conference Room, Visalia, California. A quorum was established with the following in attendance:

Joint Committee Members

Dan Galbraith, Chairman CRB Ops
Link Leavens, V-Chairman CRB Ops*
Dan Dreyer
Jim Gorden
Kevin Severns
Kevin Olsen
Etienne Rabe

Ex-Officio

Earl Rutz – CRB Chairman
Nick Hill, CPDPC Chairman

CRB Staff:

Ted Batkin
MaryLou Polek
Brian Taylor
Louise Fisher
Rick Dunn
Cynthia LeVesque*
Brent Eickelberg
Marilyn Martin

CDFA Staff:

Susan McCarthy
Art Gilbert
Debbie Tanouge
Tina Galindo

Interested Parties

Linda Haque, Ventura County
Helene Wright, APHIS
Candace Hartwig
Dave Machlitt*
Stephen Birdsall*

*Participated by phone and/or Webex

Call to Order

Chairman Galbraith welcomed all in attendance. Roll call was taken to establish a quorum and to confirm who was attending.

Review of Minutes

Chairman Galbraith asked if anyone had any questions, additions, edits or corrections to the CPDPC and CRB Operations Joint Committee meeting minutes of August 1, 2012. There were none.

Review of financial reports and approval of CRB action

a. Financial Report for CRB Operations

Louise Fisher

Fisher reviewed the CPDPC Operations Budget forecasting thru September 30th for current fiscal year. It also reflects how much over/under we are from the original budget, anticipating what we will be from the original budget. For Data Management, it reflects being over budget about \$8,328. Fisher stated the Riverside lab will be over budget about \$15,547; the Field will be under budget by \$975,000. Dreyer stated it is because of the transition to CDFA; Fisher concurred and

stated there were no vehicle purchases and not as many equipment purchases as anticipated. Supplies also went down when the traps went to CDFA.

Fisher reviewed the Biological Control Program, which was approved late in the game and should be fully expended by the end of the year.

Fisher stated the bottom line overall is that the operations budget should come in about \$860,710 under budget, mostly due to the transition. Olsen asked Fisher if she sees any variable costs that are going to occur in August or September that will change from this forecast. Fisher stated she thinks they are pretty solid numbers.

Budget Development Discussion

Ted Batkin

A revised CPDPC Operations Budget was distributed to the committee. The revisions were done this morning and are in the field staff section, relating to the regional coordinator. Fisher stated there are only a couple of items that are different from the original budget sent out last week. Batkin asked Polek and LeVesque to go over the Riverside lab operations budget. Polek deferred to LeVesque. Batkin reminded LeVesque of his comments from last meeting; he does not discuss individual salaries in open meetings. It is discussed only in closed session with the CRB Executive Committee. The figures shown are figures that are approved through that process and are not subject to open meeting discussions.

LeVesque stated there are a few things down for equipment purchases. LeVesque stated in their proposal, they recommended that they purchase some automation: MagMAX Express or equivalent which is an automated extraction system. They also want to get the VIAFLO96 (a semi automated liquid dispenser) and two additional scanners for loading insects, along with the software and licenses that go with that. They want to upgrade the Lasergene Core Suite for sequence analysis and upgrade the QuantiStudio so that they would have the instrumentation for higher throughput. LeVesque reminded the committee that a few months back, she presented this committee with an extensive justification for these. LeVesque reviewed the yearly expendables: the water system parts; hood certification; service contracts for the analytical equipment and then service contracts for the centrifuges which are the main instrumentation used for doing the extractions and Clean Harbors for all hazardous waste disposal.

LeVesque reviewed the Visalia lab budget expenses, including additional equipment and if they need to increase the number of people processing plant tissue in that laboratory. It is planned because of implementation of the Gottwald surveying procedures, which would increase the sample throughput. Budget includes: Reagents for total nucleic extraction kits; MasterMix for PCR analysis; barcoded plates for samples and extraction sleeves. LeVesque said the rest of budget was self-explanatory.

Olsen asked LeVesque if she had an estimate on what the forecasted throughput will be for the number of samples for the 2011/12 year and then for the Riverside lab and Visalia lab add-on, how many samples that budget is for. LeVesque stated they did about 40,000 samples between plant and insect samples, over the last fiscal year; though they planned for 72,000 samples, which has been their plan. Every year they plan for 72,000 samples and until they end up increasing the

need, these numbers are based on 72,000 samples. Olsen asked if that included Visalia and LeVesque stated yes.

Batkin asked Polek to inform the committee of some events regarding the laboratory that affect the budget. Batkin stated it doesn't impact the budgetary numbers, it just impacts the timeline for them.

Polek said there have been some issues in the laboratory with unconfirmed or indeterminable results on samples. At this point in time, the USDA-APHIS-CPHIS lab will be conducting a review and inspection of the Riverside laboratory which should happen within the next couple of weeks. Until that time, the laboratory is on hold for processing any samples. Polek said we will review protocols and equipment needs in the laboratory and will not be making a decision on the robotic equipment for the laboratory until after that review. Batkin stated they would like to keep those costs in the budget, pending the review, should the APHIS people agree to let us go ahead and use them. If we don't need them or won't be part of the system, then we will not expend the funds and those would just be funds that would not be spent. We've set-up a one year contract with CDFA and to go back and revise is onerous. We ask that they remain in the budget so that they can be brought back to this committee for approval mid-year or sometime downstream, should that approval be forthcoming from APHIS. This review that is going on, we were told is for both laboratories; our laboratory and the Meadowview laboratory.

