

Citrus Research Board Office

CRB/CPDPC Joint Operations Committee Meeting
CRB Conference Room
217 N. Encina Street
Visalia, Ca 93291
Minutes of Meeting
July 11, 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* Vice-chairman CRB Ops
Dan Dreyer
Kevin Severns
Jim Gorden
Joe Barcinas*
Kevin Olsen

CRB Staff:

Ted Batkin
MaryLou Polek
Brian Taylor
Louise Fisher
Rick Dunn
Cynthia LeVesque*
Brent Eickelberg
Marilyn Martin

CDFA Staff:

Susan McCarthy
Robert Leavitt
Art Gilbert
Debbie Tanouye
Tina Galindo

CCM

Bob Blakely

Ex-Officio

Earl Rutz – CRB Chairman
Nick Hill, CPDPC Chairman

*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 on June 6, 2012. There were no changes.

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

a. Financial Report for CRB Operations

Louise Fisher

Fisher stated the financials were for May. In the May Operations Meeting the committee authorized reallocation of funds to cover some SQL contract work. Funds were shifted from training and phone within the Data Management budget to cover that SQL work. There were no further financial issues to cover.

Detection Update

a. Trapping Program Report

Art Gilbert and Tina Galindo

Gilbert reported that they are replacing a trapper in Bakersfield this week. Since the last Ops meeting there have been 33 finds of ACP down in Southern California. Gorden asked, and Gilbert confirmed the 33 finds were traps in commercial citrus and some with multiple finds. Gilbert stated there are about 9,000 ACP traps out in Central California from the San Joaquin County down to Kern and over to the coastal counties; and another 289 traps out at 71 packing or juicing facilities and another 108 traps out at 11 nurseries.

Galindo referred to a list she made of the current ACP finds in groves. Some of the groves are within current treatment boundaries, some are not. Galindo stated it needed to be decided if there should be meetings for all or prioritize the areas and have meetings for treatment for those groves that are not within current treatment areas. The ones that are in current treatment boundaries, she has the crews notify the blocks around them to get them treated. One was a trap placed inside of a packing house and they did treat the block around it.

Rutz asked about the visual sampling of ACP on the trees near where the traps have positive finds; is there a lot more on the tree than are on the traps? Galindo stated Magally Luque-Williams has been taking a team out to these groves to do a visual survey; they are not done yet but so far have only found one location that had ACP.

Olsen asked Gilbert if it is still part of the trappers' protocol, when they are servicing the trap to also be looking around that area for visual finds of ACP on the trees? Taylor stated it was part of the protocol. Gilbert stated that the trappers are probably still doing it then because he hasn't told them to do anything different. Gilbert stated he would check into it.

a. HLB Survey

Tina Galindo

Galindo reported that they've completed their first survey in the Zone 3 area, which is the 2 times per year survey requirement. They're finishing up, probably by next week, in Zone 2. In August they will be returning to Zone 1 for the third survey (out of 6 per year). Galindo stated they have been able to send crews out to do visual surveys at new find sites throughout the county and test that material as well. They are now waiting for the county-wide protocol. Fisher asked if there was something that would show the treatment schedule that could be used in outreach to communicate to the growers and Galindo stated she could provide a schedule of treatments, though it may not fall exactly on those dates.

Treatment Update

Galindo referred to her list which reflected both inside and outside treatment areas and areas that need to have meetings for treatment. Galindo showed the committee the spreadsheet that reflected current treatment areas and boundaries in Orange County, San Diego, Imperial, Los Angeles, Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

Galindo reviewed Orange County map that reflected two ACP finds in Yorba Linda groves that were inside the blue line. The map also showed the Irvine detection where they're currently treating.

The Riverside County map showed the recent grove finds and the most recent CDFA detections as of 7/06/12. Galindo stated there are a lot of areas that need to be moved into. Galindo reported there were crews in four eastern areas that had finds; a few trucks in Romoland finishing that up. There is Moreno Valley and some areas out of the current Riverside area. There are some new detections out in the Cabazon and Beaumont area. Between the grove finding sites and these new detections, where are we going to go next? Olsen asked how many were found in each county and Galindo responded 30 in Riverside, 10 in Orange County; and then find site treatments were 30 in Riverside, 2 in San Diego and 2 in Imperial.

Galindo showed the map of the recent Coachella find with a second find about one mile south. The 800 meter area did have two residential properties to treat and were completed yesterday. Olsen asked if it was a residential trap and Galindo stated it was a delimitation trap.

Galindo showed a map of Imperial County that reflected the most recent activity in that area, like Salton City, Desert Shores and Niland. They just had two meetings this week for treatment in Desert Shores and Niland and there are two trucks there now.

Galindo reviewed the properties to treat in Riverside and other So. California counties and the four areas they have moved into in Riverside (Areas 10, 11, 12 and 13). They were able to move into those four areas on June 19, after the meeting in Ventura. They've had 10 treatment days out there so far. At last month's Operations Meeting they were at about 1 or 2% complete in those four areas and are now at 11-19% complete since June 19th. Some should be complete next week, like Orange County, so the crews can be moved to other areas. Galindo also reported that there was a detection in Sun Valley (San Fernando Valley), that has an entirely new 800 meter area and will need a meeting there, so the crew will be going there next.

Galbraith asked Galindo what would be her recommendation for where the treatment should go. McCarthy brought to the committee's attention the treatment budget. McCarthy said that last month in Riverside County \$1.2 million was spent on treatment. McCarthy referred to the treatment expenditures sheet provided the committee. There is only a little over \$2 million treatment money to be expended over the next 3 months (July – September). These numbers have to figure in to the discussion of treatment plans. Leavitt concurred, stating he is very concerned about the burn rate and amount of money being spent on a monthly basis; he doesn't think it is sustainable for very long. Batkin asked what was in the reserves because the decision this committee needs to make, along with the whole Board, do we continue to treat at the rate we are treating and go into reserves to make up the difference, or do we reduce the amount of treatment. McCarthy stated that at the beginning of the fiscal year, the total budget was \$16,797,757. With all the changes that have occurred during the year, no area-wide management program in place, the reduction in the CRB trapping program, the amount that CDFA has projected for the trapping, the enhanced HLB survey and Hacienda Heights, and the support for Tamarixia, McCarthy is projecting expenditures of \$15,395,505, which is about \$1.4 million under the original budget that was approved by the department. There is also \$4 million in unreserved funds that if we were to go over the \$16 million approved budget, she would have to go back to the department and get that approved, which then has to be approved by the governor's office. The concern is the rate at which the money is being spent in Riverside County alone (\$1.2 million in June).

