CALIFORNIA CITRUS PEST AND DISEASE PREVENTION PROGRAM
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Meeting Minutes
Monday, July 11, 2016

Opening:
The regular meeting of the Operations Subcommittee was called to order at 2:00 p.m. on July 11, 2016 via webinar by Subcommittee Chair Etienne Rabe.

Committee Members Present:
Ed Civerolo*  Beth Grafton-Cardwell*  Etienne Rabe*
Jim Gorden*   Jason Leathers*

Committee Members Absent:
Tom Avinelis   George McEwen

Interested Parties:
Jill Barnier*  Colleen Murphy-Vierra*  Cressida Silvers*
Victoria Hornbaker*  Karen Overstreet*  Keith Watkins*
Leslie Leavens*  Sylvie Robillard*  Bob Wynn*

* Participated via telephone/WebEx

Opening Comments
Subcommittee Chairman Etienne Rabe welcomed staff and the members of the public participating in person and online.

EDT Texas II Results
Etienne shared some slides that were provided by Neil McRoberts at the EDT task force and the CRB meeting. The first slide showed how the various EDT’s did in detecting HLB in a single limb known to be previously PCR positive and in a 3 other limbs evenly spaced around the tree. The Slupsky and Leveau labs both indicated all 4 samples to be suspect with a rate that was 80 percent or better. The PCR labs did well, better that 70 percent on the limbs known to be previously PCR positive, but fell below 40 percent for the other limbs from the tree and the other EDTs were less consistent on all limbs from the tree. Similarly, the second slide compared the results from the known negative trees. Slupsky, Leveau and the majority of the PCR labs did a good job of indicating that all samples from a tree were negative. The other EDT’s didn’t do as well in indicating that the know negatives were negative. The third and fourth slides dealt with the unknown trees (field trees, PCR negative and asymptomatic), the Slupsky and Leveau labs indicated that the majority of the unknown trees were suspect positive and the PCR labs indicated that all were negative. The other labs indicated suspect positives and suspect negatives. Etienne mentioned that CRB is in discussion about doing another test in Texas and also perhaps beginning to gather baseline data from California trees/varieties. The group discussed the results they stated that the study did a good job of providing data for each EDT that could be compared
against the other EDTS. They also felt that the Texas II study may only be showing the
difference between indoor and outdoor grown trees and other environmental stressors including
diseases should be included in any test going forward.

**Regional Quarantine Proposal**
Victoria Hornbaker provided information on the status of the Regional Quarantine Proposal. She
discussed the 4 scoping meetings that were conducted in May and June. The meetings were put
together to collect stakeholder comments. The comment period ended on June 30, 2016. The
comments are being compiled. Once the comments are compiled the proposal will be amended
and shared back out to the CPDPC, most likely in August. She showed the proposed quarantine
maps and discussed the regions. In the proposal as presented to stakeholders the only mitigation
that could be used to move bulk citrus would be a wet wash, either in the field or in a
packinghouse. She noted that the proposal didn’t have too much detail, as to allow industry to
come to the table with multiple wet was scenarios. She referred to a study completed by Spencer
Walse conducted using various wash techniques and that most of them would be acceptable for
disinfesting the fruit of ACP.

Beth Grafton-Cardwell presented information on the preharvest sprays, noting that some sprays
are not as good as others and that industry should work on that. The concern is that growers are
moving ACP from areas of high ACP populations. She talked about Spencer Walse work and
noted that maybe a fumigation or bin drench would be effective to disinfest the fruit of ACP. She
noted that growers need options and choices for mitigating the movement of ACP.

Etienne asked about a timeframe for the process. He mentioned that spray and move is still in
place and will remain in place until the new regulations are approved and in place. Victoria
mentioned that 6-9 months would be a very optimistic time frame; a more realistic timeframe
may be a year or more. Etienne requested that CDFA provide industry with a “not before date”
for implementation of the recommendations to prevent unnecessary intermediate costs.

**Update on Results of Dog Visit**
Victoria explained that the Detector Dogs visited California on the week on June 6th. The dog
team is funded by a MAC grant and they are seeing great results in Florida and Texas, with
experimental suspect detection rates over 99 percent. The dogs visited Los Angeles (residential
trees Hacienda Heights and San Gabriel), Kern (residential trees in Bakersfield and commercial
trees Maricopa) and San Bernardino (commercial trees in Redlands and residential trees in
Mentone) Counties. The dogs alerted on multiple locations (29 trees total) and every tree that the
dogs alerted on was sampled and qPCR was conducted by CDFA and USDA labs. The samples
were tested on multiple primers by USDA and all of the results were consistent. All results were
negative except on tree in San Gabriel. The tree was removed on June 18. There is ongoing
sampling being done on these trees. The CDFA and USDA are in discussions about looking at
other diseases that may impact the trees health. This was good information that gives a starting
point for future dog team visits. There was a question about sending samples from these trees to
other EDT’s and CDFA and USDA are working on developing a protocol for this. Beth feels that
this is a great opportunity to get samples to other EDT’s to see if they pick something up prior to
PCR.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.