Polek reminded the committee of suspect samples from a couple of years back. They were found in curry leaf. This issue was brought to a national level through ARS and we know there are some additional bacteria that are not *liberibacters* or may be related to *liberibacters*, but not associated with HLB disease. We're not sure if that is what is happening and how widespread it is in California. This issue is more of a scientific issue than an operational issue. Yong Ping Duan, in Florida, has been finding similar bacteria in Florida, as well. CRB does have a proposal that we will be considering that may help get to the bottom of this issue. This is a new bacteria for the United States and California. At this point-in-time there are a lot of gaps on the evolution of this bacteria, how it got here and how it's responding in the host plant and in the insect. It is going to be a work in progress. Batkin stated that part of the reason the review team is coming out is because the USDA people were questioning their procedures in their laboratory; and the process that will go on with this review is to look at the Beltsville, Riverside and Meadowview labs' procedures to make sure everyone's procedures are along the same technologies. Batkin said that one of the expected outcomes of this will be a forward movement for all three laboratories on the types of technologies used in looking for and sampling for these issues. Polek stated it is also a review of high through-put as opposed to the gold standard protocol, which is what CDFA used to use before they had the robotics, which is a much slower process. The USDA wants to validate a higher through-put protocol and the labs will be sending in comparative data to support that. Batkin further stated that one of the things discovered while in Ft. Collins was that Florida does no regulatory testing and Texas has very minimal regulatory testing and California is trying to get ahead of this game so that our processes here are on a high through-put, high validated and high level of accuracy in the system.

Batkin requested that the committee take a strong look at the budget and allow us to have the necessary numbers to move forward on high through-put processing as the system gets developed.

Tanouye stated they are still surveying and asked if they should slow down; she gave approval for hiring new people to gear-up for the survey. Batkin stated no, this is just a temporary bump in the road. Polek said CDFA is still responsible for plant samples and the psyllids can sit in alcohol for any point in time. Once this review process is done, you can start sending the Riverside lab the psyllid samples again.

Chairman Galbraith asked how long this might take and Polek stated within the next couple of weeks. Batkin said APHIS' intention is to get us back up, certified and running just as soon as possible because they know this backlog is occurring. Rutz asked if there was a sample that is in question, at this point in time, that brought all this up. Polek said the samples were sent to USDA in Beltsville and the official results are inconclusive. Rabe asked if the California samples were from the south. Polek confirmed the Los Angeles area.

Hill expressed concern over having a backlog of samples that will need to be processed. Batkin stated we will not have the same situation as last year; it should only be a two to three week backlog. Operationally, we will not be in that same situation we were in before.

Batkin asked Taylor to review the data management budget. Taylor said for the data management staff, they're recommending an increase of an in-house GIS technician; and will review that position shortly. They also propose a continuation of a portion of the GIS mapping contract with UC Kearney, with Kris Lynn Patterson's lab. The rest is fairly standard and will have Batkin go over the info management portion. Batkin stated there was a question regarding the information management system budgetary figure of \$144,822. It is a 70% charge to the CPDPC program for our in-house data management system. He lowered it from 80% from last year, to a 70/30 split because there has been an increase in the usage of the system on the CRB side and when he went through an analysis on how it should be split out, a 70/30 split was more logical and made more sense. Batkin reminded the committee it is a shared system, in that it is a server rack and this computer system was put in place before, when the CRB ran the whole Operations program. Batkin stated it is all verifiable; we can show how it works and how it splits out. Chairman Galbraith asked if the \$144,822 represents the 70%. Batkin answered, it is 70% plus there's an additional \$7,500 included in that \$144,822 for software maintenance and upgrade for what is called CRB cube, which is the SQL database system that operates all of this. There are certain software maintenance requirements that we have to have, so we put it on the high side; we may or may not need all \$7,500 for software maintenance, but is in there in the event we have to. These software maintenance issues come with the integration between the field data and the laboratory data, to make sure that that interface is smooth and the objective is anytime there is a event that occurs, that we have rapid access to that data and can print maps and go directly to the site rapidly. This was the way this system was designed from the very beginning.

Taylor reviewed the graph showing the status of the citrus layer project. There are two student interns that work at UC Kearney. They conducted 127 interviews during the month of August and were almost entirely focused on Ventura County growers. Ventura County is showing a good amount of completion on the graph. As that is completed and going forward, they have requested in this budget a continuation of those interns in that portion of the UC Kearney contract to work on the citrus layer. They hope to have the majority and/or critical aspects of the citrus layer

completed by the end of the next fiscal year; it is progressing. It will never actually be complete because things change and it will be an ongoing thing. Taylor said they are hoping to get to the point where this can be done in-house at some point in the future. McCarthy asked if all the counties on the graph were going to be completed by the end of next fiscal year. Dunn said the mission critical component, who we call to contact on a particular parcel; that's the part that we should have finished. In terms of other information, i.e. bearing status or ag status, packing house, PCA, we will fill those in as we can. But the real critical component is who we talk to for each of these parcels. Leavens asked Dunn, why are the PCA contacts so low all the way across the board. Dunn said it was primarily because their focus has been on contacting growers up to this point. He hasn't had the time to spend on it since they launched the UC contract. He had been talking with PCA's and farm managers back when he was doing it, so he was able to collect quite a bit of information then. Dunn stated that is why he wants to get this new person on, to handle a lot of the day-to-day work that is routine now; so he can dig into some of this new information. Link asked about the initial contact with the grower, if the first question is who is your PCA and what is his phone number. Dunn stated the first question is, do we have your correct address and contact information; secondly, which blocks are yours? Thirdly; what is the commodity planted in each of these blocks; and then, they launch into additional information that they can provide. Batkin stated the reason for that priority was, when there is a find, our biggest challenge has been notifying the grower and then we expect the grower to notify his PCA. We felt that was the appropriate way for us to notify a grower, so he gets the first call.