Gorden expressed his concern and stated we need to take a hard look at pulling back and focusing on areas adjacent to commercial citrus with this treatment program and try to protect those areas. Gorden stated he felt it was part of the reasoning last month of pulling out of the northwest section of Riverside County and going back towards the southeast and working through the UC Riverside area and the areas that have the commercial citrus. Gorden said he thinks areas 10, 11, 12 and 13 covered those areas but isn't sure how far that takes us. We may be able to do a fair job of filling in around the commercial citrus areas with the kind of funds we have, and maybe that would be somewhat sustainable. Gorden stated he knows we are looking at a lot bigger problem than what we have dollars and it looks like we're just digging ourselves deeper and deeper.

McCarthy asked Gorden if he is saying we should stay in areas 10, 11, 12 and 13. Gorden responded stating to look at pulling in and treating in areas around the university for now and in the areas where we have commercial citrus. We might want to redraw or rethink how we are going to approach the urban areas adjacent to commercial citrus; what we might have funds to actually do. Certainly, within 800 meters of commercial citrus, we ought to be looking at treating right now.

Severns asked Tanouye and Galindo, if money were no object, do they view this as something that is just getting so far out ahead of us that it is unmanageable? They concurred. Severns said then it is not a money thing, it is the fact that it is exploding that has got us.

Olsen deferred to Gorden's point, which he supports; if we were to blow all the money on trying to do something that is unsustainable, he thinks we need to keep in mind, for the future, that if or when there are additional HLB finds, we want to be able to operate with an iron fist into those areas and make this a sustainable program.

Barcinas stated what he has been seeing out in the field in the last two months, the finds he has seen in Riverside and in the Mentone and Redlands area, it is just getting bigger and bigger; we really need to look at this again and re-evaluate. We are still on the summer flush and don't know what is going to happen; possibly more psyllids are going to be emerging in the next flush in the fall and will really be a bigger issue.

Batkin stated maybe the blue line concept has exceeded its usefulness; rather than being a blue line where we're not treating, the lines we should be looking at are the lines where you do treat. Maybe be a little more aggressive at 1,000 meters, based on the flight patterns that we've been told about the psyllids. The zone around the commercial would be the treatment areas. Batkin said the only accepted argument he can make on that would be perhaps the San Fernando Valley and those areas up there because if it's not exploding in that direction we can continue to spot treat up there and keep it from moving in that direction. It appears, when you look at all of the epidemiology of this pest, it is moving to the east and to the south at a rate more rapidly than we can go after it. When we made the decision to notch out the Riverside area, we didn't have these detections in Riverside. This thing moves faster out ahead of the treatment; we saw that in Los Angeles and then we saw it move out into the San Gabriel Valley and now it is moving out beyond that. Perhaps it is time to do as Gorden and Olsen have said, keep the funds for fighting where HLB is. We know that it exceeds the one tree in Hacienda Heights. Maybe it is time for a complete reversal in thinking for drawing lines.

Hill asked if under the direction of this committee, recommend to CDFA staff to put together an action plan for the next full CPDPC Board on adopting the 1,000 meter treatment around groves or commercial areas, if that's possible, and how viable that is. If this committee wants to recommend the CDFA staff do that, maybe we can change direction if that is what we feel we need to do.

Chairman Galbraith asked the committee what they thought about doing away with the blue line concept and moving out to the commercial areas.

Dunn interjected that in addition to treating around the commercial citrus, we should treat aggressively in the HLB zone. He suggested being very aggressive within the 1,000 meters of that detection because in managing the vector, it is critical to managing the spread of that disease. Gorden stated that is a special case there. Gorden said he just offered his idea as a suggestion; the fact that we need to rethink this whole thing, and not necessarily solidly proposing the 800 meters, but some area that we could afford around the commercial citrus and around the university. Gorden further stated that we need to have a pretty good pile of funds to get this HLB survey going if that is something that we can accomplish. He doesn't think we want to burn through everything; we want to save some money for that project.

Rutz stated he supports the comments that have been made. He further stated he would like this committee to think about the future and how similar will the circumstances be to dealing with groves as with the residential, as we move through the battle there. Will there be any parallels we see here and will that drive any decisions on how and when to spray? If you're spraying for ACP in the groves continuously and then HLB comes to the groves; do you have an arsenal left in the growers' pocket to fight it at that point in time? What is going to happen next? It shouldn't be left off of our radar as we go through the process.

Hill stated we also need to think about the publicity end of this. If we start moving assets to protect orchards, we need to go to those growers and ask them to treat, telling them that we've been buffering them as best we can but now they need to step up and spray. It might go a long way to help the growers think that we are at least using their money to try and protect the groves as much as possible.

Chairman Galbraith stated he thinks we're just expanding the base of potential infestation sites and we're clearly losing the battle with chemicals. He feels we need to be pushing on the biological control deal more and start putting them in there to start reducing the pressure.

Chairman Galbraith asked the committee what they thought about Hill's suggestion about having the staff come back to the meeting next week with a recommendation on how they would attack or protect the commercial buffer zone. Hill asked McCarthy if they could do this in that amount of time (meeting next week). Tanouye thought it was possible and wanted to confirm 1,000 meters around the grove. There was further discussion regarding the existing 800 meters vs. 1,000 meters (which is flight distance of ACP) and it was decided to go with the 1,000 meters.

Dreyer thinks that protecting the university and the buffer around the commercial growers is key. A concern that comes up is, what about the last stand-out of commercial in islands of urbanization? That becomes an issue in his mind, to at least be addressed or looked at (i.e., Redlands area).

Gorden stated we need some kind of an idea of how big a job this is. Hopefully everyone can work together on coming up with a plan. Dunn stated he has been working with Casey and Colleen on the Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego and Imperial commercial grove layers. Tanouye stated they have been working off of an old one.

Gorden said that as we approach this, he would like to see this viewed and approached as much like an area-wide program concept as we can.

Tanouye stated the conversation has been focused on Riverside; they're finishing up in Orange and they're still treating in other counties where there are spot ACP detections. Tanouye asked if those were part of the equation or are they going to wrap up those treatments and continue to treat there. Chairman Galbraith stated he would like to hear Taylor's presentation and then come back to this whole issue.

