

Citrus Research Board Office

CRB/CPDPC Joint Operations Committee Meeting
CRB Conference Room
217 N. Encina Street
Visalia, Ca 93291
Minutes of Meeting
August 1, 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
Joe Barcinas*
Kevin Olsen

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 Tanouye
Tina Galindo

Interested Parties

Brett Chandler*
Dave Machlitt*

*Participated by phone and/or Webex.

Call to Order

Chairman Galbraith welcomed all in attendance. Roll call was taken to confirm who was attending in person and those via audio conference and/or WebEx.

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 July 11, 2012. There were none.

Review of financial reports and approval of CRB action items and expenditures.

a. Financial Report for CRB Operations

Louise Fisher

Fisher reviewed the CPDPC Operations Expenditures for June 2012. Fisher stated that a couple of months ago, \$6,200 was approved to be moved from a field line item into data management for assistance with the citrus layers.

Chairman Galbraith stated we are 3/4 of the way through the year and at about 69% of budget; Fisher concurred. Batkin stated there is one other addition that they rolled back into July, the

\$101,000 which was approved by the CPDPC for the bio-control program. It will come out of the Operations budget, of field staff people; we will make a new line item and shift it from there. He and McCarthy spoke about doing it that way as opposed to a new contract. It all fits within the original budget, it is an operational function and will hold it there as opposed to a separate line item within the budget.(??)

Olsen asked Chairman Galbraith if it would be okay for the next month's report, which would be through July numbers, which would leave two months left in the current fiscal year, we could go through the amended forecast numbers with the year-to-go numbers and any changes that we think are going to happen. Olsen asked if this amended forecast number actually becomes the forecast through the end of the year and Batkin concurred. Olsen stated that would be important for this committee to set a budget. Batkin concurred and stated they will have a better idea for that when they look at the numbers through July.

Budget Development Discussion

Ted Batkin

Chairman Galbraith stated this is opening the discussion for the start of the budget process for 2013. Galbraith deferred to Fisher who prepared a proposed budget. Fisher stated there are three columns on the proposed budget; the 2011-12 approved budget; the 2011-12 after transition, and the last column is the 2012-13 proposed. Fisher stated the attached four pages gives the details of the proposed budget numbers. Galbraith stated the 2012-13 budget as proposed at \$1.7 million is about 61% of the approved budget from last year and about 82% of the amended budget, so far. Batkin stated it was for this committee to review today and answer any questions anyone may have and if any questions come up after today, email Louise Fisher and cc Galbraith, Rutz, McCarthy and Hill. Batkin stated anyone else could be cc'd also; this is a completely transparent process, no secrets or hiding of anything. Next month's Ops meeting will be when this committee decides on recommending the 2012-13 budget to the board.

Gorden asked if field budget for fuel and all the field expenses are coming through Operations for all the trapping program. Galbraith stated yes. Chairman Galbraith asked Fisher to go through the detailed pages of the budget, so if there are any questions that come up, they can be addressed at that time.

Fisher reviewed the data management section; which includes the new GIS tech to assist the current director with the increased workloads and evolving GIS tasks and should eliminate any backlog. Fisher stated there is additional detail on the data management page of budget. McCarthy asked what the "Info Assistance" line is under data management. Fisher stated it is the data management portion of the contract for all the servers and computer system, software; CRB also has a portion of that. Dunn stated CRB has a managed service agreement for IT. Batkin stated it also includes the field supervisors' laptops and everything that is associated with the whole data management system. Hill asked if this was the complete CRB's budget for info systems or just a portion. Fisher stated it was just a portion of it. Hill asked how it was delegated out, percentage wise. Fisher said 80/20; 80% goes to CPDPC and 20% to CRB. Fisher stated those programs and the memory required and the servers that are required to process the volumes for all the data management are very expensive. Batkin stated that also includes the laboratory; all the data coming out of the laboratory for PCR's run. This whole data management system is

totally integrated into one system. It's a seven server system that manages and runs all of it. Batkin further stated that the 80/20 split; it could be 75/25 because we don't track actual use of each one. We use the 80/20 because when we built the program originally, that was the increase from our old server system that it took just to run the CRB. Fisher stated also included in the data management figure is \$7,500 in the event we need an additional contract for further development of the core field database. Fisher stated under equipment repairs, these are budget charges and maintenance charges with regard to software licensing that is not covered under our management plan with Valley Expetec. Batkin asked the committee if it would be better to rename the Info Assistance to Info Management System; Hill and McCarthy concurred. Batkin stated the heading will be changed. Fisher finished reviewing the line items for Data Management and there were no further questions.