Taylor said that one of the issues is our ability to have oversight on the project. Dunn devotes a portion of his time to viewing the work done by the interns from Kearney. Dunn doesn't have time, he is busy. The number of finds has increased dramatically; so both Dunn and Eickelberg have devoted time to generating maps, etc. on a consistent basis to keep us all up-to-date and the workload is increasing dramatically. Taylor stated there is a need for a technician who is based and trained in GIS to assist Dunn, not only in doing the routine things but also helping in this mapping program; to provide maps to growers, PCA's, interested parties, CDFA, is an ongoing process that is continuing. Taylor stated in running the hourly figures, there is more than adequate amount of time on programs that are not being totally worked on that need time, i.e., the citrus layer. The new GIS technician position not only would assist Dunn but would also be involved in conducting the interviews with growers, etc., similar to the interns from UC Kearney. There is more than adequate need. As the need for the UC Kearney technicians decrease, any updates to the layer would be done in-house.

Batkin added that when Dunn and Taylor did their analysis and when you look at the hourly needs, and the amount of stuff just falling on the floor because there wasn't somebody to do the work, it does justify an additional full-time person. In Dunn's time estimate, it was something in excess of 92 hours per week to do everything that he is doing; and in Eickelberg's analysis, it was in excess of 48 hours per week. They are already overloaded and with the increased number of finds that we are having and will continue to have, in order to provide the adequate support to the field, we believe this additional position is necessary. We're not asking for approval of the position today, just for the budgetary placeholder for the position so that the Operations Committee can review this further and give us guidance as to when the appropriate time do this is. Taylor finished reviewing the data management budget fy2012-2013, stating most figures are similar to last year's budget or revised figures from last year's budget.

Hill asked Taylor how they will receive the updated data and if there was a way to streamline getting updated information to make sure the overview of information is accurate; how often will they update the maps. Taylor stated that property change of ownership primarily comes through the assessor's information. At the farm, if something has been pushed out, etc., it comes through the field technicians, as part of grounds truthing. Hopefully it will be a continuous update. The assessor's parcels will probably go through once a year. Dunn said the same for the permit data that they have access to, will be an annual event. Taylor stated that with the packing houses, they will hopefully be able to review annually, depending on who they have contracts with. Dreyer stated it is definitely a collaborative effort.

Batkin discussed the field staff and field support budget, stating there are a number of issues in the budget, some that are still unresolved. There is the role of regional coordination and handling the grower contacts. With the determination that a commercial grove is anything over 25 trees, this has created a dynamic that we hadn't anticipated in terms of areas like Riverside County and San Bernardino County and will experience this undoubtedly in San Diego County and other areas, where the agriculture urban interface creates these small mini-farms. With the 25 trees + falling to the commercial side of that equation, it goes up exponentially the amount of time and effort necessary to contact those growers and those people who are real or hobby growers and deal with treating those areas. This is one of our most critical reservoirs of psyllid populations, if left untreated. We are experiencing that right now and have been for the past month. Batkin asked the committee to remember this as Taylor goes through his discussion on his personnel needs.

Taylor reviewed the Field budget; the \$205,000 is for three, full time equivalent, coordinators. They do not anticipate at this time, having the coordinators be full time only part time, though there may come a time needing them full time. That amount includes their mileage reimbursement and equipment needs, phone and computer. Taylor said there was a need for regional coordinators even before the 25+ tree ruling came out, especially in Riverside where there are several small growers that need to be contacted. They need to be put in touch with a treatment person and then negotiate a contract and proceed with treatment. Taylor stated that in Riverside County he has had two meetings with treatment personnel that are available, the PCO's, trying to coordinate materials they're going to use. They decided to adopt an area-wide treatment scheme. With CDFA having switched over to the 25 tree limit, Taylor stated he has been getting phone calls from homeowners asking for treatment and guidance on treatment; most of them are extremely hesitant because they're not commercial growers, they're hobbyists at best. Most of them give their fruit away; they do not entirely consume it themselves. Taylor said he gets about 5 to 6 phone calls a day from these residential growers. Taylor showed a map of a portion of Woodcrest in Riverside County. The map reflected a residential area that has been placed in the middle of an orange grove. Some of these folks have been treated, some haven't. They are upset that some neighbors have been treated and they're not. Taylor stated he needs information from CDFA as to who got treated and who was given a notice to call him. It needs to be decided how to operate with these homeowner growers. Are they going to pay for their own treatment or is CPDPC going to pay for the treatment. If we only treat a small portion, those growers with less than 25 trees that CDFA is treating, we're not going to be treating the majority of the trees.

Batkin said we're asking for budgetary authority for the next fiscal year, to have the necessary personnel to address this, wherever this may crop up. The \$205,000 is for 3 full time equivalents, which can be 6 part-time people. We won't be at those full operational levels at the start of the fiscal year, but that's what it would cost if we were. The budget can be adjusted accordingly, but the request on the table is to have the budgetary authority throughout the next fiscal year to be able to respond, as necessary, throughout any areas where we end up with psyllids in this ag-urban interface, and be able to address it. There is an enormous amount of effort that is required. Batkin told Leavens that included in this is in anticipation, if we need to pick-up the cost of David Machlitt in Ventura County through this contract. It is included in that figure. Batkin stated this is as needed and each time an addition is made, it comes back to this committee for approval. We will not move without the expressed approval of the Operations Committee.

Rabe asked why they still separate line items 601 Field Staff Compensation and 612 Regional Coordinator; why aren't they put together. Batkin stated he left it separate because Taylor does more than just field coordination; he's our Operations Director and has multiple responsibilities. Batkin stated that so there was an understanding that 100% of Taylor is not to field coordination, just his overall management of the program is. Galbraith reminded everyone that the figures shown include benefits and everything, it is a complete package.