Taylor reviewed a map that reflected recent ACP detections near commercial citrus from June 1 through July 3. The ACP find range was from San Diego County in northern Fallbrook out to Coachella, along with Hemit and finds in the Redlands and Riverside areas. Taylor stated San Diego County involves two orchards and is very much a rural area. CDFA has had their public meeting there and are already doing treatments. Taylor reviewed Orange County finds; one being in a historical park, the old Irvine Ranch with only about 40 trees there with residential around it. The other two finds were in Yorba Regional Park further north. It is on the northern side of the blue line; so it is not in the residential treatment program. There are no residential finds around it. It is also an organic grove. They are going to go in and do oil treatments and monitor heavily. Barcinas is the PCA for that area, so he will closely watch. Barcinas reported that it is about 15 acres and it is 4 parcels. Taylor also reviewed a map of Coachella, in northern Imperial County with two finds out there.

Taylor reviewed the Riverside map, stating there have been a number of finds at UCR and then a number of finds along Victoria Avenue since the first of June. There is a new find that was confirmed today right next to Dwight Holcomb's property. Taylor reported a low level of cooperation from these growers, maybe at 25% and most don't even respond to notices sent to them. Alan Washburn's group and Dwight Holcomb have been helpful. Taylor stated he was going to talk to the Ag Commissioner to see if he can add some sort of additional pressure.

Galbraith asked Gorden, in his scenario, would we continue to do the 800 or 1,000 meters around those commercial blocks. Gorden wasn't sure, not knowing how big of a job that would be. Gorden stated he proposed that as an alternative rather than just throwing in the towel completely in that area. He's not sure we want to go there right now. Galbraith asked if we've abandoned everything except for the 1,000 meters around the commercial. Gorden stated that Batkin brought up the caveat to that, maintaining a fairly vigorous response in the San Fernando Valley yet, in that area out to the north and the west towards Ventura County.

Taylor was asked what kind of acreage or number of trees would be considered commercial out in those areas he has been talking about. Taylor stated 5 acre blocks, or 2 to 4 acre blocks if a house is set there. Galbraith asked what the largest block of acreage is out there and Taylor said there are some 20 acre blocks in there. Severns asked if they were grove managed or individual owners

taking care of them. Taylor stated individual owners; there are good people out there like John Gless, Alan Washburn, Dwight. But about 50% of them don't have anybody. He has talked to some that say they have Redlands Foothill Packing House but they didn't pick anything last year so they didn't make any money and aren't going to treat. Taylor stated Eagle Valley is basically all abandoned. It has been replanted with avocados, which they're watering, but all the citrus is just slowly dying and is being kept as a buffer of dead trees between that and the avocados so people don't see the avocados out there.

Leavens asked Taylor if its commercial citrus that you are going to protect, is there a clear delineation between what is viable and what's not? Taylor answered no, there is no clear delineation. Those growers that are active, that have a packing house and a true interest in growing are fine. It is the ones that are just there, with a old family house that still has four acres and they don't really farm it. Batkin stated that one of the issues we're dealing with along this Victoria Avenue area is that there is a citrus historic preservation regulation in there that don't allow those homeowners to remove their citrus. It is part of a greenbelt law in Riverside. They put it in because they didn't want to lose their heritage of citrus; but these people that bought these homes in there, and even though they may not want citrus trees, they can't take them out. They are under the preservation rulings and are caught between a rock and a hard place. This adds to this definition of commercial citrus. They aren't required to water them, but they are required to keep them so they are caught up in a catch 22 regulations and rules. Batkin stated this is another consideration we have to take into account.

McCarthy stated her understanding of it is we're not going to be treating any of these areas except around commercial citrus. If these people themselves are not treating, there is no way that CDFA is going to treat a buffer around an untreated grove. We can't make that case to a homeowner that we're going to come into their backyard and apply these pesticides to protect this grove owner who is not going to protect himself. If the decision goes towards not treating in this area except to protect commercial citrus, we're not going to put up a buffer around that untreated grove. Leavitt stated CDFA can't afford the public relations that would happen if they were saying the justification of treatment is to protect commercial groves and then have the commercial grower talk to reporters that they're not going to do anything.

Taylor went on to Review the Redland and Mentone area, stating that this area, unlike Riverside, we do get fairly good cooperation. Taylor stated they elected amongst themselves to go into an area wide treatment program. The three big management companies that are out there, which probably manage about 75% of the groves, have all gone to their constituents and are saying they want them to treat. One of the spots being treated is the Redlands Foothill Packing House. Taylor stated he had Gilbert direct one of his trappers to put up a couple of additional traps actually inside the packing house. Most of the traps that were there were set-up where incoming fruit is delivered and we've put up a couple of additional traps on the exit side of it where the packaged material goes out. There is no requirement from CDFA Pest Exclusion to do any additional regulations if a psyllid is found at a packing house. We wanted to show that there actually was no infested fruit being shipped out. Severns expressed concern over that being sensitive information about being partners, that if there was a psyllid, regardless of the fact that it doesn't go out on an ag product. Taylor stated that in the Redlands area there are pockets of commercial citrus; so in drawing 1,000 meters out, it is fairly simple to come up with a defined boundary. Taylor shared an email from

Chris Boisseranc of Larry Jacinto Farming in Redlands. Taylor stated it echoes what Barcinas has also seen out there and it's frightening.

Galbraith asked Leavitt about the PR situation. If there is a homeowner who has a small grove around his house and isn't taking care of it, but is next to a grove that is being farmed and the farmer wants to spray and he does, but the other guy doesn't, what do we do with that? Leavitt stated it would be okay then because we could say we were protecting something. There are two issues of clarity; the public relations issue and this is a suppression project, which is not quite as clear. Leavitt stated they do this all under what is called a Proclamation Emergency Project. Leavitt further stated that to some degree, their authority is based on the fact that we're protecting somebody. If somebody turns around and says they don't want CDFA protection, he's not sure what their authority is and would have to go back to the lawyers and ask that. As long as there is somebody in the area that is a legitimate grower saying thank you for protecting me, then he thinks they're okay. McCarthy said if he still refuses to treat then there is the issue of somebody has to treat and it has to get paid for. Leavitt concurred stating somebody does have to treat, that is the bottom line. We're treating in residences, which means we're introducing pesticide into the environment; some people say there is a public health risk, though we all know it is low. So what is the justification for doing that? There has to be a benefit and if we say that we're protecting someone that grower should legitimately be spraying to protect themselves. Leavitt stated they have a very hard time justifying residential treatments if the people they're supposed to be protecting aren't going to take positive steps to protect themselves. That is both a public relations issue and it also might affect our authority as well.