Fisher reviewed the Riverside Lab budget. Fisher stated there are a number of increases under this, including staff. Under staff it includes the director and the biologist; it also includes funds to promote an existing technician to be the lab manager and hire an additional technician. These changes and the additional hire are related to changes in the technology that have been proposed. Batkin stated it is also in anticipation of starting the "Gottwald study." Gorden stated this anticipates a higher throughput at the lab. In reviewing the equipment purchases, Fisher stated all of the equipment purchases relate to the proposal that this committee saw last month from LeVesque; it relates to the automation process for Riverside. Fisher went on to explain item (4); the annual hood certifications listed were only calculated for 2 hoods and should be for 3 hoods. It was so noted and another \$190 for additional hood will be added into budget. Fisher explained item (5) regarding Visalia lab. Fisher stated it covers equipment, if we need to add two additional processing stations. LeVesque stated it also covered a balance and the licenses for the computers and the computer scanners; each of those is about \$5,000 for each setup. Fisher finished reviewing the lab expenses.

Olsen stated he had some questions with regard to duties of the director, handling all on-site HR. LeVesque stated that was for keeping track of people's attendance; if there are any issues needing to be addressed as far as performance, time management and evaluations. Batkin clarified it by stating, in the total overall management structure here, the details of time management and most of the HR issues are handled by the supervisors and directors. If there is an issue that needs to be pushed up, then it goes to Mary Fonseca, who is our overall HR specialist; she is the one who is trained with dealing with issues that go beyond just the daily routine. The supervisors are responsible for their staff and LeVesque is responsible for all of the staff personnel at the Riverside Laboratory. Olsen further stated on page 4, in the center, on the asterisk, under Biologist, "So the biologist can focus on the task currently assigned which utilizes the biologist's expertise and training." Olsen asked for further elaboration on that. LeVesque responded, the biologist is spending most of the time on analysis of QPCR results and preparation of CDFA reports for the samples; the things listed there are the current assignments for the biologist. A lot of these things were previously done by herself, as the director, she was doing all the data analysis and all the reports and has been having biologist doing those things. Olsen went on to page 5, stating that the proposal is the lab manager position start at \$42k, to be filled by John Morgan. Olsen asked if it was appropriate to discuss where he is now. Batkin replied, no, he prefers to keep the specific salaries in a closed session that we'll have at another time. Olsen concurred. Chairman Galbraith asked if there could be a closed session at the next joint operations meeting

and Batkin stated we could; we can notice a closed session of this committee.

Chairman Galbraith stated that this committee should know that all the compensation numbers include benefits. Fisher concurred, stating it includes health insurance, payroll taxes and retirement.

Olsen requested, if this budget goes through as proposed or however it manifests itself, then maybe by next June or whenever appropriate, go back and see how close we were to the forecast toward the output, etc., to enable us to improve any forecast going forward at that point. Batkin concurred.

Fisher went on to the Field section of the budget. Fisher stated under "vehicle purchases" it is anticipated that we may need one additional vehicle or a replacement, only if necessary. Travel and mileage is for the director. Fisher continued to review each line item.

Fisher stated the vehicle repair and maintenance (7) has been changed to \$1,100 per vehicle. Fisher said that (8) rental is only as needed, it wasn't used this last year, and has been decreased for 2012-13.

Fisher finished reviewing each line item and asked Taylor to explain the postage. Taylor stated the postage is for Fed Ex, so when plant samples are taken here (Visalia) and processed, they are then sent in a 2 day overnight down to the Riverside lab. There were no questions regarding Field budget.

Fisher reviewed Administration budget/expenses. Fisher stated the admin support staff is as last year, it covers a portion of CRB staff with relation to the work they do on behalf of the CPDPC, i.e., Bekah is responsible for ordering supplies, maintains all the vehicle logs, and orders vehicle services. There is Marilyn's time in setting up meetings, minutes, etc. Batkin stated that is how it was calculated several years ago when doing this; when the funding started coming from CPDPC as opposed to CRB, we added two full-time equivalent personnel to our staff to handle all the work. It isn't 2 people both assigned 100% of their time to this; it is the equivalent of 2 full time personnel on our staff. It is spread amongst 5 or 6 different people on the staff that equal 2 full time of clerical. That is the amount of Admin that we charge. Olsen asked who the five people were that it's apportioned to. Batkin stated it is Bekah primarily, with it being almost 100% of her time; Chad and Marilyn work on the program; Mary in her role as office manager to follow everything that we do and Emma also works on the program.