Taylor reviewed the line item, vehicle purchases; though not anticipated, it is for a replacement vehicle is one of the vehicles that is currently in service to CDFA technicians, needs replacement. Taylor finished reviewing the line items.

Hill stated that they need to come up with a policy on who is going to maintain and who is going to buy the vehicles. There seems to be some issue between CDFA and CRB charges. Is CRB still in charge of buying vehicles or is CDFA. Should that all be moved over to CDFA, having them give full maintenance and buying of the vehicle; there needs to be clarity and separation there. Batkin stated this is a discussion we need to have and have not had. We've had it on the CRB side because we own title to all the vehicles. The Executive Committee's recommendation to the full Board that they passed at the last meeting, was that as long as the CRB holds title to the vehicles, then all of the maintenance and responsibility of maintenance and fuel for those should go with this contract. If it becomes more feasible and economically advantageous to have the department provide the vehicles, then we can debate the discussion. The CRB does not particularly think we are in the business of buying vehicles; we set the system up originally when we were running the whole program. With the transition over to the CPDPC, we purchased an additional nine vehicles through that pass through, but all 22 of the field vehicles are titled to the CRB. Hill stated he wants a clear policy so that we don't keep tripping over these issues. Batkin concurred and stated again that the CRB Board agrees that as long as the CRB holds title to the vehicles, then we need to maintain the control of the maintenance of those, so that we can assure that they are being maintained properly. Hill and Batkin concurred that the figures reviewed today are for budgetary purposes and in the future the automobile and maintenance issues need to be addressed. Hill stated he would like to see CRB and CDFA get together and figure out what a hobby farmer is. We need to be flexible. If it means 150 trees, do we pay for that? Right now, we are falling between these cracks and things aren't getting serviced and taken care of. We need to come up with a flexible idea of what a hobby farmer is so that we don't have infestations like what we're seeing down in Riverside. We are going to run into this issue more and more.

McCarthy stated the reason CDFA picked the 25 trees is because it's been in the food and ag code for *tristeza*. It states anything over 25 trees is considered commercial. Taylor disagreed, stating it says it's considered citrus acreage. McCarthy said because it is existing in the food and ag code, unfortunately, she doesn't think they can come up with something that is flexible and also enforceable. You have to have something that you can trace back to in the food and ag code or regulation that you base your decision on. Hill requested coming back to that discussion. McCarthy stated that part of the issue is where are the funds going to come from to treat these pieces of property; if someone has 40 trees in their backyard, that is a very expensive proposition. There is a lot that goes into this.

McCarthy stated there is more discussion needed about the existing equipment and whether or not that will be transferred, however, CDFA's policy is any new equipment purchased under this program will be purchased by the department. Batkin asked why that was policy; it is up to the CPDPC. McCarthy said when the department collects the money, it is in effect, State funds being expended and so that is an issue then that some non-State entity, in effect, holds title to those vehicles. McCarthy suggested we have this discussion later with Leavitt and outside this meeting. Batkin stated there is not currently a non-State entity that holds title to these vehicles.

Rabe asked Chairman Galbraith if we should leave the \$25,000 for vehicle purchase in the budget. Hill stated to use it as a marker and figure it out later. Chairman Galbraith agreed. There were no further questions or comments regarding the field budget.

Batkin reviewed the Administration Operations Budget costs; these are the administrative support costs and there is no change in these from the previous years. Some numbers were dropped out because of the treatment analysis. It was something anticipated last year but we didn't do it and don't anticipate it. What is left in the budget is essentially the same budgetary figures for administration, our portion of the contract. There were no comments or questions.

Batkin reviewed the Biological Control Program budget; included is the bio-control research project with UC Riverside. Last year we funded a half-year of that at \$101,000. This year it is at \$222,467 because there was additional work from Mark Hoddle that had been covered under another contract that was folded into this next year's budget. If it is the desire of the CPDPC to continue to support that research, then we would ask it be included in this budget. Gorden stated it is more than research, it is the release program that they're establishing after the authorization to release these parasites. So it's the release and validation of establishing the parasites that is being supported by this. Batkin stated it includes an additional tactic, they're going to be taking in field rearing, as opposed to insectary rearing; but this covers the whole validation and release and recovery of the *Tamarixia*. Tanouye stated she believes CDFA holds a contract also with Mark Hoddle and we need to make sure it's not a duplicate. Batkin concurred. McCarthy asked if this was going to be augmented releases also. Batkin stated it is strictly the 17 strain releases being released that are mixed and then put out and recovery. These will form the bases of the colonies that will then be used in augmentative releases. This does not include any funds for anything beyond the development of the core strains for augmentative release. Rabe asked if there was some discussion about private enterprise getting involved in releases and where would that fit under this kind of budget, if eventually it gets done. Batkin said that would be under another whole separate budgetary process and it's probably going to end up in some kind of a mixture

thereof. Batkin stated he just spoke with Robert Leavitt about this. By the 19th, there will be some basic plans for this committee to discuss and debate.

Chairman Galbraith stated this completes the presentation of the CRB portion of the CPDPC Operations Proposed Budget for 2012-2013. Chairman Galbraith asked for a recommendation from this committee to push up to the full committee on this proposed budget.

09.05.2012.1 Dreyer moved and Rabe seconded to move forward this CRB portion of the CPDPC Operations budget and present to the full committee a proposed 2012-13 budget of \$2,099,429.

Motion passed unanimously

CDFA Budgets

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy stated the budget is the same one that Tanouye had presented last month. McCarthy said she has the bottom line for the trapping; it was \$1,350,563 for commercial grove trapping. Tanouye reviewed the operating expenses.