Leavens asked if there is any way we can make some kind of a policy that comes from the committee to give the troops cover. If they are making subjective decisions on whether it is a good grove or whether to abandon it; he's not sure how to do that. We may have to cut our losses at some point and let the troops do what is going to be effective in those areas that are worth protecting. Leavitt responded first to the abandoned groves. While we are in the suppression project phase, there is little we can do other than work with the industry and hopefully the packing houses will put enough pressure on growers to get those sprayed. Leavitt further stated that once we're in an eradication process, then the agricultural commissioner can declare abandoned groves a public nuisance and they can work with the land owner and be dealt with in some way. Leavitt said they were successful in working with the ag commissioners on the European grapevine moth, in both Fresno and Napa Counties. They've had 100% compliance from landowners once they realized the land would be declared public nuisances. They do have tools to work with abandoned groves, but we're not in that situation here because it is a suppression project.

Leavitt went on to talk about the commercial citrus; in the food and ag code regarding the pest control districts, he believes in particular, *Tristeza*, that 25 trees or more, by definition, is considered commercial citrus; whether they are harvested or not or if they're sold or not. They are in the process of adopting that for this project and it looks like that is going to be the working definition.

Leavens stated if there is only 25% compliance and you've got "X" amount of groves that are essentially abandoned, do you go back to the concept that we've got "X" pool of money to deal with and when resources are gone, from a pragmatic standpoint, we need to give Galindo and

Tanouye some guidance so that we maximize the efficiency of that pool of money. Leavitt agreed, but the first step is to ask the lawyers in Riverside County, what exceptions there are to this rule. If public nuisance is an exception to this rule that they have to keep these trees, then what power does the city or county commissioners or ag commissioner have then, even in a suppression project, to declare them a public nuisance doesn't force them to be forced out. We need to clarify what the law is first and what room we have to maneuver. We're in Riverside and Redlands now, and will have these questions for there. We are eventually going to encounter it, in some form or another, in the whole state.

Batkin stated the difference in Redlands is that the city has actually adopted those trees and manages them. They use Larry Farming to treat them. We need to use the city of Redlands as a model and ask Riverside to look at what Redlands is doing; then we'd solve this issue with that treatment. Severns asked if it is possible to approach it with a perspective that if this is the ordinance that Riverside has, then they are, in essence, responsible for those trees? Batkin stated they've never asked question, but suspect there is always that possibility of a discussion. We need to get a real clear definition and that is really a simple phone call to the ag commissioner there. John is very good and he is on our side; he would like to do anything that he can to help us. Blakely asked if there was any desire there to consider repealing that ordinance, given the circumstances. Batkin stated that's not a track we would want to take first; let's try to get it fixed first rather than ask him to repeal a law that they've had in place for a very long time and would be going up against a lot of historical direction. Leavitt concurred, stating to try flying under the radar first.

Gorden stated he thinks it is an evolutionary process that we're in and feels we're evolving toward the day where we're going to be living with ACP and using area-wide treatment and looking like crazy for HLB in all these areas where we have ACP established. Hopefully we get looking for HLB on a real intensive basis soon. Looking for ACP is going to be evolving.

Chairman Galbraith deferred back to Hill's suggestion. Do we want to make a recommendation to the full committee that we retrench and just protect commercial areas of citrus around the 1,000 meters or so? Olsen asked if the motion would be specific to the Riverside and L.A. areas specifically or everywhere? Galbraith stated he thought in general, statewide. Blakely stated before we figure out if we are losing this battle, we better retrench and figure out the bigger picture of the HLB possibly breaking out. We don't want to burn up all of our money and think it would be a statewide coordination. Severns asked if it pops up somewhere in Visalia, what would we do? Blakely stated you would take it event by event, location and what is going on. Visalia is a different animal compared to down in Riverside and that different animal needs to be treated in a different way. Maybe make the cut at the existing ACP quarantine boundary.

McCarthy asked Tanouye if out in Imperial and some of those areas where the finds are scattered, is it still worth going after it? Tanouye responded stating they did the largest treatment initially and that seemed to suppress it. Now they're having pop-ups in Salton City. They've been able to maintain and suppress it for a couple of years now in areas where they've had a jump on it like Imperial and Coachella. If you're talking about quarantine then Coachella Valley would be part of that because that area is also under quarantine. If there's more psyllids in Coachella then we would not do any treatment except to protect the commercial citrus. The blue line also came down

into Orange County.

Rutz stated that in looking at the different areas and how things should be dealt with, do we continue doing spot treatments, like in south San Diego County, where one or two spots in the county have been treated in the past and not many psyllids are there yet. Rutz would like to see us maintain our presence in those areas since it appears to be suppressing in those zones. If you lose the suppression concept in an area, you retrench in any area. Rutz stated a lot of thought to what happens in this (San Joaquin) valley is very important; but there is the Hemet area and a little in Coachella area and some areas in his living zone where there are concentrations of citrus and he doesn't want to lose track of that either. So maybe in areas where this thing is really exploding, we really pull back and try to fight it at the edge of commercial groves and where we have spotty outbreaks, we still stay after them until such time the circumstances change. Severns agreed with Rutz. We shouldn't give up the war in the areas where we haven't lost those battles yet. In the areas where it is pretty clear we need to do some retreating, so be it. Severns further stated we have this breeding population in L.A. and it seems like it has moved south. We haven't had an issue coming from Tijuana up. Is it just because of the treatments we've done down there. Batkin stated we do have a very active treatment going on in Tijuana, on the Mexico side of the border. Leavitt stated they have a lot of refusals in Tijuana, a lot of areas where they just can't get into; they have a lot of blockades, a lot of hacienda-type places where they just can't get into. So while they've done a great job overall in Tijuana, they still have a lot of skips and misses. What we first thought four years ago when this started, that a lot of psyllid would blow up from Tijuana, he doesn't think it is. However, he believes it is blowing from Los Angeles east and that explains everything we're encountering. Tanouye stated they continue to fight psyllids in Tijuana and they continue to treat where they can. There is a small area along the border that we have been fighting psyllids but we've been able to maintain the treatment there fairly easily.

Batkin stated we have not had a report at either Ops or any of our other meetings recently of what is going on in northern Baja, across that whole area. If we could get either Sergio or someone to give us a good thorough report of what is really occurring there, that would tell us. Has there been any testing of psyllids found on the Mexico side for HLB? Leavitt thought there was but couldn't confirm. He believes Javier and his lab down there does exactly that. Leavitt stated we should be able to get a report from down there because they do get maps.