Fisher went on to review admin travel, when staff has to attend any CPDPC meetings outside of Visalia. Fisher stated to disregard line item (3); it doesn't belong in this budget. Taking away \$5,000 from this category, makes \$133,200 the new total for Admin. After finishing the line-by-line review of the admin budget there were no further questions or comments. Chairman Galbraith asked the committee to take the budget with them to review and if there are any questions or comments about the budget, forward them to Fisher and she will answer. At the next meeting we will review and come up with a recommendation to the CPDPC.

Detection Update

b. HLB Survey

**Susan McCarthy, MaryLou Polek,
Debby Tanouye**

1) Risk-Based HLB Survey (Gottwald)

McCarthy stated there was a “little new wrinkle” with the Gottwald issue. Helene Wright with the USDA, wants to take a look at his survey methodology, so we’re waiting on them to do that. McCarthy said this was told to her on Monday morning. McCarthy stated that Gottwald did his survey in section, township and range and will have to overlay that with their (CDFA) grids and then come up with the plan. McCarthy further stated that what they needed from Gottwald in order to do that were the shape files, which they don’t have yet, and are waiting until they hear from USDA and then they will have a budget for that. Chairman Galbraith asked if McCarthy could send out to everybody, prior to the next meeting, so that committee has time to look at. McCarthy said she hoped so; she hopes that USDA gives them an answer ASAP.

Gorden asked McCarthy what does “take a look” (USDA) mean? It’s going to pass their muster? McCarthy stated USDA had some questions about his methodology, is what she was told and that they want to review it. They asked for some more information from CDFA. McCarthy said it wasn’t her call at all and the reason that she even heard about it was because she was discussing with their IT person, Casey, on Monday morning and Helene Wright from USDA was in the room. Helene said that Rocky wants to review Gottwald’s methodology and asked for some more information from CDFA. So that’s where that’s at right now. McCarthy said it’s USDA’s call right now, at this point. McCarthy stated it’s USDA’s survey plan. Tanouye stated she just wrote the proposal for the next USDA fiscal year work plan, for the agreement with the CHRP funds and they did include the HLB survey in that work plan. So it is USDA funds. Gorden asked if they were actually going to pay for this survey. Tanouye stated it depends on the outcome, they should be able to pay for the lion’s share.

Tanouye stated that she had a question for the Ops Committee. This year they’re trapping in the urban areas statewide; would you want that to continue next year? If so, she will have to allocate some of that money with the federal money then she would know how much more we would have for the HLB Survey. Chairman Galbraith asked how much it’s costing for the urban testing? Tanouye said about \$1.8 million with the county contract. Tanouye stated \$1.8 of the money they receive from USDA is allocated for statewide trapping, outside of the \$7.1 million.

Olsen asked Chairman Galbraith when we receive anything from CDFA, the USDA issue notwithstanding, if this committee could receive it with enough time to review and ask any questions, prior to the next meeting, so this committee can come to some finality. McCarthy said when she hears from the USDA, they can do the overlay and can come up with the number of samples that they need to take and then Tanouye will put the budget together. Batkin asked if that was for the Gottwald study and McCarthy concurred.

Chairman Galbraith asked McCarthy if it would be possible to put together a proposed budget that would be modified after hearing from USDA. McCarthy said she will get in touch with them (USDA) and let them know we’re trying to put the budget together. She doesn’t guess it will take them that long, but yes, we’ll have something.

Gorden stated we would want to continue the trapping program as we have it going, certainly

outside of the Southern California area where we made the decision to change to an HLB type survey rather than ACP survey. Gorden stated we want to plan to continue that, certainly in the areas that are not known to be infested now, for planning purposes at least. This seems to be a moving target.

