

Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011
Doubletree Hotel; 3100 Camino Del Rio Court; Bakersfield, CA 93308

CPDPC Attendees

Craig Armstrong, Richard Bennett, Steve Birdsall, Dan Dreyer, Bob Felts, John Gless, Jim Gorden, Nick Hill, Link Leavens, George McEwen, Mark McBroom, Jim McFarlane, Kevin Olsen, Dr. Etienne Rabe, Kevin Severns, Brian Specht

Guests

Jill Barnier, Richard Lee, Robert Kreuger, Vic Corkins, Ed Civerolo, Louise Fisher, MaryLou Polek, Shirley Kirkpatrick, Debby Tanouye, Jill Barnier, Bob Wynn, Larry Bezark, Susan McCarthy, Tanya Goodson, Nancy Holland, Kirkpatrick

Call to Order

Chairperson Nick Hill called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

Roll Call and Introductions

Bob Wynn conducted the roll call and announced that a quorum was present, followed by introductions of committee members and guests.

Public Comment

No public comments

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chairperson Nick Hill welcomed members and guests and thanked Debby Tanouye for addressing Klink's annual meeting.

Approval of Minutes from January 19, 2011 Meeting

MOTION: A committee member noted that the reference to the Saticoy Pest Control District should be corrected to read Saticoy Lemon Association. It was moved and seconded that the Committee approve the minutes of the January 19, 2011 meeting, as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

Form 700: Annual Financial Statements

Larry reminded members that the annual financial statements are due on April 1 and asked that members send them to Sacramento.

At the last meeting Bob Felts and Dan Dreyer asked if these meetings qualify for continuing education credits with DPR. Larry made contact with Valerie Ruvalcaba who administers the program for DPR. After describing past committee meetings and content, she indicated that these meetings would qualify for credits. Committee discussions/presentations on treatments could be used for 1-2 hours of general credit, while legal discussions about Committee activities could meet laws and regulations credits. To request the credits the CPDPC must submit an agenda 30 days in advance of the meeting, complete an online form and a remit a fee. The CPDPC can request the number of credit hours for each meeting.

Budget/Assessment Current Status

Susan McCarthy provided updated information on the current financial situation. She noted that \$1.3 million had been collected in January. She also discussed the process of updating the documents to present the financial information in a more understandable way in the future.

Southern California Operations Update

Debby Tanouye showed maps and discussed the most recent finds and treatment activities.

- Imperial County: treated in Seely area and no new detections
- San Diego County: new detections in Dulzura and San Ysidro, treatments are complete
- Riverside County: treatments are complete
- Ventura County: foliar treatment is complete. Imidacloprid treatment is pending – when soil temperature increases.
- San Bernardino: no new detections, still treating. Rancho Cucamonga, Loma Linda and the Upland area remain to be treated. Public meetings are scheduled for those areas the first week in April. These are large areas that will require 5,000 to 6,000 mailers for those areas.
- Orange County: completed treatments in Santa Ana, now treating in Irvine and Huntington Beach
- Los Angeles County: treatments occur every day; a public meeting is planned for Pomona the week of March 21, followed by a treatment. The Maywood area will be treated after Pomona, then Long Beach. Studio City treatments are 70% complete.

Question: How many crews are currently being used how many in Orange County vs LA County?

Answer: Seven crews at find sites in Los Angeles and Studio City and Tru-Green has five crews in Huntington Beach. Three crews in Orange County, plus Tru-Green. At least one crew is in Los Angeles at all times. If conditions in other treatments areas are not suitable for treatments, crews are pulled from those areas and used in Los Angeles.

Question: How many finds were repeat finds and to what the repeats could be attributed?

Answer: In the Maywood area there are about 56 repeat finds which could be a result of an expansion from adjacent treatment areas (such as East LA). Every find site and adjacent property is treated within two weeks of a find, but CDFA has not been able to keep up 400 meter treatments in the area. Not enough personnel and equipment to handle all treatments

Question: The expenditure report indicates that about ½ as much money has been spent in Orange County as in all of Los Angeles County. You've been really active down there?

Answer: Yes, Tru-Green is being used to try to help clean-up that area. Then move over to San Bernardino County, then put everything back into LA. Although, at least one crew is working in LA at all times.

Question: How many sites can be treated in a day?

Answer: It varies, depending on the property. In the Santa Ana area a condominium complex had to be treated. Since there was no gate access to the backyards, treatment crews had to use ladders to enter the properties. Under more normal circumstances, about 15 properties can be treated per day.