Leavens asked if it was any different from the L.A. basin, the knowledge of any HLB in the psyllid population. Batkin stated this should be discussed further down the agenda today. Leavens stated he liked the idea of having the staff go back and talk about it at next week's meeting so it could be moved forward on. Leavens further stated he thinks to abandon these larger areas is a big mistake because once you start getting pockets, as we've seen in Riverside, it is going to explode while we're buying time with the *Tamarixia*. Leavens agrees with Olsen's original concept of retreat and protect those viable commercial orchards and let's utilize the forces as effectively as we can.

Chairman Galbraith asked if someone would like to give a motion to recommend to staff on this.

07.11.2012.1 Gorden moved and Olsen seconded that we have the staff prepare a revised plan to approach the treatment in a manner that would reflect this discussion over the next few days and

be presented to CPDPC at next week's meeting. We still want to knock down the outliers, like San Fernando Valley and we want to stay with Coachella, Imperial, San Diego, where we get flare-ups, at this stage of the game. Then pull back to a 1,000 meter area wide treatment concept of adjacents to commercial citrus in the Riverside, San Bernardino area. We could always cut back to 800 meters if the committee deems it. This policy will replace and eliminate the blue line.

Motion passed unanimously.

Laboratory Activities

a. Riverside Laboratory Activities

Cynthia LeVesque

LeVesque reported that they had 985 pooled CDFA ACP samples that they tested and 124 variety collection from Bethke project plant samples that they extracted and analyzed. LeVesque reviewed her current staff as 3 permanent full time; 1 lead trap reader and 5 part time trap readers. Hepa filtration system was installed on June 23, 2012 and all biosafety cabinets were re-certified on June 25, 2012.

LeVesque reviewed the lab's time frame for goals handout which was provided the committee. LeVesque went on to review the automation lab budget proposal for 2012. This proposal was the result of an April conference call that was called by Dwayne Schnobel from CDFA to discuss how both the CDFA lab and the CRB could increase their throughput. This lab budget proposal is their proposal based on evaluating a number of automation options and staffing options. LeVesque proposed hiring a lab manager through promoting a current technician to that position. LeVesque said they were going to be trying to get into more methods development, allowing Kavitha Madishetty and herself to be able to spend more time working on methods development and working on tech transfer things. LeVesque said she spends a lot of her time doing office management type things that could be turned over to someone that has a good management background. John has a really strong management background and also a strong computer background. He has written some programs that have facilitated their ability to input data into the ABI's and to streamline the process of setting up runs on the ABI. He is now in the process of re-writing the import files for SampleWare to import the data from the ABI's because of software updates for that instrumentation. John has been very helpful in doing these kinds of things.

LeVesque reviewed the current time expenditure that is spent on all of the different aspects of processing both insect and plant samples. In both cases, the processing time is the most time consuming. If they can follow through with the proposed modification of the plant processing procedure, they should be able to bring that down by about 50% but they need tissue to validate that. Automation options will affect the extraction and the Q-PCR time and cost.

LeVesque stated that in doing these things manually, the most efficient way to do both the extraction and the PCR is to handle 5 plates a time. If you do a single plate it takes 3-1/2 to 4 hours, but every additional plate only adds about an hour to that. It is extremely labor intensive and would be very difficult for somebody to do day in and out.

LeVesque reviewed the Upgrade to Automation to Increase Throughput. They looked at a whole range of semi-automated to fully automated and also looked at a number of extraction options; focusing their attention on the Mag Max. This would allow them to continue using the same

magnetic bead based chemistry that they're using now. They had an instrument in the lab and were able to use their current extraction kits. It worked just fine, out-performing their extraction kits. They wouldn't lose any of the materials they currently have in stock and would be able to transition to the automation, using all of the consumables that they already have.

The instruments that they've settled on is the VIAFLO 96 at \$21,955 and the Mag Max Express which is from ABI, and costs \$33,782. LeVesque stated they are going to demo the I-Motion in the lab this month. That is the robot that CDFA has purchased for the Sacramento lab. LeVesque feels they need to look at it and in the experiment that they are going to be doing, they will be able to make direct comparisons because they will be using our current procedure and they'll be using the robot. They will be able to see if there is a significant difference between them. The only problem with the I-Motion is that it is about three times the cost of the Mag Max.

LeVesque reviewed what would be required to get this increase in sample throughput. If they were to do this all manually, they would have to have at least two additional technicians and three additional lab aids which would be an additional \$133,500. With automation there are three different options. With option one, if they just got a VIAFLO 96 that would assist doing extractions, they would want to have another lab aid just to count for increase in sample flow. It wouldn't really get them to a very large increase in samples; even using the robot, it would still take a considerable amount of time to process an individual plate. For option two, if they get a VIAFLO 96 and the Mag Max, they would need two additional lab aids to assist with the extraction PCR process, along with the increase in samples to be processed. That would be \$55,737 for outlay in equipment and an additional \$49,000 for salaries. In this case, the VIAFLO 96 would be located in the reagent hood so it could be used for all the PCR set-up and that would basically cut that time in half. The third option would be to have two of the VIAFLO 96. If you look at the average hands-on manpower cost per sample, it's not a significant improvement.

LeVesque reviewed page 18, which reviewed what they would have to do to reach a doubling of their throughput. The cost is clearly most fiscally advantageous to go with the Option 2; they could very comfortably double their throughput using that option.

LeVesque reviewed the current cost per insect sample and per plant sample as compared to what the cost would be if they go with Option 2. The total cost per sample is now \$5.97 for insect sample which includes salaries, rent and everything else. With Option 2, including proposed staff increases and equipment increases, it would be \$6.01 of which \$3.43 is for materials.

LeVesque stated they also looked at increasing the Q-PCR throughput because as it is with two ABI 7500 FAST instruments, they can process approximately 12 PCR plates (12-96 well plates). That is the number of plates needed to evaluate 5-96 well plates of samples. They wanted to see if there was a way to increase throughput for the instrumentation. One would be to trade-in their 7500 FAST for the new Quant Studio. The Quant Studio has a 384-well block; the list price is \$94,000 and we would get a trade-in value of \$23,500 for our instrument that cost \$50,000 four years ago. The total extended price would be \$70,500 to go with Option 1. With Option 2, we can trade in our 7500 Fast and get the 384-well plate and also get the open array block, which allows you to evaluate 110,000 data points in about 8 hours. It is a lot more expensive, but we basically recoup almost the entire purchase price of our 7500 FAST. The QuantStudio can be

equipped with a plate exchanger, so it could run around the clock unattended.