Dunn wanted to know if the question was asked of Gottwald, whether Casey's overlay process, spatially overlaying it, would modify the intended result of Gottwald's process? Tanouye answered no. Dunn asked if that meant the question wasn't asked or the answer was no. Tanouye stated they would just overlay CDFA grid system on that; they would survey the same area that Dr. Gottwald did. Polek stated then you're using different land maps for a risk factor, or she's not understanding. Tanouye stated it would simply be an overlay over Dr. Gottwald's current grid system, his STR. Dunn stated your overlay is only looking at the final result, but he thinks it's only looking at the final result of his process. Dunn stated, to be done correctly, his process needs to be modified on the input side so that the output is correct. The boundaries of the polygons between the two grids are not identical and that's the whole problem. There is a lot of math that went into the calculation of risk factor for each of the SR polys and you can't just lay a different grid over it and assign the same risk probability to it; that is what Polek was trying to say. McCarthy said the answer then is they'll check with Gottwald. Dunn stated we would probably fund conversion of the California side of his process to do that. McCarthy said they did actually ask him to use our grid system to begin with and he said no. Dunn said it's because he has been requested to apply the same process nationwide; thinking that every state will go along with and use that. CDFA has said no, we don't want to use what he's using nationwide, we want something specific to California. McCarthy said they will check with him; USDA is reviewing the whole thing.

Gorden asked what the difference between STRS and the California system? Gorden thought we used the STRS. Tanouye stated Helene would have the answer to that. McCarthy stated they switched last year. Tanouye said if that's the grids we want to use, she doesn't see the point in wasting more time and resources in trying to get it overlaying and the conversion; we'll just use Dr. Gottwald's. McCarthy said that makes sense. Gorden asked if there was some way we could get the definition of what our grid system is. McCarthy said there is, but she doesn't have it right now. Gilbert stated that their grid system is an artificial grid that is laid over the state of California, starting up at the top and going on an xy axis, going down and assigning each grid a grid number. He's not sure in which direction they go, but it is totally artificial. Gorden stated that STRS is also, it's universal. Gilbert stated the reason they've been changing back and forth on grids is because TRS and the grid they had before this, it was so that they had grids when they had projects like medfly, and the project overlapped counties. Often times the grids were not the same in all the counties and the grid numbers were all different, so they came up with an artificial grid to get it so that all counties had the same grids. The one that they came up with before, after they were using TRS, didn't do that either because when they had an EGM find in Kingsburg, they went to put traps out in Kings, Tulare and Fresno County and the grids were all different. So then they came up with this system. Gilbert asked when we overlay their grid on the township range grid system, are we doing it just for the number or are we going to look at the TRS. Tanouye said that's what she was thinking, what's the difference. McCarthy said that is fine, it's not her decision. Tanouye said operationally, for them in the field, a grid is a grid. They will just go survey those numbers; but the GIS people, she can't speak for them. McCarthy said they would

straighten this out between CDFA and Gottwald. The thing they are waiting on right now is for USDA to give them an answer.

Batkin stated it doesn't really matter what grid system you use, but to establish a budget for doing this so we know what our costs are going to be. We don't need to know what the grid system is; we need to know how many people you plan to assign to this process, regardless of what grid system. What are the cost factors for the number of people, the vehicles for them, all of those costs. We need the budget numbers. McCarthy said they didn't have information from Gottwald that they could use to develop a budget and she went to talk with their IT people on Monday to see what they needed to get from him so they could do this, and at that point she was told that USDA wants to review it.

Chairman Galbraith stated to go back to Tanouye's comments and with Gorden, there was a recommendation on his part, about whether we continue the urban trapping, the \$1.8 budget item. Is there anybody on the committee that thinks we should not continue that? With nothing said, Galbraith said he thinks we have the answer. Gilbert stated he heard Gorden say something about discontinuing trapping in Southern California; is that something that is going to happen? Gorden stated the CPDPC made a policy recommendation to discontinue trapping in certain areas of Southern California, inside the blue line. So that's been discontinued, but we haven't discontinued commercial trapping. McCarthy stated that was correct. McCarthy said she and Tanouye were discussing the program and Tanouye mentioned that we are continuing to trap commercial groves inside the blue line, which she is assuming this committee wants to do? Their understanding with the committee is discontinue trapping inside the blue line.