Rabe asked if some of this was a duplicate to what Taylor had reported. Batkin stated there won't be any duplicated figures. Galbraith did state regarding the budget, leaving everything in there as discussed for a placeholder pending how the discussions go. McCarthy stated by the 19th it will all be ironed out. Rabe stated the difference between about \$800,000 not spent on the CRB side last year because it was transferred and the \$500,000 more on the CDFA, is that just in vehicle expenses or where is CDFA going higher in the trapping? McCarthy stated that wasn't for a complete year, the transfer was partway through the year. McCarthy stated field operations for last year was \$1,784,500 for CRB. Rabe stated the total budget was about \$2.8 million for total approved for the previous year; this new one shows about \$3.2 or \$3.3. Rabe requested for the 19th, he wants to see with the two budgets combined, where are we going up. McCarthy said she could show how much was spent on the trapping between when CRB finished and then for them for the rest of that year. Dreyer stated that April 1st was the transition date, so two-thirds of the year was covered by CPDPC. Rabe said there is still a \$400,000 difference between this year and the previous; he suspects it's mostly in the vehicle/fuel type things, but if McCarthy could just outline it for this committee.

Olsen asked McCarthy about the CDFA laboratory part, where it fits into the budget. McCarthy stated CDFA pays for running the samples at Meadowview; it's not your money that pays for it. McCarthy stated she was prepared to have all that information together for the full committee meeting showing the USDA support received. Batkin asked McCarthy if on the 19th she was going to have a full complete picture of what is coming out of the CHRP side of the dollars for the whole treatment program, the entire budget. McCarthy stated yes. Batkin stated that information is needed to transfer back to the CHRP council.

Tanouye reviewed her handout which was broken down by county; Imperial, San Diego, Orange, Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino, which are the primary counties they're working in and the locations within that county. Tanouye stated she estimated, based on historical treatment

for those areas, the number of gallons of pesticide they've been applying for property and the cost. Tanouye stated that the Cost CDFA Applied column is only the cost of the pesticide and doesn't include the cost of labor. The spreadsheet is a current picture as of August 30th. In San Diego County, Tanouye stated she anticipates having more treatments in the area and will have one CDFA truck and also the pesticide contractor in the area. In Orange County Tanouye stated they will mostly have contractors working in that area. In L.A. County it will be a CDFA truck. In Riverside County it is split between contractor and CDFA trucks.

Tanouye reviewed the different county maps which reflected the areas of treatment and psyllid finds in the area. Tanouye stated they've been finding psyllids in the Coachella Valley; so Palm Springs, Indian Wells, Desert Hot Springs, all these areas they picked up psyllids. We are going to have to have a lot of treatment there and will probably send a CDFA trucks out there to do those treatments. In the Redlands area in San Bernardino County, they are wrapping up with CDFA and a commercial vendor.

Rabe asked Tanouye about the dollar amounts shown for the different counties, if it reflects the money spent already or is it her projection. Tanouye stated it is ongoing, some has been spent, but it is the projection, starting October 1. Tanouye said that at the last committee meeting there was an authorization to provide them with additional funds to continue treatment through the end of September. Chairman Galbraith asked about her costs per property, compared to a contractor's cost. Tanouye said it depends; the contractor's cost is their labor plus the pesticide. The contract went out to bid again and they actually dropped their price, so it is \$7.67 per gallon of mixed product to treat. It is a little cheaper for CDFA to do the treatment but they don't have the equipment.

Olsen asked Tanouye about the Coachella treatment; what is the reason a gallon of pesticide per property is \$163, which is way above any of the others. Tanouye stated there weren't that many properties there and she took that information off of a treatment report that she received; she thinks it is big properties. Tanouye said she would look at it. These are moving forward numbers, but some of the treatments have occurred already in Coachella. Tanouye stated that for an estimate, she took off of a treatment sheet she had received for treatments that are continuing.

Tanouye finished reviewing the projected budget fy 2012-2013. For Orange County she anticipates \$726,481 for the total program budget. Tanouye anticipates for San Diego County the total program budget of \$160,549. They found psyllids in East County just yesterday, so there will be additional treatment there. In San Bernardino County they would use CDFA trucks and a contractor for that. Total program budget is \$600,035 for San Bernardino County. To finish up Riverside, it will be around \$5 million, mainly because they are going to have to use a contractor a lot in that area to get those treatment spots. Batkin asked if it was 800 meters and Tanouye said yes. Gorden asked Tanouye if she had forecast for additional finds in that area. Tanouye stated the contractor cost would go up depending on how many more areas they added. In the other areas, she did forecast mainly temp help for six months; figuring if there are any additional psyllid detections they would have staff on hand.

Batkin asked Taylor if he has done an analysis of Riverside County, excluding the Coachella Valley, where there is commercial citrus, but there's not an 800 meter radius around. All the

commercial stuff has had finds in it. Batkin stated that a worse-case-scenario is not included in this. Batkin asked Tanouye if a projection of all the commercial citrus in Riverside, excluding everything east of the Cabazon, became infested, would you be able to treat that under this budget? Tanouye answered, no. It also doesn't include re-infestations. Gorden stated that at last CPDPC meeting it came up about how long it would take to treat around these 800 meter properties; it was indicated up to a year. Tanouye stated Riverside would take up to a year. Gorden stated that a question that he doesn't think has been adequately dealt with yet is, if it makes sense to go ahead with these treatments to that distance, if it's going to take that long to get around to them. It is something we're going to have to deal with probably sooner rather than later. Gorden suggested that maybe the science technology committee is going to have to weigh in on; does it make more sense to maybe go out to only 400 meters and get to it sooner, rather than waiting for a whole year.

