

**Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee
Executive Committee Webinar Meeting
August 12, 2025, Minutes**

There was a quorum of the Executive Committee, and the following were in attendance:

Executive Committee Members:

Kevin Ball	Mark McBroom	Keith Watkins
John C. Gless	Kurt Metheny	

Executive Committee Members Absent:

CDFA Staff:

Carl Baum	Alex Muniz	ThuyVy Truong
Joseph Damiano	Lauren Murphy	Nilan Watmore
Paul Figueroa	Keith Okasaki	Jason Wu
Anmol Joshi	Michael Soltero	
Dahmoon Maesomy	Ned Thimmayya	

Other Attendees:

Kathryn Bronsky	Dr. Saurabh Gautam	Marcy Martin
Dr. Rob Clark	Christopher Greer	Mia Neunzig
Casey Creamer	Dr. Subhas Hajeri	
Dr. Dhiraj Gautam	Hailey Jones	

All participated via webinar

Opening Comments:

Keith Watkins called the meeting to order at 2:02 PM, welcoming Executive Committee, guests, and staff. There were no public comments.

Keith Okasaki recapped that at the July full Committee meeting, the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) Legal Office provided training on the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Act). The Act applies to all advisory boards like the Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee (Committee). On the recommendation of the CDFA Legal Office, all agendas for the Committee and all subcommittees will state public comments will be limited to three minutes per agenda item. In accordance with the Act, it is recommended that committee members do not attend subcommittee meetings in which they are not members. If the members do attend, they must refrain from commenting and will not be unmuted by the person running the meeting.

Approval of Minutes:

Keith Watkins motioned for approval of the last Executive Committee meeting minutes that took place on June 20, 2025, at 10:00 am. The motion passed unanimously.

Regulatory Decision Update:

A recent Administrative Court hearing was completed. Normally when a nursery with outdoor citrus plants becomes included in the huanglongbing (HLB) quarantine, the nursery is provided the options to protect the plants within an approved structure, plant them on-site, or voluntarily destroy the plants. However, a nursery in Southern California chose none of the options and challenged the regulation in court. The matter was brought before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ); after two days of hearings, the ALJ ruled in the Department's favor.

Central Valley Pest Control District Discussion:**a. Alliance of Pest Control Districts (APCD) Activities and Budget:**

Dr. Subhas Hajeri presented the APCD budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025-26. He presented the counties and districts that are currently part of APCD and discussed the roles of management and staff within APCD. There are a total of 17 full-time staff and 14 seasonal staff.

Ninety percent of APCD's budget is dedicated to Asian citrus psyllid (ACP) and HLB activities. The APCD budget covers trapping, trap screening, commercial multi-pest inspection, laboratory work, mapping and maintaining a grower database, pest control business license to treat non-commercial properties with 25 or more trees, and grower engagement (outreach). APCD's total budget for activities is \$2.9 million, which includes administration, field work, and laboratory operations. Trapping costs are divided by the total funding allocated to trapping by the number of traps serviced. The cost to service each trap is \$19.66, plus \$5.64 for trap screening and lab analysis. In total it costs on average \$25.30 per trap.

APCD anticipates servicing 5,500 trap sites (including fall and spring season) on a bi-weekly schedule, resulting in 49,500 trap services. During the off season (winter and summer), 805 trap sites will be used resulting in a total of 2,657 trap services. There are two inspectors conducting multi-pest survey activities in commercial groves where border trees are inspected. In FY 2025-26, APCD anticipates surveying 600 properties, inspecting 30,000 trees, and collecting 3,000 plant samples and 30 insect samples.

To support the field activities the lab conducts several testing activities such as trap screening, ACP samples, commodity samples, research samples, and growers submitted samples. This lab testing is to improve the sampling and testing method for the lab operations; thus, being able to share the findings and methodology with the science subcommittee.

APCD has two full-time mappers, which map approximately 180,000 commercial acres. New maps are drawn every three to five years. In addition, they concurrently update the Grower Database with ownership information, point of contact details, and other relevant information.

b. CDFA Activities and Budget:

Keith Okasaki presented the FY 2025-26 budget for CPDPD's activities in the Central Valley. The budget includes three offices – Fresno, Visalia, and Shafter with 28 permanent full-time staff. Activities include residential and commercial multi-pest survey, residential and commercial trapping, regulatory, and residential treatment. CPDPD does not conduct eradication activities on commercial properties so there is no established budget for treatment on properties with 25 or more citrus trees. In total CDFA services 5,410 traps on commercial properties on a monthly schedule at a density of one trap per 40 acres. Of the 5,410 traps, 2,147 are serviced by CPDPD staff, while the rest (3,263) are serviced by Pierce's Disease Control Program's staff. Previously, the CPDPD data team coordinated with APCD to reduce trap redundancy. The traps are serviced monthly as recommended by the Science Advisory Panel (SAP). Delimitation traps and visual survey are used following a detection as SAP advised that visual survey and live collection were the most effective method. CPDPD has effectively eradicated all ACP populations in the Central Valley with this approach.

For grove trapping, APCD traps are serviced bi-weekly with a total of 5,305 trap sites. The total projected cost for all operations will be \$1 million. CDFA traps are serviced monthly with 5,410 combined trap sites and are projected to cost \$459,002, which includes personnel, operating expenses, and trap screening. APCD's cost per trap is \$25.30 and CDFA's is \$9.06.

For commercial multi-Pest survey or commodity survey, the goal is to survey approximately 20% of commercial citrus per year. A total of 212,163 acres were surveyed in Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, and Tulare counties, resulting in a target of surveying 42,432 acres per year. Surveys are done seasonally during the fall and spring when symptom expression is best. APCD's projected budget of \$247,746 covers surveying 25,800 acres and 30,000 tree inspections. CDFA's projected budget of \$405,995 covers surveying 42,432 acres and 1,697,280 tree inspections. APCD's survey costs \$9.60 per acre and \$8.26 per tree inspected while it costs CDFA \$9.57 per acre surveyed and \$0.24 per tree inspected. This is a seasonal operation for CDFA; all costs include salaries, and benefits for staffing, and operational costs.

CDFA does not conduct commercial treatment for ACP detection on properties with 25 or more trees and, accordingly, does not have a budget for this activity. CDFA treats residential properties in response to ACP detections. As CDFA does not treat commercial properties, APCD's involvement in conducting properties with 25 or more trees would be a welcome activity and benefit to the program.

Conclusion:

The consensus is that both presentations were good with well-presented information and a breakdown in costs between APCD and CDFA. The main goal is to find cost-saving methods and reduce redundant activities. Kurt Metheny questioned whether cost savings is the goal and if CDFA is cheaper, then why don't PCDs stop collecting

assessments and discontinue duplicative activities. No recommendation was made, and both presentations will be presented to the Committee in September.

Closing:

The meeting adjourned at 3:27 pm.