Batkin said, if he recalls the conversations at the last ops meeting and the following CPDPC meeting, essentially the blue line has disappeared, it no longer exists; you have replaced the blue line concept with the rest of this fiscal year, 800 meters of treatment around commercial groves and then next fiscal year, you're going to 1,000 meters around commercial groves that the science committee had recommended. That is where we had left it at the last meeting. Galbraith asked if there was some sort of talk about leaving a blue line going to the north, San Fernando Valley points and north. Batkin stated, yes, the treatments to the north would consist. Galbraith asked Hill if he had any recollection of that. Hill stated, if he heard the committee last time we met, it's up to this Ops Committee to come up with a plan, if we want to continue to trap in the Riverside area; and then if we want to do some sort of arbitrary blue line now, it's up to this committee to work those logistics out for the CPDPC. Hill said they (CPDPC) never got to the trapping part of it. McCarthy said she didn't think it was a particularly good idea to abandon trapping in Riverside County. Olsen asked if this committee could do this today. Galbraith asked if Olsen wanted to make a recommendation. Gorden stated he thought it was a little premature on taking a shotgun approach at that. Gorden said maybe a science committee or someone take a look at what area we really want to discontinue and then maybe take that up for our further budget discussion and specific recommendation. We need to have some further discussions as to where we're going on this and maybe to try and look out a little further from the other areas and establish what-if scenarios.

08.01.2012.1 Olsen moved and Gorden seconded, to have the science task force review the overall trapping regimen, including but not limited to, Riverside County, to address how we should be doing that, moving forward.

Motion passed unanimously

Detection Update

a. Trapping Program Report

1) Residential

Tina Galindo

Galindo stated for right now they're testing for psyllids in one area, at the 400 meters area and they are just waiting for the new protocol. That is all she has to report.

2) Commercial (Urban Trapping)

Art Gilbert

Gilbert stated that last time, Olsen asked about whether the trappers were doing visual surveys on the trees when they're trapping, and his answer is mostly. Up in the Central Valley here, the trappers are getting their traps done, some early, and so yes, they're still doing it. In Southern California, where they have higher trap numbers and now they're being asked to do these on a two week schedule, which involves them getting around to them faster; they're doing visual surveys, but maybe not all of the time.

Gilbert said there has been a little turmoil in the trapping right now. One trapper in Tulare is out because she can't see well, so she can't drive. A trapper in Kern County retired and they've replaced him. The first day the new guy got out there, he got sick and was sick all week. There is one trapper in Riverside that is out for three weeks for National Guard training; and the citrus at UCR, they didn't get around to treating it and we're trapping it until they have treated it. They aren't going to treat it until maybe the end of this week, so the traps at UCR have been going unchecked. Gilbert said they are having to kick-in some of the backup trappers and the supervisors are kicking in to try and pickup the traps on all these routes; they may be behind on a few of them.

Gilbert stated at the last meeting he was asked how many traps were in Central California urban areas; there are about 9,000 at the time and right now about 10,100. Since the last meeting, 44 traps in the Riverside, Mentone area and Redlands area have had positive ACP finds. One had nine (9); one had as many as twenty-three (23). They're continuing to find them in all those groves down there.

3) JPL AVRIS System

Ted Batkin, MaryLou Polek

Batkin reported that he, Polek and McCarthy had the opportunity to visit with the chief scientist in the department to the secretary at JPL. The reason for reporting this to this committee is its importance to our future. We have a research proposal before the CRB to fund the use of high level spectroscopy, in finding trees and ultimately diseased trees in both a commercial and an urban setting. After their discussion with JPL, we've asked them to alter their proposal from what they have been looking at, looking at HLB infected trees in a commercial grove, to being able to use this system to find citrus trees in an urban setting. It's an easier and faster target; we can get to it quicker. Then after determining those parameters, then downstream, use this for broader

spectrum in looking at diseased trees. The bottom line was they came back and said they could do that. They are putting a revised proposal to us for the use of AVRIS, which is a high speed, high-definition flyover technology. It takes a picture; the picture pixel size of that picture is four meters square. They can take 235 different reads within the square and give you a read of what is in that square off of those 235 different signals and they can filter it to actually find a tree out of the background within that square. That is the current technology that they have right now and can put into the air immediately.

Batkin stated they are working on a secondary system that takes it from four meter square pixel down to a thirty centimeter square pixel, which is one-third of a meter. With even higher definition and higher capabilities; this may be down the stream. Down the stream to them was this fall or early next spring. The objective here that we're looking at is to use this system to be able fly over the urban setting and actually define exactly where the trees are instead of what we're using now, which is a guess that there is 60% of the households have trees and they have 2 trees each, etc., and we know that isn't the case. With this, we get a highly defined example of exactly where the trees are, know which tree(s) and be able to send people to them and also get some read as to whether they're potentially infected. We will be able to tease out of that spectroscopy, difference of leaf color within that segment. It will get us more defined.