LeVesque strongly recommends that we add the lab manager position this year and implement automation Option 2. We could hire additional laboratory aids as sample numbers increase. We can add the auxiliary equipment as needed. LeVesque stated we should seriously think about the instrumentation upgrade; though clearly at this point it is not essential. When they have the E-Motion in the lab that the CDFA lab has, they are going to be doing a comparison of their current procedure and they are going to go on campus and use the MagMax that is in Dr. Vidalakis' lab so they can evaluate that instrumentation with samples of potato psyllid.

LeVesque reviewed the proposed 2012-13 budget which includes all the equipment. Chairman Galbraith asked LeVesque what it was that she was recommending for now. LeVesque responded saying she would like the lab manager and the Option 2 of getting the single carousel and the single VIAFLO 96. With that, they would be able to handle twice as many samples without any problem at all. That would make the most sense right now. Batkin confirmed these recommendations are for the upcoming fiscal year which LeVesque agreed. Batkin stated this gives the committee time to review it now and discuss it at the next meeting. Olsen asked if this was a concept proposal and perhaps at the next meeting we will have questions and will be able to go from there and Batkin agreed.

Polek stated she knew there was one of the pieces of equipment that the USDA Germplasm Repository has that you can interchange the plate. LeVesque responded saying that one of the things that was attractive about doing the upgrade to the QuantStudio, the repository recently purchased a VIA7, which is the Q-PCR instrument between the 7500 and the QuantStudio. It takes the same blocks as the QuantStudio and one of the blocks that they want to buy is what is called the card block. With that system you load a single sample into 48 wells all at one time, so you basically interrogate with 48 different PCR measurements. They want to use this for testing nursery samples and so the cost per sample would actually only be \$56 for all the different tests. They are developing all of these PCR equivalents of the nursery testing procedures; so the idea is if we bought the QuantStudio and our lab is ultimately going to be taking on all of that testing. When they needed to do the testing, they would simply borrow the blocks from them and they've already agreed to do this. With this instrument you can exchange the blocks, you don't have to do any recalibration when you exchange blocks. That would be a further convenience and basically ultimate savings; we wouldn't have to do anything special to do the nursery testing that way. Polek stated for clarification to the committee that it is able to test for more than one disease at a time. LeVesque concurred and stated you can have 48 different reactions and so you could have multiple targets for individual diseases.

Batkin stated for this joint committee to understand, not all of these costs go to just one program. Some of these things that she is talking about are going to be applicable to the CCPP and things outside of the CPDPC. When we get to the actual allocation of these budgets, some of these items will go to the CRB side of the budget, some of these will go to the CPDPC side of the budget for testing purposes for HLB. This isn't intended that all 100% of this budgetary responsibility go to the CPDPC side. Things like methods developed, those are the responsibilities of the CRB. In moving forward with the proposed budget we will look at where those differences and trade-offs are and how this concept of improving the lab gets possibly split between two organizations.

b. Sacramento Laboratory Activities

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy stated that she and LeVesque had a really good discussion over the phone about comparing the two methodologies. There have been questions about CRB pooling the maximum of five ACP per sample and CDFA does up to 25; CDFA uses slightly different methods which feeds into that. Ben Li, who developed the procedure that CDFA uses at Meadowview, has said that you can pool up to 100 using his method; we max out at 25. McCarthy stated that doing this comparison is a great idea and will be moving forward with that.

McCarthy stated that CDFA is in the process of validating a high throughput system to use as a regulatory method. Right now they can only use it for screening, so if there is a positive we have to confirm it by the slower, expensive way. But CDFA has been working on validating a high throughput system for regulatory purposes, which will help out in the long run.

McCarthy provided the committee with their requested CDFA Laboratory Activity for ACP and plant tissue samples over the last few months. Batkin stated, as a point of clarification, in regards to the change in regulatory process, both laboratories will be able to do that confirmation process since our lab is a USDA certified laboratory. It doesn't mean it has to go from one and then to the other. It will become a nationwide change in the accepted protocols for certification. Batkin stated in talking with APHIS, whatever it takes to certify a sample, we will change our laboratory procedures to those protocols.

Barcinas asked LeVesque if the lab would consider taking some independent samples from outside. LeVesque stated yes, she didn't think there would be any problem with them doing that. Barcinas asked if there was any specific way that LeVesque would want that sample taken, like an aggregated sample from one tree, separated out. LeVesque said she thought it would be best if Barcinas could separate adults and nymphs, although the lab could separate if they had to. But definitely, take from a single tree. You want to be able to go back to the specific tree if something comes up positive. Leavens asked LeVesque if the samples could be put into a Ziploc. LeVesque stated to collect them in 95% ethanol. LeVesque said she can provide vials and ethanol if an issue.

Data Management Report

Rick Dunn

Dunn reported that they continue to work with Art Gilbert and his staff on getting the daily work done in the data management department. Dunn is providing mapping for Taylor. Dunn is also working on the statewide citrus layer development. The primary difference over the last month has been completion of the digitizing of the Tulare citrus polygons. A total of nearly 117,000 acres of 7,000 polygons. They have assigned GID's to 100% of those. Dunn has just received a freshly consolidated statewide shape file that he will be sending up to Colleen based on their previous discussion. Dunn stated that at the last CPDPC meeting, there was a proposal for supplemental funding to assist with this data attribution by the Kearney lab. Dunn stated he was hoping to have it addressed at the next CPDPC meeting since it was not a quorum last time. Galbraith asked Dunn if Kris hired an intern. Dunn stated she has a couple that have been hired.

Report on Taking New Disease Technology to the Field

MaryLou Polek/Ted Batkin

Polek reported that after the only HLB detection in Hacienda Heights, it would be a great time to

take advantage of actually seeing some of the research that the CRB has been supporting in the past, how well it actually works in the field. Polek got together with Taylor, who got together with Galindo and the Cristina Davis group from UC Davis, who has developed the sniffer. The actual equipment is called an “Easy Nose.” Taylor and Galindo worked with Alex in Cristina’s lab to work out a week and to get properties that would suit the needs of Alex. That was done during a week’s time and ten trees were seen, some being at the same site. The data has been analyzed and they (Davis’ lab) did come up with some suspect positive trees. These trees would be asymptomatic, not showing HLB symptoms, but emitting volatile organic compound signal, or signature, that would indicate that that tree could be infected with liberibacter.

Polek, Batkin and Ed Civerolo, Helene Wright, Leavitt and the CDFA group had a conference call. They talked about needing to collect tissue from those trees periodically and testing through our regular method of PCR. What this could potentially tell us is what the titer level is and when would be an appropriate time for us to collect plant tissue samples for HLB analysis. The ultimate goal is early detection of HLB trees before the tree develops symptoms so that a regulatory action could take place early so that tree would not provide inoculum to spread to surrounding areas.