Rabe asked what percentage of properties or trees are missed in treatment. Tanouye stated very few because they go door-to-door and survey the yard. Rabe wanted to know what the scientific justification is for spending \$5.3 million on this kind of treatment. He accepts that buying time to reduce populations is a big help but so far, every time we've fought it, we've had to retreat. So what is the scientific justification of spending \$5.3 million over the next year? If we can have some kind of answer to that by the 19th, so we can weigh in on it. Batkin stated this has been discussed before and that is when the 1,000 meter radius came out as the minimum that we should be treating, from a scientific perspective, because of the flight time of the psyllid. We have to make decisions not just on the science of it, but also what is financially feasible. Polek stated we need to have Tim Gottwald or Neil McRoberts look at the probability and have the entomologists weigh-in and the probability of success. Gorden stated the problem he has with the way we're running right now, is if it is going to take up to a year to get to some of these properties, he has serious doubts as to the validity of going forward that way; he would rather treat out 400 meters and get it done fairly quickly. Tanouye stated in Riverside County, what they've found with so many detections that when they start making the 400 meter rings, they run together. Tanouye stated that in Riverside County they are only treating around the commercial citrus now, at 800 meters. Batkin asked if they were only to treat around a 400 meter band around commercial citrus, will it still take a full year. Tanouye said she would have to look at a map; they would have to redraw the radius. Galindo stated you could finish that quickly but the problem is all the new detections in new outlying areas that they have to keep treating.

Taylor asked Tanouye if she could review the different protocol for the different counties. You are treating out from commercial citrus in Riverside County but you're treating all finds in San Diego County. Tanouye stated it is because the agreement was anything in San Diego and Imperial because HLB is in Mexico. Taylor asked about other portions, such as the northwest portion of L.A. County in the valley, Coachella Valley. Tanouye said they were part of the priority. Taylor asked about Desert Hot Springs with 4,000 properties and no commercial citrus. Galindo stated it is the outlying areas. Taylor asked Tanouye if she could review what is being done. Tanouye stated around commercial citrus it is 800 meters between all urban areas; any detections in San Diego and Imperial County they're treating at 800 meters – if it's a single detection they might start at 400 meters to try and get that done, but if they find another psyllid then they will just move it to 800 meters because obviously there is an infestation there. San Diego and Imperial they do 100%; they do 100% in Coachella Valley; in Orange County they're

doing commercial citrus and anything in South Orange County, any urban detections in South Orange County; they're treating 100% in Northern L.A. County as they encroach Ventura County.

Chairman Galbraith asked if the budget number was to move forward and if Polek wanted to review with science committee. Rutz stated it looks as if this budget is for known current finds, a little bit of projection of staff, but no real projection on volume of new sites that need to be treated. McCarthy said she doesn't know how you could make that projection, it's a guess. Rutz said that with that many new finds, you're approaching a budget limitation here. Tanouye said given what they have so far, you're already looking at \$7.4 million, just to treat what we currently have. Tanouye finished reviewing the different counties' budgets fy 2012-2013: Imperial County outer edge treatment total program budget is \$110,526; Los Angeles County outer edge treatment total program budget is \$528,676; All areas (roll up) 800 meter treatment around commercial citrus and outer edges total program budget is \$7,431,809.

Chairman Galbraith asked for a motion to move this budget forward to the full committee for their consideration. Leavens stated he is wrestling with Rabe's pertinent question; the concept of spending over \$5 million in Riverside in a losing effort is frustrating to him. Galbraith reminded the committee we're not passing the budget here, it is the full committee that goes through that whole process; we are just going to push this up to them. Severns asked Chairman Galbraith if we could make a recommendation that treatment be stopped in Riverside County; can that be part of this proposal. Galbraith said it could be.

09.05.2012.2 Severns moved that we pass the budget with the caveat that we stop treatment in Riverside County. **Motion withdrawn.**

Link opposed making this recommendation, stating that we've got to keep suppressing these psyllids. The potential for HLB in all those mini-groves is pretty large. Severns stated he is just throwing something out there; it seems like we're talking about the elephant in the living room but we're not getting to what the issue really is. If there is any modification to that, that the committee may have a better feel for, he is all in favor of his motion going down in flames.

Rabe suggested getting a panel of entomologists for our next meeting so that they can help this committee make these decisions as to the futility or not, of what we're doing. Olsen said he thinks the recommendation to the full committee is that we ought to study this. He is not going to vote in favor of endorsing any method of this budget or the other proposal because he doesn't have enough information. Olsen stated his recommendation is that there is no recommendation other than to study it more as per Rabe's suggestion at the full committee meeting.

Batkin suggested sending a recommendation forward to the committee so in their budget deliberations on September 19th, that you assure adequate funds in reserve for implementation of anything you expect to implement in the next fiscal year, so that you don't short your assessment rate and short your income; but you don't obligate the funds in this budget, at the start, and that then gives you the opportunity to go back throughout the fiscal year and draw out of those reserve funds that you have. Batkin stated the language has to be discussed, because what is a reserve and what is an allocated reserve vs. a non-allocated reserve. These would have to be allocated reserves for treatment contingencies so that you don't shorten your assessment rate and find yourself

without the funds available. So you're not obligating the funds to any particular strategy, but you're holding them in reserve, subject to study and then approval of a direction forward. Chairman Galbraith stated that sounds like a reasonable alternative.

Gorden said we need a fairly healthy amount in there and he asked Rabe to enlighten that question a little bit more, how he would feel about, in case of a large psyllid infestation, i.e., in Bakersfield, we need to have funds available to respond to those kinds of situations for treatment.