Hill asked if the idea of the future is to be able to overlay the VOC into this also, so you can use that information and map the whole thing out more. Batkin said triple confirmation towards a highly suspect tree. It's all to be integrated. It will all be GIS referenced to our database. Everything comes out in a data format that can go directly into our system. We can pinpoint high risk areas and where we have high probabilities of infection. Downstream, our goal will be to map all of the commercial citrus in California, get a database of where we are, so that perhaps annually or every other year, we can do a flyover and see if there are changes in the spectro-imagery that indicate perhaps a movement of not only HLB, but other issues that we could look for. It is strictly a matter of finding the signal and putting the filters in the database to do this. So as far as overall citrus pest and disease prevention, it can be an absolute marvelous tool for us downstream.

Batkin told the committee that the important message out of this is, we have now forged a partnership with probably one of the highest tech, best research agencies in the world on tools that can take us to a whole new level, not only in citrus but all of agriculture. The nice thing about JPL is they're Cal Tech. They're not government, they're not NASA, those people are motivated. Their entire objective of their life is to solve a problem for somebody; not to publish a paper or further their government career. These people are dedicated to that, to find solutions that we take straight to the tree.

Chairman Galbraith went on to state that under 5. Detection Update b. HLB Survey 2)Additional Host Plant Response Program, was a mistake and it should have been stricken from the agenda.

Treatment Update

a. Residential

Tina Galindo

Galindo showed a chart that reflected where they're currently working. They had ten areas in Orange County and some are complete now; they're working the last four areas now, Irvine, Santa Ana and Lake Forest. There was a detection in Valley Center; the meeting for that detection is

August 9th. Tanouye added that Glendale is having their meeting tonight. Galindo said there are some detections in Tecate and Dulzura; they didn't require a meeting, so they're currently treating in that area. There are also a few groves in Fallbrook that they're trying to make contact with to determine if they're commercial or not. Galindo said they had some more detections in Salton City again, so they'll need to have another meeting in that area. They just finished up with Niland and Desert Shore.

Galindo stated in Los Angeles, they're currently working in the Sun Valley area. They had a detection in Glendale, just outside the blue line, so they have a meeting for that area. In Riverside, they're slowly moving out of 4 of those 13 areas. They're hovering around where the groves are because there have been some recent detections with the groves in those current areas. Galindo further stated that Tanouye has started setting up meetings for the new areas in Riverside, around the grove finds. They had a meeting in Moreno Valley, Corona and Riverside. All those areas will start on Monday. The crews will transition out of the current areas and move into those areas. They're still working in Redlands and a lot of the recent detections that the grove traps have been picking up are also in their current treatment boundaries in Redlands; so they're working around those groves, as well; also find site treatments continue. Galindo reviewed a map, showing grove and recent CDFA finds and treatment sites. A lot of them fall in their current areas in Redlands, so they're working around those. Galindo showed an Imperial County map which reflected recent detections in Salton City; Los Angeles County, where they're currently working and reflected the recent detection in Glendale, with that meeting on Monday; San Diego County map showed recent detections they've had down there and are currently working on. Galindo showed a map of area in Moreno Valley that Tanouye just worked on and will begin treatment on Monday; Riverside map, just south of their current area; Corona they will be starting Monday as well. Rutz asked Galindo about the Valley Center find; is it in the same place in the original ACP finds in Valley Center. Galindo stated a little bit south from the old detection.

Chairman Galbraith requested of CDFA if it would be possible to get their data and maps sent in ahead of time so it can be distributed out to the committee prior to the meeting. There was discussion of wind patterns with mountain ranges and how that affects the pattern of ACP finds. Batkin asked Galindo, if she thinks, with the pick-up in finds in Glendale and some of the others San Fernando Valley, are we going to look at a explosion up there or does she feel it is pretty well under check. Galindo stated that in Sun Valley, they did have some detections and there were other heavy sites in and around there; Glendale has some good numbers there also. Batkin asked what is the trapping array in San Fernando Valley; what is your detection pattern? Galindo stated they are trapping 5 per square mile. Batkin asked if that is equipped to catch a build-up of population. Galindo stated she thought so. Gorden asked if that was the same level as in Riverside and San Bernardino. Galindo stated at one point their delimitation array was 100, but with so many detections they went down to 25 around the groves; but the rest of the density in the county is at 5. Batkin stated the reason he raises this question is because he gets asked this a lot in discussions with both growers and urbans as well, is our protection grid in the San Fernando Valley and out towards Woodland Hills and that direction towards Ventura County, are we adequate in there to find and treat to prevent that same explosive movement that we're seeing in the eastern side over there. If not, are there steps we could take or could be taking to improve that. Galindo said she thought the density could be higher, but do we have the funding to do that. Batkin stated it comes down to deployment of resources. We've been moving the resources

around pretty actively and he believes that is the kind of questions this committee was designed to address and look at in helping with those decisions. If we need to shuffle resources in to make sure that happens, then this is the group that can lead those recommendations in that direction.