Question: What about the individual in Santa Ana who has been questioning Department activities in response to the ACP?

Answer: He was invited to the public meeting but did not attend. He subsequently refused to let the Department treat his property, started following treatment crews and attempted to get property owners to refuse treatment. Unfortunately, when he called Bayer for information they gave him incorrect information because the Bayer representative was not aware of CDFA's SLN for Tempo. He has since received correct information from Bayer but he still thinks that CDFA is operating illegally and has contacted city officials to notify them. Debby noted that she had sent a letter to the city manager in response and, that whenever CDFA schedules a public meeting, public officials in the affected area(s) are notified but do not usually attend. OEHHA and DPR have also discussed the treatments with this individual.

Question: As a result of this individual's talking to his neighbors, have there been more refusals?

Answer: No.

Question: Did this individual allow CDFA to place a trap on his property?

Answer: No, but some other property owners who refused treatment have allowed traps to be placed on their property.

Question: Couldn't we have more dialogue with this individual and perhaps reimburse him for tree removal?

Answer: CDFA staff has spent hours on the phone answering his questions and discussing the issues. He is not interested in a buy-out, but seems interested in running for political office and using this as a platform.

Question: Is it worthwhile to make personal visits to city managers in treatment areas?

Answer: CDFA has already made some personal visits in the LA area, and probably a good idea to continue. Louise Fisher of CRB noted that Cerrell Associates has been conducting outreach to various government groups in the area. David Pegos indicated that CDFA will continue to make personal visits as needed.

Question: Do property owners have the option to refuse treatment?

Answer: Yes, but most property owners do not refuse, especially when they realize that it's a one-time treatment.

Question: Should we continue to let property owners to opt out? If so, how can we enforce commercial producers to comply? I thought a big part of CDFA's involvement in the program was due to their enforcement authority.

Answer: In a situation where we can't achieve eradication, we can't use our enforcement authority. Bob Wynn noted that in Ventura, the objective is eradication and that it's a mandatory program there. If a grower refuses to treat, someone has to take action to make them treat. This would first fall on the ag commissioner. The commissioner uses his abatement authority to treat the grove or residential property because it's a nuisance and standing in the way of the objective of eradicating the pest. But the county has to provide the funds for the treatment. If there's a lack of resources, the county may not be able to act. Then it falls on CDFA which has the same authority to treat. Since CDFA does not have funds for ACP treatment, CPDPC money would have to be used. Larry added that CDFA does have the authority to mandate treatment but that it

requires a court hearing. The infestation in LA is so intense, that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to make a case for eradication in the LA area. Bob Wynn referred to the gypsy moth infestation in Ventura County and that CDFA had to demonstrate that they had delimited and defined the infestation and that the product(s) to be used would be very effective in getting rid of the population. Even so, CDFA still had to have police accompaniment to properties that were going to be treated. Nick Hill noted that neither the Committee nor the Department wants to push the issue to the point of getting sued and that's another reason the outreach effort is so important.

Question: What is the mechanism for the county or CDFA to recoup treatment costs?

Answer: Steve Birdsall noted that, at the county level, a lien may be placed on the treated property. Bob Wynn stated that CDFA has the same authority but it's time consuming.

Question: Is there a correlation between repeat finds and untreated properties?

Answer: It's difficult to answer that question because not all properties are being trapped. Once a psyllid is detected, all surrounding properties within 400 meters are treated, regardless of its trapping status.

Question: Has CDFA noticed if outreach efforts are effective with homeowners?

Answer: Difficult to tell.

Question: Has anyone refused treatment where there has been a find?

Answer: Yes, in the LA area.

Question: I had always understood that CDFA could conduct pesticide treatments when it was deemed necessary but now I see that there is a court process involved. Is that correct?

Answer: Yes, if the property owner refuses, he has a right to due process. CDFA would rarely pursue this course.

Question: Under what scenario could you foresee taking this action?

Answer: With the current situation, in an area which is an outlying area, with a low identifiable population and our objective is to eradicate that population, CDFA would do that. Glassy-wing sharpshooter is a good case in point. South of the grapevine, that pest is established and half-way through Tulare County. But if it's found in places like Napa, Sonoma or Santa Clara where we have an eradication program in place, then we would do that. Same with this situation.

Question: Who decided that we are not in an eradication program (the CPDPC or CDFA or both) in the LA basin and when was that decision made?