Polek stated that Taylor collected plant material that was run by the CRB lab. Everything came up negative through PCR, but LeVesque’s group also processed the lyophilized tissue and sent that tissue up to Carolyn Slupsky’s lab at UC Davis, who is looking at early detection methods as well, but using metabolimics. Polek said she hasn’t had a report from her yet. We are taking a bad situation and trying to maximize use of it to get as much information from that situation as we can, looking for early detection methods and verifying these methods. Polek stated even though these trees are suspect positive, there is no regulatory action that can occur at this point. They really are doing information gathering and confirmation. Batkin wanted to confirm that it wasn’t a non-certifiable sample. Had it been positive, it was a CDFA collected sample and therefore a legal certified sample. Taylor confirmed that CDFA took the sample but it went to our lab.

Blakely asked if the end result was to find out if these trees would turn positive, then we could have this instrument certified so that these early detections could have regulatory actions? How difficult is that to do? Leavitt stated that right now, the only certified methods are the laboratory method with the DNA. USDA, as he understands it, requires that there be no doubt that the trees have HLB. Leavitt thinks this is pretty good technology and thinks it will prove out to be 100%; but basically we’re going to have to go back to the USDA and ask them to evaluate it to see whether or not they will accept it. Right now they won’t but there is a process they can go through. He thinks the basic idea is that this is the tree’s response to the infection. The obvious questions are; is there anything else that could infect the tree that could cause the same response, therefore giving a false positive? Leavitt stated he’s asked that question and both Batkin and Polek stated that based on the results of this machine in Florida, there is not. But being USDA, will have to go through a lot of hoops and bounds to prove that. He thinks we’re heading in that direction and he is willing to, with everyone’s support in this meeting, ask the USDA to head in that direction, but he thinks it will be a slow turnaround, and feels we need to get that process started.

Batkin stated there are a lot of validation steps, a lot of questions that need to be answered but we’re moving in the right direction on it. Batkin further stated that the other thing that has come

out, we now have a strong indication of what that host plant response is; that when the liberibacter attacks the plant, what is going on inside of the tree that creates this host response. We always knew there would be one, now several laboratories at Riverside have stitched together what that host plant actually is. We're getting closer and closer and as those things go, that just adds to the database to validate this process and being able to take it to a regulatory tool.

McCarthy wanted to make sure that everyone understood that the trees tested were suspect positive and not confirmed positive. Polek confirmed, stating they can't be positive until there is a positive PCR.

Dunn asked if there was a plan to continue this type of sampling in that vicinity on additional properties? Dunn stated that ten trees is a very small sample to get a statistically valid result. Polek responded, stating she didn't know what APHIS would require. Polek thinks scientifically you would need more than ten trees to verify it. They have verified pretty reasonably, with a high level of confidence, in Florida. Severns asked if it was 10 trees and 10 samples? Polek responded, no, there were multiple replicate for each tree. Batkin stated that another point is that where this is experimental, there has been two years of field testing already that has occurred on this in multiple climates and in multiple levels of humidity, temperatures and everything. We are not starting at the beginning at the beginning of this phase, we're starting at the end of essentially the research and development. We now have enough field validation on this, that it is ready to go out and start this level of testing. Batkin further stated that the problem we're going to face with this is that validation requires measurement against known positive trees vs. known negative trees. That is difficult to do with HLB because we know that you can have a known positive and you have suspect trees all the way around it. There are a lot of steps that have to be gone through with this. Cristina has been getting, on her testing, a 95 to 98% reliability difference between known positive and known negative trees. This isn't just guess work, you have to separate in your minds between a research prospect and a regulatory actionable item. Leavitt stated we can certainly use it and are using it as an alert system and in response, we continue to increase our samples and our visual surveys so that we can respond if we get a positive by the DNA. Leavitt reminded the committee that when talking about removing trees, we are talking about removing private property or seizing private property and in the eyes of the law, it is a very big step. There are very big legal hurdles that have to be jumped over to take that very big step.

Tanouye asked if there was a recommendation on how frequently we should take samples of those leaves? Polek answered stating if it could be done once a month. Galbraith asked Polek if there was any point in continuing on with VOC testing on those trees in the future, or once you detect it, that's it. Polek stated that would still be a benefit, also some trees that are in that same vicinity.

Batkin reminded the committee that this is an ongoing research project; it is not over and this next year's proposal goes from UC Davis to commercialization, is to develop a small handheld device that does this accurate and faster in its response time than the suitcase. This will be more like a dust buster type of a handheld unit. It tentatively comes out this first year starting in October, will be the handheld unit and a field deployable unit on a manned vehicle. Those are the two intended outcomes in the next 12 months starting on 1 October.

Bio-Control Task Force Report

MaryLou Polek/Ted Batkin

Polek stated that last Monday, Batkin, Ed Civerolo and herself went down south and stopped in Hacienda Heights and then went on to Riverside. Their objectives were to take a look at a whole entire process. The project is to take the research into mass rearing for mass releases. Right now, it is Mark Hoddle from UCR, Richard Stouthamer from UCR and David Morgan from CDFA. The program is that David Morgan and Ben Rangel at the Rubidoux facility are raising the plants. The plants are then going into the rearing cages where different population lines, she believes there are 13 population lines of *Tamarixia*, are being raised and then weekly, the adult wasps are harvested. Half go back into the boxed plants and then the other half is available for release. Both Hoddle and Morgan have been doing releases and Brian Taylor was out with one of those research groups doing some releases, as well.

Polek stated they wanted to take a look at what was going on and to make sure the process was running smoothly. Things were running smoothly, as great as we would have liked them to. Polek stated she thought they were back on track; there were some differences on how the plants were to be grown and potted, but thinks they're past that now.

Batkin stated he spent the better part of last week working on this in a number of different fronts. The current status is that the little glitch in the rearing of the plants is improving. The working group on Thursday gave recommendations to Morgan and Beth on some changes that would improve the plants and make the plants more robust as they go into the rearing facilities. They were focusing at that meeting, strictly on improving the plants. However, he then met with the leaders of Stouthamer, Morse and Hoddle and Morgan and talked about further strategies. There are some things that are in the works that are important for this Operations Committee and for a report that we'll give to CPDPC as to direction of where we're going. We're limited by space on the UCR campus to conducting research in that facility. It is not capable of producing *Tamarixia* at the level of doing releases into the urban environment or to do anything more than conduct research experiments. Since our meeting on Monday, the 13 lines have expanded to 17 lines because the Hoddle's brought five more in from Pakistan; so we now have 17 different strains that are being reared separately in the facility. This is a critical point to remember; those 17 strains now are being blended and released into the urban areas for the specific purpose of seeing which of those 17 strains survive, parasitizes and continue. That process will take from 6 to 9 months to evaluate that mix that is out there. From that the scientists will recover strains that survived and so it's the survival of the fittest in the field that after six or seven generations, then they will recover back the strains. They may be cross-strains, but they will recover a strain that has high fitness in the field. That then will become the colonies that go into a mass rearing or a second generation of what we call classify; classify is a commercial level of production.