Chairman Galbraith confirmed with Tanouye what she said, if all hell breaks loose, \$7.4 million won't cut it, in the total scheme of things, i.e. Riverside. Tanouye concurred, stating the question she has that needs to be considered is, for treating around the commercial citrus, are all the growers treating their own commercial citrus; because if they're not, then that is another reservoir of psyllids that we'll never be able to get rid of. Dreyer stated that is justification for the area-wide managers. Tanouye stated for them to continue treating in those areas, they are treating every day and have a lot of crews out there, but we don't know if those growers are all treating either. We can go to other areas in the interim. McCarthy said that should be coordinated with the grower anyway; if you are treating around the grove. Tanouye said they do try to coordinate; but that \$5m is treating areas wherever a commercial grove is treating, but all the growers aren't in compliance and there's always going to be reservoir psyllids there that we won't be able to trap.

Batkin said we have a motion and 2nd on the floor, but to put a clarification in it so that you can send that recommendation to the board with some meat to it is that the committee, at minimum maintain the assessment rate at its current level or higher, in order to have adequate reserves to address these issues downstream. That would then wrap the framework around the recommendation. Chairman Galbraith asked Rabe if he would like to amend his motion to include that. Rabe concurred and so did Gorden.

09.05.2012.2 Rabe moved and Gorden seconded that the full committee maintain the assessment rate at its current level, or higher, to have adequate reserves to address these issues downstream.

Motion passed unanimously

Detection Update

a. Trapping Program Report

Tina Galindo

Galindo reviewed a handout she provided the committee with a list which covered what Tanouye had just reviewed with the committee; projecting the treatment areas that they're working in. In Orange County they finished up the seven areas that they were working around. They are currently working in the 800 meters around the groves in Yorba Linda and Lake Forest. They have some new areas in Tustin and Mission Viejo that they have a meeting set-up for next week and then they will treat there. In San Diego they've had a lot of new detections in the county, in new areas; some of them need meetings and some don't. They are just going in and treating the ones that don't have that many properties, Lakeside, Crest and El Cajon are the newest ones that they need meetings for. In Imperial County they are still in Salton City and Salton Sea Beach; they keep getting new detections in that area and are expanding the treatment area, they've been

working in there for the past few months now. In L.A. they are working in Glendale and Sun Valley. They had some new detections in Sun Valley, so they'll need a meeting there. They had about five new detections in Arlita, which is a little west in the valley, so they're setting up a meeting for that. Galindo said that yesterday, there is a new suspect which is closer to the Ventura County line in Canoga Park. They have the survey crews working out there today looking for other infested sites out there. In Riverside they have a long list of new areas that they're working in. They continue to work around the groves in the old treatment areas that they had originally set up meetings for. They had a new detection in Coachella and as Tanouye mentioned, also in Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, Painted Hills, Sky Valley, Indian Wells, Thousand Palms. There are a lot of new outlying areas that they're finding ACP. In San Bernardino they just had some recent meetings in Redlands and Mentone around the grove detections, so they have crews working out there as well.

Batkin asked what the trapping density was. Galindo stated they've been increasing to 25, since being brought up at the last meeting to increase. They are still increasing in the San Fernando Valley and then Riverside, which has scattered detections everywhere; in San Bernardino they are currently working in the Redlands and Mentone area.

Linda Hague asked Galindo how she coordinates with Taylor on whether that organic farmer or any other farmer is treating? Galindo stated she provides Taylor with the maps in the area that were CDFA finds. Galindo asked Taylor if Rainbow has treated already. Taylor said they haven't treated, that he was aware. Taylor stated that normally Galindo sends him a notification that there was a find and either she sends him the map or he has Dunn map it and that is what he works from. Taylor stated in the Rainbow case, that one is pending until he can get other information. Taylor said there are other organic growers and most are willing to cooperate; there is an organic protocol, usually repeated oil applications and intensive survey. Hague asked how the follow-up is done. Galindo contacts Taylor, who then contacts the grower and informs them that they need to do treatment (same contact protocol whether conventional or organic), to please contact their PCO and then it is usually followed-up by a phone call by Taylor to see if they have done treatment, or they call Taylor back to inform him they have done treatment and ask if there is anything else they need to do. Hague asked if there was a timeframe for that. Taylor stated they try to do in two weeks, but that doesn't always happen, especially right at the moment. Taylor further stated that some of the conventional guys get out there practically the next day.

b. HLB Survey

1) Risk-Based HLB Survey (Gottwald)

Tina Galindo

Art Gilbert, Susan McCarthy

Galindo stated for the HLB Survey, there are no updates since the last meeting. They completed the survey in Zone 1 and they're scheduled to go back in October so they can continue to test the VOC sniffer sites; then they will go back in November. They are working on Gottwald's protocols. Dunn asked if any of the indeterminate liberibacter detections were from the sniffer sites. Galindo stated no.

Gilbert informed the committee that the trapper he reported on last month has since passed away. Gilbert also informed the committee of another trapper that was injured in a National Guard incident; so the route in Tulare and Kern County has been picked up by a CDFA trapper that they

have working out of Shafter, so the trapping is up-to-date. Gilbert reported that in Escondido, the trapping is way behind schedule. Nothing has changed on the trapping in the commercial groves except for they're getting a lot more traps coming in with finds. Since the last meeting there has been 132 sites/traps come in with psyllids; with up to 119 psyllids per trap and there were 30+ more yesterday. Most of them are coming from the same general area of Riverside, Moreno Valley and Mentone. It is pretty much a status-quo on that.

Chairman Galbraith asked McCarthy about the HLB Survey, if there was any follow-up. McCarthy stated it was ongoing around the find sites as recommended by the committee. Galbraith said there was a lot of discussion at the last meeting about the Gottwald survey grids. McCarthy stated they have started on the Gottwald survey. That is all she can report.