Galbraith asked Galindo if she could prepare for the next meeting, a recommendation, if she had the funds for protecting the northern boundaries, where and how? Galindo concurred.

Leavens stated he agreed with what Batkin was talking about the wind patterns and it is just a matter of time. As soon as we get a Santa Ana event, the population down there in L.A. is bound to get this way, which is that much closer to the valley. As we find there are areas where the game is lost, we ought to be pulling traps out of there and re-deploying them, as Batkin is suggesting.

Chairman Galbraith requested, since in the budget building mode, if Galindo/Tanouye could put something together regarding trapping plan, that this committee could see early enough, prior to the next Operations meeting, so when they discuss the budget, we can see what we're looking at. Galindo and Tanouye agreed. Tanouye said part of the confusion is that they've heard two different things; at one point Dr. Gottwald was recommending more visual surveys than trappings. McCarthy stated Gottwald said at a meeting that we need to focus more of our efforts on HLB survey and less on trapping program. Gorden stated that is the direction we're going; he thinks what we have mapped out, where we have psyllids that are established, the direction is to move away from trapping psyllids and towards surveying for HLB. But in areas that are not known to be infested with psyllids, Gorden thinks we want to still stay ahead of that. That is the idea. Gorden agreed with Leavens, when the game is recognized to be lost, that we move on and substitute a different mode of operation.

Batkin stated it looks like if we increase the trapping in the San Fernando Valley and we start seeing an actual big population of psyllids building up, then we shift to testing those psyllids for HLB to make sure that we're not moving HLB out of the high risk areas in that direction of commercial groves.

Treatment Update

b. Commercial

Brian Taylor

Taylor requested the Riverside-wide map that Gilbert reported on. Taylor stated there were a number of detections in commercial citrus, mostly in the Redlands and Riverside area. That has continued this week; they're awaiting confirmation on 32 finds that were submitted on Monday. There were a number of finds in Riverside or in Redlands. There are a number of repeat finds in the Redlands area; commercial treatment is ongoing. Most of the growers that have agreed to treatment have already completed treatment; however the Riverside area has been a little more problematic. They had a meeting yesterday that Batkin eluded to in Riverside, in which they basically have agreed to more-or-less go to an area wide approach and they're going to concentrate on a portion of Victoria Avenue area. There is a meeting there this evening. Taylor is going to meet with some of the prominent growers and they're going to go door-to-door with notification to growers to treat. They are then going to proceed up Victoria Avenue to the northeast and then start hitting those down towards the southern end. That is the target. Taylor stated ideally, once they go through this first area-wide treatment phase, the growers in the area will be more knowledgeable, more accepting of future treatments in the fall and in the spring.

Dreyer asked if this was a full treatment regimen with a foliar and a systemic? Taylor concurred a foliar and systemic. Taylor stated then they'll see how well it did; right now the recommendation would then be to do a fall foliar and spring foliar and an annual systemic sometime in the summer. They'll probably do the same thing in the Redlands. They're a little further along in that they've already done treatment, so they will go up there and start evaluating how effective it has been. Taylor stated that right now, it doesn't look like it has been very effective because we still keep finding psyllids. Dunn stated that 6 of the 32 were re-detections. There is a fair amount of re-detections going on in the Redlands area.

Taylor reported that if we go to an area-wide treatment, we'll probably start abandoning doing individual maps for every find. There is no point to it and will do an area-wide map of new detections. Taylor stated that he, with Gilbert and Galindo should discuss it after meeting briefly.

Taylor further stated that there was one detection in Valley Center in San Diego County; that meeting is next week. He has not made contact with the growers at this point. There are 5 growers on the north end of the treatment area. Tanouye asked if that was in a commercial grove. Taylor stated no, it was in backyard tree.

Hill asked Taylor about the meeting there yesterday, how was it attended and what was the grower base that was there. Taylor stated the meeting there was by invitation; it was an organizational meeting.

