

Citrus Pest and Disease Prevention Committee Meeting
Wednesday, April 20, 2011
Doubletree Hotel, 222 N. Vineyard Ave., Ontario, CA 91764

CPDPC Attendees

Craig Armstrong, Steve Birdsall, Bob Felts, John Gless, Jim Gorden, Gus Gunderson, Nick Hill, Link Leavens, Mark McBroom, George McEwen, Kevin Olsen, Dr. Etienne Rabe, Earl Rutz, Brian Specht

Guests

Ted Batkin, Joel Nelson, Jill Barnier, Vic Corkins, Louise Fisher, MaryLou Polek, Debby Tanouye, Tina Galindo, Robert Leavitt, Helene Wright, David Pegos, Bob Wynn, Susan McCarthy, Linda Haque, Tom Roberts, Brett Chandler, Dan Galbraith, John Gardner, Rick Dunn

Call to Order

Chairperson Nick Hill called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Roll Call and Introductions

Susan McCarthy 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. He gave a brief overview of the residential pesticide treatment that he, Jim Gorden, David Pegos and Susan McCarthy had observed the previous day, noting that most homes in the area had at least one citrus tree and that the property in question had upwards of 100 trees to be treated.

Approval of Minutes from March 9, 2011 Meeting

It was moved and seconded that the Committee approve the minutes of the March 9, 2011 meeting, as read. The motion passed unanimously.

CPDPC Manager Duties

Susan informed the Committee that she had reviewed the manager's duty statement developed by the Committee and had discussed with her superior's at CDFA and all agreed the duty statement was in line with job expectations for the position. Susan noted that she had arranged for continuing education credits for PCAs and private applicators under the category of "other".

Budget/Assessment Current Status

Susan McCarthy provided a balance sheet and budget (attached) and reviewed with Committee members. Committee members requested that the items, "Reserve for Economic Emergencies" and "Unreserved Funds" be moved from the balance sheet and added to the budget sheet. They also requested that columns for expenses to date, percent of budget expended to date per budget item, and remaining balance per budget item be added to the budget report. Susan agreed to make those changes and send out revised spreadsheets with the draft minutes.

CPDPC Newsletter

Kevin Olsen reported that the Outreach Subcommittee was unanimously in favor of developing a newsletter and led a discussion on developing and mailing out a newsletter to growers about the assessment and Committee activities. He noted that it was important to emphasize that the newsletter was coming from the Committee, not the government and that packing house education was also important. The discussion centered on content of the newsletter and the frequency of issues. The newsletter would be mailed to every grower on the list maintained by CRB. A committee member questioned why the information couldn't just be incorporated into the Citrograph. The subcommittee thought it was important to have a stand-alone document. At the request of a committee member, Susan agreed to include an item in the first newsletter notifying recipients how they could opt to receive the newsletter electronically in the future.

MOU with Citrus Pest Control Districts

Susan discussed the proposed MOU (attached) with the committee. **It was moved, seconded and passed to proceed with the MOU.**

Communications Report

Louise Fisher provided an update on CRB outreach activities, including press releases, seminars at home and garden shows and master gardeners' groups, radio spots, and working cooperatively with Ventura County Farm Bureau.

Louise addressed the question of PSAs being aired in other states and noted that there is no additional cost to the Committee for those PSAs.

Ted noted that he had met with the LA City Council and the Pasadena City Council regarding the ACP and that the two groups would add items to their Facebook pages. Ted is going to follow up with other cities in the area. He also noted that various city officials would be adding links to their own Facebook pages.

Additional Funds for CRB Activities

Ted addressed the committee regarding the \$300,000 that had been awarded to the CRB in the previous fiscal year but for which no grant or contract had been generated. \$135,000 of the work was completed in the Committee's previous fiscal year and the remainder in the current fiscal year.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to establish a \$135,000 grant for the previous fiscal year's work.

Another motion was made, seconded and passed to augment the current fiscal year \$620,000 grant by \$165,000 for a total outreach/communications grant in the current fiscal year of \$785,000.

Committee Procedures

Susan discussed adopting a set of bylaws for committee procedures and noted that other boards and commissions have existing bylaws that could be used as templates in developing bylaws for the CPDPC.

Southern California Operations Update

Tina Galindo provided an update on public meetings and pesticide treatments in Southern California. She noted that there had been no ACP detections in San Diego since January, 2011, and in Imperial, there have been four detections.

Trapping Analysis Results

MaryLou Polek and Rick Dunn presented some results from the spatial analysis conducted by CRB, consisting of time-lapse maps indicating finds and treatment areas. She noted that, in addition to the current data analyzed, tree age and variety and negative trap finds should be factored into the analysis. Ted said that the message so far from the data analysis is that treatments are working and that additional analysis may provide answers for making the program more efficacious.

Subcommittee Reports

Etienne Rabe reported on the science subcommittee teleconference which involved developing a set of questions that should be asked of the data analysis.

The questions included:

1. Is the current treatment effective? And can the data answer that?
2. How do conditions (tree age, variety) affect efficacy? And what leads to retreatment?
3. Are we making a dent in suppression?
4. What do outliers mean?
5. What level of suppression would be considered effective? (MaryLou says no amount of data would provide an answer).
6. Develop a set of criteria for best use of money.

Report from the CHRP Council

Joel reported that USDA is committed to funding CHRP next fiscal year at the same level as this year.

Public Outreach

David Pegos reported on communication activities by CDFG. He outlined the process for notifying residents and public officials prior to public meetings and pesticide treatments. Find-site residents, plus residents within the 400 meter treatment area and an additional 100 meters around this area all receive an invitation to the public meeting. The numbers of residents notified for a treatment may vary from less than 100 to upwards of 2000. The agricultural commissioner and staff are also invited to the open house. At the open house, a number of CDFG, DPR and OEHHA staff man stations to answer individual's questions. Within 1-2 weeks of the public meeting, residents receive a pre-treatment notice. Following completion of the treatment, the resident is sent a notice that treatment has been completed and thanking them for their cooperation. Public officials receive a proclamation of emergency project (PEP) as well as the same information as residents. CDFG also provides briefings for elected state officials from affected areas.

Other Items – Treatment Options

Jim Gorden noted that last year the Committee had directed Debby to focus on knocking down the outlying areas, then to pull back towards LA. A discussion on treating psyllid populations in Los Angeles followed.

Motion: The committee acknowledges that the executive committee may meet to decide on additional expenditure of funds for urban treatments prior to the next meeting. Motion seconded and passed.

Date and Location for Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for 10:00 a.m. June 15, 2011 in Bakersfield.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.