Detection Update

a. Trapping Program Report

Tina Galindo

Galindo reported on this with the detection updates.

Laboratory Activities

a. Riverside Laboratory Activities

Cynthia LeVesque

LeVesque reviewed her powerpoint. They did 3,428 pooled CDFA ACP samples; 11 samples from 3 sites were suspect for Las; 1 sample suspect for Lam. They were all from L.A. and were submitted to APHIS and determined to be inconclusive. All other samples were negative. Current staff is 3 permanent, full-time; one lead trap reader, 5 part-time trap readers.

LeVesque stated the preliminary pooling data was presented at the Citrus Health Research Forum in Colorado. It showed that when you pool more than five insects you do see a significant decrease in the CT value. This is an ongoing study and other labs are participating in it, including the Texas lab.

LeVesque showed the poster on pooling data that she submitted for the Citrus Research Forum in Colorado. LeVesque stated they currently have a BioSprint 96 in the lab right now that they're doing head-to-head comparison between the Magmax-96 Viral RNA and the One-For-All Vet kit, using that instrument.

Data Management Report

Rick Dunn

Dunn had nothing new to report.

Bio-Control Task Force Report

Jim Gorden, Brian Taylor

Gorden stated there was a meeting a couple of weeks ago and they're up to 64 release sites for *Tamarixia*. They've had quite a few recoveries and the DNA tests indicate, where they've done them, they are recovering the released *Tamarixia* that Hoddle has cultured from Pakistan. Polek reported that they're going to have a meeting next week with USDA APHIS individuals doing long term strategy and funding strategy as well.

Stem and Leaf Subcommittee Update

Ted Batkin, Link Leaven

Leavens said they had two mandarin growers in attendance. It amounts to about 1% of the total mandarin sales and if the procedures are done at the packing house level with the protocols that work, the thing is probably at a very low risk. The problem is, they think there are lots of trees that are put out and there are gunnysackers that put the stuff in banana boxes and wind their way into oriental markets and flea markets. They think the risk is pretty great.

The growers were not willing to go to the point of having an emergency ordinance to remove the stem and leaf; it only amounts to 1%. Leavens stated that Batkin made a summation of the meeting that this committee can read and decide if you want to take action on it.

Chairman Galbraith asked if those gunnysack operations bypass packing houses completely. Leavens said yes, but eliminating any field packing would be a handle on that. Dreyer stated they would bypass assessments also. Leavens concurred and stated it would be difficult to control from the Ag Commissioners' standpoint. They had Tulare County's Ag Commissioner on the line. Galbraith asked if there was some kind of a census or recommendation. Leavens stated that the last paragraph in Batkin's report sums it up. If we continue to enforce the existing rules and they go into standard boxes, those mini cartons, you will probably get the bulk of the control but quantifying what amount goes out the back door is very difficult. We are at risk.

Batkin stated that after an hour of very interesting discussions, the Stem and Leaf Task Force recommends to this committee that this committee forward a recommendation to the CPDPC, supporting a recommendation that the department ask the Ag Commissioners to enforce the existing code that requires stem and leaf mandarins to be packed in approved commercial packaging and be processed through a packing facility. It causes the agriculture commissioners in the counties to enforce the code so that any stem and leaf mandarin sold at point-of-sale that are not packaged in proper packaging and put through packing houses, be cited and take action within their county. This code is on the books but is not being enforced.

The initial report out of the task force is to follow this pathway. There may be additional legislation and there may be additional things downstream that are going to take some time to generate and put together. For right now, if they just enforce the code as it exists, it should address the bulk of the issues of the problems. The problems, as defined by the task force are people going out into their small yards or orchards, packing them in whatever they want to and transporting to farmers markets or roadside whatever and selling them uncontrolled and unprotected; especially those that are originating in areas of high ACP populations with the potential of transporting HLB.

McCarthy asked if there were any code changes. Batkin stated there are no code changes at this point; it is just a recommendation up through the line to ask the department to inform the County Ag Commissioners to enforce the code.

Severns commented on the county enforcement, in his opinion, that is being selectively enforced. It's not that it's not being not enforced at all. Batkin stated they want to stop selective enforcement and go to state wide enforcement.

Chairman Galbraith asked for a motion to adopt this recommendation.

09.05.2012.3 Leavens moved and Severns seconded the motion to support the enforcement of existing code that requires all fruit to be packed in an approved new container. The committee also includes the recommendation for the requirement that all stem and leaf mandarins be processed through a packing house using approved quarantine procedures.

Motion passed unanimously

CPDPC Report

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy stated the committee was going to be meeting on the 19th in Riverside.

Chairman Report

Dan Galbraith

Chairman Galbraith announced to the committee that this is his last meeting as chairman of this committee. He thanked everyone working on behalf of the committee. Chairman Galbraith further thanked Chairmans Rutz and Hill for asking him to serve in that capacity and thanked them for the honor of doing that. Chairman Galbraith turned it over to Chairman Hill.

Chairman Hill thanked Galbraith for all his hard work and service. Chairman Hill went on to nominate Jim Gorden as the Chairman of the Operations Committee from this point forward. Chairman Rutz concurred completely and thanked Chairman Galbraith for his service, it has been exquisite. Rutz further stated that Galbraith will still remain on the committee.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m. The next meeting will be held at the CRB Conference Room in Visalia on Wednesday, October 3, 2012 at 10:00 a.m.

Certification

I, Ted A. Batkin, President of the Citrus Research Board, do hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the CRB/CPDPC Joint Operations Committee Meeting held on September 5, 2012.

Date

Ted A. Batkin, President