Chairman Galbraith stated Buffer Zone Area Discussion under Treatment Update should have been stricken from the agenda and moved on to the next agenda item.

Laboratory Activities

a. Riverside Laboratory Activities

Cynthia LeVesque

LeVesque reviewed her powerpoint. They did 1440 pooled ACP samples; everything tested negative. Current staff is 3 permanent, full-time. There is one lead trap reader, 4 part-time trap readers.

LeVesque stated the laboratory air supply was isolated. They had some re-venting done so that the air conditioning unit that supplies the laboratory only supplies the laboratory. That should help them to maintain separation and then they have the filtration system that only filters the laboratory air supply.

LeVesque stated they've been studying the CT Values with conventional PCR. That was just completed and she will present that at the next Ops meeting. LeVesque reported they've been helping the Vidalakis lab with validation of their total nucleic acid extraction procedure; that's been completed as well. They're in the midst of studying the ACP pooling. They received samples from Florida today. They started working with some samples that they had from their previous work with David Hall, just to initiate that work with diluting positive samples of potato psyllids with ACP. They are still working on the high throughput extractions for total RNA.

They're going today to the Vidalakis lab to look at the demo of the procedure that they've worked out.

LeVesque reported that they are designing new import files for Sampleware. There is some information on improvements in how they're handling the data to expedite doing sampling analysis and report preparation. These are going to considerably reduce the amount of time that is spent on those tasks.

LeVesque stated she will be presenting a poster on the pooling data at the Citrus Health Research Forum at the end of August.

b. Sacramento Laboratory Activities

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy apologized for forgetting to ask the lab to send her the number of samples they processed. McCarthy stated she would email everyone that information later this week. Galbraith asked if Dave Pegos received anymore reports. McCarthy stated he sends them out when he gets them.

Data Management Report

Rick Dunn

Dunn reviewed his slide of citrus layer attribution; reporting on the progress of this project in concert with the UCKAC, Krislynn Patterson's lab. Dunn reminded committee that at the last meeting the CPDPC had not yet approved the supplementary funding; they did at their last meeting and two student interns are working on that project. They've conducted 77 interviews with primarily Ventura County growers since they began and have been updating; they're making progress on the attribution of information to the Ventura side of the citrus layer. Dunn stated they have begun getting some attribution attached to the Tulare County segment, as well.

Status of VOC Detection System

Ted Batkin, MaryLou Polek

Batkin stated there really isn't much more. They're working with the manufacturer of the technology; his next target is an improved handheld device that will go into the field. Batkin said we'll have more on that as we get our next fiscal year's budget of funding. They have reduced it down to the breadbox size for easier deployment in the field. This is just ongoing research and we haven't taken it back to the field since the last report to this committee. They are making plans to take it back out and do some more field verification testing.

Galindo stated they went back and tested the suspect trees and will return in August. Taylor asked if there have been any continue ACP finds because you did go in and do treatment; and are there any plans to treat those suspect trees with pesticides to prevent ACP from getting on them? Galindo stated she doesn't think they found ACP on those sites because they've surveyed them, but will keep an eye on them. There are other trees around the suspect trees that they're collecting and testing. Taylor asked if collecting in the 800 meter area. Galindo stated if they find ACP on those surrounding trees they can treat; that is the question, do you want to do that treatment. Taylor said, or do we want to do prophylactic treatment.

Bio-Control Task Force Report

Jim Gorden, Brian Taylor

Gorden stated there is a big meeting in Riverside next week; after that there will be a lot more to report. In the meantime, there isn't really much more than what was presented at the last meeting. Batkin stated we're up over 8,000 releases of *Tamarixia*, in 46 different sites.

CPDPC Report

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy had nothing more to report from earlier. They will be meeting next Wednesday in Visalia.

Chairman Report

Dan Galbraith

Chairman Galbraith asked Leavens if he would have some kind of a report on the Stem and Leaf Committee by next meeting. Leavens said by next Ops Meeting he thinks they should have something.

Chairman Galbraith thanked McCarthy for distributing the minutes to the CPDPC committee; she stated she will do that from now on.

Hill stated on the operational side, for those that weren't at the last meeting, this committee was discussed and decided to keep it going the way it is going and probably will take on more responsibility as far as logistics.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m. The next meeting will be held at the CRB Conference Room in Visalia on Wednesday, September 5, 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 August 1, 2012.

Date

Ted A. Batkin, President