Batkin went on to report that they had a report that just went out last Friday that APHIS has now stepped into the game and has offered to build facilities in California. Their original plan was to build them in Salinas, but that has been re-thought and agreed that it is probably going to be in Southern California. What has happened now, the APHIS people from Mission, TX who have been developing *Tamarixia* are now going to be merging in with our taskforce, working with us on bringing new plants into California that work extremely well as a rearing plant. But more importantly, bringing dollars into the program and expertise, so that we will accelerate the movement from our development of the strains that survive here into the ability to actually rear

them on a mass rearing basis; and Joe Barcinas, who is part of this committee, is part of that working team to move this from experimental work into commercial production. Batkin further stressed patience; we have to go along with the biology. We can't accelerate biology beyond its own pace, but that pace is moving very rapidly right now. In parallel, a number of things need to occur and will occur. We need to keep this effort of getting the correct mix of the strains of *Tamarixia* that survived and are the fittest and have that as the base colony, but we have to do all of the infrastructure development of building facilities and getting techniques for rearing in a mass rearing element. It is different than rearing in the university environment for small production. It's a work in progress; we have some of the best people in the world as part of this task force team and they're not just Californians, they're from Malcolm USDA and we'll bring them in from wherever we can into that mix.

Batkin stated there is a bio-control task force through the CHRP program (scientists from a broader arena) and that group will be meeting in Ft. Collins, CO in the end of August and we're getting more input and support from them into this. The whole purpose of the task force is to do what we laid out to do originally and that is to build this in three steps: Phase 1 – getting the experimental process through and to getting the right strain; Phase 2 – beginning to get into the commercial levels of production; and Phase 3 – is the long term strategy so that we have a sustainable program that will go on into perpetuity. We're now moving and completing phase 1 – we're getting the correct strains and we're starting to move in and develop the strategies for phase 2, which is the commercialization of this and move forward. It is moving as rapidly as we possibly can. The strategy includes a sustainable method for providing *Tamarixia* to the whole state of California for this process. Sustainable not only scientifically but economically; who is going to pay for it over the years; how it is going to be funded and where we're going to build the facilities. We have the Cal-Poly facility in play on this and ready to essentially start the action on it at any time. We have the first green house to go out there. These things are all a work in progress and there is a tremendous amount of energy going into that process.

Rutz asked if any *Tamarixia* have been recovered yet in the field, and if so, have they sequenced? Batkin stated they are in the process of sequencing them now. They have recovered some but those have only been out there for several months. They want to let that continue to build and grow. Stouthamer is in the process of looking at those original recoveries to determine what it is. Rutz asked about sustainability. Is there a thought process as to how the private sector can be part of this sustainability and the funding that goes with that? Batkin stated that is a big part of it. It is the sustainability question; how do we get a sustainable funding base under these activities so that the private sector, by investing in this, will not just have a rapid increase and then fall off the cliff in a couple of years. In order for this to be sustainable, there has to be an economic plan that will keep the private sector constantly fed so that they would be able to sustain production over time.

Galbraith asked Batkin, based on his best estimation, when we might see some significant release? Batkin stated, based on conversations, if everything works as it is drawn-up on the chalkboard, we should be able to look at pretty significant releases as early as Spring 2013. We have to let the strain melding occur and buildup and then they have to be taken into the facility and reared up.

Severns stated since there is already talk about seeing the strains meld, is there evidence of them reproducing in the field. Gorden stated yes, they are collected. Huddle sent them some stuff and

there are exit holes all over, up and down the stem from *Tamirixia* exiting from stuff in the field. They've collected stuff from the fields to take back and test. Polek stated they found it 150 feet from the release site, so it is moving. Batkin stated they are adapting well to Southern California. They already have data on the zone differentiations and will give us a read on how these strains differ from different temperature areas. They fully expect a strain differential between these three climate zones.

CPDPC Report

Susan McCarthy

McCarthy had nothing more to report other than what she has already reported on.

Chairman Report

Dan Galbraith

Chairman Galbraith stated he sent an email out to everyone about the question of recording details. That was based upon input he was receiving from several committee members. He thought it would be best to bring this to the full committee so we can give staff clear guidance on what it is we want to see; are we touching all of the bases that we should be touching on. If we are, are you getting the detail that you want out of it; if not, where can we improve it?

Galbraith started with this topic and stated that when he goes into a meeting and hears someone talking about things, they give great data, basically what is happening on a party-line type thing and where he picks up the best information is talking to them afterwards and they give him their intuitive feelings; what they really think about the whole thing. Galbraith stated he would like to hear a little more from whomever is talking about what they're seeing out there, what is their intuitive feel about it. Galbraith thinks that will help get a better grasp on things.

Galbraith stated Rabe mentioned he would like to see more financials regarding the CDFA trapping issues, along with results, concerns and update on Hacienda Heights trapping progress. Olsen stated Dave Peso's report is good and a lot is incorporated in it; but that would be a good report to have before this meeting. McCarthy stated that comes from USDA and they don't really have control over when that is generated. They (USDA) have all the data and they scrub it and what can be, is released. Olsen asked if we could talk to them and see if that is adjustable. McCarthy said we could ask,. Olsen stated he understood but stated they may not be sensitive to what the value of that report may have if the timing is adjusted.

Leavens stated a committee was appointed to the Stem and Leaf Mandarin Sub-Committee Report and everybody got busy and we didn't get some responses. Leavens asked Batkin if he would send out a query for the last two weeks of August and first week in September to see if we can put it together before the mandarins start hitting the road. Batkin stated it was already on his task list.

Severns stated he likes the "seat of the pants" feel to this thing, though he is satisfied by the transparency anytime he has asked something. One of the things to heed is not just the hard data, but trying to anticipate. He thinks this committee gets that whenever intuition is communicated to them.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p.m. The next meeting will be held at the CRB Conference Room in Visalia on Wednesday, August 1, 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 July 11, 2012.

Date

Ted A. Batkin, President