Answer: It's all of us together, including the science and technology folks. The primary consideration that goes into the decision is the availability of an effective lure to attract the pest to a trap to kill it or to trap it for determining the extent of the infestation. In the case of ACP, no lure is available. With no lure on a trap, it is difficult to use that in a court to define an infestation. That's one of the criteria that a judge reviews. And then, do you have appropriate tools to kill the pest. We have that. Since we don't have an effective lure, it's very important to continue to fund the research into volatile lures.

Bob Wynn noted that there have been references to the Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) project and that problems arose with that program due to aerial treatments. No aerial treatments have been proposed for ACP eradication. In contrast to ACP, CDFA did have a very effective

LBAM lure and could define the infestation. However, since CDFA could not demonstrate the damage caused by the pest, it could not establish that it was an emergency.

Question: If treatments are maintained at the same level, what is the forecast for treatment-related expenditures?

Answer: CDFA has looked at the remaining areas to be treated. There are about 70,000 parcels still to be treated in LA. CDFA expects that the amount budgeted by the Committee for treatments will be about \$2 million less than is needed. That's one of the reasons that CDFA has put priority on the areas along the border to prevent infected psyllids from entering California.

Question: Why are so many crews being used in Santa Ana when central LA is probably a higher risk area for introducing HLB?

Answer: Because of the relatively light infestation in Santa Ana, CDFA thinks that eradication is possible in that area.

Comment: It's very important that the Committee knows what its budget is, year-to-go and what funds are available.

Response: Susan will bring that information to the next meeting and Debby has established cost accounting codes for each county so that the expenditures could be tracked by county.

Question: What's the follow-up on Ventura? All quiet up there and the sprays have been done?

Answer: CDFA did the Tempo treatment and is going back this month to do the imidacloprid treatment. The soil has been too cold until now.

Question: What is going on with Agrian and how will that interface with what CRB is doing?

Answer: The paperwork for the contract with Agrian should be completed the week of March 21. Then data can be entered electronically in the field and Agrian can manipulate the data as needed. The data will belong to CDFA and CDFA can share the data with the CRB. iPads will probably be in use in the field in April.

-Action item: Susan to schedule a meeting with Agrian, PDEP and CRB.

Memorandum of Understanding with Citrus Pest Control Districts

Susan McCarthy summarized bill language and the current requirements for an MOU to be in place by July 1, 2011 with the three pest control districts that are associated with and currently funding citrus Tristeza activities (the Central Valley Pest Control District, the Southern Tulare County Citrus Pest Control District and the Kern County Citrus Pest Control District). Funding for these districts is estimated at approximately \$2 million annually.

Etienne Rabe moved, seconded by Jim Gorden that the following be adopted:

Whereas the AB 281 Committee was formed by the Citrus Disease and Prevention Act and charged under sections 5930 and 5931 of the Act, in consultation with the Department, to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Citrus Pest Control Districts to provide management and funding for the implementation of the Citrus Tristeza Virus Effective Plan no later than July 1, 2011 and,

Whereas the AB 281 Committee is not yet structured, either financially or management-wise, to address this issue by the mandated July 1, 2011 date,

It is herewith moved that the Committee recommends no funding or operational involvement for FY 11/12 and that this action shall be reconsidered no later than July 2012 for FY 12/13, and it is resolved to request the Department to draft an MOU between the AB 281 Committee and the pest control districts along the above outline, which would satisfy the stipulation in the Act for consideration by the Committee, at the next meeting.

Following discussion, the motion was approved by the Committee.

Preliminary Trapping Analysis

MaryLou Polek presented Ted's overview. CDFA's trap card data has been shared with CRB, and added to a database and computer mapping program. The next steps will be to develop questions to be asked through analyzing the data. The estimate to have this process completed is expected to take approximately two months.

Other Items

Bob Wynn announced that Larry Bezark is retiring and this meeting will be his last. The committee thanked Larry for his efforts over the past year. Bob indicated that Susan McCarthy will be working with the committee in the future, and that one-hundred percent of her time will be devoted to the Committee and associated issues. Susan McCarthy gave a short resume of her work experience.

Bob noted that Karen Ross, the new Secretary of Agriculture, is receptive to the idea that the Manager should have a direct-line to the Secretary due to the importance of this program.

Subcommittee Reports

Louise Fisher, CRB, presented a budget overview of the communications program (attached). She noted that both Cerrell Associates and Nuffer Smith Tucker will be providing monthly reports (attached) to the CRB and covered recent JIC activities. She also discussed several venues at which outreach on the ACP and HLB was provided and the outline for outreach activities provided by Cerrell Associates. She noted that Cerrell Associates is working with Southern California Edison and Los Angeles District of Power and Water to have flyers inserted with utility bills.

Board members questioned the inclusion of the \$20,000 for the trapping analysis in the communications grant. Louise answered that the \$20,000 was included in the outreach and communications grant because the paperwork for that grant had not been finalized.

Question: What about the PSA airings in areas outside of California?

Answer: Louise said that she was already following up on that.

Question: What are the reserve funds to be used for and what will happen to the reserve funds (\$83,000 on the report)?

Answer: These are funds that were not specifically allocated and if they don't get spent, they will not be invoiced.

Kevin gave the following report from the Outreach Subcommittee:

- Need some kind of system for print materials
- Develop an inventory system that is transparent to all involved. Maybe place on Sharepoint? Louise to work with CDFA and USDA to see what is doable.
- Work with Louise to act as a clearing house for requests of printed materials
- Louise to put together a current inventory of all materials
- Want to rework some categories in next year's budget so that print materials are "called out" to a greater extent, yielding more transparency and planning ability
- Ascertain where the current stream of requests fits with the current budget and provide a forecast of material demand. Initially, rely on NST to help. That's part of their business.
- Offer print materials through links, so that recipient can print his own materials
- Look for sponsor for printed materials
- Utilize outside funds whenever possible, so that this Committee is not the only source of funding for printed materials

Science Subcommittee update by Etienne Rabe: The subcommittee consists of George McEwen, Steve Birdsall, Jim, MaryLou Polek, Beth Grafton-Cardwell, Etienne Rabe and Ed Civerolo. They have yet to contact Kevin Hoffmann to see if he wants to participate. Science Subcommittee has held two teleconferences. The first teleconference focused on determining role without duplicating existing efforts of other groups. They want to function as a conduit for requests from the Committee to appropriate sources. This subcommittee will teleconference prior to each full Committee meeting.

Transition Subcommittee: Kevin Severns reported that the subcommittee had not met since it last reported to the Committee.

Science & Technology Subcommittee Report

MaryLou Polek noted that there is increased interest in using nutritional systems to prolong the productivity of HLB-infected trees and that it's important to be aware that these nutritional do not "cure" the tree. Also, she stressed that psyllid control is especially crucial when growers use nutritional instead of removing infected trees since the infected tree will be a source of inoculum. When psyllids lay eggs on infected trees, the nymphs feed on the tree and can then infect other trees throughout their life span. MaryLou added that the when infected psyllids repeatedly inoculate a tree, the effect seems to be exacerbated in the tree. She also discussed the progress being made on the development of compounds that have attractant properties. It is estimated that there might be a compound to place in the traps by the end of the calendar year.

In reference to the use of green vs yellow traps, MaryLou noted that the green traps cost about \$1.15 each and the yellow traps cost about \$0.40 each. She stated that, in her opinion, the green trap does not offer enough increased efficacy to justify the added cost. She added that Kris Godfrey and Debby Tanouye will be deploying both yellow and green traps at the same locations to determine how the traps function under California conditions.

In response to a question about HLB replication within a tree, MaryLou noted that it is known that the bacteria is known to replicate within the tree but can be very unevenly distributed.

Report from the CHRP Council

Joel Nelsen reported that in January, USDA indicated potential budget reductions to the California share of the CHRP. Joel and Mike Wootton went to Washington and were told by USDA officials, the potential \$2 million cut would be reduced to \$1 million; further recent discussions with USDA indicate there will be no reductions in funding this year. USDA is going to fund activities (\$3 million) in Northern Mexico with dollars outside of the CHRP program (leaving CHRP funds for existing programs).

Other Items

Mark McBroom asked for information about the Sweet Orange Scab (SOS) Quarantine in Arizona. MaryLou Polek answered that SOS was found in Arizona within the last month, as well as 11 counties in Florida. USDA will issue an interim rule sometime around March 25. Joel Nelsen discussed quarantine activities in Texas indicating that fruit must be washed and waxed, not just de-leaved, and that despite trace-backs, SOS has not been found in California. He added that due to SOS finds in Arizona, fruit coming from Arizona into California will have to be washed and waxed.

Nick Hill asked about the status of leafy material in citrus shipments. CDFA talked to affected counties, and USDA has stressed with Arizona that citrus must be commercially cleaned.

Date and Location for Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 10:00 a.m. April 20, 2011 in Riverside.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.